PRESSURES FOR CHANGE: A CASE STUDY OF CENTRE CITY REDEVELOPMENT IN CANTERBURY

Karen Angela Sieracki

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Urban Studies.

Urban & Regional Studies Unit
University of Kent at Canterbury
July 1983

D49117/84

F 102883

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the redevelopment of the city centre of Canterbury. The period covered starts in 1940, but the main focus is on the 1970s and two specific projects: the Marlowe and Rosemary Lane sites.

The analysis focuses on the link between the organisation of space and social processes, and examines the impact of the community (eg residents groups) and local government on the redevelopment process.

In order to develop a conceptual framework to study city centre redevelopment a review of pluralist, elitist, neo-elitist and Marxist approaches to community power is carried out. This leads to the concept of the context of local political decision making and the identification of four types of conflict underlying city centre redevelopment: (a) conflict over different uses of land - between commercial, access and residential uses, (b) conflict between the levels of government, (c) conflict between the local authority and the community and (d) conflict between the economic and political roles of the local authority as landowner and town planner.

The advantage of this approach is that it avoids a static structural analysis and focuses on the pressures for change. The four potential bases of conflict are seen as deriving from the contradictory forces underlying city centre redevelopment.

The findings of the study are as follows. Canterbury City Council was subject to external constraints in the form of financial and town planning powers possessed by higher levels of government. This had the effect of partly removing town planning issues from the local political arena, and prevented Canterbury City Council from being in sole control of the provision of new commercial developments, new car parks, and new roads. The internal decision making process of the Council was centred in a

clique consisting of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Council committees and senior officers. It was in this group that policy was formulated and decisions made. To a large extent local councillors were not accountable to the electorate due to the overwhelming majority of Conservative Councillors. As a result Canterbury Council excluded the articulation of many interests and this contributed to the dramatic rise in pressure group formation in the early 1970s.

The two major developments aroused differing levels of public opposition. The Marlowe shopping development was less controversial than the Rosemary Lane car park development for three major reasons. Firstly, the "management tactics" of the Council were more successful with regard to the Marlowe site in the containment of political opposition. Secondly, the cost of the Rosemary Lane development was to be borne by the Council whereas the cost of the Marlowe development was perceived as being borne by the developer (the hidden costs of the development such as infrastructure were not taken into account and they would be met by the Council). Finally, the Marlowe development was seen as not generating as severe negative externality effects as the Rosemary Lane development, eg congestion, pollution, noise, etc.

Canterbury City Council's policy can be seen as assisting commercial development and counteracting its negative externalities (eg increased traffic congestion, increased building and land rents, and pressure on the medieval infrastructure). It did this by the promotion of the Marlowe site commercial development, by building the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park at its own expense and by containing political opposition. In this way the overall effect of Canterbury Council's policy was to assist private profitability and socialize the costs of private development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In an endeavour such as this, it is difficult to mention all those who have helped me, so I hope I will do justice to everyone. My greatest thanks goes to my husband, Mr. C. Hards, for his unfailing support and understanding. Next, my thanks goes to my supervisor, Mr. C. G. Pickvance, for his dedication in reading, digesting, and discussing every idea I had as well as every word I typed. My great thanks also goes to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. Sieracki, as well as to my brother and sisters and their families in the States, who have continued to support and encourage me throughout my studies. My thanks goes out to my friends who have supported me in this endeavour: to Mrs. E. Hurren for her comforting and jovial presence on the train in the early hours of the morning, to Mrs. L. Honey for her interest and continued support, to Ms. N. Jarvis for her kind assistance, especially with regard to time and the use of a typewriter, and to the others who have expressed interest and encouragement over the years. Finally, my thanks goes to all those whose kind assistance made my research possible and to the people of Canterbury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER TWO - THE NATURE OF TOWN PLANNING 14

1. The Significance of Land 15
2. Evolution ot Town Planning Powers 18
3. Theoretical Conceptualisations of Town Planning . . .30
   A. Interventive 31
   B. Trend 32
   C. Reductioninst Marxist 33
   D. Discussion: The Contradictory Nature of Town Planning 34

CHAPTER THREE - THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT: THE LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT OF TOWN PLANNING . 39

1. Town and Country Planning Acts 41
2. Nature of the Statutory Powers of Town Planning . . .50
3. New Structures of Government 53
4. The Role of Town Planning Policy 54
5. The Types of Conflict and Its Effects 56

CHAPTER FOUR - TOWN PLANNING AS A BASE FOR THE EXPRESSION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS 58

1. Market Based Land Institutions 59
2. Nonmarket Based Land Institutions 70
   A. The subjective awareness and growing concern for amenity and conservation 72
   B. The increased interest and attention given to public participation in the Town and Country Planning Acts 75
3. Conflict and Its Implications 80

CHAPTER FIVE - THE CONTEXT OF LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING 81

SECTION I - CRITIQUE OF APPROACHES TO LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING 81

1. The Pluralist Approach 82
2. The Elitist Approach 91
3. The Neo-Elitist Approach 96
4. The Marxist Approach 105
   A. The Instrumentalist Perspective 107
   B. The Structuralist Perspective 108
5. Summary and Discussion 114

SECTION II - THE CONTEXT OF LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING 117

1. The Economic Base of the Locality 118
2. The Distribution of Legislative Powers and Financial Controls Between the Levels of Government.123
   A. Legislative Powers 124
   B. Financial Controls 130

3. The Degree of Control by the Local Electorate . . . 137
Local party organisation and its relation to the national party organisation 142
Local party organisation as a focus for aggregating interests in the community 143
Corporate management techniques of local government 147
4. The Context of Local Political Decision Making as a Source of Conflict 149

SECTION III - THE LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING PROCESS 150

1. The Economic Role of the Local Authority 150
2. The Political Role of the Local Authority 151
3. Conclusion 152

CHAPTER SIX - THE COMMERCIAL BASE OF CENTRAL CANTERBURY . 154

I. Canterbury as a Commercial and Administrative Centre 154
II. The Commercial Development of Canterbury from 1940 to 1967 159
III. The Commercial Development of Canterbury from 1967 to 1979 166
IV. Retention of the Medieval Infrastructure 172
1. Growth in Concern for the Medieval Environment. .172
2. Canterbury City Council's Conservation Policy . .174
V. Conclusion 176

CHAPTER SEVEN - THE GOVERNMENTAL CONTEXT 178

I. The Canterbury Development Plan 180
II. Conflict Over Money for Roads and Traffic Control . 186
III. The Multi-Storey Car Park at Gravel Walk 189
IV. The Kent Structure Plan 191
V. The Further Commercial Redevelopment of Canterbury .194
VI. Conclusion 198

CHAPTER EIGHT - THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL AND THE LOCAL ELECTORATE 200

I. The pre-1967 period: Low pressure group activity and general support for Council redevelopment policy in the centre of Canterbury 201
II. The post-1967 period: Growth in concern for the environment and the rise in pressure group activity.205

CHAPTER NINE - THE LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING PROCESS OF CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL: THE ROSEMARY LANE AND MARLOWE SITE DECISIONS 222

I. The Rosemary Lane Site 222
II. The Marlowe Site 251

III. Explaining the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe Site Decisions 267
1. Economic Constraints and Initiatives 267
2. Political Constraints and Initiatives 274
3. Conclusion 282

CHAPTER TEN - CONCLUSION 284

BIBLIOGRAPHY 289

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - MAPS OF CANTERBURY 324

Map I - General Map of Canterbury 324
Map II - Map Depicting Land Use in Canterbury 325
Map III - Map Depicting Land Ownership in Canterbury . .327

APPENDIX B - HISTORICAL DATA FOR CANTERBURY'S CONTEXT OF LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING 1940 to 1969 329

APPENDIX C - HISTORICAL DATA FOR CANTERBURY'S CONTEXT OF LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING 1970 to 1979 422

APPENDIX D - RESEARCH METHODS 590

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This thesis investigates the link between the organisation of space and social processes. The empirical phenomenon studied was centre city redevelopment in Canterbury. The thesis analyses the relationship between town planning, the local authority, and the community, and in particular, the conflicts arising.

Several different types of conflict can be identified. There is conflict over the different uses of land - between commercial uses, access uses, and residential uses. There is conflict between the levels of government because of the delegation of responsibilities and functions among the different levels of government. There is conflict between the local authority and the community because of the lack of control by the local electorate over the local authority. There is conflict between the economic and political roles of the local authority as landowner and town planner. These potential bases for conflict arise from the contradictory, structural forces that underlie city centre redevelopment.

The city is seen as evolving within a social, economic, and political context. It cannot be meaningfully analysed in isolation. The key theoretical question concerning city centre redevelopment in Canterbury is the nature of the relationship between the city and capitalist political economy, ie the link between the organisation of space and social processes.

In order to distinguish the approach taken here from previous work in this field, we will briefly outline the above approaches. A more detailed theoretical analysis will be carried out in Chapter five. It is important to bear in mind that at this stage we are applying a "broad brush" approach in looking at authors to exemplify major types of approach. The four paradigms outlined in the thesis serve as a means of identification and of understanding and individual writers do not necessarily exemplify all their features.

The pluralist approach asks itself the question- 'does anyone at all run the community?' (See Agger, Goldrich, Swanson 1968b, Anton 1968, Anton 1970, Banfield 1961, Baur 1968b, Connolly 1969a, Dahl 1968, Dahl 1969a, Dahl 1969b, Duverger 1972, Eisenger 1972, Grieger 1974, Gyford 1976, Hahn 1972a, Hawley and Wirt 1968, McFarland 1969, Polsby 1963, Polsby 1969, Sayre and Kaufman 1968, Simon 1968, Wildavsky 1968, Zisk 1974.) The pluralist conception of power stress individuual relations and concrete, observable behaviour. Interest groups are those groups that are formally organised around specific issues. Local government is seen as a neutral arbitrator among interest groups. There are no cumulative effects arising from the local political decision making process because power, resources, and interest groups shift according to different issues.

In the pluralist approach, the community is perceived as a discrete, autonomous unit that has no constraints operating on it. There is no discussion of the relationship between national and local factors and how they impinge upon the community.

The pluralist approach investigates who makes the decisions and how these decisions are made; but it does not explain why particular decisions are chosen for investigation. These resulting generalisations provide us with knowledge as to what happened, but fail to offer an adequate explanation of how and why it occurred.

The elitist approach is the second one found in the community power studies literature. (See Aiken and Mott 1970, Bensmen and Vidich 1968, Clark 1972, Clelland and Form 1968, Connolly 1969a, Crain, Katz and Rosenthal 1969, Giddens 1974, Hawley and Wirt 1968, Hewitt 1975, Hunter 1968, Merelman 1968, Miller 1958a, Miller 1959b, Miller 1974, Stanworth and Giddens 1974, Thoenes 1966.) It asks the question - 'who runs the community?' This question contains the a priori assumption that such a group exists. Issues are used to illustrate the exercise of power and its effects on groups. Power is seen as derived from hierarchical position in the institutional structure of government and business.

There are two main types of groups found in the elitist approach - the elites and the nonelites. The elites are those individuals who occupy high institutional position. The nonelites possess a subordinate role because of their lack of high institutional position. The effects of power relations are cumulative. The elite group is in a more advantageous position and the analysis of issues shows how it maintains and strengthens this position at the expense of the nonelite group.

The elitist approach tries to determine who are the leaders of community by asking key informants (who are supposed to be "in the know"). This method, the reputational method, assumes informants know what is happening, but cannot validate this assumption. It conceives of power as overtly exercised.

This approach investigates individuals and their institutional position. However it does try to analyse certain structural relations, ie the institutions of government and business. But these are defined in a limited manner because they are not linked to wider social, economic and political factors.

The neo-elitist approach is the third one found in the community power studies literature. (See Bachrach and Baratz 1962, Bachrach and Baratz 1963, Bachrach and Baratz 1970, Baine 1975, Crenson 1971, Dearlove 1973, Debnam 1975, Dennis 1970, Dennis 1972, Dennis 1974, Donnison 1973a, Donnison 1973b, Eversley 1973a, Green 1968, Lipsky 1970, Lowi 1969, Muchnick 1970, Newton 1969a, Newton 1969b, Newton 1974, Newton 1975, Newton 1976, Pahl and Winkler 1974, Presthus 1968, Saunders 1975, Saunders 1979b.) It maintains there are two levels of power - the overt and covert levels. The overt level of power refers to observable phenomena. The covert level of power refers to the structure and operation of local government institutions and the way they place constraints on pressure groups seeking to articulate their interests in the local political decision making process. This phenomenon is termed the "mobilisation of bias". Its effect is to reinforce social and political values of the institutional structure.

The main effect of the "mobilisation of bias" is to restrict the emergence of interests and issues around which pressure groups form. The approach identifies two types of issue. Firstly, there are those that occur in the local political decision making process. These issues are considered to be relatively unimportant because they do not threaten the elite group. Secondly, there are the nondecisions and nonissues. They are considered to be the important ones to analyse because they illustrate the filtering effect of the "mobilisation of bias". The "mobilisation of bias" prevents potentially threatening issues from being articulated on an overt level in the local political decision making process.

The neo-elitist approach tries to determine who occupies what place in the local economic and political institutions. Institutional position is equated with the exercise of power.

The neo-elitist approach can be seen as the first explicit attempt in the literature (through its concept of the "mobilisation of bias") to analyse structural forces that help to determine the workings and outcomes of the local political decision making process. However, this attempt to analyse structural forces is limited in scope to the institution of local government because it does not take into account the context within which this institution operates.

The Marxist approach is the last one to have been applied in the community power studies literature. (See Alford 1975, Balbus 1971, Bridges 1974, Castells 1977a, Castells 1977b, Castells 1978, Clark 1977, Cockburn 1977, Fischer 1978, Georing 1978, Girardin 1974, Gold, Lo, Wright 1976, Harlowe 1977a, Harvey 1975, Harvey 1976, Harvey 1978, Hayes 1972, Holloway and Picciotto 1978a, Lamarche 1976, Lebas 1977, Lindberg, Alford, Crouch, Offe 1975, Lojkine 1976, Lojkine 1977, Massey 1977a, Massey and Catalano 1978, Miliband 1969, Miliband 1973, Miliband 1977, Mingione 1977, Mollenkopf 1975a, Offe 1975, Offe 1976, Offe and Volker 1975, Pickvance 1976a, Pickvance 1976b, Pickvance 1977a, Pickvance 1977b, Pickvance 1978a, Pickvance 1978b, Poulantzas 1972, Poulantzas 1973, Poulantzas 1975, Preteceille 1976, Roweis 1975, Szelenyi 1978, Westergaard and Resler 1975, Wolfe 1974, Wright 1976, Wright 1978.) Power is related to the operation of the capitalist mode of production in society. Power is class power and social classes are derived from the institution of private property and their relationship to the mode of production. There are two main social classes - the bourgeoise and the proletariat. The most important issues are those that involve the struggle between capital and labour.

Since the importance of the state has grown immensely from the time Marx was writing, most theoretical writing on it is recent. Broadly speaking it identifies two main roles for the state. The first role is to ensure capitalist domination. The second role is to ensure the cohesion of the social formation.

The Marxist approach gives us a theoretical framework for analysing the potential bases for conflict and stresses the class basis of conflict in particular. However, this framework needs to be refined when it is applied to a particular empirical situation. The Marxist approach is structural in that it tries to link urban based conflicts with work based conflicts and contradictions within society as a whole.

The approach used in my research on centre city redevelopment in Canterbury is basically structuralist. In particular, I have sought to overcome what I shall define later as the two major difficulties found in the Marxist approach - the static nature of structural analysis and the loose relationship between the theoretical framework and the empirical phenomenon.

The framework used to analyse the relationship between the organisation of space and social processes is structural. It allows for an explanation of how conflict occurs over centre city redevelopment and its effects. In contrast to traditional structural analysis it seeks to overcome this static nature by uncovering the underlying dynamic - the pressures for change.

The concepts I shall introduce are the context for local political decision making and the economic and political roles of the local authority. The concept of the context for local political decision making is intended to serve as a middle range concept to help elucidate the pressures for change. This concept refers to the contradictory, structural forces which constrain the action of the local authority and which create potential bases for conflict with respect to city centre redevelopment. Three such bases of conflict will be identified: conflict over the use of land, conflict between the levels of government, and conflict between the local authority and the local electorate.

Conflict is one visible and tangible form of a contradictory relationship. Although conflict is an empirical referent of a contradictory relationship, this does not mean that conflict and contradiction are one and the same thing. Conflict is one form that a contradictory relationship can take, but not all contradictory relationships generate overt conflict.

The particular case of centre city redevelopment is concerned with the theorisation of the relationship between the economic and political. My conceptualisation of the economic and political roles of the local authority is intended to give insight into economic interests and activities and the local political decision making process. The local authority's involvement via town planning politicises city centre redevelopment. The political sphere encompasses inherent value judgements about societal goals, values and progress. It allocates values within society. The local political decision making process is the way in which the capital accumulation process becomes politicised. Centre city redevelopment entails the involvement of public and private sectors.

The conceptualisation put forward here of the contradictory nature of town planning is related to this. In the literature, common caricatures of town planning are found. Town planning is seen by some as reinforcing market forces. On the other hand, town planning is seen by others as overcoming market forces. The contradictory nature of town planning does attempt to restructure market conditions, while at the same time, to alleviate the social effects of urbanisation. Town planning is linked to the structure of the economy, the structure of society, and the changing role of the state.

The conceptual framework is developed fully in Chapter five but it may be useful here to indicate the argument that will be presented there.

The concept of the context of local political decision making draws attention to three constraints on local authority action: the local economy, the authority's relations with other levels of government, and its relations with the local electorate. Each of these contraints is simultaneously a source of conflicts. In this way, our approach is structural, and emphasises the forces (ie arising out of the conflicts) which lead to changes in this structure.

These can be illustrated one by one. Firstly, the local economy consists of production, consumption and circulation activities. These compete for the use of land such that the central locations of cities are more amenable to commercial activities (circulation sphere). If this is so, one can argue there is a threshold limit to the advantages of central locations for commercial activities. Beyond this limit, they become disadvantages because of the cumulative nature of negative externality effects. It draws attention to the dynamic character of the impact of economic activities on space: the local economy is a source of conflicts over land use, and these conflicts lead to restructuring of the local economy.

Secondly, local authorities are constrained by higher levels of government, due to the distribution of town planning and financial powers between the different levels of government. This gives rise to conflicts between levels of government which can have several important effects. Firstly, it can constrain the local authority's (lower tier's) actions. Secondly, it can affect the kinds of externality effects that are generated by activities in the central area, thereby having an impact on future centre city redevelopment. Thirdly, it can remove town planning issues from the local political arena. Finally, it can reinforce the ineffectiveness of voting as a political resource available to the electorate.

Finally, the local authority is constrained by the local electorate and this relation is one of conflict. The local electorate may influence the local authority by voting, and by the formation of third party pressure groups. If this is so, one can argue the importance of pressure groups is a function of the ineffectiveness of the local electoral process as perceived by the local electorate as well as being due to the degree of central government control of local government. Again, one can see how conflict can lead to a reorganisation of the local political situation in which the authority acts.

These three bases for conflict can have a cumulative, constraining effect on the local authority. But they can also generate a new potential base for conflict - between the economic and political roles of the local authority. The authority has both to provide certain basic services required by the local economy, and maintain political order by providing an arena for political participation among other things. One can argue that these economic and political roles are themselves in conflict since in some cases they require initially contradictory actions. On the whole we shall suggest that in the field of city centre redevelopment this conflict is resolved a) in favour of the profitability of commercial capital and the socialisation of costs such as traffic congestion and car parking, and b) by insulating the decision making process from the electorate.

Having indicated the major ideas guiding the research reported in this thesis, it is necessary to say something about the nature of a study of a single town and about the methods used. The study carried out here is restricted to one town and it must be asked to what extent such a case study can throw light on the hypotheses stated above. Two problems with the case study methodology are identified by Saunders (Saunders 1979:7). The first problem is how the conclusions drawn can be generalised to other towns. The second problem concerns the relationship of the theoretical and empirical realms.

I would argue that these criticisms do not apply to the case study above. The significance of the first problem depends upon the theoretical framework used. The conclusions of a study refer to specific features of the town (eg the particular developments in the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites) and in purely descriptive studies there is no basis for extending these conclusions. However when the conclusions seek to explain the specific features by appealing to more general concepts (eg conflict between a local authority's economic and political roles, predominance of negative externalities at a certain level of concentration of commercial activities, socialisation of costs), the theoretical framework used raises the possibility of generalisation. The answer to this problem however depends on an evaluation of the generality and particularity of the features of each case.

The second point concerning the relationship of the theoretical and empirical realms is always a problematic one. At one extreme, the two realms are collapsed and the result is pure description. At the other extreme, the theory is so divorced from its empirical referent so that it 'floats away' from the empirical phenomena it tries to explain. All that can be said is that we have been aware

of the problem and have made a conscious attempt to avoid either of these two dangers.

In conclusion, I will mention the main sources of information in this study.(Appendix D.) A variety of methods were used. Firstly, many documents were consulted such as: Canterbury City Council's (CCC) financial accounts, CCC minutes of Council committee meetings and full Council meetings, CCC papers (some were confidential), CCC reports (published and unpublished ones),CCC letters (some were confidential), Kent County Council (KCC) financial accounts, KCC minutes of committee and full Council meetings, KCC reports (published and unpublished ones), KCC letters (some were confidential), central government documents and reports, Acts of Parliament, Department of Environment (DoE) circulars, DoE letters (some were confidential), DoE reports, Kentish Gazette and Kent Messenger from 1940 to 1979, Municipal Yearbook and other minor sources. The main gaps were detailed financial information on the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites and local election results.

Secondly, interviews were conducted with some forty people. Among those interviewed were past and present councillors of Canterbury City Council and Kent County Council, DoE officers, amenity society leaders and members, local businessmen, and residents.

Finally, I engaged in participant observation as secretary to the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from September 1977 to August 1979. My duties involved: attending meetings, taking minutes, typing up minutes agendas, correspondence, reports, filing, distribution of all relevant materials to members, administrative duties, following up enquiries, obtaining information on certain issues, and liaising with the press, members of the CCAC, councillors, officers, amenity societies, businessmen, and residents.

The thesis is organised in the following way.

Chapter two discusses the contradictory nature of town planning and how it is linked to the potential base for conflict between the economic and political roles of the local authority. Chapter three investigates the institutional context of town planning. It discusses the statutory base of town planning and its operational procedures. It analyses the structural forces that can generate a potential base for conflict between the levels of government. Chapter four discusses town planning as a base for the expression of conflicting interests. It shows how town planning embraces a wide scope of interests, therefore, allowing for the possibility of the formation of third party pressure groups.

Chapter five discusses the theoretical concept of the context for local political decision making. This concept was developed out of a critique of the elitist, neo-elitist, pluralist, and Marxist approaches to community power studies. It analyses the structural forces that can generate three potential bases for conflict: conflict over the use of land; conflict between the levels of government; and conflict between the local authority and the local electorate. Chapter five also analyses local political decision making. It discusses how the context for local political decision making affects the decisions that are made by the local authority and how it generates the potential for a new base of conflict between the economic and political roles of the local authority. Chapter five provides the theoretical framework for the following three Chapters which discuss centre city redevelopment in Canterbury.

Chapter six investigates the economic character of Canterbury between 1940 and 1979. It looks at commercial expansion in Canterbury since the Second World War by focusing on centre city redevelopment. (Appendices B and C.) However, this rise in commercial activity has not been without its problems as set out in the chapter: There was conflict over the use of land and the impact on the medieval infrastructure, and over traffic congestion and access problems.

Chapter seven analyses the government context over the same period in which the City Council operated with regard to its plans for centre city redevelopment. This local and central government structure placed constraints on the City Council's freedom to direct commercial development in Canterbury.

Chapter eight investigates the relationship between the City Council and the local electorate and the impact this had on city centre redevelopment from 1940 to 1979. It discusses the political context in which the City Council operated and in particular, the reasons that lay behind the mushrooming of pressure group activity in the early 1970s.

Chapter nine focuses on the City Council's redevelopment proposals for the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites. It does so with reference to the context outlined in the previous three chapters. It looks at how this context set certain constraints on the City Council and what scope for action the City Council had in initiating its redevelopment proposals. The economic and political roles of the City Council help us to analyse the City Council as actor in this discussion.

Chapter ten is the conclusion and looks back over the thesis to see to what extent it has achieved the aims set out here.

C H A P T E R T W O

THE NATURE OF TOWN PLANNING

This Chapter elucidates the contradictory and structural forces that help to provide the framework for conflict within the local authority itself - between its economic and political roles. Conflict within the local authority is generated by this framework coupled with the cumulative effect of the structural forces that underpin the context of local political decision making: those that generate the potential bases for conflict over the use of land, between the levels of government, and between the local authority and the local electorate.

Land is significant because it provides the material base for production, circulation, and consumption activities. Land has a pervasive function that helps to give rise to conflict over its competing uses such as production, circulation, and consumption activities. Centre city redevelopment is one type of private sector development which is dependent upon the local authority in various ways, of which town planning is one. The different types of involvement of public and private interests will be discussed later in the Chapter. Town planning is an institutionalised process that tries to resolve land based conflict.

The Chapter is divided into three sections:

1. Significance of Land
2. Evolution of Town Planning Powers
3. Theoretical Conceptualisations of Town Planning
    - A. Trend Town Planning
    - B. Interventive Town Planning
    - C. Reductionist Marxist Model of Town Planning
    - D. Discussion: The Contradictory Nature of Town Planning

1. The Significance of Land

Land is the medium through which the activities of production, circulation, and consumption are spatially organised. They are mutually interdependent activities and therefore compete for the use of land. This competition provides the basis for conflicting interests over the importance and use of land. Assessing the relative importance of land is an inherent political activity in the decision making process. Town planning tries to resolve these conflicts, but I shall argue that in the process of doing so, it creates the potential for a new type of conflict - ie between the economic and political roles of the local authority. Therefore, land based conflicts are indicative of wider social, economic, and political forces.

The activities of production, circulation, and consumption are the users of land. What helps to determine the final use of land is the outcome of these competing claims which become articulated through the development process. The development process consists of a set of relations structured around the users of land. This set of relations is composed of the interaction of land based market institutions, the nonmarket based land institutions and groups, the users of land, and the town planning process. It is the interaction of these four elements that help to determine how land and its use is allocated. Land is a commodity within the wider context of social, political, and economic forces.

On the one hand, land is a basis for individual profit and on the other hand, it is the source of collective irrationalities and costs. The land based market institutions favour a collective interest in land to minimise the impact on them of the negative externality effects that can be generated from the use of land. Thus I am arguing that collective intervention(eg town planning) is not ipse facto against the interests of these institutions. The land based

market institutions, their functions, and the types of pressures they exert upon the development process are listed below:

1. estate agents whose function is to bridge the gap between the buyer and seller through the provision of information and social contacts.
2. financial institutions whose function is to bridge the gap between the buyer and seller through the provision of capital.
3. land developers whose interests lie in the translation of the current use value of land to potential value of land.
4. construction industry whose interests lie in the actual physical provision of the built environment.
5. other professional interests such as architects, surveyors, engineers, etc who help to actualise the demand for the use of land into built form.
6. landowners who have a legal set of rights in land that can be sold or worked in conjunction with the developer and in respect of which rent may be charged to the tenants.

The above is an outline of the market based land institutions involved in the development process. (For more detail see Chapter four.) These market based land institutions benefit from town planning as an institution to regulate the negative externality effects generated by the cumulative use of land for various activities and to reduce uncertainties because of the collectively irrational character of the private land market.

For the market based land institutions, land is an object of private speculation that has collective consequences mainly in the form of externality effects. It is important to note the collectively irrational character of land allocation by the market mechanism and the conflicts between the different types of land development.

This may take the form of incompatible uses of adjacent plots of land. The nature of these collective irrationalities changes as land development strategies change. The market based land institutions favour intervention in the collective interest because it is only the government that has the power to intervene in this way to cope with the costs of individual decisions and with political backlash. Town planning attempts to restructure market conditions through controlling these obstacles partly as a response to the needs of capital.

Also involved in the town planning process are nonmarket based land institutions and groups who are and will be affected by the allocation of land and its use, but who are not directly involved in the development process as are the market based land institutions. They, too, want town planning as an institution to regulate externality effects and uncertainties, although not for the needs of capital, but to improve the environmental quality through the control of the social conditions of urbanisation.

The strategy taken by these groups which are usually locally based and indirectly affected by the various users of land (in that they are not the actual users of land, but are affected by the externality effects generated by its users) mainly concentrate on influencing the institutional local political decision making process within which market forces interact with respect to land and its use. (These groups can also be termed 'third party pressure groups'. (For more detail, see Chapter four.) Third party pressure groups, due to their nature, cannot influence the market directly as opposed to the market based land institutions that can. Therefore, they are limited to this type of strategy.

The institutional framework of town planning is subject to the pressures resulting from the interplay of local class forces, national class forces, market based land institutions, and the potential users of land. The local authority as town planner can have the effect of either politicising issues or buffering the private land based market institutions. Politicisation of issues occurs if the "management tactics" of the local authority fail. Local authority involvement in development has the potential effect of politicising this process as seen in the case of centre city redevelopment in Canterbury. The constraints operating upon the local authority will be discussed in the context of local political decision making in Chapter five.

2. Evolution of Town Planning Powers

This section investigates the evolution of town planning powers and looks at how they correspond to the changes in the relative power of the interests that supported them. It also analyses the role of commercial interests and their success in Britain in the support of town centre shopping.

The post-war town planning system was shaped by four famous reports. The Barlow, Scott, Uthwatt, and Reith Reports (HMSO 1940, 1942a, 1942b, 1946) provide an insight into the nature of town planning and the evolution of its powers. The Barlow Commission was set up to look into the causes that influenced the geographical distribution of industry and the industrial population in Great Britain in the 1930's (HMSO 1940:1). This Report was seminal in its conceptualisation of the "problems" thought to be caused by urban growth. The Report highlighted the social problems of haphazard and ill-regulated growth, eg slums, sickness, stunted population and human misery (HMSO 1940:8). The Report concluded that urban growth was concentrated in certain areas at the expense of other areas.

Regional imbalance and economic decline was thought to be another effect of urban growth. During the inter-war period (1919 to 1939) changes had occurred in Great Britain's industrial structure (Cherry 1974a: 80): There was a decline in the clothing, textile, agricultural, and personal services industries; there was an increase in the electrical appliance industry, entertainment services, and the vehicle construction and building industries; and there was a depression in the extractive, heavy engineering and shopbuilding industries.

The Report recommended that industry should be decentralised for strategic, economic, and social reasons. It said congestion within city centres would be relieved, thus making the communication-transport network more efficient. The Report also recommended that a town planning system should be found at the national level because the "problem" (eg urban growth) occurrred at this level. The Report also called for the need for national guidance in this area. It maintained if a town was well planned, then the disadvantages of urban growth would not occur. The assumption underlying the Report's justification for town planning was the following: If a national system existed, then the problem of urban growth would disappear because town planning would have taken over market forces.

The Scott Report (HMSO 1942a) followed along the lines of its predecessor, the Barlow Report,by stating that urban growth had impinged upon the countryside by using good agricultural land for development. Agricultural land was thought to be of the utmost importance for the well-being of the nation. The Report noted the attraction of agricultural workers to the cities for jobs and attributed this to the disparity between rural and urban wages. It was also concerned about the loss of rural amenities and it stressed the dichotomy of town and country. The Report had a veryromantic and Rousseauian style, for example:

> "We have become convinced, if we were not before, that there is an innate love of nature deeply implanted in the heart of man and that the 'drift from the land' has been occasioned in large measure by economic inequalities between town and country rather than by any deep love of supposed urban joys. We are unable to subscribe in any way the view that the countryside man is inferior to the townsman".
>
> (HMSO 1942a:v)

Thus, the Report recommended that the uncontrollable and anarchic forces of development should be constrained through the institution of a town planning system. The Report felt this would remedy the unsatisfactory characteristics of inter-war town planning. They were:

1. the lack of local authority powers to prevent development
2. the weakness of the local authority in not being forceful enough to enforce its plans in opposition to the strong interests of market based land institutions
3. the lack of government machinery to consider these national problems
4. town planning should be concerned with all types of land use, especially agriculture.

The Uthwatt Report (HMSO 1942b) investigated the problem of compensation and betterment levies in relation to the private sector (assuming that the government had the statutory jurisdiction over the development rights of land). The control over the development rights of land was perceived to be the main way to control urban growth and the problems it produced. The Report assumed the need for a town planning system whose main objective would be to control and channel urban growth on social, political, and economic grounds. The Report maintained that a national town planning system was needed to secure the best utilisation of land use and to resolve the competing claims for the use of land. Town planning, the Report stated, did not diminish the total

sum of land values but redistributed them through increasing the value of some pieces of land and decreasing others (HMSO 1942b: 14).

The Report anticipated that the problem of compensation and betterment would arise in the interim period before total government ownership of land would occur in conjunction with the government jurisdiction over the development rights of land. The Uthwatt Report took the Barlow Report one step further by recommending the total public ownership of land as a means for controlling anarchic urban growth. This would enable urban growth to be contained and modified. Therefore, the Report believed, this control would eradicate the problems of urban growth.

The Reith Report (HMSO 1946) also took the ideas of the Barlow Report one step further by trying to deal with the problem of congestion that was created by uncontrolled urban growth. The answer to this problem was the creation of new towns. The Report maintained that new towns would:

1. decentralise the existing concentration of industry and the industrial population
2. correct regional imbalance
3. preserve the countryside.

The Report recommended that communities should be self-contained - ie individuals should live and work in the same area. This would reduce the journeys to work and the magnitude of congestion problems. The Report also recommended that the communities should be balanced in their social composition and structure. It advocated (as in the three previous Reports) the establishment of a national town planning system that would have the authority to deal with the "problems" of urban growth in conjunction with the local town planning authority.

What do the Reports tell us about the nature of town planning? The following six characteristics emerge. Firstly, the Reports possessed a physical orientation to the "problems" of urban growth and their physical solutions. This was due to their theoretical premise of physical determinism. The Reports naively believed that if one changed the physical environment then the social and economic conditions would automatically change for the better. Therefore, the Reports possessed a theoretical approach of physical determinism to urban problems which were, by their nature, multi-faceted.

Town planning was concerned with the containment of urban growth, the conservation of the countryside, the creation of new towns, and the enforcement of a green belt (Hall 1973b:42-64). These objectives of town planning were related to the value system of society at that time (which defines what is "good" and"beneficial"). This then became articulated through the political decision making process in the claim for government intervention.

The emphasis on physical solutions to the "problems" of urban growth was also because of the impact of the involvement of the design professions in town planning. The objectives of town planning were interpreted and guided by the town planning profession that was monitored in the last instance through democratic, accountable procedures. There was a great deal of freedom in the day-to-day administration of town planning. Town planners were expected to resolve conflicts of interests, ie to play an umpire role. The role the town planning profession played was an elitist one because it interpreted the values of society and then tried to actualise them in town planning (Hall 1973b: 373).

Secondly, the Reports agreed that market forces would not provide an adequate social and economic environment. This implied a value consensus as to what a good environment was such as amenities, open space, preservation of the countryside, and controlled development. The Reports considered that government intervention was necessary to "cure" the dysfunctions of market forces. The Reports expressed a dissatisfaction with the operation of the market in two main areas:

1. the securing of social stability
2. the securing of economic stability.

These goals could be accomplished through the implementation of a town planning system that would control market forces. Town planning (as one facet of state intervention) was conceived to be in opposition to market forces and the long term goal was to make them redundant.(HMSO 1940, 1942a, 1942b, 1946). This perceived relationship of market forces and town planning favoured nonmarket based land institutions (with particular reference to third party pressure groups) in trying to gain some control over the urban environment because the government was potentially easier to influence than market based land institutions.

Thirdly, the mode of state intervention that was decided upon was the town planning process. Town planning was perceived to have the ability to control the forces of development, ie to rationalise them to ensure the provision of a "good" urban environment and to prevent incompatible land uses. Town planning, it was thought, would control and guide the pace and direction of social and economic changes. Town planning was perceived to be the way through which the externality effects of land development could be controlled. The rationalisation of anarchic development and market forces would be to the benefit of market based land institutions as well as the collectivity.

The Reports thought town planning would channel the positive externality effects to the benefit of the community and nation and thus mitigate the impact of the negative externality effects. However, the price mechanism only represents part of the costs of land use and development. The remainder of these costs is usually in the form of collectively higher costs to the public at large. Town planning sought to control the externality effects of land use and development that could be felt through various ways other than price. This position on the collective effects of land use and development was particularly relevant to third party based pressure groups because it provided a coherent base for the expression of their interests. Since town planning is a rational activity, it would have objectives and an administrative process that would form the organisational base to attain its goals. Town planning was designed to be a redistributive activity.

Fourthly, town planning was perceived by the Reports to be a response to already perceived dysfunctions in society and to cope with future anticipated problems. Town planning was an ex-post facto attempt at a solution. What the Reports did not discuss was the idea that although town planning was to be a future oriented activity, it was constrained by past and present decisions.

Fifthly, the Reports thought a national system of town planning was needed if the objective (to control market forces) was going to be achieved. The Reports maintained that a national system of town planning control would centralise its decision making and make its policies coherent. Town planning would still be defined as a local government responsibility but it would depend upon central government policy. This favoured the interests of the administrators and the bureaucrats at both national and local levels. Staff levels would have to be increased to administer the expanded role of town planning. The

1947 town planning system was designed along those lines.

Sixthly, the premise that underlay the basis for town planning was the following: The private market was insufficient in allocating land for different uses whether they be socially or economically based. In the nineteenth century (the era of laissez-faire capitalism) it was felt that the market could fulfill social and economic goals. Thus, there was no perceived need for state intervention. However, during the later part of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century, various physical characteristics of urbanisation threatened social stability and the conditions for capital accumulation. They were:

1. the chaotic sprawl of cities
2. the deterioration of the countryside through the encroachment of urban growth upon agricultural land and labour
3. congestion.

Town planning was seen to have an interventionist basis because it was perceived in opposition to market forces. These forces would eventually be superceded by town planning's redistributive aims. Interventive town planning was popular in 1945 to 1947.

Finally, the Reports were enmeshed in their own historical context of the post-war climate of investment, expansion, and growth. This context helped to determine the predominant interests and the understanding of what was feasible. (This is different from today when town planning is operating in a very limited or no growth context.)

The inability of market forces to produce certain economic and social goals implied a value judgement as to what those goals were and their relative worth. The question here is what interests support these different "values"?

The implications of such responses to social and economic goals could be potentially conflicting depending upon their implementation and the values that underlie them. These different sets of "values" were articulated through the political process because town planning is a mode of state intervention.

Problems of urban growth such as slums, unsanitary conditions and congestion had been defined as "problems" before the publication of the Reports. The Industrial Revolution brought with it a growing complexity between human activities and their spatial location and interaction. Inequality in housing, income, and the environment became more apparent and visible in the nineteenth century as more people were concentrated into cities.

Hall and Cherry (Hall 1973a and Cherry 1974a) give quite a concise history of the intellectual and social basis for defining the problems of urban growth. Various conservation and amenity groups were formed in the late 1800's and early 1900's which had the effect of defining and drawing attention to the environment. For example, the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) drew attention in the 1920's to the problem of rural land use and development. Therefore, town planning was partly designed as a response to such unacceptable social conditions.

On the other hand, the problems of urban growth constrained the productive forces of capital. The increasing separation of the work place and the place of residence put more emphasis on the transport and communication networks. Congestion in urban centres contributed to additional costs in time and labour. Regional depression and imbalance became recognised as a problem in the 1930's.

Town planning was designed in part, as a response to these market irrationalities. It was seen as improving the efficiency of the economy (in this case efficiency can be equated with profit) and the distribution of resources. Town planning, in its attempt to restructure market conditions, maintained and created new conditions for capital accumulation by its attempt to control the use of land.

The machinery of local government was a significant factor in the development of town planning. In the late 1800's, ad hoc government authorities were replaced by popularly elected, multi-faceted authorities that were responsible for a range of services and facilities (Cherry 1974a: 34). County councils became instituted in 1888 (Local Government Act 1888), county boroughs in 1888 (Local Governemnt Act 1888), municipal boroughs in 1835 (Municipal Corporation Act 1835), and district councils in 1894. Central government intervention dramatically increased by the turn of the century. The undertaking of town plans, as defined by the statutes, became a responsibility of the councils of county boroughs and urban and rural district councils (1909 Town and Country Planning Act). County councils were only called in to undertake the making of town plans if these councils felt unable to carry out this duty. This duty was subject to the discretion of the Minister. (It must be remembered that the making of town plans was not obligatory until the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act.) By the turn of the century, local government had become a more cohesive, recognisable unit. It was accountable to the public in the making of town plans. Therefore, the idea of public and municipal control was widely established and accepted.

The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act helped to create a more specific machinery for town planning through

the institution of new units of town planning administration at local and central levels with particular emphasis on the central, national level. The central control of town planning was considered to be the key to land use planning. This control was modified in the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act in its new approaches to town plan preparation at county and local levels and the incorporation of public participation in the town planning process. The different levels of government thus provided the institutional framework within which town planning was implemented.

The growth of town planning as a profession and the growth of the town planning associations helped to give some impetus and legitimacy to the town planning interests. The development of the town planning profession began in the nineteenth century with the Garden City movement of Ebenezer Howard and the formation of professional bodies such as: the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1834, the Institute of Civil Engineers in 1818, and the Surveyors Institution in 1868, to name a few (Cherry 1974a: 40-44). Architects were the first professional body to consider town planning. The Town Planning Institute was formed in 1913 to "advance the study of town planning and civic design, to promote the artistic and scientific development of towns and cities, and to serve the association of those engaged on or interested in the practice of town planning" (Cherry 1974a:58). No one profession was permitted to dominate the Royal Town Planning Institute. However, it was mainly composed of the design professions. This had two main implications:

1. Town planning became heavily influenced by the design professions which emphasised physical change in the environment as an answer to solving social problems. This was done at the expense of other interests involved in town planning.

2. The design professions were able to exert political pressure on the levels of government to create opportunities for work by forming into a professional body concerned with town planning alone. By the inter-war period (1919 to 1939) there was an increasing number of posts in local government for full-time town planners.

Since the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, the scope of town planning has increased due to social, economic, political, and technological developments such as: the increase in car ownership and the subsequent generation of more traffic; this led to transportation planning that involved the use of land as part of the communications network. Other developments included regional development and regional planning that originated from regional based economic problems; town planning that was concerned with the total environment; and social planning that concentrated on the needs of deprived areas and community development. The influence of a wide range of disciplines and viewpoints was reflected in this increased scope of town planning.

Since World War II, there has been a gradual shift away from the 1940's view that town planning could control market forces. This was due to two significant reasons: Firstly, town planning (because of its contradictory nature) provided a base for the expression of conflicting interests - those of the market based land institutions, administration and bureaucratic interests, professional interests, and the interests of nonmarket based land institutions and groups. Therefore, the ability of town planning to control market forces was constrained by the articulation of these conflicting interests.

Secondly, town planning was based on an erroneous conceptualisation of its relation to market forces, ie

what town planning could or could not do in relation to them. As we have seen earlier in this section, the advent and institutionalisation of town planning as a process was characterised by town planning as attempting to over-ride market forces to provide a "good" urban environment - ie to provide what the market had failed to do. As I will argue in the next section, this theoretical conceptualisation of town planning produced unattainable goals because of the contextual constraints that operated upon town planning.

One result of the intellectual and practical dissatisfaction and disillusion with town planning as a means of controlling market forces was the general emergence of the view that town planning could reinforce the working of market forces, and that it was negatively based and limited in what it could actually achieve. This caricature of town planning was also based on a faulty conceptualisation of town planning that will be discussed in the next section.

3. Theoretical Conceptualisations of Town Planning

In the preceding section on the evolution of town planning powers, it became evident that there were several different types of theoretical conceptualisations of town planning. They underpinned ideas about what town planning could or could not do. I would like to categorise these positions as follows:

A. interventive conceptualisation of town planning
B. trend conceptualisation of town planning
C. reductionist Marxist conceptualisation of town planning
D. contradictory nature of town planning.

The most important point underlying these conceptualisations of town planning is how each position analyses the relationship of town planning to market forces.

A. Interventive

The interventive conceptualisation of town planning analyses the relationship of town planning to market forces in this way: Town planning is seen to be able to over-ride and control market forces. The 1947 town planning system was perceived to intervene with market forces to provide a "good" urban environment. It is thought that the market produced the "problems" of urban growth. Therefore, it was felt that state intervention was needed to replace market forces. The interventive nature of town planning was based on the assumption that laissez-faire capitalism was not working according to the principles of social, political, and economic justice. Town planning was seen to be a necessary activity to overcome market forces when they failed to produce an efficient and desirable solution for the "problems" of urban growth. Town planning was seen as a tool to rationalise and control market forces, eventually eliminating them.

State intervention was thought to be needed to secure social and economic goals (it was believed) that would not come about solely by the operation of the market. (See Cantanese 1974, Cherry 1974b, Cowan 1973, Cullingworth 1973, Davies 1972, Donnison and Eversley 1973, Friend 1976, Gladstone 1976, Hall 1973a, Hall 1973b, Hall 1976, Heap 1975, Lambert and Weir 1975, Law 1976, McLoughlin 1973a.) It was believed that the intervention of the state, in the form of town planning, occurred to solve the "problems" of urban growth. Instead of solving these "problems", it had created others in the town planning process such as conflict between the different levels of government and conflict in the implementation of public participation in town planning. Therefore, the main impetus of interventive town planning was to change the criterion of land allocation and use from being only market based to socially and environmentally based.

The major types of interests that supported the concept of interventive town planning were the nonmarket based land institutions and groups, namely the third party pressure groups and the Labour party after the second World War. These groups were not directly involved in the development process but were affected by the negative externality effects that were generated from the cumulative use of land. Because of structural reasons, third party pressure groups could not directly influence market forces. Therefore, these groups saw town planning as a means through which they could exert pressure on market forces to control them for the purpose of obtaining a "good" environment.

B. Trend

The trend conceptualisation of town planning analyses the relationship of town planning to market forces in this way: Town planning is seen to reinforce market forces. Trend planning maintains that the town planning system's only effect on market forces is to reinforce them in the allocation of land. Some of the current literature (See Ambrose 1977b, Ambrose and Colnutt 1975, Barras, Broadbent, Massey 1973, Broadbent 1977, Cowan 1973, Donnison and Eversley 1973, Elkin 1974, Foley 1973, Goodall 1972, Hall 1973a, Hall 1973b, IEA 1974, Lambert and Weir 1975, Marriott 1967, Neutz 1973, Ratcliffe 1976.) maintains that although town planning was originally conceptualised as interventive, it has merely cumulatively reinforced them and their subsequent effect on the allocation of land and its use.

The major types of interests that support the concept of trend planning are the market based land institutions. These groups are directly involved in the development process and it is in their best interests to facilitate the operation of market forces. Trend planning tries to facilitate the operation of market forces.

The allocation of land and its use is thought to be the outcome of an orderly competitive process. The market balances the competing claims for the use of land. It assumes that individuals maximise their monetary returns and their budget is the only constraint operating on them.

Both interventive and trend conceptualisations of town planning perceive town planning and market forces to be polar opposites. This is an erroneous conceptual distinction that will be discussed in more detail later in this Chapter. The interventive conceptualisation sees market forces and town planning in direct opposition to each other, with town planning trying to control market forces. The trend conceptualisation, on the other hand, assumes the existence of a totally free market situation, ie town planning reinforces market conditions in the allocation of land and its use.

C. Reductionist Marxist

The reductionist (or vulgar) Marxist conceptualisation of town planning (See Cox 1978a, Harrison 1977, Hoover 1974, Lamarche 1976, Lean and Goodall 1966, Lojkine 1976.) perceives the relationship of town planning and market forces in this way: The institution of town planning reinforces market forces in the allocation of land and its use. The role of the state is not that of a neutral arbitrator or referee but that its role is of an executive committee of capitalists. Economic forces are perceived to be the main determinant of the state's intervention in the form of town planning in the allocation of land and its use. There is no place for political activity in the model. Political factors are not considered to be analytically independent of economic ones. Thus all causes are merely reduced to economic forces.

The reductionist Marxist model gives us a myopic view of the capitalist context in which the allocation of land and its use occurs because it does not investigate the political sphere as a set of relations analytically independent from the economic sphere. It is necessary to discern the nature of urban conflicts in order to assess the impact of the political, social, and economic forces on the allocation of land and its use.

D. Discussion: The Contradictory Nature of Town Planning

From the above discussion, it becomes apparent that a reconceptualisation of the relationship between town planning and market forces is needed. I shall argue that the relationship between town planning and market forces should not be conceived of as polar opposites, but that town planning contributes to the restructuring of market forces and conditions. Market forces are an abstract concept that refers to the investment opportunities for capital accumulation.

Certain aspects of town planning form an integral aspect of market forces: the expectation of whether or not town planning permission will be granted; the local authority's role as co-ordinator and supplier of information in its formulation of structure and local plans that are concerned with future uses and development of land; the local authority's role as site assembly agent for the developer by buying land; and central government's policy of compensation and betterment, ie the rate and level of taxation of land and its use. Town planning is an institution that does have an effect on the allocation of land and its use.

The state helps to reduce the private sector's production costs through its provision of services and facilities that are financed from the generation of potential profits by the private sector (that are found in the form of rates and taxation). For the private sector, the principle goal is profit maximisation. Tension between the public and private sectors arises due to the political, legitimation function of the public sector and the public sector's external relationship to the capital accumulation process.

Other factors that determine the supply and demand for land and its use are: attitudes, beliefs, subjective values, accessibility, locational and institutional considerations, the existing use of land, and the general trends of investment. Much depends upon the actual negotiating position of the buyer and seller. By analysing the relatively discrete elements of town planning and the market, one can determine in which ways town planning can contribute to restructuring market conditions. The effect that is produced is dependent upon <u>both</u> town planning and the market acting as a joint mechanism for allocating land to different uses in different locations.

The Marxist analysis of the market model provides the conceptual tools for an analysis of the context (ie the mode of production and the social formation) of the allocation of land and its use. It recognises the historical, social, political, and economic forces as important to the understanding of the allocation of land and its use. The Marxist model does not perceive the city as an atomised unit, but as a product of society to be understood within the context of that society. The allocation of land and its use is dependent upon a matrix of inter-related factors such as the competing claims of the users of land for production, circulation, and consumption activities, the social context, and the development process. The town planning system provides the institutional framework for these pressures.

Urban conflicts are not mere reflections of the underlying tensions between capital and labour in the workplace for two main reasons. Firstly, one of the functions of cities is to facilitate the transference of surplus value from production to circulation to consumption and then back again to production (Lamarche 1976, Lojkine 1976). This circulation of surplus value gives rise to additional conflicts other than those between capital and labour. Competition occurs among and within the different spheres of activity for a share of this surplus value. Secondly, the role of the state adds an extra dimension to the circulation of surplus value. This is for two reasons: Its relationship to the capital accumulation process is external, and as a vehicle for collective action, the state depends upon legitimacy for its actualisation. The state can thus absorb and provoke new conflicts.

Urban struggles can be seen either as phenomenal expressions of the wage labour - capital relations (Castells 1976, 1977a and Harvey 1976) or as possessing their own independent specificity grounded in the sphere of social consumption (Saunders 1981). It is not the case that urban struggles can be merely reduced to capital and labour conflicts. This would imply a direct cause and effect relationship between the two. In urban struggles, it is important to determine its specificity through its relation to social consumption, to competitive politics and to the particular locality and issue (Saunders 1981: 275-6). How far one can extend the concept of class in analysing urban struggles is debatable. On the one hand, Castells and Harvey extend it to outside the workplace. On the other hand, Saunders leaves the concept of class at the workplace and sees urban struggles as a different dimension of social activity. He does not see class relations as necessarily determining the character of urban struggles.

Town planning can be seen as an attempt to reconcile competing claims over the use of land. I argue that the town planning system arose for two main contradictory reasons:

1. It is partly a response to the class struggle, ie to improve environmental quality through the control of housing conditions, public health, congestion etc. Town planning was originally seen to be a response to these social conditions: overcrowding, poor housing conditions, long journeys to work etc.

2. It is partly a response to the needs of capital through its relationship to market forces in the support and maintenance of the conditions for the accumulation of capital.

Evidence for these statements can be found in the discussion of the Barlow, Scott, Uthwatt and Reith Reports in Section 2 of this Chapter. Town planning could not control market forces as these Reports had envisioned. Town planning is essentially a response to the characteristics of capitalist society. Because it is a mode of state intervention and the state is internal to the class struggle, town planning illustrates the contradictory nature of state intervention.

The response of town planning to social and economic problems can be seen to illustrate the contradictory nature of state intervension. Since there exists this peculiar separation of economics and politics in capitalist society, town planning is considered to be primarily a political activity. It is a mode of state intervention. Therefore it is implicitly concerned with value judgements. Alternatives are at stake, choices are involved, and decisions are taken on behalf of the general public. Town planning operates within political arrangements and institutions. An incongruence exists between town planning as a rational, conscious activity with a particular set of ends and means and of conflicting interests and viewpoints that are embedded in the political process.

On one level, town planning treats all individuals as citizens and equals in its attempt to alleviate the social problems of urban growth. Town planning is part of the legitimation process of state intervention. Social problems become defined as "problems" which then become articulated with pressures for their solution in political institutions.

On another level, through its attempt to restructure market conditions and its external relationship to the capital accumulation process, town planning does favour certain capital interests at the expense of others, depending upon the interests involved in the competing claims for land use.

This Chapter demonstrates that the nature of town planning is contradictory because it attempts to collectively alleviate the social conditions and problems of urbanisation, while at the same time, it tries to restructure market conditions. The contradictory nature of town planning provides the basis of conflict within the local authority itself as manifested between its economic and political roles. My empirical research concentrates on town planning and its relation to centre city redevelopment in Canterbury. The contradictory nature of town planning provides the basis for conflict between the local authority as landowner and town planner.

Chapter three will analyse the underlying factors that form the institutional context of town planning. It will discuss the statutory basis of town planning and its operational procedures. Such structural forces can generate a potential base for conflict between the levels of government.

C H A P T E R T H R E E

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT:
THE LEGISLATIVE POWERS OF TOWN PLANNING

This Chapter is an attempt to outline the structural and contradictory factors that generate potential bases for conflict between the levels of government with respect to the statutory base of town planning and its operational procedures. These forces form part of the underlying dynamic of city centre redevelopment and will be seen as one set of factors that constitutes the context of local political decision making (See Chapter five.). These contradictory relationships threaten the status quo and thus new compromises have to be reached. Such structural factors can give rise to conflicts and create pressures leading to their change.

The state's own functioning itself must be seen as an object of analysis as well as the external pressures that act on it. The origin and conceptualisation of town planning were discussed in Chapter two. This Chapter is concerned with the practices of town planning.

The structural factors that will be discussed in this Chapter are the following:

1. the increase in the legislative scope of town planning since the beginning of the twentieth century
2. the increase in central government's control of town planning since World War II

3. the discretionary powers of town planning. The statutory powers of town planning are vague and ambiguous with regard to the delegation of responsibilities and functions of town planning, thus leaving them open to discretionary interpretation
4. the nature of the statutory based powers are fundamentally negative
5. the new structures of the Department of the Environment (1970) and local government (1974)
6. the role of town planning policy with respect to each level of government.

The above structural and contradictory forces can generate potential bases for conflict between the levels of government. (See Association of County Councils, Association of District Councils, Association of Metropolitan Authorities, London Boroughs Association, Greater London Council 1979, Boaden and Alford 1969, Cross and Mallen 1978, Flynn 1977a, Flynn 1977b, Flynn 1978a, Flynn 1978b, Flynn 1978c, Flynn 1979, Friend, Power and Yewlett 1974, Griffith 1966, Griffith 1976, Hartley 1971, Heap 1973, Heap 1974, Jackson 1966, Purdue 1977, Richards 1973, Scarrow 1971, Stanyer 1967, Stanyer 1976, Telling 1970, Thornhill 1971, Wilson 1948.) This conflict can take two forms. Firstly, conflict can occur between central government and the local authority. Although town planning is primarily defined as a local responsibility, its appeal system is on a national level. The Minister acts in a quasi-judicial capacity. Conflict can thus occur between the levels of government with regard to town planning policy. Secondly,conflict can occur between the tiers of the local authority because of the lack of explicitly defined town planning powers found in the Acts.

The effects of such conflict can be the following:

1. a limitation on the local authority's autonomy and and hence its actions, because it is contrained by central government and county council

2. in relation to centre city redevelopment, it affects the types of externality effects that are generated by the central concentration of commercial activities (See Chapters six and seven.)
3. the alienation of the local electorate from the town planning process and the extent to which decisions are taken by central government reinforces the ineffectiveness of voting as a political resource (See Chapter 5.). The ineffectiveness of voting is not just due to structural forces at the local level in the operation of the local political system but it is also due to the degree of central government's control over the local authority.

This Chapter will be divided into five sections. Section one will discuss the history of the Town and Country Planning Acts and how they illustrate the increase in the legislative scope of town planning and the increase in central government control of this function. Section two will discuss the nature of the statutory powers of town planning - how they are vague and ambiguous with respect to the delegation of responsibilities and functions of town planning between the levels of government and how they are negative in character. Section three will investigate the new structures of government and examine the implications for the town planning process. Section four will analyse the role of town planning policy with respect to each level of government. Section five will take a look at the types of conflict that can be generated from these structural and contradictory forces underpinning the levels of government with respect to town planning and their effects.

1. Town and Country Planning Acts

Legislation provides the basis for the implementation of the town planning process. This Section aims to highlight from a brief history of the Town and Country Planning Acts

two main factors: the increased scope of town planning since the first Town and Country Planning Act in 1909 and the increase in central government control (which basically started with the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act).

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the scope of town planning has increased. The 1909 Town and Country Planning Act gave the local town planning authority discretionary powers to draw up a town planning scheme with respect to land development. The schemes had to be approved by central government. The local town planning authority was not statutorily obliged to draw up these schemes. It was optional for the local town planning authority to do so. These town planning schemes were applicable to the development fringe areas of the suburbs of existing towns but not to city centres where the land use had already been determined. The 1932 Town and Country Planning Act extended the possibility of control over land use by the institution of town planning schemes to city centres and the countryside. Consequently, all land was now potentially subject to control over its use.

The earliest town planning legislation (from 1909 to 1932) provided the opportunity for local authorities to develop local town planning schemes. During this period, town planning remained optional. The local authorities that drew up the plans zoned land for much more development than what could have been possible. The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act tried in two main ways to reduce this anarchic situation where each local authority tried to attract the maximum amount of development. Firstly, the 1947 Act made town planning obligatory. Secondly, responsibility for town planning was now centralised. However, another Town and Country Planning Act (1944) preceded the 1947 Act because of the extensive areas that were blitzed in World War II.

The 1944 Town and Country Planning Act mainly dealt with the redevelopment of extensively war damaged areas and obsolete development. (Sections 1 and 9 of the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act defined these areas.) The Act stated that redevelopment of these areas may occur through their compulsory purchase by the local authority. (See Sections 1 and 2 of the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act.) The majority of the bombed areas were located in the centre of cities and the 1944 Act helped to pave the way for centre city redevelopment after the War. The 1944 Town and Country Planning Act anticipated the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act because it assumed that town planning would be a centralised, statutory responsibility.

The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act made several more important departures from the previous Acts. The local town planning authority now became statutorily obliged to draw up a development plan for its area. The development plan was not only to include a physical survey of the land (as was the case in the previous town planning schemes) but to assess "the economic and sociological analysis of the potentialities of the future requirements of the area" (1947 Town and Country Planning Act). These development plans were subject to Ministerial approval. Not only had town planning become more than the physical assessment of land, but it had also become future oriented. The main purpose of the development plan was to provide the guidelines for the granting or refusal of town planning permission in the town planning authority's area. As from the first day of July 1948, town planning permission was required for all development. According to the statutes, the right to develop land and for what particular use was determined by the local town planning authority.

Another important addition to the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act was the provision made for the listing of buildings that were for special historical or architectural interest and the determination of preservation orders for these buildings and for trees and woodlands. The listing of buildings was subject to the approval of the Minister.

There were certain shortcomings to the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act. Firstly, the development plan was too rigid and detailed. Thus, it could not easily respond to change. Traffic and demographic factors had not been taken into account and car ownership had dramatically increased since World War II. Secondly, the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act increased the scope of town planning over the previous Acts. It had the effect of producing an incongruity between the local authority's area of jurisdiction for town planning and the inter-relationship of its other legislative responsibilities. The structure of local government became inappropriate for the increased responsibilities. The Local Government Act 1972 could be seen as an attempt to remedy this problem. (However, it is debatable whether or not the Act did solve this "problem".) Thirdly, the financial arrangements for the development charge on land was thought to be inadequate because of the ever-increasing gap between current use value and development value. The Conservative government stopped betterment levies in 1954. Finally, the administrative process of town planning proved to be huge and cumbersome. There were administrative delays in Ministerial approvals and enquiries. Thus, plans were rendered obsolete by the time they were approved.

The 1954 Town and Country Planning Act abolished the development charge on land that was instituted after the 1947 Act. The 1962 Town and Country Planning Act did not take into account the remaining criticisms of the 1947 Act, but supplementary provisions were made to local town planning authorities in terms of the consideration of objections and representations of building preservation orders and the serving of enforcement notices. There were two general cases in which enforcement notices could be made:

1. if the development of the land was carried out without the granting of town planning permission

2. if the development did not comply to the conditions that were attached to the town planning permission.

Provision for appeal on enforcement notices was made in the Act.

The 1967 Civic Amenities Act provided for the designation of conservation areas, ie areas of special historical or architectural interest. Attention was now not only given to individual buildings per se, but to the entire area that provided the context for those individual buildings (ie the street scene).

The 1968 Town and Country Planning Act was the first legislative attempt to deal with the criticisms of the development plans (that were first instituted in the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act). It formulated a set of two tiered plans: the structure plan and the local plan. The structure plan was similar to the old style development plan because it had to be approved by the Environment Minister.However, it differed from the development plan in several important ways. Firstly, the structure plan was designed to take into account traffic management (the problem of movement and communication and how this was linked to the pattern of land use) and demographic analysis as well as an economic and sociological analysis of the "potentialities of future requirements of the area" (1968 Town and Country Planning Act). Town planning was now supposed to take a more comprehensive view of the environment than ever before, ie it included areas other than land use planning areas over which the local town planning authority had control and influence. Secondly, structure plans would indicate broad priorities and not detailed land uses that was characteristic of the development plans. Thirdly, new approval procedures for structure plans had been set up in the Act. These procedures were not only concerned with respect to the public examination of the structure plan, but also to the provision for public participation in the drafting of the structure plan.

Although the structure plan was the main innovation of the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act, the provision made for local plans in the Act should not be discounted. The local plan was designed to apply the broad priorities indicated in the structure plan in the detailed planning of land use in particular areas. The local plan did not need the explicit approval of the Environment Secretary since it would be drawn up in accordance with the centrally approved plan. Thus, the structure plan would be the framework for the more detailed and specific analysis found in the local plan. It was prepared and approved by the local town planning authority.

The local plan was an important departure from the previous Town and Country Planning Acts because it formed part of a two tiered system of plans. However, the 1968 Act did not change the basic idea of town planning control as found in the 1947 Act, but it tried to change how the town planning process was implemented. The realisation of the 1968 changes was totally altered by the splitting of the responsibility of the two types of plan between the county and district authorities following the re-organisation of local government in 1974. The 1972 Local Government Act undermined the unitary assumption of the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act. The problems of co-ordination and conflict between the county and district councils became very severe.

Another distinguishing feature of the 1968 Act was that the local town planning authority had the power to stop further development while an enforcement notice appeal was being made. These notices were called stop notices and were instituted to tighten up on the loopholes found in the 1962 Act. Other new provisions in the 1968 Act were those restricting the demolition of listed buildings. The penalties for an offence were increased to a fine of £250, imprisonment, or both. The last feature of the 1968 Act was that a building preservation notice could be served on a building that was not listed.

The 1971 Town and Country Planning Act provided supplementary powers to the local town planning authority in three main areas:

1. the penalty for noncompliance with a stop or enforcement notice with respect to a listed building was increased to £400
2. the local planning authority was permitted to do emergency works for the preservation of unoccupied listed buildings
3. schemes of positive development could be embarked upon with the consent of the Environment Secretary.

Thus, the scope of town planning has considerably increased since the beginning of this century. There occurred a shift in the Acts from only considering the use of land to considering the economic, social, and demographic factors that impinged upon its use. However, the increase in statutory powers remained fundamentally negative and emphasised the architectural aspect. (This will be discussed in more detail in the following section.) This trend for the scope of town planning to increase has largely been brought about by two main factors: the contradictory nature of town planning which provided a base for conflicting interests and an attempt by the state to "manage" the potentially threatening political implications of these conflicting interests.

The wider scope of town planning and the delegation of its functions and responsibilities in the Town and Country Planning Acts was an attempt to make town plans more comprehensive. However, this increased the potential for conflict between the different aspects of town planning. For example, the preservation of agricultural land and the countryside came into conflict with the outward spread of towns and cities. Both were seen to be town planning problems

and consequently the solution to each of these problems would have an effect on each other. Another example is that current DoE policy favours the revitalisation of inner city areas that can exacerbate the congestion already found in these severely congested areas.

The wider scope of town planning allows for the overt emergence of conflicting aims and tensions that can exert some pressure on the process of land allocation and its use. For example, the increased involvement of the public in town planning decisions (as advocated by the Skeffington Report 1969) tended to make the development control process more lengthy (ie whether or not to grant planning permission for development). This ran counter to the recommendations made in the Dobry Report (1975) to streamline and improve the development control process. Both Reports had conflicting implications for each other.

From a reading of the Town and Country Planning Acts, it can be seen that most of the powers given to local town planning authorities entailed central government having a supervisory capacity over those powers. Therefore, the increased involvement of central government in town planning matters had been commensurate with the increased scope of the local authority's town planning powers. The local town planning authority needed ultimate approval from the Environment Secretary for listed buildings, the designation of conservation areas, and structure plans. If the Environment Secretary did not think that the local town planning authority is doing its job properly, then he has default powers that enable him to step in and take over. If a local town planning authority refuses to give a town planning decision on a town planning application, an appeal can be made to the Environment Secretary. If a town planning application is controversial, representation can be made to the Environment Secretary. If the town planning application is major and controversial, the ultimate responsibility and decision on it rests with the Environment

Secretary. He would have two options open to him:

1. he could formally "call in" the town planning application. It would mean a public inquiry would be called or,
2. he could say it was a matter for the county or district council to decide.

The structure plan is submitted to the Environment Secretary for public examination and approval. The Environment Secretary can make modifications to the plan as he sees fit. He can also require the local town planning authority to prepare a local plan. If he is not satisfied with it, he can prepare it himself. The county council has to confirm that a local plan would generally conform to the structure plan. The county council would then issue a certificate to that effect before the local plan could be implemented. If the certificate is not issued, the Environment Secretary can decide on the matter and the local plan might have to be reformulated.

The hierarchical appeal system of town planning applications and structure and local plans can undermine the local authority's town planning powers. The Environment Secretary has a legally determined "room for discretion" in deciding upon town planning matters. The courts do not usually question whether or not the Environment Secretary's decision represents good policy. On that point, he is responsible only to Parliament. The Environment Secretary is the final arbitrator of what is good town planning. (This is not explicitly defined in the Acts.) The High Court usually concurs with the Environment Secretary's decision. Therefore, the Environment Secretary possesses wide discretion in town planning matters (which also includes town planning appeals) because almost any decision that he makes can be seen as a matter of policy. This wide discretion of the Environment Secretary in town planning

matters (such as default powers, approval of conservation areas and listed buildings, and the call-in procedure for certain town planning applications) helps to undermine the local town planning authority's responsibility. In doing so it increases the alienation of the local electorate from their local council and politicises those individuals who are not directly accountable to the local electorate (such as council officers and civil servants).

2. Nature of the Statutory Powers of Town Planning

The delegation of responsibilities and functions between the levels of government (as found in the Town and Country Planning Acts) is vague, ambiguous, and discretionary. The statutory powers of town planning are negatively based and are ones of control. They mainly deal with the architectural design and built forms aspects of town planning.

Town planning powers are distributed between the three levels of government: the central, county, and district levels. The tone of the statutes concerning the delegation of functions in town planning are far from being explicit. Indeed, they are vague and ambiguous. Thus, there is room for discretion in the implementation of town planning powers. Conflict can occur between the different levels of government over which level has the right to exercise authority in certain town planning matters.

The delegation of town planning responsibilities from one level of government to another was first instituted in the 1909 Town and Country Planning Act. The local authority could draw up a local plan (which was not obligatory at that time) that would then have to be approved by central government. The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act instituted and systematised dual town planning powers. All local town planning authorities were statutorily obligated to draw up a development plan for approval by the Minister. Powers were extended to central government for the co-ordination and approval of the plans.

As regards the development plan, the county council was "subject to an obligation to consult with the district councils in the county before the plan is prepared" (1947 Town and Country Planning Act). The Act did not specify how and on what basis this consultation was to occur. Conflict within the two tiers of the local authority could occur in the drafting of the development plan. This consultation provided the basis for political bargaining whose outcome was dependent upon the relative strengths of bargaining resources available to each level of government.

The 1968 Town and Country Planning Act made more obvious the need for satisfactory machinery to ensure the co-operation between the county and district councils. This lack of adequate machinery was exacerbated by the re-organisation of local government in 1974 (1972 Local Government Act). The structure plan (which was drafted by the county council in consultation with its district councils) needed to be approved by the Environment Secretary. The local plan (which was prepared by the district council but in some extra-ordinary cases by the county council) did not have to be explicitly approved by the Environment Secretary. However, the county council had to ensure that "the proposals in the local plan generally conformed to the structure plan as approved by the Secretary of State" (1968 Town and Country Planning Act). If the local plan did conform, then the county would issue a certificate of approval.

If conflicts do arise between the county and district councils over the structure plan then, to a certain extent, they will be publicly aired at the examination in public of the Structure Plan under the authority of an Inspector appointed by the Environment Secretary. The public examination of the structure plan forms part of the administrative machinery that enables the Environment Secretary to decide (among other things) on the conflicting

town planning policies of the two tiers of local government. It can be termed as an adjudicatory function of the Environment Secretary because it attempts to resolve the question of divisions of power and responsibilities of town planning between the county and district councils. The Secretary of State superficially acts in the capacity of an umpire. This capacity should not be confused with the notion of the state acting as a neutral referee in town planning powers.

Concurrent powers are those that are exercised by both the county and district councils. They are an example of the lack of explicitly defined powers between the county and district levels. Town planning development is one of these powers. It has jurisdiction over the following: derelict land, conservation areas, building preservation notices, tree preservation notices, and the acquisition and disposal of land for town planning purposes (See Local Government Act 1972, DoE Circular "Allocation of Functions in England" no 121/72).

Although town planning in the Acts was defined as a local responsibility, certain town planning applications are classified as county matters. County matters broadly fall into three categories (Cullingworth 1976): the working of minerals; a conflict or prejudice concerning the implementation of the structure plan priorities; and an inconsistency with the local plan. With any development, however, the county must be consulted on the proposals in relation to the Highway Acts (Section 28A of the Road Traffic (regulations) Act 1967, Schedule 19 of the 1972 Local Government Act) and the 1972 Local Government Act on traffic management grounds.

Throughout the Acts, there are no rigid rules and procedures for schemes of co-operation between the county and district councils while at the same time, the Acts try to ensure that full understanding between them can occur.

As discussed previously, several Acts and DoE circulars have tried to set out the terms of reference for the division of responsibilities between the two tiers of the local authority. The relationship of the structure and local plans, what constitutes a "county" matter, and the traffic and access implications of development provide examples of ambiguity concerning the delegation of the powers and responsiblities of town planning between the county and district councils. Whether or not these ambiguities have been resolved in practice depends partly upon the relationship between the county and district councillors and officers.

3. New Structures of Government

The Department of the Environment was restructured in 1970 and local government was re-organised in 1974 (1972 Local Government Act). The justification for these new structures was that re-organisation was necessary for a more efficient management of resources and the promotion of a more democratic and responsive form of government (Redcliffe-Maud Report 1969 and 1972 Local Government Act). Specific attention was given to the re-organisation of local government to make its areas more democratic and efficient in the provision of its services and facilities. However, the new structures of government did not work out as intended. The DoE was re-organised in 1976 and Transport was made into a separate Ministry again. Local government re-organisation was contrary to the assumptions of the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act and therefore the latter could not work as intended.

A main hypothesis I will discuss more fully later in the thesis is: One of the main effects of the new structures of local and central governments has been the depoliticisation of issues and the alienation of the local electorate from its local authority and the town planning process. The new structures of government illustrate the dilemna that the state structure finds itself in - as it tries to grapple

with one type of problem, it may generate a new type of problem. The structure and delegation of town planning responsibilities was designed to cope with the problem of the management of resources and to create a more democratic form of government. However, this has helped to create other problems such as the insulation of the elected representatives from the accountability process which contributes to an undermining of representative democracy; the removal of decisions from the local political arena due to the influence of central government; and ambiguity in the delegation of town planning responsibilities.

The new structures of central and local government did not take into account the corresponding change that would occur in the relations between the levels of government. In some cases, it is apparent there is a lack of adequate machinery for co-operation between the levels of government. However, the Town and Country Planning Acts assumed this co-operation would automatically happen because of the new structures of government. Conflicts in this area are still acute, but they are not necessarily expressed in overt political forms.

4. The Role of Town Planning Policy

The town planning policies of all the levels of government provide the guidelines and general framework for government decisions on town planning applications and other matters. Without such policies, there is a noticeable vacuum for assessing government decisions on town planning matters. The criteria for such decisions are often not made explicit so therefore, discretion plays a major role in the local political decision making process.

The Environment Secretary and the local town planning authorities are committed to certain kinds of town planning policies. Therefore, it is difficult for them to adopt an unbiased approach to a controversial town planning application where one party will be arguing against their policies. This can be termed as a conflict of interest and is applicable to the issue of departmental bias and the application of town planning policy to an individual decision (McAuslan 1975: 561-578). Impartial decisions on town planning matters cannot be made because the town planning policies of government are "biased". On the other hand, both the Environment Secretary and the local town planning authority are expected to have town planning policies and to carry them out, otherwise a vacuum of guidelines for political decision making (with respect to town planning matters) would occur. Thus, a paradoxical situation arises where the Environment Secretary and the local town planning authority have town planning policies and yet are supposed to be unbiased in their approach in deciding upon town planning matters.

What appears to happen in practice, for example, is that current DoE town planning policy is the main focus of attention at public inquiries. Cases are argued on the basis of current DoE policy on town planning matters because the decision of the Environment Secretary should be related to the current policy. Current DoE town planning policy (until 1979) is the following: It appears to favour the encouragement of development within town centres as opposed to development outside the town unless there is a specific need; the encouragement of local authority partnerships with private developers in the development of town centres; and that town planning issues have to be of more than just local importance and controversy for the Secretary of State to call in a town planning application for the purpose of holding a public inquiry.

The slowness of procedures for drafting town plans and having them approved and revised meant that during much of the time decisions were made by the local town planning authorities on town planning matters without such a plan. Plans were supposed to incorporate the local authority's town planning policy as well as the addition of inputs from central government and the local community. Town plans were to provide the criteria and guidelines for assessing town planning matters. However, there were noticeable time gaps between the drafting of a town plan and its approval, leaving an implicit framework for assessing town planning matters, thus obscuring the basis upon which decisions are made by the local town planning authority.

5. The Types of Conflict and Its Effects

The previous sections have discussed the contradictory, structural factors that generate the potential bases for conflict between the levels of government with respect to town planning. These factors are briefly summarised below.

1. the increase in the legislative scope of town planning since the beginning of the twentieth century
2. the increase in central government control of town planning since World War II
3. the discretionary powers of town planning. These powers are vague and ambiguous in relation to the delegation of responsibilities and functions of town planning
4. the nature of the statutory based town planning are fundamentally negative
5. the new structures of the DoE (1970) and local government (1974)
6. the role of town planning policy with respect to each level of government.

Conflict between the levels of government can occur between central government and the local authority, or between the two tiers of the local authority, ie between the county and district levels.

The effects of such conflict between the levels of government may vary in relation to the local political decision making process and centre city redevelopment. Three possible effects are:

1. constraint on the local authority's actions
2. the types of negative externality effects that are generated by the central concentration of commercial activities (See Chapters six and seven)
3. alienation of the local electorate from the town planning process. The extent to which decisions are taken by central government reinforces the ineffectiveness of voting as a political resource. The ineffectiveness of voting is not just due to structural forces at the local level in the operation of the local political system, but it is also due to the degree of control of central government over local authorities.

The further implications of this type of conflict between the levels of government in relation to the local political decision making process and centre city redevelopment in Canterbury will be discussed in Chapters six, seven, and eight.

CHAPTER FOUR

TOWN PLANNING AS A BASE FOR THE EXPRESSION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS

Town planning can be perceived as an attempt to resolve land based conflicts which correspond to its contradictory aims identified earlier in Chapter two to alleviate social conditions and problems of urbanisation while at the same time trying to restructure market conditions. Chapter two analysed the nature of town planning and the different interests associated with its origins - the market based land institutions and the nonmarket based land institutions and groups. The contradictory nature of town planning has created new types of conflict that can be articulated in the local political decision making process.

The town planning process provides the opportunity for different interests to become involved in the allocation of land and its use. However, the fact that an interest can be articulated in this process is no indication of its effectiveness. Certain interests do not have to be overtly articulated to be effective. The occurrence of conflict within the town planning process entails a study of the tactics used by the local authority to "manage" it (See Chapters five and nine.) It is the responsibility of the local political system to "manage" conflict and to bear the costs for that "management".

Town planning is inherently a political activity because it is concerned with the allocation of conflicting values. The allocation of land and its use is an implicit value judgement about societal goals. Town planning is one process through which these goals and values become

materialised. The study of town planning occurs through the empirical manifestation of its activity that can reflect the political strengths of conflicting interests.

These conflicting interests that are contained in the town planning process help to generate the base for conflict between the local electorate and the local authority. The conflicts these interests can give rise to create the pressures leading to their change and form part of the underlying dynamic of centre city redevelopment. Town planning as a base for the expression of conflicting interests is one of the factors constituting the context of local political decision making. (See Chapters five, six, seven, and eight.)

This Chapter will discuss the different types of interests expressed in the town planning process and in the allocation of land and its use. There are two main types: market based land institutions and nonmarket based land institutions and groups. (It must be remembered that these two types are rough categories and are not strict demarcations.) Section one will discuss the market based land institutions and their respective interests in the allocation of land and its use. Section two will discuss the nonmarket based land institutions and groups and their respective interests in the allocation of land and its use. Section three will analyse the type of conflict that is generated and the implications this has for the context of local political decision making.

1. Market Based Land Institutions

Following from its contradictory nature, the town planning process incorporates the interaction of land based market institutions and nonmarket based institutions and groups. It is necessary to analyse the market based land institutions, their functions, their interests, and

the types of pressures they exert on the development process. They benefit from town planning as an institution which tries to regulate the externality effects of development and change of use and to reduce the uncertainities arising from the collectively irrational character of the private land market. For the market based land institutions, land is an object of private speculation that has collective consequences mainly in the form of externality effects. (See Alexander 1974, Ambrose 1977b, Ambrose and Colnutt 1975, Barras, Broadbent, Massey 1973, Barras and Catalano 1975, Benington 1975, Greenberg 1974, Hall 1965, Hamilton 1975, Harrison 1977, Heap 1975, Henderson and Ledebur 1972, Holliday 1973, IEA 1974, Lamarche 1976, Lean and Goodall 1966, Lojkine 1977, Marriott 1967, Massey 1977a, Massey and Catalano 1978, Minns and Thornley 1977, Neutze 1973, Rassmussen 1973, Ratcliffe 1976, Richardson 1977, Roweis and Scott 1976, Scott 1976, Vance 1971, Willhelm 1962.) Town planning, through its attempt to restructure market conditions, tries to overcome these obstacles. It can partly be seen as a response to the needs of capital.

As we saw in Chapter two these land based market institutions are the estate agents, the financial institutions (whose function is to bridge the gap between the buyer and seller through the provision of capital), land developers, the construction industry, other professional interests such as architects, surveyors,engineers, landowners, and the users of land.

There are several factors that determine land values[1]. Firstly, there is the current use value of the land in question. Secondly, there are the expectations of the market. Finally, there is the question of whether or not town planning permission has been granted for the site.

From the buyer's perspective, there are three main elements that influence his selection of a site:

---

[1]The word value in the term land value does not have any Marxian connotation. This phrase is used in the commonsense way.

1. what is the physical shape of the site
2. where it is located in relation to other services (ie the complementarity and specialisation of activities), facilities, the infrastructure, etc. (the externality effects in the locality)
3. how accessible is the site for the individuals who will engage in a particular type of activity on that site.

The site's attractiveness to the potential buyer is not merely dependent upon the physical aspects of the site, but its surrounding environment and the amount and types of investment involved in it. Access to the site is important for the particular land use.

It must be kept in mind that the particular factors which contribute to increasing land values are in a constant state of flux. The constant increase in land values affect its demand. The rate of inflation also tends to affect the demand for land because the value of land increases commensurately with the rate of inflation, thus making land a good investment in times of high inflation. If accessibility to the site becomes more difficult for the users (ie if the location of the users changes with respect to the site or if access to it is undermined by the congestion of transport networks), then this has the effect of decreasing the site's desirability and thus its value. Therefore, land values are not solely determined by an inherent quality of the land itself, but land values are more determined by external factors such as the site's relationship to market conditions and the surrounding environment.

Financial institutions form another important element in the development process because they supply the capital for construction and/or purchase of land to the developer. The prime consideration is the availability of funds for investment in property development. Two crucial questions to ask are: What are the market expectations for investment

and what is the rate of inflation? Pension funds, banks, insurance companies, and building societies are the main financial institutions that invest in property development. If monies are available for investment in property development, then they are subsequently being diverted from other areas of investment such as manufacturing and industrial areas. It is important to determine the strength and content of the flow of investment capital.

Property developers are another element in the web of relationships concerning town planning and the future users of land. The property developer has several options open to him in developing land. If the land involved is owned by one landowner, then the developer can either buy the land from the landowner at (hopefully) a relatively cheap price (before the landowner is aware of the site's attractiveness) or, the developer can have a lease drawn up whereby he will be able to rent the land from the landowner over a particular period of time with a specified number of rent reviews. If the land ownership is fragmented into many separate units, then the developer has to find a way to unify these separate bits of land. This process is called site assembly. Four options are open to him:

1. the developer can buy out the existing landowners
2. the developer and the landowners can form a company. The landowners' shares are proportionate to the size of the contributed land. The land is seen as the down payment for investment in the company. Land ownership remains fragmented.
3. the developer can lease the land from the landowners for a long period of time (99 years) and with (hopefully) infrequent rent reviews
4. the developer can buy or lease the land from the local authority which assembles the site by buying out each owner.

The property developer is responsible for the construction of the site because he engages and pays a contractor to build the structure. It is up to the developer to find the capital to finance the building's construction costs. The main assets of a property developer are his existing properties and buildings that he can use as collateral for the loaned capital he would use in future development. Lending by financial institutions is done on the basis of the property's asset value. There are two important factors that contribute to a property's asset value: the annual rent and the return on capital. The asset value of a property is calculated in terms of this equation:

$$\text{Asset value equals} \quad \frac{\text{annual rent (ie net profit from letting of the building)}}{\text{return of capital (ie net profit - income less taxes, property rates, depreciation, expenses, interest on loans, the repayment of principle, etc.)}}$$

The asset value is unrelated to the construction costs of the building. The greater the annual rent, the higher the asset value will be. An important factor is the market expectation that rents will increase. This expectation can cause asset values to rise disproportionately in conjunction with what the property and buildings would sell for in the open market. Developers can over-extend themselves in this way by obtaining too much credit from their properties and from a disproportionate rise in asset values in comaprison to the actual market sale price.

The construction industry is another important element in the development process. How much the actual development will cost to build depends mainly upon the cost of building materials, labour, and inflation rates. Usually there will be a contingency clause for inflation in the contract because of the higher rate of inflation in materials and labour than in other sectors of the economy.

Landowners form another link in the development process. Property development must occur somewhere, which means that the question of the ownership of land is a significant one. The crucial questions to ask are the following: Does the landowner want to sell or lease the land? If he wants to sell the land, what is his asking price? Is he aware of the advantages open to the developer and of the current market situation? If he wants to lease the land to the developer, then for how long will it be and how often will rent reviews occur? Does the landowner want to enter into some type of partnership with the developer (where the land is seen to be the landowner's contribution to the investment)? This can be advantageous to the landowner because he usually does not need additional capital for the investment and he can receive a nonreturnable down payment from the developer. This type of situation can also be beneficial to the developer in that his risk with the development is minimal because he has not fully invested in it and his holding costs are negligible. (There are no principal and interest payments on the loans for the land.) This enables the developer to channel his equity in other directions. Whatever the landowner's interest is in the development process, this has important implications for the relationships that are found in the process.

The consumers of the development constitute another link in the development process. There are two main categories of consumers: those who will rent the building and those who are the clientele of the tenants. How the rent is determined has a crucial impact on the two types of consumers. Several factors help to determine the level of rent that is charged:

1. the expectations of the rental market as to whether rents will continue to increase/decrease and the supply/demand of the type of use to which the building is to be put.

2. the current level of rent - eg for office space in London it is £ 17 per square foot
3. the location of the building. What services/ facilities is it near?
4. the question of access. How close is the building to major transport networks (both public and private)?
5. what the building itself provides in terms of amenities such as air conditioning, security, maintenance etc.

It is not merely the physical amenities and appearance of the building upon which the level of rents rests. What is included in the rent is, to a large extent, independent of what the developer has provided. The level of rent has several different kinds of impact upon both categories of consumers:

1. how does it affect the profitability of the renter's business in the sense that rent forms a major part of his overheads. (It is subtracted from the gross profit in the calculation of the profit.)
2. how is this cost then transmitted to the consumer who makes use of the services and facilities that the development provides.

The local authority in England can have several types of involvement in the development process. Firstly, it is the statutory town planning authority that can grant/ refuse town planning permission. It has been demonstrated previously that the granting of town planning permission can contribute to an increase in land values.

There is a second relationship: The development process can be one generator of local authority income. The types of uses to which property can be put can increase the total rateable value of the district, thereby increasing one of the main sources of income for the local authority.

In this respect, commercial and industrial uses of land proportionately increase the rate's income more than residential uses. However, the impact of this increase in the total rateable value of the district is lessened for three reasons.

Firstly, the amount of the resources element of the Rate Support Grant[1] decreases from central government. Less money is allocated to the district council from central government coffers. The only way in which an increase of the total rateable value of the district council could affect the amount of the resources element would be when the district council is above the limit set by central government.

Secondly, the commercial and industrial development would increase the demand for the services and facilities provided by the district council such as refuse collection, roads, street lighting - mainly those of an infrastructural nature. This could have possible implications for residential accommodation, amenities, education, and transport.

Thirdly, if a new commercial development increases the shopping trade in the district, the district council does not benefit from this increased profitability to the shopkeepers since rates do not rise in proportion to a trader's profitability margin. Thus, commercial development does not provide only benefits to a council.

The third relationship the local authority can have to the development process is that of landowner. This relationship can take three forms. Firstly, the local authority can lease the land to the developer over a certain period of time with provision made for rent reviews. The local authority will obtain a ground rent from the development.

---

[1] In 1980 the Rate Support Grant was turned into a block grant.

The rental of the land can be subsidised in the sense that full rental value is not charged by the local authority. The subsidisation of rent can be used by the local authority as an incentive to draw commercial and/or industrial interests to the district. For example, in commercial and industrial estates that are owned by the local authority, the rent charged is usually below the current market value. This possibility is reflected in the recent suggestions to attract industry to inner city areas by rent subsidies.

Secondly, the local authority can have a greater share in the development process by coming to an arrangement with the developer concerning the development's profit. In this sense, the land is understood to be the local authority's equity in the development. The value of the land helps to determine the extent of the council's participation in the development's profits. In this case, the local authority is seen to take a more active part in initiating the development. Finally, the local authority can sell the land to the developer for a profit. Due to the Community Land Act 1975, any land the local authority buys that it intends to sell for development must be sold at full market value.

Table 1 illustrates the three roles the local authority can play in the development process. (See page 72.) This Table illustrates the diversity of market based land institutions. The magnitude of change in all three cases (based on the varying role of the local authority) is quite small. The change mainly occurs within the landowner groups. The remainder of the market based land institutions are relatively unaffected. However, this does not discount the possibility that the level of profitability for each group can be different in each case.

TABLE 1 - A COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENT ROLES THE LOCAL AUTHORITY CAN PLAY IN RELATION TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Relationship to the Development Process	Roles of the Local Authority		
	I Local Authority leases land	II Local Authority has a share in the development	III Local Authority sells the land
Original Landowner			
1) Local Authority ground rent	*	*	the rent is received in the form of the sale price of one payment rather than several over time
2) private ground rent	-	-	-
Private Developer	*	*	*
Finance Companies	*	*	*
Construction Industry	*	*	*
Other Professional Interests (such as architects, surveyors, engineers)	*	*	*
Consumers			
1) Tenants	*	*	*
2) Clientele of the tenants	*	*	*

Key
- nonparticipation in the development process
* participation in the development process

The Community Land Act which was enforced between 1975 and 1979 (see Boddy 1982 for analysis) was the most recent legislation that affected the local authority as a market based land institution. This Act provided the legislative authority for the local authority to do three main things (School for Advanced Urban Studies, University of Bristol 1976): to interpret community needs; to resolve the competing demands for land use; and to allocate land to satisfy these needs. In the Act, the local authority was supposed to promote development in accordance with its town planning aims and priorities. The question of local authority priorities illustrated the impact of political bargaining between the different levels of government and the local community.

The Community Land Act 1975 stated the local authority was supposed to consider the needs of the community. This implies the existence of a consensus within the community as to its needs and the means of satisfying them. However, the local authority also had to consider the needs of the developers because it had to make land available to them. This Act made the local authority responsible for the continuity of developers, otherwise it would be held responsible for causing shortages in industrial, commercial, and/or residential accommodation. In this respect, the political implications could be disastrous. The economic implications could also be disastrous because property and the buildings on it were one of the main sources of revenue (in the form of rates) for the local authority. Thus, conflict could exist between the two types of needs (economic and political) the local authority had to consider. The Act was oriented to giving preference to the needs of the developer and other market based land institutions that could be seen as sectional interests. If the local authority had greater financial resources to enable it to finance and build developments, then the development process would become more politicised.

Capital must be forthcoming from central government to local authorities so they can purchase the land. In 1975-6, central government allocated about £35 million to local authorities in England for the buying of land. This is a comparatively small sum for the purchase of land throughout England by local authorities for the Community Land Act 1975 to have an impact. The sum was further reduced in 1976-77, thus making it difficult for local authorities to purchase land in the amounts implied by the Act. The Community Land Act was abolished by the Conservative government in 1979 but the Development Tax continued.

The main impetus of the Community Land Act 1975 is directed towards the landowner who does not really have any great effect on the use of land, but who can realise the increase in land value due to its subsequent development. The Act does not alter the situation where the private developer is fundamentally concerned with profitable development. In some cases, the local authority can have a great influence in initiating development. However, the final onus for development lies with the private developer. This is due in part, to the lack of financial resources made available to the local authority to enable it to finance development and have more of a stake in the development process. Thus, the Community Land Act 1975 does not appear to alter the use of land from how the pre-existing town planning and development systems operated. This crucial limitation defeats one of the main aims of the Act which is to resolve the competing demands for the use of land.

2. Nonmarket Based Land Institutions

The previous section discussed market based land institutions (including the local authority as landowner - one of the market based land institutions) and their relationship and interests in the development process. This section will investigate the nonmarket based land institutions, their interests, and their relationship in the development process.

Other groups involved in the town planning process are those who will be (or are) affected by the allocation of land and its use, but who are not directly involved as the users of land. They, too, want town planning as an institution to regulate the externality effects and uncertainty not for the needs of capital, but to improve the environmental quality through the control of the social effects of urbanisation.

The strategies adopted by these groups (who are usually locally based and indirectly affected by the various uses of land because they are not the actual users of land, but are affected by the externality effects caused by its users) mainly concentrate on influencing the institutional framework of town planning, ie the local political decision making process within which market forces interact in the allocation of land and its use. (These groups can be termed as third party pressure groups.) Third party pressure groups (by their nature) are not actors in the market like the market based land institutions. Therefore, they are limited to this type of strategy.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century in England, there has been an increase in the formation of third party pressure groups around town planning issues. The evidence for this trend lies in two main areas:

A. the subjective awareness and growing concern for amenity and conservation
B. the increased interest and attention given to public participation in the Town and Country Planning Acts.

I will now discuss each area in more detail.

A. The subjective awareness and growing concern for amenity and conservation

The amenity and conservation movement in Great Britain began to expand rapidly in the 1950s. (There was evidence for this movement before this date. See 1904 Ancient Monuments Act.) The Civic Trust was formed in 1957 and it had 250 affiliated groups. By mid 1973, there was over a thousand affiliated groups and today there are over two thousand (McAuslan 1975: 127). The Civic Trust was primarily formed "to provide much needed technical support and professional advice to local societies, as well as to identify and publicise their achievements" (Lowe 1975: 74). Since the 1950s, other major national bodies have been formed such as the Council for the Protection of Rural England, Friends of the Earth, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, and the Victorian Society.

The general characteristics of amenity societies are the following: They tend to be composed of owner occupiers in aesthetically pleasing environments from middle class backgrounds (see Amery and Cruickshank 1975, Bradley 1977, Cherry 1974b, Civic Trust 1976, Dobby 1978, Kimber and Richardson 1974, Lowe 1977, McAuslan 1975, Smith 1974). There is a high proportion of them in South East England (Gregory 1971). The total membership to local and national environmental groups has been estimated between one and two million (Lowe 1975: 73). (However these figures may be inflated due to overlapping memberhsip between different organisation.) According to these estimates, the magnitude of concern for conservation is great within a certain social strata of the population who are mainly located in a specific geographical area. The figure of between one and two million gives a rough idea of the commitment to the environmental cause, making it comparable to major political parties and trade unions. It is interesting to note that the work on conservation and the environment is "outside" party political controversy. It appears that all the major political parties agree to environmental and conservation causes in principle, but differ in their implementation of this policy.

The 1967 Civic Amenity Act provided the opportunity for the formation of Conservation Advisory Committees in conjunction with the designation of Conservation Areas. These committees are not a statutory obligation per se, and their formation is partially dependent upon the district council and its relationship to the local electorate. The DoE's justification for such committees was "to obtain local knowledge and expertise and more understanding and co-operation between authorities, amenity groups, and the public" (DoE Circular 147/74 HMSO 1974a). The committees are an attempt to incorporate amenity groups into the local political decision making process to make them less of a potential political threat. Institutionalisation of this kind can lead to reformist types of action and demands on behalf of the amenity societies. Access to the local political decision making process, as well as the group's resources, can be an important determinant of the group's effectiveness in the local political decision making process. Conservation Advisory Committees can be seen as one possible means through which access to the local political decision making process can be obtained.

Conservation had been the traditional concern of architects, art historians, and more recently, Town Planning Institute members. One would most likely expect that the professional "ideology" of the design disciplines would have a great influence on the theory and practice of conservation. This "ideology" is oriented"to the accommodation of diverse economic and social conditions and not to the means of changing them" (Smith 1974: 113). (My emphasis) Therefore, emphasis is placed on physical design and its impact on the environment. This professional "ideology" is status quo oriented.

The current, popular notion of conservation is that it is good for everyone in the "community". This notion tends to obscure the sectional interests of conservation and

its "elitist" implications. The selection of areas and buildings for conservation is not a "democratic" process. The selection depends upon expert assessment, national standards, and specialist teams. The idea of conservation assumes that some buildings are superior to others and should therefore be preserved. The value judgements of those who make decisions on these matters are important in determining what is aesthetically pleasing and culturally enhancing. One unintended consequence of conservation policies is that they appear to over-ride other unstated interests, eg the interest of tenants and indigenous residents who are displaced through gentrification. The physical, observable aspects of conservation policies prevent them from having their legitimacy too seriously undermined. The immediate, physical, tangible effects of conservation policies are more apparent than other town planning policies.

The policy of conservation has no time limit. A tension exists between the decisions that are taken now for their immediate impact and those that are taken now for the long term. A potential incompatibility can exist between those that are taken in the present and the intangible future. This type of decision demands an awareness of direct and indirect changes within an urban structure that is complex and difficult to understand. There are types of groups who are affected by town planning and conservation decisions, but they do not particpate in this debate; eg future generations, those who reside outside the district council's area of responsibility, and those who live in the district but do not participate.

The notion of conservation generally has more support from the middle class. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, the professions involved in conservation are middle class oriented. Technical skills, which are an important resource in determining a group's effectiveness are mostly drawn from areas such as architecture, surveying,

history, and town planning. Also, there exists various professional bodies that are sympathetic to conservation issues such as the Royal Institute of British Architects, the Town and Country Planning Association, and the British Ecological Society (Lowe 1975: 74). Secondly, the middle class can generally reap more "benefits" from conservation than the working class. The middle class more often live in listed buildings. Gentrification is usually a domestic, profitable investment and provides a basis for commitment to the area. Also, there is a difference in focus between middle and working classes because the middle class usually has more resources with which to invest in amenity and conservation, whereas, the working class is more concerned about access to services such as education and health.

Amenity and conservation disputes involve political decisions that are concerned with the allocation of values and costs in society. Town planning decisions try to resolve the problem of inputing monetary values to amenity values (those which are primarily concerned with the quality of the environment). Town planning decisions have implications for the future use of the community's resources.

B. <u>The increased interest and attention given to public participation in the Town and Country Planning Acts</u>

Up until the 1962 Town and Country Planning Act, little mention was made of public participation in the Acts. The first notable mention of the general public in relation to town planning decisions was in the 1962 Town and Country Act with reference to the public inspection of the development plan and its amendments and the publications of notices of town planning applications in the local newspaper combined with a twenty-one day minimum period for representations.

The 1967 Civic Amenities Act had special provisions for the advertising of town planning applications in conservation areas. A notice for seven days or more had to

be displayed on the site requiring town planning permission and notices in the local nespaper had to be given special attention.

Public participation had become more of an issue by the time of the passing of the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act. The conditions surrounding public particpation for structure and local plans became more defined, but the discretionary and ambiguous tones of the Town and Country Acts remained. The new features of the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act were: (my emphasis)

1. Individuals who wanted to make representations should be given <u>adequate</u> opportunity to do so.
2. Individuals should be <u>made aware</u> of their rights.
3. In the preparation of structure and local plans, public participation should occur in stages (eg after the preliminary survey work had been done.) However, there was no platform for the public to debate the primary questions as to why there was a need for a structure plan at all.
4. There should be public examination of both the structure and local plans. The structure plan would either be approved, rejected, or approved with certain modifications by the Environment Secretary. On the other hand, the local town planning authority would be its own judge in the approval or rejection of the local plan providing that it <u>generally conformed</u> to the structure plan. A conflict of interests could obviously arise. The local town planning authority had its own set of town planning policies, while at the same time, it was supposed to be its own unbiased judge in evaluating those policies and criticisms made of those policies.

The 1968 Town and Country Planning Act gave the individual the statutory guarantee that he would have access to information about town planning matters and have the opportunity to represent his views to the local town planning

authority who would be obliged to consider them. However, the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act does not specify how and on what basis the local town planning authority is to consider representations. This is important to point out so one can gauge how effective these representations will be in influencing the local town planning authority's local political decision making process.

The Skeffington Report (HMSO 1969b) on public participation in town planning was an argument in favour of greater public involvement during the formative stages of the generation of plans (ie structure and local plans). The arguments became seriously undermined when the Committee stated they:

> "doubted the necessity of recommending that the public should be involved from the start in the establishment of broad aims or goals that the community wishes to see achieved . . . In the context of British planning these aims are implicit and accepted . . . It is the attaining of the objects specific to the plan itself, the policies and the alternative ways to achieving them that needs to be debated"
> (HMSO 1979b: 24)

The establishment of broad aims or goals are precisely the questions that need to be debated. The Report advocated public participation not at the level of primary questions and assumptions, ie about the nature of the community's aims or goals, but at the level of second order questions, ie how these goals or aims are to be implemented.

The Report implicitly recognised the link between the local authority and the local community (via elected representatives to represent sections of the community) was being undermined by the committee system of local government. The Report's suggestions for dealing with this situation were aimed at the elected representatives.

It advocated that members should be more informed on town planning issues and that a more open debate on town planning issues should occur at council meetings rather than those issues being decided at the majority political party meetings. (The relationship the elected representative has with his/her local political party organisation - if there is one - is another factor that can undermine his link with those whom he is supposed to represent. These factors will be discussed in more detail in Chapter five on the context of local political decision making.) These measures, if ever implemented, might probably not be too successful because the mere possession of information is not a guarantee that an elected member would be able to make an impact on town planning decisions. It is necessary to consider the role of the council officers in producing the information; the relationship of the elected representative to his local political party organisation; and whether or not the elected representative is a member of the town planning committee.

The main aim of the Skeffington Report is to facilitate greater public involvement in town planning matters and the drafting of plans. The Report generally defined the context for public participation. Therefore, the creation of actual opportunities for participation rest with the local town planning authority and the type of relationship it has with its local electorate. This type of relationship would help to partly determine how effective public participation would be, either as a means of securing legitimacy for fait accompli decisions or as a means for influencing local political decision making on town planning matters.

The recommendations of the Skeffington Report were not taken up by the government of the day: They were not incorporated in the 1971 Town and Country Planning Act. The 1971 Town and Country Planning Act was not a significant departure from the 1968 Act on the matter of public participation. The 1972 Town and Country Planning (Amendment) Act contained some important qualifications with respect to the role of the

Environment Secretary and public participation in structure plans. 1972 Amendment Act stated the Environment Secretary was "not obliged to consult with or consider the views of the local planning authority or individuals . . . he may consult with them" (1972 Town and Country Planning (Amendment) Act HMSO 1972a). These qualifications gave the Environment Secretary more discretionary powers in coming to his decision on the structure plan, thus having the effect of undermining the potential effectiveness of the public participation procedures.

From a reading of the Town and Country Planning Acts, it appears that public participation was generally an unknown quantity before 1965. Public participation involves the articulation of interests concerning the allocation of land and its use. The way in which decisions are made and the extent to which different interests and groups are permitted to participate in the local political decision making process can have as much an effect on that decision than any set of value judgements or political principles. Due to the ambiguous and discretionary tone of the Acts, public participation can mean different things to different people. There is no explicit criterion available for judging its effectiveness. Usually, it is up to the local town planning authority's discretion to decide when to incorporate public participation and to assess the objections to the proposed plans.

From the preceding discussion, we have seen how the subjective awareness and growing concern for amenity and conservation and the increased interest and attention given to public participation in the Town and Country Planning Acts have given rise to an increase in the formation of third party pressure groups (which are nonmarket based land groups) with respect to the allocation of land and its use. Public participation involves the explicit co-option of the local electorate to the local political decision making process. It carries with it the stamp of legitimacy. This partially explains the dependency of the execution of

the local town planning authority's policy on the public participation process.

New forms of public participation can be a potential risk for the local town planning authority. On the one hand, public participation can be seen as an aid to policy execution to secure legitimacy and acceptance of that policy. But on the other hand, public participation can be politically threatening because it cannot be totally controlled by the local authority. The local authority can use "management tactics" to control the potentially threatening implications of public participation. ("Management tactics" and their use by the local authority will be discussed in greater detail in Chapters five, six, and eight.)

3. Conflict and Its Implications

The preceding sections have analysed town planning as a base for the expression of conflicting interests. As we saw from Chapter two, town planning incorporated many different types of interests that could be roughly categorised into two main areas: market based land institutions and nonmarket based land institutions and groups with respect to the allocation of land and its use. This Chapter has analysed these two general categories in more detail. They form the underlying and contradictory forces that can generate a potential basis for conflict between the local electorate and the local authority.

It has been shown that these two types of interest can come into conflict with each other and with the local authority in the town planning process. These structural factors form part of the context of local political decision making. It will be discussed in more detail in the next Chapter. The context of local political decision making has a constraining effect upon the local authority and the actual decisions that it makes on town planning matters (eg centre city redevelopment).

C H A P T E R F I V E

THE CONTEXT OF LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING

In this Chapter, I present a conceptual framework for analysing the pressures for change in city centre redevelopment, ie how structural forces can generate potential bases for different types of conflict and its effects with respect to local political decision making. Firstly, I will discuss how other models have approached this problem, viz the pluralist, elitist, neo-elitist and Marxist paradigms briefly referred to in the Introduction. In my critique of these positions, I will seek to point out their strengths, failings and difficulties. Secondly, I will introduce a conceptual framework that will try to overcome the criticisms of the above approaches. This conceptual analysis will then be applied to my empirical data in Chapters six, seven, eight and nine.

SECTION I - CRITIQUE OF APPROACHES TO LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING

The community power literature, which had its beginnings in the 1950s in the States, had three main approaches concerned with the working and effects of the local political decision making. The approaches can be termed the pluralist, elitist, and neo-elitist approaches to local political decision making.[1]

---

[1] I realise the danger of categorising analytical approaches in this way. Such a typology is useful to focus on the broad differences between approaches, but does not imply that every writer exemplifies a particular approach fully.

The Marxist approach to local political decision making became more widely used in the early 1970s in both Western Europe and the States. It had been previously thought that the Marxist approach was only adequate to analyse macro-social processes.

Our discussion of the four approaches will cover:

1. the main substantive features of the approach

2. the type of methodology employed

3. the approach's strengths and shortcomings on both the conceptual and empirical levels.

The final part of Section I will present a summary and discussion of the previous four parts. This will lead to a discussion of the context of local political decision making in Section II and of local political decision making itself in Section III.

1. The Pluralist Approach

The pluralist approach to local political decision making basically states there exist many issues with a corresponding number of groups and their interests. There are many centres of power that are based on the number of issues and the groups that mobilise around them. The inequalities that are generated by the outcome of local political decision making are not cumulative nor are they progressive. Instead of asking the question - Who runs the community? (which implies that one group/individual does), the pluralist approach asks the question - Does anyone at all run the community?

Issues are used to illustrate power and its effects on groups. Issues are defined as those disputes that are visibly fought in the local political decision making process. The pluralist approach does not make explicit the criterion it uses for defining what the "key" issues are, nor does it analyse how issues become defined as issues in the first place. The status and origin of issues are assumed by the pluralist approach. (See Agger, Goldrich, Swanson 1968b, Anton 1968, Anton 1970, Banfield 1961, Baur 1968b, Connolly 1969a, Dahl 1968, Dahl 1969a, Dahl 1969b, Duverger 1972, Eisenger 1972, Greifer 1974, Gyford 1976, Hahn 1972a, Hawley and Wirt 1968, McFarland 1969, Polsby 1963, Polsby 1969, Sayre and Kaufman 1968, Simon 1968, Wildavsky 1968, Zisk 1974 for work that can be loosely termed as pluralist.)

The pluralist conception of power stresses individual relations and concrete, observable behaviour. The most "powerful" is the individual or group who predominates in local political decision making and benefits from its decisions. Power is seen to be exercised through political participation. However, it appears that terms like "power", "influence", "authority", and "compliance" are all interchangeable within the pluralist approach which creates confusion between the theoretical conceptualisation of power and its empirical referents.

The pluralist approach is oriented towards interest groups who are defined as separate individuals and who are formally organised around a specific issue. They play a dominant role in the approach because the basis of power is perceived to change with each issue. It is the issue that produces the different coalitions of interests. Therefore, interest groups change with each issue. In the pluralist approach, interests are equated with stated policy preferences. This definition excludes the possibility that interests can be unobservable and that individuals and groups can be mistaken about what their interests are because of the existence of a "managed" consensus. The issue area is thought to be the independent variable. Interest groups

are seen to be the dependent variable because they are generated as a response to the emergence of an issue. The diversity of interests and groups and the time boundedness of issues usually has a fragmentary impact on groups through the outcome of decisions. Group involvement is specific to an issue. The pluralist approach assumes that society is divided into an enormous range of potentially organisable groups waiting to be actualised.

The pluralist approach states that all groups do not have the same resources (eg time, money, expertise, organisational ability, information, and energy) and their distribution is unequal. However, what one group lacks in a resource, another may have. Despite the unequal distribution of resources, groups are perceived as being potentially equal. Therefore, all groups have the same potential for power, whether or not they decide to utilise their resources.

The pluralist approach maintains that interest groups do have an effect on the local political decision making process. Their participation is seen to be a major source for obtaining power. Power is thought to manifest itself on the overt, visible level. The approach concentrates on investigating the appearances of power.

The effects of local political decision making are noncumulative. Winners and losers vary according to the issue because it is the issue that determines the coalition of individuals and groups. Therefore, no one group systematically benefits or is disadvantaged by the effects of local political decision making. The approach assumes winners and losers are mutually exclusive categories. There is no conceptual "middle" ground where groups can gain in one sense but lose in another.

The local government institution's role is perceived to be one of a neutral arbitrator among the interest groups. The approach states the local government institution does not have an interest in the issues. The pluralist approach maintains that local political institutions are the only forum where major group conflicts are debated and resolved.

Conflict is another predominant feature of the pluralist approach. Conflict is defined as being "external" because it occurs among groups (ie groups in conflict with other groups) and not within the group itself. Conflict is resolved when the issue has been settled by a decision in the local political decison making process. However, it will occur again when another issue arises. Conflict is thought to be functional in the pluralist approach because it contributes to the integration of society.

The pluralist approach states there are no cumulative effects arising from the local political decision making process due to the shifting of power, resources, and interest groups according to different issues. The wider social context within which local political decisions are made is precluded from investigation because the pluralist approach treats local political systems as having a high degree of autonomy.

Broadly speaking then, the pluralist approach emphasises the values and preferences of groups; the consensus as to how local political decision making operates; the multiplicity and divergence of issues and the associated interests and power relations. Some of the problems that are associated with this perspective are as follows: the approach is constructed in a structural and historical vacuum; the community is perceived to be a discrete, autonomous unit; there are no constraints operating on it; and a discussion of the link between national and local factors and how this affects the local political decision making process is absent.

To illustrate these statements about the pluralist approach, I will briefly refer to some of the major works using the approach. Dahl's book Who Governs? (Dahl 1968), is one of the most widely quoted books in the pluralist literature. Dahl studies New Haven, Conneticut and looked at the issues of education, urban redevelopment and political nominations. Dahl listed five criteria for defining the pluralist approach. He thought of them as statements about power relations (Dahl 1968: 36-41):

1. There are many types of resources that are available to the ordinary citizen for influencing officials.
2. Although resources are unequally distributed, individuals having access to one type are usually badly off with respect to other types of resources.
3. No single influence dominates all others for most key decisions.
4. Influence resources are limited to the issue area of a specific decision.
5. No one is lacking in some influence resource, ie everyone has the right to vote.

The five above points demonstrate that the analysis is based on observable, empirical data. Dahl does not recognise the constraints that operate on individuals which prevent them from utilising resources. He is not interested in the origin of issues and interests.

Banfield, in his study of Chicago (Banfield 1961), came to the conclusion that politics was the process of bargaining and the accommodation of competing interests. He stated the most influential in the process would be the most successful. McFarland (1969) asserted that power was not concentrated due to political conflict being multi-lateral and multi-dimensional.

Sayre and Kaufman (1968), in their study of New York City, outlined their reasons for employing the pluralist approach to their empirical data:

1. the fragmentary nature of government decision making in New York City
2. the overlapping of many groups in society
3. core groups related to one issue can act as satellite groups linked to other issue areas. All groups are inter-related.
4. a common set of assumptions and goals pervades the decisions that are made in different issue areas.

These empirical studies illustrate the emphasis which is placed on: the number of groups, the number of issues and how issues determine the character of interests and the coalition of individuals. They also assert that the effects of decisions made in the local political decision making process are noncumulative because decisions are not influenced in a systematic manner.

The majority of the pluralist studies have used the decisional method for collecting empirical data. It is seen as a means for determining where power lies within the community. The decisional method involves looking at who makes the decisions and how they are made on key issues within the community. Information is gathered through interviews, participant observation, documents, and newspaper clippings. The decisional method looks mainly at those issues that are explicitly debated within the local political decision making process. The method attempts to reconstruct: key issues; who opposed them; who supported them; and who won and lost.

Several criticisms can be made of the pluralist approach:

1. The criterion for selecting issues to study is ambiguous and not made explicit on a theoretical level. There is a degree of arbitrariness present in the pluralist literature as to how to select issues for analysis.
2. The method does not allow for the possibility of the occurrence of latent issues due to its emphasis on observable data. Thus, it does not take into account the existence or impact of influential and hidden (loosely organised) groups.
3. The pluralist approach equates the geographic concept of the community with the social and economic concept of the community.
4. The alleged emphasis of the pluralist approach is on groups, but the methodology used concentrates on individuals. The pluralist approach makes a conceptual jump from a concentration on individuals as an empirical source of data to its assertions about group orientation. The relationship of the empirical data to generalisations made about groups is not made explicit.

The pluralist approach is based on the assumption that appearances are the only level of reality. Issues and interest groups are associated and then connected by regular observation. This reveals that interest groups form after the emergence of an issue. The main cause-effect relationship is made: Issues cause interest groups to form and organise. The local political decision making process thus incorporates a succession of these cause-effect relationships.

After repeated observations are made, similarities begin to appear among issues, interest groups, and the decisions that are made in the local political decision making process. One generalisation that can be made about the basis of these similarities is: Different issue areas cause different coalitions of interest groups to form. These groups benefit differentially from decisions that are made in the local political decision making process. Reality is infinite in variety. These observations are selective because the main foci are issues, interest groups, and the decisions made in local political decision making. Although the pluralist approach takes into account the cause-effect relationship among issues, interest groups, and decisions, it does not analyse the context within which this relationship occurs.

If a lack of open conflict exists, then the pluralist approach maintains it is because of a consensus regarding the existing political order. The pluralist approach is limited because it does not attempt to ask why such a consensus exists.

Power, for the pluralist approach, lies within individuals, ie individuals who are successful are deemed to be powerful. Power is based on the observable relationships between individuals. Power is thus treated as a descriptive tool rather than a theoretical concept. The pluralist approach asks the question: Who has the power? rather than analysing the contradictory and structural forces in society as a means to explaining conflict and change.

Generalisations are made on the basis of similarities that develop from the selection of issues, the formation of interest groups, and the outcomes in the local political decision making process. The pluralist approach does not analyse the relative significance of these similarities. There are an infinite number of points for comparison between the different units of analysis, but the pluralists do not make explicit their criterion of comparison. The dimension of differences is neglected in the pluralist approach. What the pluralist approach offers is a description of the different elements that appear to be arbitrarily chosen. These generalisations provide us with knowledge as to what happened, but they lack the explanatory force as to how it happened.

The production of knowledge for the pluralist approach can be summarised in the following steps:

1. Events are associated on the basis of a time sequence and repeated observation.

2. Similar points of comparison connect events that are summarised into generalisations.

3. Generalisations attempt to compare characteristics (that are potentially infinite in number and appear to be arbitrarily chosen). This is the process that helps to determine the manner and extent in which facts are connected.

4. These generalisations are verified or disproved through the empirical observation of particular instances by using the process of induction.

2. The Elitist Approach

The elitist approach maintains that one group, termed the elite, systematically benefits from decisions that are made in the local political decision making process. The important question asked by the elitist approach is: Who runs the community? The approach assumes a priori that such a group exists.

Issues are used to illustrate power and its effects on groups. Issues are defined as only those disputes that generate conflict in the local political decision making process. Defining who the elites are and what are the "key" issues poses difficulties in the elitist literature. (See Aiken and Mott 1970, Bensmen and Vidich 1968, Clark 1972, Clelland and Form 1968, Connoll 1969a, Crain, Katz and Rosenthal 1969, Giddens 1974, Hawley and Wirt 1968, Hewitt 1975, Hunter 1968, Merelman 1968, Miller 1958a, Miller 1958b, Miller 1974, Stanworth and Giddens 1974, Thoenes 1966.)

Power is perceived to be derived from a hierarchical position in the institutional structure of government occupation or business concerns. Elites are usually defined as those individuals who occupy high institutional positions in those structures. This definition assumes that

power is concentrated at the top of the institutional pyramid. The elitist approach does not investigate how those individuals who occupy lower institutional positions can constrain the elites because the approach assumes that their actions are unimportant.

There are two main types of group in the elitist approach: elites and nonelites. The nonelite group is perceived to have a subordinate role because of their lack of high institutional position. The elite and nonelite groups remain relatively consistent and stable in their composition. Interest groups are usually considered to be nonelite and do not benefit from decisions made in the local political decision making process because of their lack of high institutional position.

The elite and nonelite groups respond to factors generated outside the internal dynamics of the group, ie an issue provides the base for conflict between the two groups. The elitist approach does not investigate the internal dynamics of groups and how this can affect the group's interaction with its environment. The elite, as a ruling group, are active in more than one policy area. Therefore, their participation in issues is not solely determined by a specific issue area, but by the relationship between the issue and the institution concerned.

All groups do not have the same resources. Institutional position is perceived to be the key resource from which other resources can be generated, eg money, time, skill, etc. Resources are unequally distributed and are most likely to have cumulative effects. If one group lacks institutional position, then it will most likely lack other resources, thus becoming doubly disadvantaged in the distribution of resources. There is a relatively stable coalition of resources due to the relatively consistent nature of the institutional structure. It is the institutional position, or lack thereof, that helps to determine the pattern and distribution of other resources.

Interest groups (which are considered to be nonelite groups due to members' lack of high position in political and economic institutions) have a negative effect on the local political decision making process because their interests and ideas are not effectively articulated or implemented. Participation in the local political decision making process is perceived to be a strategy of the less powerful due to their members' lack of high institutional position.

The outcome of the local political decision making process is to the benefit of the elite, thus maintaining the status quo. The result is systematic: the elite always benefit at the expense of the nonelite. Both groups are conceived to be mutually exclusive: the elites are the "winners" and the nonelites are the "losers".

The local government institution is one area from which the elite can be found. The elitist approach maintains the local government institution has its own interests and actively seeks to further them. Interests are attributed to institutional position because the elitist approach conceptualises interests as having an existence outside the domain of specific issue areas. Interests determine the issues. The conceptual framework of the elitist approach pereceives institutional position to be the independent variable and issues and interests to be the dependent ones.

Conflict has the effect of reinforcing the separation of the community into two main groups - the elite and the nonelite. Conflict is never resolved because the power structure is relatively stable and because it is derived from the institutional structure. Conflict is determined by the parameters of that structure. Thus, the elitist approach presents a self-perpetuating picture of society.

The effects of the power relations are cumulative in the elitist approach. Thus, the elite group is doubly advantaged at the expense of the nonelite group. Power relations are relatively stable because of the relatively constant coalition of resources that are derived from the institutional structure. The elitist conceptual framework does not allow for the possibility of change nor for mobility between the elite and nonelite groups. The elitist approach precludes the possibility of change because the elite and nonelite groups are relatively fixed and are determined by the relatively constant nature of the institutional structure.

The elitist approach emphasises institutional position[1] for four reasons: it is the basis of power; it gives rise to interests that determine the issues; it defines the relations among the elite and nonelite groups; and it defines who benefits and loses in the local political decision making process. The approach includes some structural elements such as the institutional structure of local government and business concerns. However, its concept of structure is limited because it only applies to those political and economic institutions within the community. The elitist approach lacks a historical perspective because it ignores the dynamic of how past decisions constrain and affect

---

[1] N.B. Some writers use the term "elite" to refer to social status independent of institutional position. But this is a minority usage; the majority link the elite with top institutional position.

present and future ones. The community is thought to be an autonomous unit. Therefore, the approach is precluded from taking into account the relationship between national and local factors.

To illustrate these statements about the elitist approach, I will briefly look at the work of those who used the elitist approach combined with reputational methodology. Hunter's study of Atlanta, Georgia (Hunter 1968) revealed that the city was run by a small, relatively cohesive economic elite. The power structure was conceived to be a pyramid. Bensman and Vidich's study of Springdale (Bensman and Vidich 1958) also revealed the existence of a small elite who dominated the community and whose values were congruent. The community was found to be tightly knit. The maintenance of this harmony was a fundamental objective of the political leaders. The study concluded that economic and political power went hand-in-hand.

Hunter, in his study of Atlanta (Hunter 1968), introduced the reputational method for determining how and for whom the local political decision making system operates. The reputational method tries to determine who are the leaders of the community by asking key informants who are supposed to be "in the know". Reputed power is equated with actual power. It is implied that appearances and reality are equivalent. But a reputation for power is not necessarily a valid index for it (Bonjean and Olson 1971: 165).

The reputational method assumes that the informants know what is happening in the community. It does not distinguish between those who may or may not know. Furthermore, it restricts the conceptualisation of power to the overt, visible level and prevents its conceptualisation on a more abstract and theoretical level. The reputational method also assumes that power (which is derived from institutional position) is stable over time.

The reputational method is clear, but its results are ambiguous. The power structure is assumed to be monolithic in nature. The reputational method looks at individuals and their institutional position. Thus it reinforces the elitist conception that senior institutional position is a necessary and sufficient condition for membership of the elite group.

3. The Neo-Elitist Approach

The neo-elitist approach is the third approach to community power. As its name implies, it is a derivative of the elitist approach. There are two main areas of deviation: in the conception of power and in the cohesiveness attributed to the elite group.

There are two levels of power relations (Bachrach and Baratz 1962) that are perceived to be operating in the neo-elitist approach. Firstly, there is the overt, visible level of power. This refers to the relations among those individuals who actually participate in the local political decison making process.

Secondly, there is the covert level of power. This refers to the structure and operation of the local government institution and how this prevents pressure groups from articulating their interests in the local political decision making process by placing constraints on their mobilisation. The phenomenon is termed the "mobilisation of bias". The effect of the "mobilisation of bias" is to reinforce the social and political values of the institutional structure. The effects of the "mobilisation of bias" can limit, whether or not individuals are aware of its effects, the scope of the local political decision making process (Bachrach and Baratz 1962, Bachrach and Baratz 1963, Frey 1971).

The neo-elitist approach investigates how the institutional structure of local government and its operation prevent interests from becoming articulated in the local political decision making process. The main effect of the "mobilisation of bias" is to prevent the formation of pressure groups around interests and issues. The "mobilisation of bias" helps to determine two types of issues that can be generated in the local political decision making process.

The first type of issue are those that occur in the local political decision making process. These are perceived to be relatively unimportant because they do not threaten the elite group and they overtly occur in the local political decision making process. The "mobilisation of bias" has filtered out those issues that would be potentially threatening by preventing groups from mobilising and articulating their interests in the local political decision making process.

The second type of issue are nonissues and nondecisions in the local political decision making process. The neo-elitist approach states that these are the important ones to investigate because they illustrate the filtering effects of the "mobilisation of bias". The "mobilisation of bias" prevents politically threatening issues from being articulated on an overt level in the local political decision making process.

The neo-elitist approach maintains: that the "mobilisation of bias" helps to determine which issues come to be defined as issues in the local political decision making process. Once an issue has become so defined, disagreement can occur over the preferences for its solution. This kind of conflict is nonthreatening to the elite group. The elite group also benefits from the implementation of the "mobilisation of bias" which prevents threatening issues from being articulated in the local political decision making process and interest groups from being formed around those issues.

Therefore, the neo-elitist approach illustrates what Lukes (1974) terms a two dimensional concept of power. The first dimension is the overt level of power that concerns itself with who makes the decisions on issues that are articulated in the local political decision making process. The second dimension is the covert level of power that concerns itself with how certain issues and interests are systematically excluded from being articulated in the local political decision making process.

There are two main types of groups in the neo-elitist approach - elite and nonelite. The nonelite group is perceived to have subordinate roles to the elite group because of its lack of high institutional position in government and business organisations. The formation of interest groups (who are the nonelite) is a strategy used only by the relatively powerless, ie it is utilised by the nonelite to increase their bargaining ability (Lipsky 1970).

Interest groups have a negative effect on the local political decision making process because as the nonelite, by definition, they are systematically the nonbeneficiaries of the local political decision making process. The main effect of the "mobilisation of bias" is to prevent potentially threatening issues (from the elite point of view) from being defined as issues and from being articulated in the local political decision making process. The neo-elitist approach maintains interests are consciously articulated, rational, and observable when linked to an overt issue.

In the elitist approach, the elite is perceived to operate in a pluralist sense (ie as loose coalitions of individuals) because the actual composition of the elite depends upon the issue. However, the emphasis of the neo-elitist approach is not placed on divisions within the elite group, but on the division between the elite and nonelite and the effects of the "mobilisation of bias". The internal dynamic of the elite group is not investigated because there is a lack of theoretical conceptualisation concerning the forces underlying elite group formation. The neo-elitist approach also assumes the existence of an elite, but it does not investigate the operation of constraints (ie the political, economic, and social constraints that operate on local and national levels) on the elite.

The exact character of the elite is determined in part by the issue area. However, this does not limit the elite participation to one issue areabecause of institutional position and the implementation of the "mobilisation of bias". Because the "mobilisation of bias" is inherent in the institutional structure and its subsequent operation, individuals who occupy high institutional positions can help, through their actions, to determine which issues become defined as issues that are articulated in the local political decision making process. The actions of individuals in high institutional positions are the empirical referents for the concept of the "mobilisation of bias".

The neo-elitist approach maintains resources are unequally distributed and have cumulative effects. If one group lacks high institutional position, then it will also be disadvantaged by the implementation of the "mobilisation of bias". There is a relatively stable coalition of resources because of the relatively constant nature of institutional position and because of the pattern and distribution of other resources that are determined by the operation of the institutional structure. Thus, the neo-elitist approach gives us a self-perpetuating picture of society.

The elite and nonelite of the neo-elitist approach are perceived to be internally uniform in their interests, motivations, and perceptions. The main effect of conflict is to reinforce the division between the elite and nonelite groups. The neo-elitist approach maintains the effects of the "mobilisation of bias" is to systematically disadvantage the nonelite. The "mobilisation of bias" is perceived to be systematically successful in preventing the important issues (ones that are potentially threatening to the elite and therefore one of the pressures for change) from becoming defined as issues in the local political decision making process.

The outcome of the local political decision making process is to the benefit of the elite group because the relations of power are unchanged. Issues provide the potential base for conflict between the elite and nonelite groups. Therefore, conflict is endemic to society because it is determined by the parameters of the structure and operation of political and economic institutions.

The government institution is one of the main institutions from which the elite group is derived and from which the "mobilisation of bias" can be implemented. The neo-elitist approach perceives that the government institution does have its own interests (such as its continuance) and does

seek to articulate them. The "mobilisation of bias" can be seens as one way through which its interests can be articulated in the local political decision making process.

The effects of the power relations are cumulative. The elite are doubly advantaged at the expense of the nonelite. Not only do the elite have greater resources at their disposal (they are derived from their high institutional structure) but the elite benefit from decisions that are made in the local political decision making process. Within the elite group, the effects of the power relations are not so concentrated because of the shifting coalitions of elite participation and resources on different issues. The neo-elitist approach maintains this is the main reason why the formation of a "super" elite does not occur.

Several of the neo-elitist studies (Crain, Katz, and Rosenthal 1969, Green 1968, Presthus 1968, Newton 1976) maintain there is an appearance of nominal pluralism that attempts to mask the operation of the elite group and the articulation of its interest in the local political decision making process. The elite is empirically defined as the set of "key" decision makers who are the locally elected representatives on the local council. The main effect of the "mobilisation of bias" is seen to create a consensus of values as to how the local political decision making process should operate. The studies point out that the "mobilisation of bias" furthers elite interests to the exclusion of nonelite interests. This emphasis on the effect of the "mobilisation of bias" makes the studies stress the constraints that operate on the nonelite in the articulation of their interests in the local political decision making process. The neo-elitist approach implies that there might be constraints operating on the elite, but this possibility is not theoretically developed.

KENT LIBRARY UNIVERSITY

The neo-elitist approach emphasises high institutional position for five key reasons:

1. It is the basis of power relations.
2. It gives rise to interests which determine implicit issues.
3. It defines relationships between the groups.
4. It defines who benefits and loses.
5. It defines the concept of the "mobilisation of bias". It prevents issues from being defined as issues and hence the lack of pressure group formation in these areas.

The neo-elitist approach does not ignore the institutional structure. However, it does not take into account the wider social, economic, and political forces which impinge upon that institutional structure. It places too much emphasis on the particular nature of an individual's institutional position. This emphasis results from the approach's lack of abstraction from individual behaviour. Secondly, the community is perceived to be an autonomous, ahistorical entity because the approach does not take into account the interplay between national and local factors. The above are two serious theoretical deficiencies in the neo-elitist approach.

The type of methodology that is usually associated with the neo-elitist approach is positional. The positional method aims at determining who occupies what place in the local economic and political institutions. This method succumbs to some theoretical and empirical pitfalls because of the assumptions that underlie its use:

1. Institutional position is equated with the exercise of power. Power is theoretically conceived to operate on the overt and convert levels, but only systematically for the benefit of the elite. Thus, there is no possibility for change because the

implementation of the "mobilisation of bias" systematically benefits the elite at the expense of the nonelite.

2. The method does not ask itself the theoretical question why the top leadership roles as defined by the hierarchical nature of the institutional structure are the most important ones with respect to the local political decision making process. The method assumes a congruence between formal authority and effective power.
3. The theoretical concept of nonissues or nondecisions tends to mask the distinction between covert, conscious control (which is the lack of public visibility) by the elite over the emergence of issues from the more subtle effects of the "mobilisation of bias" that is inherent in the structure and operation institutions, particularly local government ones.
4. The method does not look at constraints that operate on the elite because of its theoretical deficiency.
5. The criterion for theoretically defining a nonissue can be vague and ambiguous. This gives the empirical license to include everything and anything.
6. Since overt issues are thought to be unimportant because they do not threaten the elite, it is difficult to empirically ascertain the existence of an elite except by high position in the institutional structure (if there is not any potentially threatening conflict then it would not be necessary for an elite to manifest itself).

Several empirical studies have analysed how local authorities possess the ability to control and shape their environment through the implementation of the "mobilisation of bias". It involves an investigation of their structures and mode of operation. (See Davies 1972, Dearlove 1973 for his study on the London boroughs of Kensington and Chelsea, Dennis 1970, Dennis 1972, Dennis 1974, Eversley 1973a, Muchnik 1970 for his study on Liverpool, Saunders 1979b for his study on Croydon, and Saunders 1975.)

These studies focused on the institution of local government and how its routine operation affected certain segments within the community. A study of air pollution in two Indiana towns explicitly tried to illustrate the concept of nonissues and nondecision making with limited success (Crenson 1971).

The neo-elitist approach is the first, explicit attempt in the literature analysed thus far (through the concept of the "mobilisation of bias")to analyse the structural forces that help to determine the workings and outcomes of the local political decision making process. The concept of the "mobilisation of bias" looks at the operation of the institution and how this affects issues and their articulation in the local political decision making process. However, the neo-elitist approach precludes the possibility of understanding change because the effects of the "mobilisation of bias" are considered to systematically benefit the elite. Therefore, it reinforces the existing institutional structure and its operation. In addition, the attempt to analyse structural forces is limited in its scope to the institution of local government and, in some cases, to the institutional aspect of business concerns. The neo-elitist approach does not try to analyse the context within which these institutions operate. Therefore, the neo-elitist approach cannot explain the nature and origins of conflict within the local political decision making process and the pressures for change in that process.

4. The Marxist Approach

The Marxist approach perceives that power is derived from the operation of the capitalist mode of production, ie its genesis is within the structure of society. Power is class power and classes are derived from the institution of private property and its relationship to the mode of production. Power is conceived to be manifested in two main ways. The first way is economic. It is determined by the relation to the mode of production, the institution of private property, and the operation of the market. The second way is political. It is determined by the ability to benefit from the functioning of the political decision making process. Although the political system is considered to be relatively autonomous from the economic system, the Marxist approach asserts the ultimate primacy of economic power. In other words, the class that is economically dominant will hold the reins of political power.

The most important issues for the Marxist approach are those that involve the struggle between capital and labour. This does not preclude the possibility that other types of issues are capable of generating conflict, eg those issues that involve the different fractions of capital or labour.

The Marxist approach maintains that, in the long run, there exist two main social classes that are defined by their relationship to the capitalist mode of production, the institution of private property, and the operation of the market. They are:

1. the bourgeoisie who are the owners of the production process
2. the proletariat who sell their labour power as a commodity to the owners of the production process.

The Marxist approach makes a distinction between a class-in-itself and a class-for-itself. A class-in-itself is determined by its objective economic position in the workplace. Whereas, a class-for-itself is also determined by objective economic relations, but with an awareness of what they entail, ie class consciousness. Class interests are primarily determined by the economic relations of production, but they only become overtly articulated because of the factor of class consciousness. The bourgeoisie is the dominant social class because it controls the means of production. There is a dependence of political power on economic control. The Marxist approach makes an important theoretical break from the three previous approaches. It asserts that social classes are determined by the structure of society and they do not "spontaneously" arise due to the generation of an issue[1].

Marx himself was not concerned with the state per se, but its importance was realised in an ad hoc manner. In the Marxist approach, there are two roles of the state. (Since the Marxist approach is based on a macro-structural theory, the local authority is seen as part of the wider state apparatus.) They are:

1. its role in ensuring cohesion of the social formation. Legitimacy is one means to try to ensure the reproduction of class relations, the reproduction of the labour force, and the reproduction of the conditions within which the accumulation of capital occurs.

---

[1]The above discussion contains a high degree of simplification. Because of the importance attached to social classes in the Marxist approach, a further elucidation is needed on social class boundaries. See Poulantzas 1975 and Wright 1976 for the debate on this issue.

2. its role in the class struggle. The state is seen as part of the class struggle and it has a tend ncy to exacerbate social contradictions that arise from the mode of production. Ideology is seen as one factor that is generated from the relations of capital and labour. One of the effects of ideology can be to politically organise the bourgeoisie and to politically disorganise the working class.

There are two main perspectives within the Marxist approach (Gold, Lo, Wright 1975). The first perspective is called the instrumentalist. Miliband is an example of the instrumentalist perspective of the Marxist approach (Miliband 1969, Miliband 1973, Miliband 1977). The second variant is termed the structuralist. Poulantzas is an example of the structuralist perspective of the Marxist approach (Poulantzas 1972, Poulantzas 1973, Poulantzas 1975). Each perspective will be discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

A. <u>The Instrumentalist Perspective</u>

This perspective focuses on the ties between the bourgeoisie and the state. The perspective maintains that the state serves the interests of the capitalist class because it is controlled by the capitalist class and because it also has a predisposition to the capitalist class through the class ethos of its civil servants. The state is subject to external pressure from the capitalists and internal pressure from its civil servants to dominate the working class.

This perspective analyses three main areas:

1. the nature of the bourgeoisie - the dominant class
2. the mechanisms that link this class to the state
3. the relation between state policies and class interests.

The perspective concentrates on the links between these two groups inside and outside the state structure. It states that the capitalist class benefits from the operation of the state because of these social links with those occupying positions in the state structure and from the pressure it can exert upon the state. The class relationship to the mode of production is over-shadowed by the emphasis that is placed on the social and political relationships among individuals.

B. The Structuralist Perspective

This perspective analyses how state intervention is determined by the contradictions and constraints of the capitalist system. Emphasis is placed on structural constraints, ie constraints emanating from the operation and structure of the capitalist system rather than focusing on individuals who occupy institutional positions. It looks at the "external" constraints that can limit the scope of the state's activities. Almost exclusive emphasis is placed on the objective relations of the capitalist system which determine the roles of the state and its functioning. Those who run the state are conceptualised as being mere "support agents" of the capitalist system.

Poulantzas's starting point is the class structure and its relation to the mode of production and how this mode of production is becoming more social in character.

He emphasises the political function of the state which is to maintain the social formation. For him, the state attempts to mediate between two types of pressures. They are the following:

1. the pressure of the working class. The state attempts to disintegrate the political unity of the working class by the translation of workers into individual citizens who are equal.
2. the fragmentation of the capitalist class. There are fractions within the capitalist class. The state attempts to guarantee the long term interests of the capitalist class as a whole through its policies and other modes of intervention.

The perspective gives the impression that conscious action, as empirical data, plays a negligible role in the analysis, whereas in the instrumentalist perspective too much importance is placed on voluntaristic action.

* * *

These two perspectives within the Marxist approach treat the political system as one means of achieving the institutionalisation of conflict. Conflict is defined as a problem for the political institutions to "manage". Potentially politicised issues can become depoliticised through institutionalised political relationships. The Marxist approach allows for the possibility of conflict occuring within a group because social class and nonclass interests can exist in the same group. However, the Marxist approach maintains the most important type of conflict for the evolution of society is between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Conflict is determined by the relationship of these classes to the mode of production.

Nonclass interests are defined as interests other than those that are directly linked to social class interests - eg ethnic, community, territorial, and religious interests. These types of interests can be "superimposed"

upon social class interests. Issues and conflicts based on nonclass interests are more likely to be politically organised at the local level than social class interests. The Marxist approach does not explicitly state why, but following from this approach, the selective representation of nonclass interests occurs for several reasons. Firstly, there is the nature of state legislation, policies, and directives. How the state allocates benefits helps to create divisions other than social class, eg old age pensioners, motorists, pedestrians, those who pay rates according to property type, etc. Secondly, the geographical boundaries of the local authority are significant, and finally, residential segregation within the wards of the local authority has an effect.

In some urban based conflicts, nonclass interests appear to predominate over social class interests. Marxists argue that this pattern of selective representation of interests tends to legitimate the pluralist, liberal image of the state. The selective representation of interests can further the political fragmentation of the working class.

The Marxist approach gives us a theoretical base such as social classes for analysing the potential base for conflict. However, this concept needs to be refined when applied to a particular empirical situation. It is understood that the theoretical and empirical levels of analysis are qualitatively different, so an attempt is made to link them more directly by incorporating the concept of nonclass interests, the selective representation of these interests, and their effects.

The political system and its bias towards the selective representation of interests has the effect of obscuring the link between urban based conflicts and production based conflicts. Urban based conflicts tend to exacerbate the contradictions and conflict which exist in the productive sphere among the social classes.

Which group benefits and which group is disadvantaged as a result of decisions made in the local political decision making process is not a zero sum equation in the Marxist approach. The groups are not mutually exclusive. However, it does not always follow from the Marxist approach that those groups who benefit from the decisions made by the state apparatus are those who have the power. The emphasis is on the state's relationship to the interests of capital and to pressure groups.

In the Marxist approach, the effects of the "benefits" resulting from the decisions made by the state apparatus to the working class are in the long term cumulative. The class struggle matures capitalism. It is thought that the class consciousness of the working class needs to be heightened to unify objective interests. Over time, the conflict between the two classes will appear to be more visible and frequent. The greater the conflict, the greater the possibility for change in the capitalist mode of production. The Marxist approach perceives that changes in society will follow from contradictory developments in its economic base.

A great deal has been written about using the Marxist approach for analysing cities (See Alford 1975, Balbus 1971, Bridges 1974, Castells 1977a, Castells 1977b, Castells 1978, Clark 1977, Fischer 1978, Georing 1978, Girardin 1974, Harlow 1977a, Harvey 1975, Harvey 1976, Harvey 1978, Holloway and Picciotto 1976, Holloway and Picciotto 1977, Holloway and Picciotto 1978a, Lamarche 1976, Lebas 1977, Lindberg, Alford, Crouch, Offe 1975, Lojkine 1976, Lojkine 1977, Massey 1977a, Massey and Catalano 1978, Mingione 1977, Mollenkopf 1975a, Offe 1975, Offe 1976, Offe and Volker 1975, Pickvance 1976a, Pickvance 1976b, Pickvance 1977a, Pickvance 1977b, Pickvance 1978a, Pickvance 1978b, Preteceille 1976, Roweis 1975, Szelenyi 1978, Wolfe 1974, Wright 1976, Wright 1978.) but few empirical studies have been done in comparison. Of the empirical work

that has been done, most of it has concentrated on the macro level of analysis (See Harloe 1977a as a good example of utilising the Marxist approach to the process of urbanisation.). The main area of concern has not been with the local community. In the empirical work that has been done (See Castells 1978, Cockburn 1977, Elkin 1974, Hayes 1972, Pickvance 1977a) several difficulties have occurred.

Firstly, there is the difficulty of applying a macro-structural approach to a local empirical situation. There is a danger that the theoretical-empirical link becomes tenuous. If this is the case, then the theory can be seen to be "floating away" from the empirical phenomena it is trying to explain. There would then be a discontinuity between the theory and its empirical referent. Certain theoretical terms would have the tendency to becoming "umbrella" expressions that would encompass different types of empirical phenomena, thus losing their analytical sharpness. Another effect could be the exclusive emphasis placed on the empirical data to the disregard of any theoretical analysis. "Middle range" concepts can help to bridge this gap between a macro-structural theoretical approach and a local community empirical situation.

Secondly, there is the difficulty of avoiding a static explanation. The structuralist perspective has a tendency to see structures as self-perpetuating and neglect the way in which they can be changed by human action over time. The structure then becomes reified as a set of objective forces that denies the possibility for human action. Therefore, one is presented with a self-perpetuating picture of society.

The Marxist approach tries to link urban based conflicts with work based conflicts. Urban based conflicts are not seen to be mere reflections of the underlying tension between capital and labour in the work place for two main reasons.

Firstly, one of the functions of cities is to facilitate the transfer of surplus value from production to circulation to consumption. This circulation of surplus value gives rise to additional conflicts other than those between capital and labour. Competition occurs among and within the different spheres of activity for a share of the surplus value.

Secondly, the role of the state adds an extra dimension to the circulation of surplus value because of the state's "external" relationship to the capital accumulation process and to the artificial separation of economics and politics in society. The state is a vehicle for collective action that necessarily depends upon legitimacy for its actualisation and implementation of its actions. The state can thus absorb and provoke new conflicts.

Urban based conflicts are seen to be those conflicts within society as a whole. Conflicts at the work place are seen to be those conflicts based on the division of capital and labour within the production process. The Marxist approach maintains there two types of conflict are artificially separated. But urban based conflicts are not perceived to be mere reflections of capital and labour based conflicts. This would imply a direct relationship of cause and effect between the two types of conflict.

If the theorisation process progresses too far, the link between theory and empirical phenomena becomes vague. Ideas only become connected with other ideas and thus lose their touch with the empirical realm. Truth or falsity of the theory would then rest on whether or not the theory is internally and logically consistent. The theory would then self-generate its own concepts which would be imposed upon the empirical phenomena. Reference to the empirical phenomena would not be needed to verify the theory.

Power, in the Marxist approach, has structural foundations because it is perceived to be an attribute of social classes and not individuals. Power relations are abstractions from the empirical phenomena. The base of power lies in the relations of contradictory, structural forces that are perceived to constrain and control individual behaviour. However, the structuralist underpinnings of the Marxist approach can be emphasised too much. Objective forces then become reified, thus denying the possibility of individual action and change in the analysis.

5. Summary and Discussion

From the above discussion of the four approaches, certain similarities are apparent:

1. All four approaches investigate how decisions are made with respect to a particular set of issues.
2. All four approaches attempt to empirically identify the individuals/groups who are opposed to the issues, those who are for them, and those who have benefitted or have become disadvantaged as a result of the decision(s) that was (were) made in the local political decision making process (although the theoretical explanations of why some benefit and others do not are different).
3. All four approaches try to come to grips with the concept of power.
4. All four approaches perceive the local authority to be an important element in the analysis.

A major problem found in the community studies literature is that the wider social context is not taken into account. The environment within which the local community interacts in most cases, is taken for granted. It is this context which can help to determine and generate issues, conflicts, the mobilisation of groups, and can affect the decisions made in the local political decision making process. Another problem is that the community is used as the unit of study, and the interplay between national and local factors and how this impinges upon the local political decision making process is not recognised. The interplay between national and local factors is important in understanding the dynamics of local political decision making and the pressures for change. (See Pahl (1976) for an assessment of this importance.)

The Marxist approach does attempt to elucidate the links between wider societal processes and the locality. The origins of conflict within the community can be found in the contradictory, structural forces of capitalist society. However, there is a danger in this approach that the locality becomes reduced to the status of an example of these wider, structural forces. This is due to the gap that exists between the macro level of analysis and the micro level of empirical data.

All four approaches focus on similar, empirical phenomena. They all investigate decisions made in the local political system and how the issues are used as empirical referents of power. Some of the empirical findings of the four approaches are similar. They are the following:

1. There is usually a low level of public participation in the local political decision making process.
2. Those who do participate are usually a small number who are continuously active in the local community.
3. The direct pressure that is exerted upon the local councillors by the electorate is usually ineffective on its own.
4. Informal pressure that is exerted by the pressure groups appears to be a main feature of the empirical explanation.

Thus, there appears to be a high consensus among the approaches about the operation of the local political decision making process. Given this agreement at the empirical level, each approach differs in the way it links this empirical data (whether it be implicity or explicitly) to the theoretical framework.

The main strength of thepluralist approach is on the empirical level. It provides a good description of the immediate empirical situation. However, the approach reaches its limits when it tries to do more than offer a description because of its lack of explicit theoretical framework. The elitist approach attempts to look at the institutional structure of local government, but the analysis is precluded from making links from that structure to the wider social context by its narrow definition of structure. The concept of "mobilisation of bias" in the neo-elitist approach is useful for determining how issues come to be defined as issues in the local political decision making process and the impact of these nonissues and nondecisions on the articulation of interests in the local political decision making process. The "mobilisation of bias" only pertains to the operation and structure of the local government institution. It ignores the other links to the wider societal structure that can constrain those individuals who occupy high institutional position.

The Marxist approach tries to acquire an understanding of the contradictory and structural forces that constitute the process of local political decision making. It investigates the relationship of the community to the wider society. However, there is a danger of applying a macro level theory to a local empirical situation if the link between the theory and the empirical data is not made explicit. Another danger of structuralist analysis is that it can fail to allow for the possibility of change and result in a static, mechanistic explanation of empirical phenomena. Section II will attempt to overcome these weaknesses of the structuralist Marxist approach and incorporate the strengths of the pluralist, elitist, and neo-elitist approaches.

SECTION II - THE CONTEXT OF LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING

This section will develop the concept of the context of local political decision making which we have seen is neglected in three of the four approaches discussed. This section will explain the contradictory[1] factors that constitute the context of local political decision making; how each factor can become a potential base for conflict;and how these conflicts affect the kinds of decisions that are made in the local political decision making process. The context of local political decision making is the environment within which formal local political decisions are made. Section III will discuss the process of local political decision making and how the different types of conflict (that are generated in its context) can act as constraints on the types of decisions that are made. It also analyses the potential base for conflict within the local authority itself - between its economic and political roles in local political decision making.

The context of local political decision making is a concept that helps us to trace the relationship between the locality and the wider social context. It is important to determine how this relationship can constrain the locality, what are its biases, and how it affects the local political decisions that are made. The local authority, the community and the process of centre city redevelopment are not totally discrete, autonomous entities. All are integral components of a wider social structure.

The context of local political decision making provides the framework within which the formal local political decisions are made. It incorporates the underlying dynamic that gives rise to the pressures for change with regard to centre city redevelopment. How this environment affects the decisions that are made will be the focal point of Section III where I will discuss the local political decision making process itself.

---

[1]The term contradiction, denotes a relation between two or more conepts that are antagonistic and inconsistent with each other when linked together. Conflict is a consequence of the contradictory relation. Although conflict is an empirical referent of a contradictory relationship, this does not imply that conflict and contradiction are one and the same thing. Conflict is one form that a contradictory relationship can take, but not all contradictory relationships generate conflict.

The main factors that constitute the context of local political decision making are:

1. the economic base of the locality
2. the distribution of legislative powers and financial controls among the levels of government
3. the degree of control of the local authority by the local electorate.

Each factor gives rise to a characteristic type of conflict in relation to centre city redevelopment. We will now discuss each of these three contextual factors at greater length.

1. Economic Base of the Locality

In the capitalist mode of production, the economic base of the locality is determined by three main spheres of activity: production, circulation, and consumption. They are mutually dependent activities. The production process transforms national resources into commodities that are useful to man. It is the industrial or manufacturing sector. Surplus value originates in the production process because of the injection of labour power into that process.

The circulation process bridges the gap between the production of commodities and their consumption. It is concerned with the distribution of commodities, ie the commercial service sector. The activities of circulation involve transport, communication, time, distance and location factors. It is through this activity that the commodity becomes translated into monetary form. In addition, the management function regulates the relationships between the activities of production, circulation and consumption (Castells 1976: 159). Local government and urban planning are parts of this management process.

The activities of production, circulation, consumption, and management require land. Land provides the material base for these activities and is the medium through which these activities are spatially organised. The development process provides the arena for their interaction. These activities compete for the use of land. This competition expresses conflicting interests over the importance and use of land to each particular activity.

Within each type of activity, land has a certain level of importance. In the production process, land is one of the factors of production along with capital and labour. All three elements are equally important in the production process. The relative importance of land is greater with respect to circulation activities. Land and its location are particularly important for commercial activities. They require very particular locations to facilitate the exchange relationship between the consumer and the commodity. A particular location is dependent upon the intrinsic value of the site itself, accessibility, and externality effects. The intrinsic value of the site itselfrefers to its physical dimensions. Accessibility facilitates exchange. The greater the accessibility to the site, the greater the potential for the number of contacts to be made. Externality effects are dependent upon the types of activities found in a particular area. The specialisation and complementarity of activities creates a high degree of interdependence that increases the externality effects because of their close physical proximity.

Different types of commercial activities have different requirements in relation to central locations in cities. Convenience shopping (which is basically concerned with food and everyday shopping necessities) is not so dependent upon central location because of the relative smallness of its catchment area and frequency of trips. However, consumer durable shopping is relatively more dependent upon central locations because such items are

infrequently bought, are longer lasting. The catchement area is thus wider. The increased use of car ownership has made peripheral locations for commercial activities more accessible, thus helping to make them as advantageous as central locations for commercial activities (if not more so). However, rising energy costs can have the effect of making central locations more accessible due to the relatively higher costs to peripheral areas. Although the majority of people do not live in the centre, the range of commercial activities in the city centre is likely to be more concentrated than those activities located in peripheral areas.

Ownership rights over land are translated into a land rent charged to the users of the land. The level of rent that is charged is dependent upon two main factors:

1. the intrinsic features of the building and land
2. the types of externality effects that are generated in the area and which are not necessarily dependent on any action taken by the landowner.

The level of rent charged is dependent upon the favourability of the two above factors to the potential users of the site. The more favourable the site is, the more likely the rent will be higher. High rents do limit the access of some potential users to the site. The future potential of a site may lead to a rent out of line with the current use of the site.

At first, central locations provide the most favourable areas for commercial activity for two main reasons. Firstly, they are usually in the position of maximum accessibility. However, there is a limit to these advantages. Secondly, the interdependence of activities generates situational advantages. The centralisation of commercial, financial, and administrative activities produces greater efficiency in the circulation process. This has the effect of speeding up the circulation of

of capital and reducing the indirect costs of production.

However, at a certain limit (or threshold) these advantages become disadvantages that have cumulative effects. In trying to achieve his own self interest, each user of centrally located sites produces unintended consequences such as congestion (which means delays in time and increased costs) and high rents, all of which have adverse effects on the efficiency of the circulation sphere. These adverse effects decrease private profits and raise public costs. The "fossilisation" of the built environment constrains the future spatial configuration. This "fossilisation" process occurs because the built environment is relatively more permanent and has more inertial tendencies in responding to changes in society than political, economic, and social factors. There usually exists a time gap between changes in society and changes in the built environment.

The conservation policies of the local authority and the conservation interests within the community tend to exacerbate these inertial tendencies of the built environment. They respectively enforce and advocate the retention of the historical infrastructure. They concentrate on the retention of the physical characteristics of buildings, streets, trees, etc. The historical infrastructure can constrain the type of use of a particular site, not only because of the physical dimensions of the building but also because of the surrounding environs that can affect accessibility to that site.

There are three major types of negative externality effects that are generated by commercial redevelopment:

1. the lack of accessibility that can take two forms:
   a. traffic congestion
   b. lack of car parking spaces near the city centre
2. the high costs of rents and land that can encourage the loss of residential floorspace within the city centre

3. the conservation policies and interests that can perpetuate the historical infrastructure. This could have the possible effect of constraining the future allocation of land and its use.

These disadvantages are a direct consequence of the advantages which make central locations attractive for commercial activities and are cumulative in nature. What has been created by the needs of individual capital becomes inimical to its needs in the future. The relationship between the advantages and disadvantages of centrally located sites for commercial activities provides the basis for trying to determine the pressures for change in the allocation of land and its use.

The outcome of the competing claims for the use of land (resulting from the activities of production, circulation, and consumption) help to determine the use of land. These competing claims become articulated through the development process. The development process consists of a set of relations structured around the users of land. This set of relations is composed of the interaction of market based groups and institutions, nonmarket based groups and institutions, the users of land, and the town planning process. It is the interaction of these relations that help to determine how land and its use is allocated. Land is a commodity within the wider context of social, political, and economic forces.

Land allocation is inherently a political activity in the local political decision making process. Town plannning is an attempt to resolve these conflicts over the use of land, but in the process of doing so, it creates other kinds of conflicts. Therefore, land based conflicts are indicative of wider social, economic, and political forces. These structural factors that can generate the potential base for conflict over the use of land constitute the first element in the context of local political decision making.

2. The Distribution of Legislative Powers and Financial Controls Between the Levels of Government

The distribution of town planning powers and financial controls among the levels of government are the second set of factors that constitute the context of local political decision making. The following trends and features are significant:

1. the increase in the legislative scope of town planning since the beginning of the twentieth century
2. the increase in central government control of town planning since World War II
3. the discretionary powers of town planning which give the statutory powers a vague and ambiguous quality
4. the nature of statutory town planning powers which are fundamentally negative
5. the new structures of the DoE (1970) and local government (1974)
6. the assignment of specific town planning responsibilities to each level of government.

These factors condition the operation of the local political system and are frequently given insufficient attention.

Local government in England became more systematised in the nineteenth century. The 1835 Municipal Corporations Act delegated self-government charters to many towns. The 1888 Local Government Act dealt with local government as a whole. It became the foundation for local government structure prior to reorganisation of local government in 1974 in three main ways (Richards 1973: 21): Firstly, it provided for a new, higher and elected tier of local authority - the county council. Secondly, it established both the county councils and the county boroughs as the first tier of local government structure. (In the case of the county boroughs, it was the only tier.) Thirdly, it reorganised the financial relations between central and local government.

The 1894 Local Government Act further systematised district councils in England. Both the 1888 and 1894 Local Government Acts separated the governing of town and country. Urban districts and noncounty boroughs were allocated to the towns and rural districts were allocated to the country areas. The problems of urban areas were perceived to be distinct from the rural ones.

The influence of central government grew in the twentieth century in two main areas. They are:

A. in the legislation and delegation of services to local government under the auspices of central government
B. in the financial aspect because central government was becoming increasingly responsible for the management of the national economy.

The increasing influence of central government in local authority affairs provides a new potential base for conflict between the levels of government. Each area will be discussed in detail and the implications of central government influence over local authorities will be examined.

A. Legislative powers

In the 1920s, central government became concerned with the maintenance of minimum standards for local authority services. A type of monitoring role of central government over local authorities emerged from this initiative of central government. This was eventually replaced by central government concern over local authority achievement of equal standards in the post World War II era. The 1929 Local Government Act removed the first major service from local authority control - unemployment relief. This major trend of the loss of local authority control over services has continued until the present day.[1] The growth that occurred in the scale and type of local authority services was greatest in the first tier of the local government structure.

---

[1] It is not within the scope of the thesis to go into an explanation of the changes in local authority responsibilities eg whether or not this was due to class struggle, the functional needs of capital etc. See Friedland and al (1977) for a general perspective, and Dearlove (1979) for an application to British local government.

The following services were either taken away from local authority control and then subsequently administered by adhoc boards or they became the direct responsibility of central government:

1930 - The licensing of passenger road services was taken away from local authorities and given to twelve regional panels of traffic commissioners.

1936 - 3,500 miles of trunk road was placed directly under the control of the Ministry of Transport.

1945 - The Water Acts delegated the responsibility of the water supply to special boards from local authority control.

1946 - National Health Service Act removed the responsibilit for hospitals from local authorities to regional health boards.

1947 - Electricity Act nationalised the electricity industry of which two-thirds had been owned and operated by local authorities. Electricity was now administered by a special board.

1947 - Municipal passenger transport was nationalised. However, the British Transport Commission had a brief life. It was denationalised in 1953.

1948 - Gas Act nationalised the gas industry of which 37% was owned and operated by the local authorities. Gas was now to be administered by a special board.

(Jackson 1966, Keith-Lucas and Richards 1978, Morton 1970)

Local authority services did grow in the immediate post World War II era, but most legislative powers were concentrated on the first tier at the expense of the second tier. (The first tier is the county level, whereas the second tier of local government is the district level.) Also, a great majority of those services had to be provided at the minimum standard set by central government. Those services were:

1944 - Education Act delegated elementary schools to county level. Many second tier authorities had

been maintaining elementary schools.

1946 - Police Act transferred the law and order function to the county level from the district level.

1946 - National Health Service Act concentrated the left over health functions at county level.

1947 - Fire Services Act returned this function to the local level, but it was convenient only at county level.

1947 - Town and Country Planning Act concentrated town planning powers at the county level instead of at the district level.

(Morton 1970)

In comparison to the 1940s, the 1950s and early 1960s saw little change in the way of legislation. However, central government was consolidating its control over local authority's legislative responsibilities.

The 1972 Local Government Act continued the previous trend towards the centralisation of control (there were fewer local government units) and uniformity of structure (all local government in England was composed of two tiers). The 1972 Local Government Act also changed the distribution of functions and responsibilities between the two tiers of the local authority.

The major effects of twentieth century legislation with respect to the allocation of responsibilities between the levels of governmenthave thus been:

1. The loss of local authority control over certain services (particularly with respect to infrastructure services) either to ad hoc boards or to central government. This tended to depoliticise the provision of these services.
2. The loss of second tier control over the provision of services. This tended to aggravate the tensions between the counties and the larger urban districts.

Town planning is a responsibility shared between all the levels of government. In the earliest town planning legislation (1909, 1932), the second tier of the local authority was given the opportunity to develop local planning schemes. In this period, town planning remained optional but those local authorities which drew up plans zoned land for vastly more development than what could have realistically occurred. Local authorities tried to attract the maximum amount of development to reduce this anarchic situation.

The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act firstly made town planning obligatory and secondly it centralised responsibility. However, the 1947 Act gave the major responsibility for town planning to the administrative counties and the county boroughs and delegated limited powers to the second tier. The 1968 Town and Country Planning Act and the 1972 Local Government Act had the effect of redistributing the different aspects of town planning between the two tiers of local government as shown in Table 2.

As we saw in Chapter three, the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act introduced the assumption of a uniform local government structure in the preparation of structure and local plans. The structure plan was a statutory obligation and had to be approved by the Environment Secretary. Whereas the local plan did not have to be approved by the Environment Secretary; it had to conform to the strategic policies of the structure plan. The 1968 Town and Country Planning Act assumed that the local plans would automatically fit in with the structure plan and that local authorities would be unitary rather than two tiered. If the two levels of local government were not in agreement in their town planning policy, then the preparation of the structure and local plans could generate a potential base for conflict between the two tiers.

Table 2 - Delegation of the Aspects of Town Planning Between the Two Tiers of Local Government After Re-Organisation

Counties	Districts
Structure Plans	
Local Plans (in special cases)	Local Plans (most)
Development Control (strategic and reserved decisions)	Development Control (most)
Acquisition and Disposal of Land	Acquisition and Disposal of Land
Clearance of Derelict Land	Clearance of Derelict Land (c)
National Parks (subject to existence of boards)	
Country Parks (c)	Country Parks (c)
Footpaths and Bridleways	Footpaths and Bridleways
Commons -registration	
Caravan Sites - provision	Caravan Sites - provision (c) licensing and management
Gipsy Sites - provision	Gipsy Sites - management
Small Holdings and Cottage Holdings	
	Allotments

Cont/. . . .

Table 2 (Cont.) Delegation of the Aspects of Town Planning Between the Two Tiers of Local Government After Re-Organisation

Metropolitan Counties	Metropolitan Districts
Structure Plans	
Local Plans (in special cases)	Local Plans (most)
Development Control (strategic and reserved decisions)	Development Control (most)
Acquisition and Disposal of Land (c)	Acquisition and Disposal of Land (c)
Clearance of Derelict Land (c)	Clearance of Derelict Land (c)
National Parks (subject to existence of boards)	
Country Parks (c)	Country Parks (c)
Footpaths and Bridleways	Footpaths and Bridleways
	Commons - management
Caravan Sites - provision (c)	Caravan Sites - provision (c) licensing and management
Gipsy Sites - provision	Gipsy Sites - management
Small Holdings and Cottage Holdings	

c - concurrent functions

(Richards 1973: 188-191)

Town planning policy and decisions could be used to prevent development, thus giving the local authority some jurisdiction over the local economy. However, this would leave too much room for uncertainty. It would not be conducive to central government's management of the national economy. The Environment Secretary does have strong reserve powers to maintain central government's responsibility for national economic management. This reason partly accounts for why town planning powers are not totally concentrated at the local level.

Table two reveals there are two potential bases for conflict with respect to the allocation of town planning functions between the levels of government before and after the re-organisation of government. Firstly, conflict can occur between the two tiers of local government because of the lack of explicitly defined town planning powers in the Acts and the unitary assumptions of the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act. Secondly, conflict can occur between the local authority and central government because although town planning is primarily defined as a local responsibility, its appeal system is on a national level. The Minister responsible for town planning can act in a quasi-judicial capacity.

B. Financial Controls

The second type of control exercised by the levels of government is financial. This can range from central government's overall responsibility for the national economy to the local authority's budget. (See Ashford, Berne and Schramm 1976, Benington 1975, Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy 1974, Evans 1974, Fine and Harris 1976, Friedland, Alford, and Fox-Piven 1976, Friedland, Alford, and Fox-Piven 1977, Gough 1975, Harris and Sharpe 1977, Heclo and Wildavsky 1974, Hepworth 1970, Hepworth 1976, Jackman 1978, Marshall 1969, Marshall 1974, Maynard and King 1972, Minns and Thornley 1977, Morton 1970, Northwest Professional Group 1974, Powell 1970, Sedgemore 1978.) There has been a dramatic rise in local government

expenditure since the beginning of the twentieth century. This due to several factors:

1. the increased rate of expansion of local government services that has been faster than the growth in the economy.
2. the cost of local authority services has risen faster than in the private sector. This phenomenon is termed the relative price effect. This refers to the labour intensive composition of local government services and the difficulties of raising productivity, eg in fields such as education; together with the absence of any restraint on demand. Most local authority services are provided free of charge.

The growth of local authority expenditure has contributed to political centralisation within the levels of government. Until recently,central government aid to local authorities has increased proportionately. This has helped increase central government control over local authority spending, as manifested through the establishment of cash limits on the Rate Support Grant and loan sanctions for capital projects. These controls were a means of ensuring that the current and capital expenditures by local authorities were in conformity with central government's overall economic programme and in conformity with the Ministers' patterns of priorities. However, it is important to remember that central government cannot totally and completely control local authority spending. Local authorities can raise income through the rates, and so far the power to set rates has not been removed, though penalties for high spending local authorities have been introduced.

Central government has become increasingly rsponsible for economic management. This entails the control of public expenditure. The 1929 Local Government Act introduced the block grant that became an essential part of local government finance. The block grant was designed to meet the needs of local authorities in relation to the legislative functions they had to perform and to provide some compensation to the local authorities for their loss of income from the

total derating of agricultural land and the partial derating of industrial land (Keith-Lucas and Richards 1978, Jackson 1966). The block grant (General Exchequer Contribution) was made annually. It was a fixed amount that was revised periodically by central government.

The General Exchequer Contribution was abolished in the 1948 Local Government Act. This Act implemented a new system of financial assistance to local authorities from central government. The new form of grant was termed the Exchequer Equalisation Grant. It was payable by central government to those counties and county boroughs whose financial resources were below a certain minimum. The change to the Exchequer Equalisation Grant was fundamental because it affected all local authorities.

The 1958 Local Government Act abolished eleven specific grants that included local authority expenditure on behalf of the local health authority, fire, care of children, town and country planning, road safety, enforcement of the law in relation to road traffic, electoral registration expenditure, welfare services, and school crossing patrols (Griffith 1966: 63). Central government fixed the annual aggregate amount of the general grant. The Exchequer Equalisation Grant continued, but in a different form as a rate deficiency grant.

The Rate Support Grant was introduced in 1966 and became the means through which central government began to develop and systematise its procedures for financial controls over local authorities. It was composed of three elements: the needs, the resources (the new form of the old rate deficiency grant), and the domestic elements. The Rate Support Grant performed two important functions apart from providing resources for local authority services:

1. It helped to alleviate the effects of the rather dramatic rate increases of the 1960s. The domestic element demonstrated political concern over the effects of rate increases and was a means of cushioning domestic ratepayers (ie voters) against rate increases, thereby defusing the rates' impact.
2. It provided the means through which macro-economic constraints on local authority expenditure could be exerted. The Rate Support Grant is an important part of central government expenditure. Cash limits on the Rate Support Grant were instituted in the 1976/77 financial year.

Cash limits on local authority expenditure made the local authority more susceptible to unexpected changes in the economy such as changes in interest rates and inflation. Therefore, this had the effect of releasing resources in an unplanned and unforseen manner. It helped to create an element of uncertainty in local authority resource planning. Table 3 illustrates the impact of the Rate Support Grant and its pervasive presence as being the main source of income for local authorities. Table 3 also shows how dramatic a change in the Rate Support Grant can be for local authorities.
(See page 141.)

From 1945 onwards, the emphasis on national economic planning grew with the formal planning of public expenditure. Prior to that, central government concern over local authority finance was over the financial stability of local authorities. Whereas today, central government is concerned that local authority expenditure reflects its own priorities and does not conflict with national economic policies (Keith-Lucas and Richards 1978). There has been an important shift of the focus of central government financial controls over local authorities since the beginning of the twentieth century.

Loan sanction has remained as one of the means through which central government attempts to control local authority expenditure coupled with the various types of central government grants. In these ways, central government can

Table 3 - The Comparison of Grants to Rates as a Source of Income

Financial Year	Percentage of the Total	
	Grants	Rates
1964/65	51.1	48.9
1965/66	51.2	48.8
1966/67	50.7	49.3
1967/68	53.1	46.9
1968/69	53.3	46.7
1969/70	54.5	45.5
1970/71	56.4	43.6
1971/72	56.4	43.6
1972/73	57.7	42.3
1973/74	60.4	39.6
1974/75	61.9	38.1
1975/76	66,5	33.5
1976/77	65.5	34.5
1977/78	61.0	39.0
1978/79	61.0	39.0
1979/80	61.0	39.0
1980/81 (est)	61.0	39.0

Sources: Data for information up to 1974/5 - Layfield Committee Report on Local Government Finance HMSO 1976i: 385)

Data for information since 1975/6 - Public Money December 1981)

influence the provision of local authority services and the democratic accountability of local authorities.

Rates, the second source of income for the local authorities, are not capable of meeting the burden of increased expenditure. Rates are inelastic because the rateable value does not keep pace with the purchasing power of money, especially in times of inflation. Property revaluations are supposed to be held approximately every five years, but they have often been postponed. This contributes to the inelasticity of the rates. As a result, the rate poundages are increased every year which is politically unpopular. There has been a rise in the domestic element of the Rate Support Grant in an attempt to avoid rate conflicts. Rates are a regressive form of taxation because a high proportion of the income of the less well-off is spent on rates than for those who are well-off. Table 4 illustrates the changing proportion of the sources of income for local authorities. It also illustrates the proportion of central government aid to the rates as a source of revenue for local authorities. (See page 143.)

The major impact of economic planning at national level by central government on local authorities is the relative inflexibility of public expenditure. The constraints that operate on local authority expenditure and contribute to its inflexibility are the following (Griffith 1966):

1. marginal determination of priorities
2. major capital expenditure involves annual expenditure (therefore, expenditure on capital projects is continuous)
3. national resources limit the total volume of public expenditure and decisions are made within those limits.

The financial controls of central government place local government in a paradoxical situation: Central government

Table 4 - The Proportion of the Sources of Income for Local Authorities

Financial Year	Percentage of Total Income		
	Rates	Central Grants	Other
1924/25	42	22	36
1934/35	33	27	39
1944/45	28	31	41
1954/55	33	36	31
1964/65	33	37	30
1968/69	32	39	29
1969/70	31	40	29
1970/71	30	42	28
1971/72	30	42	28
1972/73	30	43	27
1973/74	28	45	27
1974/75	31	49	20
1975/76	28	55	17
1976/77	26	56	18
1977/78	29	53	18
1978/79	29	53	18
1979/80	30	52	18
1980/81	38	50	12
1981/82	33	50	17

Sources: Data for information up to 1973/4- Powell 1970, Layfield Committee Report on Local Government Finance HMSO 1976i: 384)

Data for information since 1974/5 - National Income and Expenditure HMSO 1982)

is responsible for the general management of the economy and for the standards of public service, while at the same time, it tries to promote effective local democracy.

In conclusion, the distribution of legislative powers and financial controls among the different levels of government can generate a potential base for conflict between both tiers of the local authority and central government. The possible effects of such conflict on centre city redevelopment can be the following: Firstly, it can constrain the local authority's (lower tier's) actions. Secondly, it can affect the types of externality effects that are generated by the central concentration of commercial activities. Thirdly, it can remove town planning issues from the local political arena to the national (central government level) because of the hierarchical appeal system of town planning. Fourthly, the extent to which decisions are taken by central government can reinforce the ineffectiveness of voting as a local political resource. The ineffectiveness of voting is not just because of structural forces at the local level, but it is also because of central government's control over local authorities. These possible effects will be discussed in more detail with respect to centre city redevelopment in Canterbury in Chapter seven.

3. <u>The Degree of Control by the Local Electorate</u>

The third influence on the local political decision making process is the extent to which it is controlled by the local electorate. This influence is particularly evident when cross national comparisons are made. However, within a single country, it may also give rise to differences. This control can take two forms: through the electoral process and through pressure groups. One can argue that the importance of pressure groups is a function of the ineffectiveness of the local electoral process as perceived by the local electorate. Therefore, it is important to

explain why this ineffectiveness exists. Conflict will thus tend to occur between the local community and the local authority if there is a lack of representation of different interests on the local council. In the case of town planning, I shall examine in subsequent detail whether the interests of those who own the land, the interests of those who want to develop the land, and those who are affected by the externality effects generated from the use of land are adequately exercised through voting or whether other means of influence such as pressure groups emerge.

The first channel of local influence is voting in local elections. This is the means by which local councillors are chosen. The local councillors are the formal actors in the local political decision making process. They actually make the local political decisions on the overt level. What interests the councillors represent; how accountable they are to the community; and how they behave are crucial factors for understanding the decisions that they make. The importance of elections and who is elected is limited by the distribution of functions over which the councillors have jurisdiction. As we have seen, many functions have become removed to nonelected administration boards with the subsequent loss of local authority control. Also, it is important to determine the extent to which local decisions are taken by central government and how this can reduce the effectiveness of voting as a political resource.

The local electoral process provides the institutional context for local political decision making. From the perspective of the local electorate, local elections are a haphazard means of controlling the accountability of local councillors, their responsiveness to the community, and the interests they represent. Voting in local elections is the formal means through which the community can exercise some degree of control over the councillors and the representation of interests on the council. The factors that diminish voting as a political resource are summarised here. They will be discussed in detail later.

1. Emphasis at election times is placed on national political parties and their performance rather than on local political party record, thus contributing to an insulation of local candidates from the local situation and issues.
2. Interests within the community tend to aggregate around two or three major political parties on the council, thus reducing the chances of outside groups to effectively challenge the council.
3. The role of the local party organisation in the recruitment and selection of candidates can exclude certain interests from being represented.
4. The committee system of local government centralises policy and decision making within the council's majority political party.
5. The committee system of local government operating with corporate management techniques tends to create a decision making clique of senior officers and committee chairmen. This tends to give the other councillors within the majority party as well as opposition councillors a "back seat" in the local political decision making process.
6. The relative infrequency of local elections when compared to political decisions that are taken daily lessons the accountability of the councillors to the local electorate.
7. The selective representation of nonclass interests at the local level tends to exclude the representation of other interests. Many interests are not held as individual ones, but as membership of groups.

These structural factors have the cumulative effect of making voting in local elections an unsatisfactory means of control by the local electorate over local councillors. These factors contribute to the inertial tendencies of the system and its resistence to change.

In addition to these seven features of the local political system, there is a further important factor.

It is the limited degree of autonomy of local councils. The more central government influences local political decision making, the less effective voting will be as a political resource. The structural factors at the local level with respect to the local electoral system are:

1. the potential ineffectiveness of voting as a political resource
2. the degree of control of central government over the activities of local authorities.

My hypothesis is that the potential inadequacy of voting as an effective political resource and central government control over local authority decisions form the structural base for conflict between the local electorate and the local authority. If certain manifest interests are not articulated in the local political decision making process, then it is more likely that pressure groups will form outside the local party organisation (subject to the constraints of resources, organisational ability, and sufficient motivation).

Local councillors are the vehicles through which interests can be articulated in the local political decision making process. The expression of certain interests are precluded due to the cumulative effect of: the nature of councillor selection and recruitment, the background of the councillors, the local party organisation, the extent of discipline in local political parties, the committee system of local government, the corporate management techniques of local government, and the political party composition of the local council.

The second observed influence on the council by the electorate is through pressure groups. In the lasthalf of the twentieth century in British local government, there has been a trend toward the growth of formally organised pressure groups with respect to town planning issues. These

groups can be termed third party groups because they are indirectly affected by the various users of land. They are affected by the externality effects of land that are generated by its users. Third party groups, because of their nature, cannot influence the market directly as can the market based institutions concerned with land and its use. Therefore, they are limited to the strategy of influencing the institutional framework of town planning within which market forces interact in the allocation of land and its use. These pressure groups have several common characteristics:

1. the type of organisation - The structure of these groups are usually composed of a Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer. This constitutes the leadership element to whom the local authority can relate.
2. the social base - The social base of these groups is mainly composed of middle class home owners.
3. the type of demands - Usually the demands are not very challenging to the local authority. They are most likely to be reformist in nautre. Whether or not this type of demand could be easily met by the local authority is a matter of debate.

The structure of the locally elected representatives and officers comprise the institutional framework of town planning. A considerable literature exists on local voting, councillor-officer relations, and local party organisation. (See Dearlove 1973 and 1979, Elkin 1974, Gregory 1969, Hampton 1970, Newton 1974 and 1976.) Very similar to the argument advanced here is Dunleavy's thesis (Dunleavy 1980a) that local authorities are insulated from the electoral process. He also maintains that influences from the local electorate are wholly or partially "screened out" from local political decison making. He questions the role of local elections as a viable means of control by the electorate over the local authority.

To explain how limited is the control of councils by the electorate will now be discussed. They will be grouped into three parts; the role of the local party organisation in relation to national political parties, and to local community interests, and the corporate management techniques of local government.

Local party organisation and its relation to the national party organisation

In England, local parties are branches of national party organisations. This trend became more apparent after World War II. The Conservative Central Office played a much less active role in local government affairs before World War II than Labour's Transport House. It was not until 1947 that the Conservative national party organisation appointed officers to strengthen the links between the national Conservative party and local councillors (Keith-Lucas and Richards 1978: 122-123).

Partisan attachments are a key factor in understanding and analysing local elections and their impact as a selection mechanism for the representation of interests. Partisan voting helps to simplify the electorate's choice of candidates. Emphasis is placed on the party to which the prospective candidate belongs. Not so much emphasis is placed on his/her individual character and performance. The role that political parties play in the aggregation and articulation of interests and opinions in the community on local and national matters is important.

Thus, in England, the success or failure of a particular political party in local elections is closely linked to the national political climate, popular support, and the performance of national parties. Local factors are not the main determinants of a party's success in local elections. (See Gregory 1969, Newton 1969a, Newton 1969b, Newton 1974, Newton 1975, Newton 1976.) The actions of the candidates for local elections have little effect on their performance in the local elections. This dependency of local political parties at local elections upon national parties' records at national level gives the local councillors some freedom of political movement and tends to insulate them from being directly accountable to the local electorate.

Since the local political party organisation is strongly aligned with its national counterpart, campaigns for local elections are oriented to the national record of the political party and the impact of these policies at the local level. There are legal restrictions placed on

advertising and the money spent on campaigns. Thus, local political campaigns reinforce the influence of national party performance on local elections. Voting decisions are simplified because the alternatives are explicit and distinguishable from each other. Local issues tend to be forced into the background in the local political party campaigns.

The local political party organisation provides the basis for the candidate's campaign through its provision of money, individuals to help canvass and to distribute leaflets, printing facilities, organisational support, etc. Candidates who do not have the backing of a local political party organisation find it very difficult to overcome the constraints operating on them because of their lack of resources. These constraints can have the effect of limiting the potential number of candidates who wish to stand on an independent basis in the local elections.

Therefore, emphasis is placed on national political parties and their performance rather than on the local political party record. It contributes to the insulation of local candidates from local situation and issues.

Local party organisation as a focus for aggregating interests in the community

There are usually two or three main political parties in local government into which interests are aggregated. (The larger the local authority, the greater the probability that its political system will be dominated by the two national parties - ie Labour and Conservative (Stanyer 1975: 25-31).) If the council opinion is roughly unified into two or three blocs, then the chances of outside groups effectively challenging the council are reduced. This can explain to some extent why certain pressure groups sometimes work through the local party organisation in an effort to articulate their interests.

The local party organisation may not articulate specific ward interests due to its linkages with the national party. This can have the effect of disaggregating interests from behind the local party organisation to supporting the formation of other groups to articulate these interests. Ward based local elections can act against the interests of small minorities.

The manner in which prospective candidates are recruited and selected by the local party organisation is also important in understanding which types of interests might be represented on the council. In "safe" seats, the person selected as candidate is sure of election. The criterion employed by the local political parties in recruiting candidates is crucial. Although these criteria are not standardised among all local political party organisations, one factor does appear to have prominence: The individual who is selected has usually been a member of the local political party for some length of time and has become involved in its functions, eg charities, raffles, jumble sales, talks, political campaigns, etc.

Once elected, the councillor can be influenced by the administrative departments because of the part-time nature of his position. The administrative departments of the council do possess some degree of professional autonomy because they are not merely "servants" of the local councillors. This professional autonomy is based on scientific or quasi-scientific rationality. "Facts" can be used to support a particular point of view. This mantle of rationality is also utilised by the councillors in dealing with the community and in their articulation of interests. The impact of scientific or quasi-scientific rationality on the relationship between officers and the local councillors is an important area to discuss in relation to the local political decision making process.

The majority party on the local council dominates the committee system of local government which, in turn, tends

to dominate all decisions. Every councillor is allocated to a committee and he/she becomes involved in a specific topic that covers the entire district. Depending on other factors, this could reduce any chance a councillor would have in advocating his/her ward's sectional interests.

Once a political party has gained a majority on the council, five main factors determine the way local interests are articulated in the local political decision making process. They are the following:

1. the party composition of the committees
2. the determination of agenda items for committees and council meetings (this depends on relations between the officers and the local councillors)
3. the extent of party discipline with respect to voting at committee and council meetings
4. the interaction of the majority and minority parties, ie coalitions, factions, etc.
5. the interaction of the local political parties and their constituents, ie the degree of responsiveness of the local party machine to its constituents' demands and the types of pressures that is/is not being exerted on the local party organisation from its constituents.

Each committee has its own meeting which the public can attend as observers, but not as participants. At these meetings, the councillors on the committee discuss and vote on agenda items. However, pre-meetings are often held beforehand with the officers and several councillors from the committee to determine what will be on the agenda and how to vote on certain issues. If the majority party discipline is strong, then most councillors will vote according to party lines. This is one way in which the majority party exercises its dominance over the committee system of local government.

Each committee meets every six weeks, and a full council meeting is held at the end of each six week cycle. It is at the full council meetings when the full council votes on items passed by the committees as well as other selected items. The full council can delegate executive powers to certain committees which means that items passed by those committees do not have to go to the full council for its approval. If the discipline of the majority party is strong, then the same situation occurs as in the committee meetings. Most committee decisions are accepted by the full council with little or no discussion. The control of the committee system is through the majority party. The end result is the centralisation of all policy and decision making through the majority party (See Brier 1970 for his study on Hull; Elcock 1975 for his study on Humberside; Hampton 1970 for his study on Sheffield; Heclo 1969 for his study on Manchester; Newton 1976 for his study on Birmingham; and Wiseman 1963a and 1963b for his study on Leeds.)

The block vote system in local elections tends to favour the large political parties and exclude the smaller ones (Keith-Lucas and Richards 1978). In this system each voter has as many votes as there are vacancies to be filled, but they may not give more than one vote to any candidate, eg if there are three councillors per ward, then the voter has three votes for three different candidates. This prevents any minority group from concentrating their votes on any candidate. Their votes are spread over the total number of candidates. Thus, the chances for a minority candidate becoming elected are severely limited. The block vote system has the effect of "squeezing out" the weaker political parties or other community interests.

The frequency of local elections was complicated before local government re-organisation because of the different types of local government structures and the various combinations of partial renewal. For the county council, elections were held either every year (system of partial renewal when one third of the county

councillors were up for election each year), or every three years when all the county councillors retired. Each county councillor was elected for a term of three years. All borough councils had annual elections at which one third of the councillors were up for election. The boroughs were divided into three member wards, and each ward had an election each year. Urban and rural districts had a choice as to when they were permitted to have elections, eg annually, bi-annually, tri-annually, etc. Most urban districts had partial renewal while most rural districts had simultaneous retirement (Stanyer 1976). The term of office for borough, urban, and rural district councillors was three years.

The system of partial renewal does not allow for any dramatic changes to occur in the party composition of the local council. Change can occur gradually because any new councillors have the old majority with which to contend.

Finally, councillors make political decisions daily, whereas their election is every three or four years. This relative infrequency of local elections tends to insulate the councillors from being directly accountable to the local electorate. The greater the time lapse between local elections, the more insulated the local councillors are in terms of the political pressures that might be exerted upon them from the decisions that they make.

Corporate Management Techniques of Local Government

The committee system of local government results from the re-organisation of local government in 1974 (1972 Local Government Act). This was justified as providing a more efficient management of resources and services that would promote a more democratic and responsive form of government

(Redcliffe-Maud Report 1969, 1972 Local Government Act, and the Bains Report 1972). Specific attention was given to the creation of a more rational set of local government areas and distribution of responsibilities and functions.

The corporate management techniques (such as the post of Chief Executive, senior heads of departments, Project Team Meetings) have been used in local government since its re-organisation. They have helped to create a clique of high level officers and committee chairmen who make the decisions at council and committee meetings. The other councillors on the committee can find it difficult to obtain information and to have an impact on the committee's deliberations. The areas of committee responsibility and the administrative departments of the local authority are oriented to handling types of problems and demands. They are not oriented to handling specific individual problems and demands. The sectional ward interest of a local councillor can be pushed into the background because of the organisation of the local party and the committee system of local government. Therefore, the committee system of local government (after re-organisation) based on corporate management techniques tends to exclude the ordinary councillor from the local political decision making process.

These subsections have demonstrated how the role of the local party organisation in relation to national political parties and local community interests and the corporate management techniques of local government can exclude the representation of interests on the council and reduce the effectiveness of voting as a political resource. This can have the effect of fostering the formation and mobilisation of pressure groups.

Thus the degree of control of the local authority by the local electorate is the third contextual factor affecting the council's decision making process. It is a source of continual conflict.

4. The Context of Local Political Decision Making as a Source of Conflict

So far we have discussed in detail the three key features of the context in which local councils operate which constrain their decision making: the local economic base, the legislative and financial powers of higher levels of government, and the degree of control of the local electorate.

These features are important in two ways: firstly they constrain the local council from acting autonomously and secondly they are bases of further conflicts.

* The first contextual constraint on the local political decision making process was the economic base of the locality. The potential base for conflict was generated over the use of land.

* The second contextual constraint consisted of the legislative and financial powers exercised by the levels of government. Two different potential bases for conflict can be generated: between the two tiers of the local authority and between the local authority and central government.

* The third contextual constraint on local political decision making process was the degree of control by the local electorate over the local authority. This can provide the potential base for conflict between the local electorate and the local authority.

The cumulative effect of these contextual constraints and their accompanying potential bases for conflict is the creation of <u>new</u> potential base for conflict - between the economic and political roles of the local authority.

SECTION III - THE LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING PROCESS

Section II analysed the factors that constituted the context of local political decision making. We now turn to the local political decision making process itself. We shall use the terms 'economic' and 'political' roles of the local authority to identify the two main types of council activity.

1. The Economic Role of the Local Authority

The economic role of the local authority refers to the provision of infrastructural services and facilities such as car parking, roads, the acquisition of land, development, the co-ordination of public transport, refuse disposal and collection, and sewers. These services can be seen as benefitting capital accumulation on local and national levels depending upon the economic base of the locality and the population generally. However, the economic role of the local authority is 'external' to the process of capital accumulation because it generates the conditions for capital accumulation and does not use the capital accumulation process as an end in itself. In other words, these services do not have profit as the main motivation.

The infrastructural services provided by the local authority are vital to capital accumulation in two ways: firstly, for the reproduction of labour and secondly, as a devalorised means of production. Devalorised means of production is a type of capital from which a proper return cannot be obtained, eg public transport. The state provides those services and facilities which are necessary to capital but which capital cannot provide economically on a general basis. As the process of capital accumulation becomes increasingly interdependent, so the requirement for infrastructure and other related services relies on the local authority's ability to find funds that are limited.

The major limitation is in the potential consequences of increased expenditure, ie an increased rate burden. The previously mentioned developments in central-local relations can be seen as a response to this difficulty. Firstly, the degree of central funding limits dependence on local rates, a sensitive form of taxation. Secondly, the redistributive use of central funding (via the needs and resources elements of the Rate

Support Grant) partly breaks the link between the locality's economic base and its ability to provide services, eg central government authorises the provision of similar facilities within all local authorities. Thirdly, the use of nonelected bodies for infrastructure provision can be seen as a means of removing this provision from the vagaries of political debate (Pickvance 1978b).

This increasing interdependence between the capital accumulation process and the economic activities of the local authority can be illustrated by the impact of negative externality effects on the central concentration of commercial activities and how this generates pressure on the local authority to alleviate these negative externality effects. The lack of accessibility is one major externality effect. Because of the interdependence of the local authority to the capital accumulation process, the local authority is placed in the position of attempting to alleviate this lack of accessibility, ie by providing new roads and new car parking facilities.

2. The Political Role of the Local Authority

The political role of the local authority is to provide a locus of political participation for the local electorate. The local authority presents itself as representing the common and general interest of society as a whole. The main goal of the local authority's political role is to achieve political stability. This can be accomplished through various means, such as public participation, regulation, and integration of the various segments of society. The local authority is one locus in the state apparatus for political participation, regulation, and integration. The political role of the local authority is to legitimise its pattern of resource allocation to maintain its political survival.

"Management tactics" are one means through which conflicts are institutionalised in the local political decision making process, ie to make them nonthreatening. Third party pressure groups are the "environment" the local authority has to "manage" to survive. The "management tactics" of

the local authority can be seen as the means which the local authority tries to impose its definition of the situation on third party based pressure groups to achieve a "managed" consensus concerning the public good.

Each new form of public participation (whether it be statutorily based or in the form of the mobilsation of third party pressure groups) is a potential threat to the political survival of the political party in control of the local council. On the one hand, public participation may be necessary to secure the legitimacy of the local authority's policy execution. However, on the other hand, it is potentially threatening to the council because it is not totally under its control. The authority's objective is to make the opposition to the local authority and the different forms of public participation politically nonthreatening. There are different levels of public participation depending upon how effective each level is in the local political decision making process. The degree of effectiveness is reflected in the types of decisions that are made in the local political decision making process. It is also reflected in who benefits and in which ways from those decisions.

Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to introduce the concepts which will be used in the analysis of the empirical material in the remainder of the thesis. In Section I we examined critically the existing literature of community power studies. Our criticisms led us to try to combine the empirical focus of pluralist, elitist and neo-elitist work with the structural concerns of the Marxist approach, but without losing stress on pressures for change in these structures. To do this we introduced the concept of the context of local political decision making in order to capture some of the structural forces acting on the local authority and to identify some of the major pressures for change due to the conflicts they triggered off.

In Section II we broke down this context into its component parts. Firstly we outlined the economic constraints which could operate on the local authority - the economic base of the locality and the local government finance system. Within these constraints, the local authority does have room for manoeuvre. The local authority's land holdings provides it with means of promoting initiatives with regard to development. Another important area of discretion is the local authority's ability to finance its own development.

Secondly, we outlined the political constraints which would impinge upon the local authority - its relations with central government, the county council and the local electorate. Within this triangle of constraints, the local authority can manipulate these relationships through its use of "management tactics" in order to pursue its own proposals.

Section III distinguished between the economic and political roles of local authorities. The following four chapters will analyse city centre redevelopment in Canterbury from 1940 to 1979 by using the theoretical framework presented in this chapter. These chapters will highlight the pressures for change underlying centre city redevelopment in Canterbury.

CHAPTER SIX

THE COMMERCIAL BASE OF CENTRAL CANTERBURY

In Chapters 6, 7 and 8, we shall present a description of the economic and political situation facing Canterbury City Council. These will fill in the context in which Canterbury City Council took its decisions to develop the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites. As we have indicated in Chapter 5, these elements of the context help explain Council policy since they acted as constraints on the Council's freedom of action.

In the present chapter, we will discuss the economic character of Canterbury. First we outline the growth of Canterbury as a major sub-regional commercial and administrative centre. Then we examine some of the by-products of this commercial role: conflict between economic activities, traffic congestion and access problems, high building and land rents, and conflict between economic activities and the medieval infrastructure.

I. Canterbury as a Commercial and Administrative Centre

Canterbury was a shopping centre before World War II and since then it has grown into a major service centre. Canterbury is now the sub-regional shopping centre of East Kent; it is the administrative centre of Canterbury District Council; it is an office centre as a result of the office development that occurred in the early 1970s;it is an ecclesiastical centre because of the Cathedral; it is an educational centre with a University, several colleges and public schools located within a 2 mile radius of the city centre; and it is a tourist centre because of the

attraction of its medieval infrastructure and the Cathedral. The city centre is a focal point for these activities. "Canterbury is a classical market town," stated the City Architect, "and prosperity depends on people coming into the city. Canterbury is a sub-regional centre for tourism, shopping, administration and ecclesiastical activities." (P. Jackson 1)

As a commercial centre, Canterbury serves three main functions. Firstly, it is the dominant shopping centre in East Kent for special purpose shopping which entails selling goods of a comparison and durable nature. Secondly, it is a sub-regional centre for a smaller area that provides for shopping trips involving more frequent durable expenditure. Finally, it is a district centre for weekly shopping trips for residents in the immediate surrounding area. The following Table illustrates the breakdown of these functions.

TABLE 5 - THE DISTRIBUTION OF SHOPPING FUNCTIONS IN CANTERBURY

Special purpose shopping	516,000 persons
Sub-regional shopping	167,000 persons
District shopping	66,500 persons
Local shopping	1,4150 persons

Note: The figure for local shopping includes those persons resident within the central area of Canterbury. (Canterbury City Council 1981)

The City Council wanted to maintain Canterbury's position in the shopping hierarchy of the County despite resources being invested elsewhere (see Table 6). In East Kent, the other towns that could se seen as providing competition to Canterbury are as follows:

1. Ashford
2. Herne Bay and Whitstable
3. Margate and Ramsgate

Each town will be discussed in relation to its commercial activities.

1. Ashford

During the 1970s, Ashford expanded following commercial and industrial development (see Table 6). Its residential base grew between 1959 and 1977 due to an overspill agreement with the Greater London Council (1959 Town Development Act Agreement though in 1977 the Greater London Council decided not to renew the agreement). At present, it has a catchment area of 81,000 persons. (Kent County Council 1975) It is a sub-regional employment and service centre whose catchment is extensive, but relatively small in population terms. Ashford was the only town in East Kent to be designated as a growth point in the Kent Structure Plan. In this Plan, Kent County Council wanted to encourage more industry, shopping and office activities.

2. Herne Bay and Whitstable

Herne Bay and Whitstable are largely local shopping and service centres in addition to their resort and residential function. In terms of the Kent Structure Plan, Ashford was to gain priority over these towns in the attraction of industry. As one can see from Table 6, they have small catchment areas.

3. Margate and Ramsgate

Margate and Ramsgate are the largest of the coastal towns whose resort function has been reduced in importance.

TABLE 6 - TRADE ESTIMATES FOR TOWNSIN EAST KENT
(£ at 1971 prices, 1960 = 100)

Canterbury

YEAR	FOOD & CONV.	NON-FOOD SHOP.	TOTAL	INDEX
1961	5,366,000	10,703,000	16,069,000	100
1971	6,085,000	17,075,000	23,160,000	144
1981	7,318,000	30,342,000	37,660,000	234

Ashford

YEAR	FOOD & CONV.	NON-FOOD SHOP.	TOTAL	INDEX
1961	3,362,000	3,938,000	7,300,000	100
1971	3,846,000	5,434,000	9,280,000	127
1981	4,496,000	7,798,000	11,795,000	161

Herne Bay

YEAR	FOOD & CONV.	NON-FOOD SHOP.	TOTAL	INDEX
1961	2,513,000	1,980,000	4,493,000	100
1971	3,454,000	2,970,000	6,424,000	145
1981	4,562,000	4,434,000	8,996,000	202

Whitstable

YEAR	FOOD & CONV.	NON-FOOD SHOP.	TOTAL	INDEX
1961	2,052,000	1,392,000	3,444,000	100
1971	3,099,000	2,560,000	5,455,000	158
1981	4,660,000	3,626,000	8,286,000	220

Margate

YEAR	FOOD & CONV.	NON-FOOD SHOP.	TOTAL	INDEX
1961	3,862,000	4,770,000	8,632,000	100
1971	6,109,000	6,548,000	12,657,000	146
1981	9,276,000	9,712,000	18,988,000	220

TABLE 6 - TRADE ESTIMATES FOR TOWNS IN EAST KENT (Cont.)

Ramsgate

YEAR	FOOD & CONV.	NON-FOOD SHOP.	TOTAL	INDEX
1961	4,173,000	3,990,000	8,163,000	100
1971	5,653,000	4,977,000	10,630,000	130
1981	7,651,000	6,648,000	14,299,000	175

(Kent County Council 1975)

There has been a relatively recent diversification in economic activity, but employment growth prospects are poor. The retirment function remains quite strong. The Kent Structure Plan wanted to encourage an increase in shopping floorspace with particular regard to the comparison goods trade.

Table 6 illustrates Canterbury's role as the sub-regional centre for special purpose shopping East Kent. Canterbury has the highest volume of trading - over four times greater than that of the smallest, Whitstable, and nearly twice as great as that of the largest, Margate. With regard to the rate of growth we can see that in the years from 1961 to 1971, Canterbury grew at approximately the same rate as Herne Bay, Whitstable and Margate. Only Ashford and Ramsgate had slower growth rates. However, in the years from 1971 to 1981, Canterbury's growth was expected to "explode" according to the 1981 estimates in comparison to the other towns in East Kent. The difference in growth rate between Canterbury on the one hand and Ashford and Ramsgate on the other was particularly marked. These figures highlight the main trend in the period which was that the coastal towns lost trade relative to Canterbury.

In the Kent Structure Plan, it was agreed that Ashford had the capacity to absorb more shop and office growth, whereas at Canterbury, there were severe limitations because of the character and scale of the built environment. The County Planning Officer explained, "A critical decision for Canterbury is to restrain growth in favour of conservation, with Ashford boosted for commercial development." (H. Deakin 1)

Kent County Council wanted to encourage shopping development in other East Kent towns in locations that were capable of acting as counter-magnets to Canterbury for the comparison goods trade. As the Chief Executive of the City Council understood Kent County Council's policy:

> "The whole emphasis is on restraint and restraint of course does not mean modest growth but may mean moving backwards. The thinking behind the restraint policy is the need to preserve Canterbury and allow the growth of other Kent towns. It is said that by holding back a buoyant area such as Canterbury, it would help other towns which would be good for Kent as a whole." (C. Gay 1)

II. The Commercial Development of Canterbury from 1940 to 1967

Canterbury's main shopping area (in the south eastern quadrant of the city) was severely damaged in the June 1942 blitz. The main bulk of rebuilding on war damaged sites occurred in the 1950s, with further rebuilding in the 1960s and proportionately less in the 1970s. At the time of this writing, not all the war damaged sites have been redeveloped, the Marlowe and Rosemary Lane sites being the notable exceptions.

In the debate about the replanning of Canterbury that followed the 1942 blitz, there was no disagreement about the use of central land for shopping activities. But conflict did occur over how central area land should be planned to accommodate shopping activities. There was conflict over the retention of Canterbury's historic character such as the narrow lanes, small buildings and the building of twentieth century infrastructure such as wide streets, large buildings and broad vistas. This historic fabric was seen as an impediment to the efficient operation of commercial activities. It was thought to hamper access to the central area and limit the construction of large buildings.

A pressure group was formed in 1945 calling itself the Canterbury Civic Defense Association (CCDA). This group was particularly opposed to the compulsory purchase of central land by the City Council. In the early 1950s, the group concentrated on the preservation of the medieval character of Canterbury, which in their opinion, consisted of the small, narrow lanes and historic buildings.

This interest in retaining Canterbury's historic setting was the manifestation of the budding of conservation interests. This concern contributed to the "fossilisation" of the built environment. This term refers to the process by which the physical structures (and infrastructure in general) changes more slowly than the types of activities that are housed in them. Thus, the built environment can constrain the types and location of future activities.

The 1945 draft Canterbury Plan (the Holden-Enderby Plan) concentrated the shopping area at the south eastern quadrant of central Canterbury. (See Appendix B.) The Plan stated that heavy industry would be encouraged to move to an industrial estate at Broad Oak, although some light industry would remain in Northgate.

This same Plan assumed that through and local traffic would be catered for (by the construction of inner and outer ring roads) prior to any rebuilding. Drastic proposals were also made in the draft Canterbury Plan with regard to traffic flow in the city centre: a parallel road to the existing shopping street in the centre of Canterbury and a new civic way (80 ft. dual carriageway) linking the newly planned civic centre to Burgate. However, events did not happen in that order. The rebuilding happened first which had the effect of cumulatively and progressively generating traffic congestion within the central area. Very little money was spent on roads in comparison to what was spent on rebuilding. The little that was spent on roads was used for road widening.

The infrastructure of the blitzed central area was based on twentieth century design. Roads were to be widened or relocated; temporary and permanent car parks were provided and service areas were located at the rear of shops. The access factor was emphasised. The central area of Canterbury was planned to encourage access to the shopping area, not only from the consumer's point of view, but also from the shopkeeper's point of view.

The 1945 draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby Plan) also stated that the central area of Canterbury (approximately seventy-five acres) would be subject to compulsory purchase by the City Council for the eventual comprehensive redevelopment of this area. Compulsory purchase was considered by the City Council to be a "satisfactory and expeditious manner" of comprehensive redevelopment.

The question of compulsory purchase became a local political issue. The local traders and a great majority of residents were against compulsory purchase on the following grounds: it was unjust to those traders who had lost their premises in the blitz; it was too costly; and the cost would be borne by the ratepayers.

Between 1945 and 1949, the City Council presented several different versions of the 1945 Holden-Enderby Plan for Canterbury. The main changes were in the location and types of roads and in the amount of land for compulsory purchase. (At one stage, there was no provision for compulsory purchase at all.) The final Plan that was sent to the Minister of Town and Country Planning for approval was a modification of the original Holden-Enderby Plan. It had reduced the amount of land for compulsory purchase. In 1950, the Minister of Town and Country Planning approved the compulsory purchase of approximately eleven acres by the City Council in the central area.

The compulsory purchase of central area land in Canterbury by the City Council had several important and far-reaching ramifications that were unintended:

1. The composition of local capital changed from the small, local family businesses to a majority of multiples of national firms. The local trader could not afford the higher levels of ground rent and rates after redevelopment because his compensation was based on 60% over 1939 site values (which was well below current market value at that time).
2. The local authority as landowner through compulsory purchase brought together the commercial fractions of capital (especially those that were nationally based) and gave them a convergent interest. This had the effect of restructuring market forces and increasing the situational advantages to commercial capital for the use of central area land.

3. Shopping activities became concentrated at the St. George's area of the town at the expense of the Westgate area. (See Appendix B.) The differences in the type of shopping within the central area became emphasised. These differences became exacerbated in 1956 with the relocation of the bus station from the Westgate area to the St. George's area. A year later the Westgate traders (who were in the main still local and private) complained that the relocation of the bus station had a detrimental effect on their trade. In 1960 the Canterbury Society took the initiative in proposing a rehabilitation scheme for the Westgate area.

The bulk of the rebuilding of central Canterbury occurred from 1951 to 1957. By 1955, eighteen shops, offices, and a newspaper office were completed and work was in progress on another eighteen shops, two banks, a new bus station, and a church. Schemes for another twenty shops, a department store, insurance offices, and public house had already been agreed. A new bus station at St. George's Place improved access to this part of Canterbury. It became apparent by 1957 that the St. George's Street area had become the busiest trading area in Canterbury's history. Business activity was being concentrated in this newly built area.

By the late 1950s traffic congestion was defined as a "problem" by the traders and residents alike and became a local political issue. The traders perceived the construction of new roads and more car parks as the solution to the traffic problem. In this way, it was thought that traffic (as one of the negative effects generated by the increasing concentration of commercial activities on central land) would be minimised, but in reality, this had the effect of exacerbating traffic congestion and concentration.

Some of the local residents saw the construction of new roads as damaging to the remaining medieval fabric. Conservation interests were advocating its retention. The Canterbury Preservation Society was formed in 1952 and eventually became known as the Canterbury Society. Its main aim was to ensure that new development would not conflict with the old and it opposed the demolition of listed buildings and new road schemes.

The City Council tried to obtain financial approval from the Minister of Transport for the construction of the A2 diversion and the inner ring road. It was unsuccessful in its attempts. The road programme had suffered most severely in the cutbacks in government spending because of the national economic crisis at the time.

The pace of redevelopment was comparatively slower in the 1960s and the traffic problem began to take priority. The inner ring road the A2 diversion were finally built after a fifteen to twenty year delay since they were originally planned.

More shops were constructed in the Longmarket area of Canterbury in 1960, although the total pace of rebuilding had decreased. The annual retail turnover for Canterbury in 1951 was £5,005,000. In 1961 this amount had increased absolutely as well as in comparison with the other towns in East Kent. (See Table 6.) The number of tourists had greatly increased according to the City Entertainments and Publicity Officer's report on tourism. The report stated that the influx of tourists had brought prosperity to Canterbury and that the main beneficiaries were the shops, hotels and restaurant businesses. By 1961 the Council

maintained that provision must be made for the parking of 4,000 more cars and one possible solution of this problem was a multi-storey car park. At that time, there were 1350 car parking spaces in Canterbury and Canterbury had more car parking spaces for its size than any other town in East Kent. The Council decided on a car parking policy (see Appendix B November 1961) that would have the effect of increasing traffic to and in the central area of Canterbury. A start had been made on the A2 diversion in 1962. This was the first part of the inner ring road.

More rebuilding was being planned by the City Council in consultation with Property Investments Consolidation Limited in relation to the Whitefriars site. This was a central site and the main use for the site was commercial. The second five year review of the Canterbury Development Plan was submitted to the Minister in 1965. The review reinforced the central concentration of commercial activities. In the review, the Whitefriars development was seen to be the most important development in the immediate future. Commercial redevelopment took priority over the road capital works programme. The review stated there was to be no large scale expansion of industry, although the WIncheap Industrial Estate would be allocated for light industry and warehousing. The major highway proposals remained unaltered in the review. However, there was an important addition to the review: provision was made for four multi-storey car parks at "principal points of entry into the city".

During this period of commercial redevelopment in Canterbury, the following trends emerged. Firstly, there were the unintended effects of compulsory purchase by Canterbury City Council in the late 1940s. The main effect was the encouragement of multiple stores (branches of national firms)at the expense of local firms. Secondly, because

the bulk of the redevelopment of Canterbury occurred during this period, a polarisation of shopping activities became apparent. Shopping activities became more concentrated in the St. George's area (south eastern quadrant of the city) at the expense of the Westgate area (north western quadrant). Central locations of commercial activities afforded the greatest advantages in terms of points of greatest access and the interdependence of different types of commercial activities. Thirdly, the increase in vehicular traffic and the delay in road building led to access problems. Traffic congestion and lack of access can be seen as among the negative factors that arise from the cumulative concentration of commercial activities. Finally, the solutions to these access problems were generally agreed amongst all sectors of the community - ie traders, residents and councillors. Very limited political interest was shown with regard to their impact on the environment.

III. The Commercial Development of Canterbury from 1967 to 1979

In 1967 the City Council decided to build a multi-storey car park on the Gravel Walk site. The implementation of this decision was subject to Ministerial approval because the City Council needed loan sanction to borrow money for this capital project. The proposal for the multi-storey car park became a controversial local political issue. Some residents were against the location of a multi-storey car park in the central area of Canterbury because of the extra traffic it would generate and the detrimental effect this would have on the medieval character of the city. The Civic Action Group was formed in February 1968 to oppose this proposal. The traders wanted more car parking spaces in the centre of Canterbury to facilitate consumer

access to the centrally located sites. The Minister of Housing and Local Government approved the controversial plans for the multi-storey car park in 1968 and limited its height to only four storeys. (The original proposal was for six storeys.) The Council felt a multi-storey car park would control and contain car parking within the city centre. The Council had plans for commercial redevelopment on all its surface car parking in the central area.

The Minister of Transport in 1968 approved a grant for the second stage of the ring road from Wincheap Green to Burgate. It was to be a dual carriageway with several roundabouts. The second five year review of the Development Plan was approved by the Minister of Housing and Local Government in 1969, but the Minister had deleted the plans for the parallel relief road in the centre of Canterbury. It was thought that the inner ring road would remove all but the essential traffic from the city centre.

The Buchanan Report was published in 1970 and was seen as trying to solve this "problem" of access. The Report recommended a system of loop roads in and out of the city centre, an updated ring road concept, the provision of multi-storey car parks on the loop-ring road system, and the pedestrianisation of central streets. The problem of access was finally given formal recognition by the Buchanan Report. Public debate ensued over the question of "access for whom" - residents, out-of-town shoppers, tourists, pedestrians, motorists, etc.

The City Council tried to implement some of the Report's proposals but had limited success. In April 1970, it introduced an experimental one-way system in Canterbury's central area. Partial pedestrianisation of several small medieval streets in central Canterbury occurred in 1971. Ring road extension plans for St. Dunstans/Northgate areas were introduced in 1973 but were partially shelved a few months later because of public opposition. Plans for a multi-storey car park at Stour Street (Rosemary Lane) and Longport were discussed in different Council Reports and proposals from 1972 onwards, but none were built.

The "problem" of access remained. The attempts by the City Council to solve this problem were rather limited. As the Secretary of the Canterbury Chamber of Trade said, "We've got to have car parking. It is essential to keep Canterbury alive for the traders. There is no other alternative other than to have a multi-storey car park." (K. Waller 1) The Chairman of the Canterbury Society felt that "Canterbury is getting to the saturation point on the roads. The local traffic is the real problem." (K. Pinnock 1) Even where the attempts were successful, they had the effect of further increasing the central concentration of commercial activities because the relative ease of access encouraged more movement to the city centre.

During the 1970s, more commercial redevelopment occurred in the form of offices and shops. At this time, the Stour Street area had become attractive to developers for office development. Between 1971 and 1974, nine new office blocks had been built in Canterbury. As of July 1974, twelve valid town planning permissions for office development had not yet been used. Of those twelve,

seven were in the city centre and five of those were in the Stour Street and Beer Cart Lane area. There were also eight outstanding permissions for changes of use to office development (mostly from residential uses). (See Appendix A for a map illustrating land use in Canterbury.)

Two other sites outside the central area had been earmarked for office development in the late 1970s. However, they were refused by the Environment Secretary after public inquiries had been held. One application was for an office block at the corner of St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane which would have had approximately 68,000 square feet of office space. The City Council owned 35% of the land. The public inquiry was held in July 1976. In December 1976, the Environment Secretary refused permission for the office block on the grounds that the property company had gone into liquidation, the office block was badly located, and that it was out of character with the surroundings.[1]

---

[1]Commenting on the Inspector's decision, the Chairman of the Northgate Association said, "It is excellent that an independent inspector comes to the same conclusion as that voiced by the local people. It proves we are not trying for the moon or talking nonsense, but ordinary commonsense about planning in Canterbury. The result of this inquiry also shows how essential it is that a major planning issue of local controversy should be decided by an independent Environment Department inspector. It shows that this is the only way Canterbury will get the right answer on the Rosemary Lane car park scheme." (C. Simpson 1) The Chairman of the Oaten Hill and District Society added, "Without trying to sound pompous,this was a victory for democracy. Many residents from the area went to the inquiry every day. The opinion of the inspector tallies very much with the opinions we were putting forward and it is gratifying that the points we were making have been noted so fully by him in his decision." (P. Williams 1) The Environment Secretary's report on the inspector's findings states that "the Secretary of State agrees that if left on its own, the office block, the subject of the present application would be badly located and out of character with its surroundings. For these reasons, he thinks his proper course must be to accept the inspector's recommendations and refuse planning permission."

The other application was for a four storey office block and car park on Rheims Way. A public inquiry was held in March 1979 and the application was refused in June 1979 by the Environment Secretary on the grounds of the need for conservation and town planning restrictions. In his report, the Inspector said:

> "The traffic and environmental conditions are such that planning permission would not be given for this substantial office development. This zoning, however is overlaid by the Kent Structure Plan policies and while it might be possible to design an office building for this site which would not detract from the appearance and setting of the conservation area, the larger the floor area permitted, the greater the bulk of that building and the more difficult it would be to secure a sympathetic development." (Kentish Gazette 1.6.79)

As for the increase of further shopping development, the City Council played a key role. The City Council felt it was important to retain Canterbury's position as the "premier shopping centre of East Kent" for the prosperity of the city. Since the re-organisation of local government in 1974, Canterbury District Council had made the redevelopment of some of its centrally owned land (such as the Marlowe, Watling Street, and Rosemary Lane sites) one of its main priorities. The Council Leader maintained:

> "Our policies, which were clearly stated in May 1973 and repeated again in 1976, include the development of the Marlowe and Watling Street sites as well as the other wartime bomb scars which have been ignored for 30 years." (A. Porter 1)

The City Council's justification for further commercial development was that more income was needed in Canterbury. The City Council wanted commercial growth in the city to continue. The Chairman of the Estates Committee felt that

"Canterbury could take far more shopping space than the existing car parks could provide and still be viable. The two are complementary and not in opposition." (J. Wilkins 1) The interdependence of these commercial activities generated situational advantages. This had the effect of encouraging the further centralisation and concentration of commercial activities.

Another application for office and shopping development at Station Road East had been considered by the City Council. The design also included on-the-spot car parking. The City Council's Town Planning Committee gave outline planning permission for the proposal in December 1979. However, the application had to be referred to Kent County Council on traffic management grounds. Later in the month, Kent County Council refused permission for the development because of the extent of the traffic flow from the Wincheap to the Riding Gate roundabout. In his report, the County Surveyor said:

> "I am strongly opposed to this application. Canterbury is an area of development restraint where further office development is to be strictly limited and where there is a presumption in any event against speculative offices. There is already a substantial commitment for other office development in Canterbury much of it yet to be built and a strong possibility that existing offices in the city centre will be vacated soon and therefore also available to meet demand. The area is ripe for redevelopment which would enhance the approach to the city from the railway station. But other possibilities need to be explored in the District Plan context compatible with the traffic problem of the Wincheap roundabout." (Kentish Gazette 28.12.79)

Commercial growth outside the city centre tried to compensate for the relatively low number of central sites in relation to their demand. Commercial development occurred on the Wincheap Industrial Estate and Broad Oak Trading Estate. The Key Markets superstore opened on

Sturry Road in November 1979. Outline planning permission was granted for a Sainsbury's supermarket in Northgate. These out-of-town sites were more accessible than central sites and provided on-the-spot car parking facilities.

IV. Retention of the Medieval Infrastructure

The retention of the medieval infrastructure was another factor that helped to constrain the pressures for growth in central Canterbury. As we shall see, the City Council did not really have a conservation policy per se, but there was a growing need for one (due to the central concentration of commercial activities).

The role of the medieval fabric can be analysed at two levels. Firstly, I will analyse the growth of popular interest and concern for this environment which led to it becoming a local political issue. Secondly, I will investigate how this interest and concern was reflected in City Council policy.

1. Growth in Concern for the Medieval Environment

During the 1970s, numerous amenity groups formed in Canterbury for the specific purpose of looking after Canterbury's historic character. Apart from the Canterbury Society, the Civic Action Group and the Stour Valley Society, these consisted of: St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society, Canterbury Planning Action Group, Black Griffin Lane Residents' Association, Blackfriars Association, Oaten Hill and District Society, North Lane Area Group, Northgate Association, Whitehall Action Group, Action for Rosemary Lane and Canterbury Cares. They all had one common aim: the preservation of some part of Canterbury's medieval fabric. The degree of preservation

was a matter of dispute, but they opposed plans that involved the demolition of buildings or any alterations to the historic character of Canterbury.[2]

The formation of these groups indicated a growing awareness of concern for the environment and also helped to stimulate more interest in this question. Their comments on town planning issues helped to make conservation in Canterbury a local political issue. As the Chairman of the Planning Committee of the Canterbury Planning Action Group put it, "The Group brought office development to the attention of the people of Canterbury. It (the Group) is concerned with halting the idea of the proliferation of large scale buildings." (L. Gage 1) And the Chairman of the Northgate Association maintained that "the Rosemary Lane proposal seems to be a political issue now due to the business of priorities - whether you put people in houses first or make car parks." (C. Simpson 2) Conservation became a matter of public debate. This brings us to the question which is how this growing interest in Canterbury's historic character was reflected in the City Council's policy.

---

[2]As the Chairman of the Canterbury Society stated: "The Canterbury Society grew out of a society largely interested in conserving old buildings. It gradually extended its interests so it had gone into the whole field of planning especially with regard to roads. We realise that planning is not just a matter of having good architecture and preserving old buildings and preserving the appearance of a place." (K. Pinnock 2). The planning representative of the Oaten Hill and District Society maintained: "The prime consideration is the preservation of the historic character of Canterbury." (J. Brown 1)

2. Canterbury City Council's Conservation Policy

It is necessary to make a distinction when analysing the City Council's conservation policy between the City Council's rhetoric and its actions.

The various Reports authorised by the City Council in the 1970s on conservation matters are the best examples of City Council rhetoric and can be seen as responses to the growing public interest in these matters. The Buchanan Report (1970) advocated the preservation of the "tightly knit character of the central area". It maintained this could be accomplished by the pedestrianisation of the city centre and the controlling of traffic outside the city centre. Neither of these recommendations have been implemented by the City Council (as of 1980).

In October 1972 a report on the Stour Street area was published by the City Architect. The Report planned to make the area the quiet residential district it had once been. The Report recommended that since there was a high percentage of listed buildings in the area, it was the Council's statutory duty "to preserve and enhance the area's character and appearance" under the 1967 Civic Amenities Act and the 1970 Town and Country Planning Act. The Report was encouraging to conservationists. However, the realities were otherwise. Between 1971 and 1974 the greatest concentration of office development in Canterbury occurred in this quadrant of the city and it was to become the location of the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park.

In 1974 an Office Development Report was prepared by the City Architect which stated that no new offices should be allowed in the city centre. However, there were two main exceptions:

1. the change of use or extension to existing office buildings
2. office use of banks, building societies, estate agents, or any other use generally considered compatible with the character of the central area.

The Report also listed a set of design criteria for new development in the city centre.

These exceptions minimised the potential impact of the Report since they included most of the types of development preferred in the area. Also, at that time in central Canterbury, there were very few potential sites left for office development. There was some scope for office development outside the city walls, but a property slump had occurred in 1973-4 which reduced the amount of capital available for development.

The consultative draft of the Conservation Study was completed by the City Architect's Department in December 1978. Some of its major recommendations were: to build on the majority of the city's central car parks, the pedestrianisation of many of Canterbury's streets, and the location of major car parks outside the city walls to preserve the central area. The amenity societies had nothing but praise for the Study and agreed conservation must be the prime consideration for Canterbury. This Study has not been given official status by the City Council (as of 1980).

During the 1970s, the situation in Canterbury was the following: The advantages of central locations of commercial activities had reached their threshold limit and were becoming disadvantages - ie traffic congestion and high rents and land values which resulted in the loss of residential floorspace. Peripheral development became more attractive and as we have seen, marked a new phase of commercial development in Canterbury. The City Council was at first against the development of out-of-town sites but revised its opinion in 1979. There was a rise in concern about the medieval fabric of Canterbury as evidenced by the growth in amenity societies in the early 1970s. The express aim of these societies was the preservation of Canterbury's historic character. It led to the collapse of the general support for central commercial development/more roads/ more car parks/more commercial development which had prevailed in the 1950s and 1960s.

V. Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to help set the context in which Canterbury City Council's proposals for the development of the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites were formulated. We have shown that a consistent aim of Council policy since the war has been to maintain Canterbury's role as the major commercial centre in East Kent. This policy involved the Council in initiating or supporting a variety of development schemes and accompanying road and traffic improvements. These developments were concentrated in the centre of Canterbury, and led to a polarisation between high and low status shops in the St. George's Street and Westgate areas of the city centre.

Initially these developments were made with broad popular support - or at least without significant political opposition. However, in the late 1960s this consensus broke down and the later attempts to promote commercial development were made in the force of considerable opposition. Until 1979 new commercial development was concentrated in the centre of Canterbury, but in that year, peripheral development was allowed for the first time. This policy reversal can be seen as a reflection of the strength of political feeling over central area redevelopment, as well as the economic attractions of out-of-town areas. The changing relations between the City Council, Kent County Council, central government, and the local electorate are the main themes of the next two chapters which describe the other aspects of the context of the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe site proposals.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE GOVERNMENTAL CONTEXT

The second main feature of the context in which Canterbury City Council went ahead with the plans to build the Rosemary Lane car park and Marlowe development is the local and central government structure within which the Council operates. This structure - central government and Kent County Council, the higher tier of local government - placed considerable constraints on the freedom of Canterbury City Council to direct the commercial development of the city centre as it wanted.

These constraints take a variety of forms. The main cases of concern to us are statutory constraints particularly in the town planning and transport spheres and financial constraints.

In Chapter Three we discussed in detail the general statutory constraints in the planning sphere. We described:

1. the increase in the legislative scope of town planning since the beginning of the twentieth century
2. the increase in central government's control of town planning and financial controls since the second World War
3. the discretionary nature of town planning powers which are fundamentally negative
4. the re-organisation in the structure of the Department of the Environment (1970) and local government (1974).
5. the role of town planning with respect to each level of government.

In the present Chapter we illustrate how these constraints operated in the specific case of Canterbury. We shall look particularly at conflicts before the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe cases between Kent County Council and Canterbury City Council which reveal the nature of the constraints imposed on Canterbury City Council.

Before doing this it is worth noting the particular historical origin of Canterbury District Council which is a factor affecting its relations with Kent County Council. From 1234 to 1974 Canterbury had been a self-governing unit. King Edward IV had granted Canterbury county status in 1461: "one whole county . . . by itself corporate . . . distinct and utterly separate from the county of Kent for eternity." The Charter of 1461 had confirmed Canterbury as a self-governing unit since 1234. This meant that Canterbury had the status of a county borough until 1974. The City Council was very proud of this tradition and strongly resisted any attempt to change it. The spirit of autonomy continued after local government re-organisation as we shall see in respect of the conflict between the City Council and Kent County Council over the Kent Structure Plan.

The consequence of the 1974 re-organisation therefore was that Canterbury City Council lost its county borough status and simply became a district council on a par with other councils which had a less illustrious past. This was seen as demotion by the Canterbury councillors and from Kent County Council's point of view, the task was to accustom Canterbury City Council to its new lower status. The change was particularly important in the town planning sphere because the loss of county borough status reduced Canterbury District Council's town planning powers with regard to the Kent Structure Plan and the future redevelopment of Canterbury.

We now examine five cases prior to the two developments which provide the focus of the thesis in order to illustrate the character of the relations between Kent County Council and Canterbury District Council which are such an important element of the context for Canterbury's plans:

I. the Canterbury Development Plan with particular reference to the question of compulsory purchase
II. conflict over money for roads and traffic control
III. the multi-storey car park in Gravel Walk
IV. the Kent Structure Plan
V. the further commercial redevelopment of Canterbury.

I. The Canterbury Development Plan

We shall start by examining the Canterbury Development Plan which will illustrate the conflict over the question of compulsory purchase between the City Council and the Ministry of Town and Country Planning. The June 1942 bombing raid on Canterbury had obliterated the south eastern quadrant of the City. Those who lost their premises were mainly shopkeepers who were keen to rebuild on their own land. Although there had not been a local election since 1938, the shopkeepers were hopeful that the City Council would support them in their rebuilding programme.

In 1945 the draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby Plan) was completed. Provision was made in the Plan for the compulsory purchase of seventy-five acres under Section one of the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act. The City Council favoured compulsory purchase as the means for redeveloping Canterbury. In March 1945 the Plan was sent to the Minister (on an unofficial basis) for his general comments.

The Minister of Town and Country Planning replied in September of that year and gave his general approval of the Plan with particular reference to the parallel relief road and compulsory purchase. He thought that the Council should immediately submit to him a formal application for a declaratory order of compulsory purchase to expedite the rebuilding of Canterbury. The question of the compulsory purchase of central area land had by then become a local political issue in Canterbury. A local election was held in November 1945 and voted in candidates standing on a no compulsory purchase platform. This was the result of the controversy over the question of compulsory purchase. The new Council was against compulsory purchase of central area land in the redevelopment of Canterbury.

For over two and half years (January 1946 to September 1949) the Minister put pressure on the City Council to accept the idea of compulsory purchase of central area land. The City Council resisted this pressure and offered several alternatives to the Minister - eg owners would develop their land freehold, but they would give the necessary land for road widenings and a loop road from Kings' Bridge to avoid the building of a parallel relief road. The Minister disagreed with these proposals.

As any proposed scheme had to be approved by the Minister, no progress could be made on the redevelopment of Canterbury. The Minister threatened the City Council by saying that if the City Council did not submit a Plan to him soon, then under the powers granted to him by the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, he would order Kent County Council to prepare the Plan. The City Council was thus faced with two alternatives:

1. to prepare a new Plan. Opponents of this said further delay and expense would be incurred.
2. to agree to a compromise. The Minister said he would agree to:
    a. a relief road catering for two-way traffic and the provision of two-way traffic on the main street
    b. the reduction of the civic avenue to sixty foot in width

only if the City Council would agree to compulsory purchase and the parallel relief road. But compulsory purchase and the parallel relief road were parts of the original Holden-Enderby Plan that had suffered the strongest criticism. Several years later, the Council was to find itself approving parts of the Plan to which it had originally opposed. The local electorate in Canterbury found themselves in an odd situation. They had voted in candidates who were against compulsory purchase only to find out that two years later these same councillors would be voting in favour of compulsory purchase which went against their express wishes. This situation alienated the local electorate from the local political decision making and town planning processes.

In March 1949, the City Council decided to accept in principle the Plan for the redevelopment of Canterbury through compulsory purchase. If no alternative was submitted by any of the Council's critics to the Council within a month, then the City Council would proceed with the steps for compulsory purchase. By July, the City Council agreed to the compulsory purchase of central area land and applied to the Minister of Town and Country Planning for a declaratory order.

It was then discovered by the Minister that the City Council was premature in its application for compulsory purchase because the application was in advance of the City Council's submission of its Development Plan. The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act required the local planning authority to submit a Development Plan within five years of the appointed day of the Act, and allowed applications for compulsory purchase only after the Development Plan had been submitted and approved by the Minister of Town and Country Planning.

In September 1949 however the Minister agreed to the City Council's "short cut" in the redevelopment of Canterbury's central area. He stated that compulsory purchase could proceed (pending the outcome of the public inquiry) in advance of the submission and subsequent approval of the Development Plan. The public inquiry on the question of compulsory purchase of central area land in Canterbury was held in December of that year.

The decision of the Minister of Town and Country Planning on the compulsory purchase issue was delayed because of a row between the City Council and the Ancient Monuments Board over the preservation of St. George's Tower. The City Council wanted the Tower demolished for road widening schemes. The Ancient Monuments Board maintained that the Tower was worthy of preservation and the Ministry of Works would not agree to its demolition. An agreement was reached by May 1950 and the Tower was scheduled as an ancient monument. It would have to be maintained by the ratepayers, but the Minister of Works would make an initial grant to restore it to a reasonable condition. The Minister of Town and Country Planning then confirmed the compulsory purchase order of

approximately eleven acres for the redevelopment of Canterbury by the City Council which included the preservation of St. George's Tower.

The City Council submitted the Development Plan to the Minister of Town and Country Planning in 1951, and the public inquiry on the Development Plan was held in 1952. In October 1953 the Minister approved the Development Plan for Canterbury with minor modifications: the extension of the City boundaries to include the London Road Estate, and the reduction of the area for comprehensive redevelopment from thirty-three and half acres to thirty-one acres. It had taken approximately eight years for the preparation, submission and approval of Canterbury's Development Plan.

This example shows how under the pre-1974 local government system the Canterbury City Council dealt directly with central government, and how central government had the power to shape considerably the course of town planning in Canterbury in the period immediately after the war.

The impact of central government in the debates over the Development Plan had three main effects. It delayed the process of rebuilding, thus exacerbating the pressures for change. It prevented the City Council from implementing freehold commercial redevelopment in the blitzed central area. By removing the issue of compulsory purchase from the local political arena, it reduced the scope of local decision making. This may have been a factor in alienating the local electorate of Canterbury in town planning matters such as the Development Plan.

The constraining impact of central government depended largely on the powers of the Minister of Town and Country Planning. Under the town planning legislation, he had extensive discretion since the Acts did not specify what constituted "good" town planning. Almost any decision that he made could be seen as a matter of policy. The policy of the Minister of Town and Country Planning from 1945 to 1950 was that compulsory purchase was necessary for comprehensive redevelopment of war damaged areas or those areas that had a bad or obsolete layout. Although the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act left the question of whether or not the local town planning authority wished to designate areas for compulsory purchase up to the local authority itself, the Minister was able to enforce his policy on local authorities by withholding approval of Development Plans and loan sanctions. Without the approval of the Minister in these matters, redevelopment of war damaged and other areas could not proceed.

The Minister was committed to a policy of compulsory purchase of war damaged land for redevelopment purposes. Because of this policy, the Minister could not be indifferent to the City Council's wish to retain the freehold of the war damaged sites. The City Council argued against the Minister's policies. However, the Minister was expected to have policies and carry them out. Otherwise, a vacuum of guidelines for decision would occur. A paradoxical situation resulted when the Minister had town planning policies, yet he was supposed to be unbiased in his approach in deciding upon town planning matters.

This case highlights the two contradictory roles of the Minister of Town and Country Planning. On one hand, the Minister is responsible for executing central government town planning policy with considerable discretion allowed by the acts. On the other hand, he is the impartial adjudicator of planning appeals.

Clearly, the Minister's policies of compulsory purchase constrained the City Council's plans for redevelopment of central Canterbury. The constraining effect on the City Council helped to insulate the local councillors from the local electorate by removing the issue of compulsory purchase from the local political arena. The local electorate was thus alienated from the issue of compulsory purchase because of the conflict between the levels of government.

II. Conflict Over Money For Roads and Traffic Control

The second main example we will consider illustrates the conflict between the City Council and the Ministry of Transport over the allocation of money for roads and traffic control.

In 1955, after the approval of the Development Plan, the City Council began to pressurise the Ministry of Transport for grant approval for the inner ring road, which had already been approved in principle in the Development Plan. The money was not available to the Ministry of Transport because of the national economic situation which led to cutbacks in government expenditure (and in particular, capital expenditure on roads).

Meanwhile, the traffic problem in Canterbury was becoming progressively worse and pressure was being exerted on the City Council from the local traders and the local residents. The local electorate of Canterbury was becoming increasingly frustrated because this pressure seemed to have no impact on the construction of these roads. Although the traffic problem became a local political issue, its solution did not appear to be at the local level. The Minister of Transport finally approved the grant for the construction of the A2 diversion and the first stage of the inner ring road in October 1961. After a public inquiry in February 1967 on the second stage of the inner ring road

(from Wincheap to Burgate), the Minister of Transport approved the full grant allocation in September 1968.

The traders and amenity groups put pressure on the City Council to solve the traffic problem in Canterbury. The City Council made several proposals and commissioned various reports that analysed the problem such as the Buchanan Report in 1970, the Brian Colquohoun and Partners Report on road proposals for the St. Dunstan's area in 1973, and the City Architect's Report on the north eastern section of the ring road in 1973. Many of the road proposals were shelved due to excessive cost and the controversy they caused.

A second conflict arose over a proposal by the City Council to ban lorries using the A2 through the city centre. This brought the City Council into conflict with central government. In October 1973, the Public Works Committee planned to ban lorries from using the A2 through the centre of Canterbury because of the congestion problems in the central area. The City Council wanted assurances that a by-pass for Canterbury would be built as soon as possible. The plan for a lorry ban was used by the City Council to put pressure on central government to start construction of the A2 by-pass. Plans for a Canterbury by-pass were first proposed in 1945, but its construction had been delayed due to central government's lack of financial resources.

On 7th November 1973, the Minister of Transport named three routes for Canterbury's A2 by-pass. It was said these routes were forced out of the Government because of the City Council's threat of an A2 lorry ban. The routes caused a storm of controversy. There was no indication in the DoE report when the work on the A2 by-pass was likely to begin.

The Minister of Transport came to talk to the City Council on the 17th November about the by-pass and the A2 lorry ban. Several City Councillors and residents felt the visit was part of a whitewash campaign to pacify the City Council over its A2 lorry ban. The Minister made a veiled warning of what might happen if the Council proceeded with its A2 lorry ban. He said the Government had residual powers that it could use if it became clear there was a "real" conflict of interest.

At the beginning of January 1974, the City Council decided to enforce the A2 lorry ban by a majority of one vote. On the 10th January, the Minister of Transport stopped the City Council from imposing the A2 lorry ban. He issued a directive that prohibited the Council from making the order without his consent. The City Council wanted a public inquiry to be called by the Minister on the controversial A2 lorry ban.

The re-organisation of local government was imminent. It came into effect on 1st April 1974. Canterbury City Council was now a district council incorporating Bridge/ Blean Rural Council and Whitstable/Herne Bay Urban District Council. The City Council lost the initiative on its A2 lorry ban because of local government re-organisation. New councillors were elected who did not want to proceed with the ban. The public inquiry for the Canterbury A2 by-pass was finally held in January 1977.

These conflicts between the City Council and the Ministry of Transport had several important effects:

1. The conflict constrained the City Council from commencing the construction of the roads. There was a fifteen year delay over the construction of the roads from their approval in the Development Plan in 1953.

2. The traffic problem, as a local political issue, was removed from the influence of the local electorate.
3. The extent to which decisions were taken by central government reinforced the feeling that voting was an ineffective political resource.

These cases again illustrate the impotence of the City Council in relation to central government. Any action that the City Council took was thwarted by central government.

III. The Multi-Storey Car Park At Gravel Walk

The third main conflict which illustrates the importance of the external governmental context is that between central government and Canterbury City Council over the multi-storey car park at Gravel Walk in the late 1960s.

In February 1967 the City Council approved the plans for a multi-storey car park on the Gravel Walk site as part of the Whitefriars redevelopment scheme. It thought that a multi-storey car park of six storeys in the city centre would provide one of the best solutions to the access problem in central Canterbury. Also, more car parking spaces were needed because of the extensive retail element in the Whitefriars scheme.

The Council needed Ministerial approval to be able to borrow the money for the multi-storey car park. The Royal Fine Arts Commission suggested in February 1968 that the size of the proposed multi-storey car park should be reduced by two stories to protect the views of the Cathedral. The Council decided to reduce the height of the multi-storey car park by one storey because a reduction of two floors would entail a six month delay (contract tenders had already been accepted by the City Council). In addition, there

would be a reduction of 102 car parking spaces. The City Council decided to proceed with its plans for a reduction of one storey in spite of the great public opposition to the scheme. A new pressure group, the Civic Action Group, opposed the location and the building of the multi-storey car park at Gravel Walk.

The Minister of Housing and Local Government held discussions with the City Council throughout March 1968 on several topics. They included the proposals for the multi-storey car park at Gravel Walk, the City Council's car parking policy, the City Council's road programme, and the establishment of a conservation area in Canterbury.

In April 1968 the Minister of Housing and Local Government gave his approval for the controversial multi-storey car park, but limited its height to only four storeys. This represented a reduction of two storeys as urged by the Royal Fine Arts Commission. By June, work had begun on the multi-storey car park. The Minister's decision was based on his town planning policy at the time in the light of the discussions that were held with the City Council on car parking, road programme, and conservation policies.

Once again we can see that a conflict, this time between the City Council and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government interferred with the freedom of the Council to redevelop the centre of Canterbury. It led to a reduction in the overall height and total number of spaces provided, and removed the issue of the multi-storey car park from the influence of the local pressure groups, thus contributing to the alienation of the local electorate from the Council on town planning issues.

IV. The Kent Structure Plan

As we saw in Chapter Three, structure plans under the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act were designed to provide the general planning framework for the counties. They were to be accompanied by separate district (local) plans which would be a more detailed implementation of the structure plans' policy and statements. The Act which established this system assumed that a unitary system of local government would emerge as a result of local government re-organisation. This would have meant that a single authority would draw up both the structure plan and local plans. However, the rejection of this system in the 1974 re-organisation (despite its advocacy by the Maud Report) meant a divided responsibility for town planning. Since different tiers of government would prepare each type of plan, the compatibility of the local plans with the structure plans could not be guaranteed in practice. These factors set the stage for the conflict between Kent County Council and Canterbury City Council over the Kent Structure Plan's policy to restrain growth in Canterbury.

The tension between Kent County Council and Canterbury City Council manifested itself in the form of overt conflict over the Kent Structure Plan for approximately two years (from April 1976 until the examination in public (EIP) of the Kent Structure Plan in June 1978). Kent County Council's justification for its policy of development restraint in Canterbury (while allowing for "present commitments") was based on the need to preserve the City's historic character and to allow for the development of other East Kent towns. The County Planning Officer explained:

> "The County Council would never wish the degree of restraint to be such that the economy of Canterbury or its ability to preserve its stock of ancient buildings were damaged. But Canterbury should recognise and I believe it does so that very vigorous economic growth in the city could wreak at least as much damage, possibly more so. The levels of restraint shall be settled in the District Plan, reflecting the Structure Plan and adjusted over time." (H. Deakin 2)

Kent County Council regarded the redevelopment of the Marlowe site as a "commitment". Any other proposals that already had town planning permission were also classified as "commitments". All other proposals for development would have to be assessed within the framework of the Structure Plan.

However, the City Council wanted to determine for itself the degree of restraint for Canterbury's growth. The City Council maintained "restraint would kill Canterbury". The City Architect stressed, "We are concerned that there could be a detrimental effect on Canterbury. The problem, as we see it, is that the proposed policies could be fairly widely interpreted." (P. Jackson 2) The City Council wanted Kent County Council's "commitments defined and quantified". Up until the examination in public of the Structure Plan, numerous meetings were held between the County Council and the City Council over the Structure Plan's planning guidelines for Canterbury.

The amenity societies backed Kent County Council's policy of restraint for Canterbury. There was some degree of confusion over the difference between the City Council and the County Council's views, but the amenity societies saw Kent County Council as a potential ally against the City Council. The Chairman of the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee stated:

"Though we do recognise there is to some extent a difference in interests between the business community and those more concerned with the preservation of the peculiar character of this city, we do agree on the need to avoid buildings out of scale and sympathy with the existing city and on the need to pay particular attention to the setting and approaches to the city. The majority of the community wants to emphasise the view that the over-riding interest should be the conservation of a city unique in its character which can only be preserved by a policy involving restraint." (Prof. Keith-Lucas 1)

On the other hand, the Chamber of Trade opposed Kent County Council's policy of restraint for Canterbury. As the Chairman stressed:

"My members feel that Canterbury has to be developed. We shall give our full support to the City Council in the amendments it suggests. As we see it, the plan puts a stop to developments in the area. The ban on further car parking facilities would drive people to other towns. We feel it would kill the city centre. I can't say it would make Canterbury a dead town but it will detract from the shopping attractions we offer and which traders have worked so hard to build up. It is one of the premier shopping areas of the county but if they put a stop to development we shall lose trade." (K. Waller 2)

In October 1979, the Environment Secretary made several amendments to the Kent Structure Plan. Basically, he approved of the restraint policies for Canterbury's growth and tried to quantify the limits of that growth. In his report, the Environment Secretary said:

"The preservation of the special character of the City of Canterbury is of great importance to the nation. Notwithstanding the objections by the City Council, the Secretary of State considers the policies for development restraint as set out in the Structure Plan as appropriate for Canterbury, but he proposes to clarify them." (Kentish Gazette 12.10.79)

The main clarifications for Canterbury were as follows: a restriction to 4,300 homes from mid 1977 to mid 1982; industrial development not to exceed 15 hectares from mid-1977; a ban on speculative office and shopping developments and a presumption against redevelopment in the form of massive or high buildings out of scale with the central area.

The City Council was not too pleased at these amendments, but was satisfied to the extent that the Environment Secretary had precisely stipulated the limits to growth. The City Architect felt:

> "The Environment Secretary and the panel seem to have accepted some of the points put forward by the City Council. Our first point was that the degree of restraint should be quantified and he has done this so far as housing is concerned by giving some figures. He has also given some anticipated and accepted floor space for offices, in the entire district of nearly 28,000 square metres." (P. Jackson 3)

Once again then we can use this example to point out the importance of the external political context (in this caseKent County Council and central government) in preventing Canterbury City Council's ability to develop Canterbury as it wanted.

V. The Further Commercial Redevelopment of Canterbury

A fifth way in which conflicts between the levels of government affected centre city redevelopment in Canterbury can be seen by looking at the respective policies of Kent County Council, Canterbury City Council and central government concerning the future commercial redevelopment of Canterbury. These conflicts became apparent when decisions were made by the City Council on town planning applications and public inquiries were held on those decisions.

Firstly, I will look at Canterbury City Council's policy. The City Council, in the mid to late 1970s, had a pro-redevelopment policy for the central area (which included the provision of multi-storey car parks) and a policy against the development of hypermarkets, supermarkets, and retail outlets outside the city centre. The City Council thought that development outside the city centre would jeopardise the centre's viability as a shopping area. (Only in 1979 did the City Council revise its view of this.)

On the other hand, Kent County Council's policy (as discussed earlier in Section IV with regard to the Kent Structure Plan) was one of development restraint in Canterbury because of the bad effects it would have on its historic character and other towns in East Kent in terms of competition. The County Surveyor commented:

> "Although I am glad that it does seem that both councils accept restraint in the interests of conservation as an objective it would be misleading to pretend that there is no difference in approach between us and it remains to be seen whether the policies in the Structure Plan are firm enough to provide for a District Plan which will in practice achieve our common objective and gain support of the local people. The County Council is well aware of the responsibility it shares with the City Council for the planning of this nationally and internationally reknown historic place, and we shall watch carefully the effectiveness of the controls proposed." (H. Deakin 3)

To illustrate Kent County Council policy, we may examine its reaction to the proposal for an office block block at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane which it was required to examine under Section 28A of the 1967 Road and Traffic Act for its traffic implications in the already congested central area of Canterbury. Kent County

Council took the initiative in investigating this proposal. It then referred it to the Environment Secretary because it was a departure from the 1970 Development Plan. The proposed multi-storey car park at Longport was also referred to Kent County Council on traffic grounds at the request of Kent County Council. Kent County Council said some land would have to be compulsorily purchased to cater for the increased traffic flow. The City Council proceeded to compulsorily acquire the land. Kent County Council was also against a proposed supermarket development on Sturry Road on traffic grounds and because of the possible effect the development could have on the existing congestion in the central shopping area. As the County Council's Senior Assistant Divisional Planning Officer maintained:

> "It is wrong to allow such a development before a District Plan for Canterbury has been prepared and approved in 18 months to two years time. The proposed Marlowe complex is an exception. The improvement of other main centres should be encouraged as a counter-attack to Canterbury, but these would need to be concentrated in a few main centres with large catchment areas, in order to compete for the comparison goods trade that is attracted to Canterbury." (J. Owen 1)

Kent County Council's policy was one of development restraint at Canterbury with particular regard to traffic management implications. The above cases have illustrated how these two aspects of Kent County Council's policy are inter-related.

Thirdly, I will look at central government policy towards the commercial redevelopment of Canterbury. This policy was one of restraint except in cases where the existing floorspace was inadequate, as in the case of convenience food shopping. This can be seen in the following decisions.

As mentioned previously, the Environment Secretary held a public inquiry on the proposal for an office block at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane in October 1975 because it was a departure from the 1970 Canterbury Development Plan. This planning application had been a controversial one among amenity and conservation groups within the city and they had been pressing for a public inquiry. However the property company involved in the development went into liquidation before the public inquiry. The result of the public inquiry was that the Environment Secretary refused the town planning application. The reasons he gave were: the scheme would harm the area; it was badly located; and it was out of character with the surroundings. The amenity and conservation societies (who had opposed the development since it was first proposed) were pleased at this decision.

A second case took place in July 1978 when the Environment Secretary approved the town planning application for a supermarket on Sturry Road against the wishes of the City Council on the basis that there was a lack of food shopping space in Canterbury. In his report, the Inspector said:

> "None of the relatively small food stores in Canterbury centre can provide the range of goods which are the features of more food convenience good retailing and it would be wrong in my view to deprive the citizens of Canterbury of the type of facilities proposed, possibly at lower prices also." (DoE 1977)

This application caused little controversy among the amenity and conservation societies.

To sum up we can see that the conflicts between the City Council, Kent County Council and central government over the futher commercial redevelopment of Canterbury had two effects: They encouraged the development of sites outside the city centre that were more accessible than central sites and they extended town planning issues from the local political arena to the national level because of central government's involvement in the public inquiries.

Vl. Conclusion

In this chapter we have illustrated the way in which central government and the higher tier of local government, Kent County Council, constrained the plans of Canterbury City Council. Broadly speaking they attempted to place limits on Canterbury City Council's plans to increase development in the city centre, to discourage it in the outskirts and to divert lorry traffic which interfered with city centre activities. These limits were experienced by Canterbury City Council as constraints but were seen by Kent County Council as preventing local decisions from being made in disregard of broader considerations, such as the location of shopping facilities within the county or facilitating through lorry traffic from Dover to London. Canterbury's pre-1974 county borough status made it all the more resentful of these impositions.

The ways in which these constraints were imposed varied. Central government and Kent County Council had certain statutory powers vis-a-vis Canterbury City Council, and central government also had important financial powers. The most relevant statutory powers were in the town planning and transport fields. However the picture was more complex than this because statutory powers were normally vague and ambiguous and provided an obvious base for conflict between

the different levels of government. This has been shown in respect to the cases of the Canterbury Development Plan, the Kent Structure Plan and the further commercial redevelopment of Canterbury. As we have mentioned the ambiguities were particularly obvious in town planning where the reorganised local government system did not provide for a means by which local plans drawn up by district authorities such as Canterbury would conform to the Structure Plan drawn up by Kent County Council.

In the next chapter we shall examine the final aspect of the context of Canterbury City Council's planning policy: its relations with the local electorate.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL AND THE LOCAL ELECTORATE

The third contextual influence affecting Canterbury City Council's ability to undertake projects such as the Marlowe and Rosemary Lane developments is its relationship with the local electorate. The central issue here is whether the Council can count on public support for - or at least mild public opposition to - its redevelopment plans, ie whether its policies have legitimacy in the eyes of the local electorate.

The two main channels by which the Council's relation with the local electorate is mediated are: local elections and local pressure groups.

We shall outline these two aspects of the political context in which Canterbury City Council operated. Two periods will be identified: the period up to 1967 when few pressure groups existed and where the City Council could count on the public's support for, or non-opposition to, central commercial redevelopment plans, and the period after 1967 when there was an upsurge of pressure groups which challenged the legitimacy of the City Council's plans. This change of climate will be attributed partly to the general rise in concern with amenity and environment in the 1960s and partly to the ineffectiveness of existing local political parties for the expression of this concern.

I. The pre-1967 period: Low pressure group activity and general support for Council redevelopment policy in the centre of Canterbury

During the period between 1945 and 1967 Canterbury City Council was controlled either by Independents (until 1949) or by Conservatives (1949 onwards). Labour's success in local elections was rather sporadic during this period. At best, they only managed to gain a handful of seats on any occasion. However the distribution of seats between the parties was initially more equal than it later became. By the 1960s the Conservatives had an overwhelming majority of Council seats and a much greater degree of discipline was exercised within the Conservative group. We shall now examine how the Conservatives managed to consolidate their position on the City Council.

The early post-war period saw a challenge to the Council's policy for central redevelopment in Canterbury. This came about in the following way. From 1938 - 1945 the Council consisted of 8 councillors who had been elected in 1938, 6 aldermen who had been chosen in 1938 and 10 councillors who had been co-opted during the War. The Council had a Labour majority. In 1945 the Council proposed to submit an application to the Minister for the compulsory purchase of land in the city centre in order to redevelop its. (It was the Holden-Enderby Plan for Canterbury. See Chapters six and seven and Appendix B for more detail.) Their opponents (who were in the main residents of Canterbury) claimed it was out of touch with public opinion and that it should wait until after the November 1945 local election before making the application. The Council did postpone its submission and the 1945 local election was therefore fought on the compulsory purchase issue.

The opponents of compulsory purchase were organised as a pressure group calling itself the Canterbury Civic Defense Association, the CCDA. This organisation was originally composed of property owners who were affected by the compulsory purchase proposal. The group expanded to include all those who opposed the Holden-Enderby Plan for the redevelopment of Canterbury. The Independents fought and won all eighteen seats at the November 1945 local election, defeating the Labour Council. The CCDA continued to sponsor Independent candidates until the early 1950s which saw the demise of the group. The early 1950s saw the emergence of the Conservative party's involvement in local elections.

However the CCDA-backed Independent Council was unsuccessful in its attempt to oppose compulsory purchase, and in 1949 the Indepedent Council was obliged to agree to it. This was because the City Council could not prevail against the Ministry of Town and Country Planning's policy which was that central redevelopment must involve compulsory purchase. As the CCDA failed to win this fight its support declined, though it continued to sponsor Independent candidates until the early 1950s.

The intervention of the Canterbury Civic Defense Association in the immediate post-war years is in fact an exception to the general rule during the 1945-1967 period, namely that pressure group activity was very low. Clearly it was facilitated by the lack of Conservative involvement in local elections at this time which if it had existed might have been expected to express the opposition to Labour's plans for compulsory purchase.

The Conservative party involvement in local politics in Canterbury in fact started in the late 1940s and it became the best organised of the two parties during this period. This can be seen by the extent of their support, its early announcements of candidates for the local elections (in some cases, this occurred more than six months prior to the date of the local election), and by its regular contesting of all seats at the Canterbury local elections.

On the other hand, the Labour party's involvement in Canterbury's local elections was sporadic during the pre-1967 period. This was due to its lack of resources in terms of money, support and potential candidates. It did not possess the well-oiled machine of the local Conservative party organisation.

By the 1960s therefore the link between Canterbury City Council and citizens had become mediated by the local political parties. The selectivity of parties in communicating public opinion thus starts to become a relevant analytical issue at this time. However equal attention must be given to the degree of party discipline within party groups on the Council. Only when this discipline is tight is the selectivity of interest representation at its greatest.

In general it would appear that a highly disciplined pattern of voting within the majority party on the City Council only began when the Conservatives consolidated their position as the majority party. Before this, there had been stormy debates within the majority party in the Council chamber, for example over the proposals for the compulsory purchase of central area land in Canterbury and the architectural treatment of the Ravenseft colonnade in October 1951. (Several councillors did not like the proposed architectural treatment. Others maintained that if the scheme was deferred, then the redevelopment of Canterbury

would be further delayed. The Ravenseft scheme was deferred, but it was approved in November after another lively debate.) Once the Conservative party became the majority political party on the Council, there was a remarkable absence of lively debates in the Council chamber. (See Appendix B for more detail.)

From the end of the second World War therefore, there was a trend for the City Council to become dominated by one political party. During the 1960s, the Conservatives held an overwhelming majority on the Council: they usually held twenty-two of the total twenty-four seats (including six aldermen). We would argue that it was the lack of effective opposition on the Council which had the effect of restricting the articulation of other interests, and was a major factor in the formation of pressure groups in the period after 1967.

In addition the committee system of local government heightened the domination of the Conservative party over the Labour party and the Independents. The result was the centralisation of all policy and decision making through the Conservative group on the Council.

During this period, the links between City councillors and local businessmen became more apparent. It was the practice of the City Council during the second World War to co-opt retired businessmen to vacancies on the Council. The individuals chosen by the City councillors to become aldermen had usually been councillors themselves. The majority of the councillors and aldermen were either active or retired local businessmen. (This majority decreased as the multiple and chain stores established themselves in Canterbury.) Also there was close contact between the City Council and the Chamber of Trade. Sometimes the head (or ex-head) of the Chamber of Trade was also a City councillor.

In addition, many of the local councillors were also members of the Chamber of Trade. Contact and liaison between the two bodies was frequent. However, the status of the Chamber of Trade diminished since the completed redevelopment of Canterbury and the influx of multiple and chain stores.

To sum up, our discussion of the relationship between the local electorate and the City Council in the period before 1967, there appeared to be a general consensus amongst the local electorate behind the City Council's policies on centre city redevelopment. There was a negligible amount of discontent, the most notable example being over the question of compulsory purchase which became an issue in the 1945 local election and which led to the election of the CCDA sponsored Independent candidates.

This period saw the rise to dominance of the Conservative party locally, and by the end of 1967, the Conservatives had a tight grip on the City Council through its numerical predominance and tight party discipline. Despite the fact that the Conservative councillors were largely drawn from among businessmen, thus leading to a narrowing of the interests represented on the Council, the excluded interests did not seem to have been articulated through pressure groups. Hence our picture of this period as one of consensus between the Council and the electorate.

II. The post 1967 period: Growth in concern for the environment and the rise in pressure group activity

By 1967 then, the Conservatives had become entrenched as the majority party of the City Council. This situation continued in the period from 1968 to 1979 except for a

Labour-Liberal Council which briefly gained control prior to local government re-organisation in 1974. (This was from 1972 to 1974.) However, the post 1967 period is unlike the previous period in that Canterbury saw a mushrooming of pressure groups which challenged the direction of Council policy. Before turning to a discussion of these pressure groups we shall first outline the pattern of party control over the period, and the new internal organisation structure introduced after local government re-organisation in 1974.

From 1967 to 1971, the Conservatives had an overwhelming majority on the City Council. Both Labour and Liberal local party organisations had a negligible impact on local elections due to the lack of organisational resources. In 1971, the Conservatives were evenly matched against an opposition that consisted of five Labour, six Liberals and one Independent councillor. The 1971 election was only the second in which the Labour party had contested seats after several years' absence because of a lack of cash and an inability to find candidates. At this time, the Liberal and Labour councillors formed a shaky coalition. This co-operation between Liberal and Labour councillors was quite tenuous because of their differing views on the provision of roads. This became evident in the debates over the provision of a Rheims Way/ Whitstable Road link road, the A2 lorry ban and the road proposals for the St. Dunstans area. In each case, the two parties took up different positions, Labour being in favour of the roads and lorry ban. (See Appendix B for further documentation of this.)

This change in party strength in the early 1970s coincided with increased concern for the environment among the local electorate. During this time, there was a general feeling among the electorate that the Conservatives would have done little about the traffic problem in Canterbury and the conservation of the city's historic character.

Public discussion of the traffic problem in Canterbury had been stimulated by the publication of the Buchanan Report in 1970. There was much debate about traffic congestion, the provision of new roads and car parks and the pedestrianisation of the city centre, and dissatisfaction with the Conservative treatment of the report and its recommendations. This was a key contributory factor in explaining why the Conservatives lost their dominant position on the City Council after a period of approximately twenty years.

After the May 1971 local election, (there were twelve Conservative councillors and aldermen and twelve opposition councillors) there was an expectation that the Council with its present composition would be able to "do better" than the former Conservative Councils in solving the access problems in Canterbury. Attempts were made to introduce pedestrianisation to certain sections of the central area. These attempts were limited in scope because of the lack of resources for major road infrastructure and the divisions within the Liberal and Labour coalition regarding their provision.

However after 1974 Canterbury was again run by a Conservative Council and this position continued throughout the remainder of the decade. The 1974 local government re-organisation replaced the previous Council limited to the city by a District Council covering a much wider area - and including Whitstable and Herne Bay. The new Council had 51 seats and the Conservatives gained 33 of them in 1974 to the 18 of the opposition parties. In Canterbury itself, the number of councillors was reduced by approximately one third from 18 councillors and 6 aldermen before re-organisation to 15 councillors after re-organisation. The return of Conservative rule was to a large extent due to the new territorial basis of the Council.

It was particularly after re-organisation that tension between the City Council's pro-redevelopment policy and public interest in conservation became apparent. The redevelopment of the Rosemary Lane, Marlowe and Watling Street car parks was the number one priority of the City Council. The Planning Department's time and staff were concentrated on the redevelopment schemes as opposed to conservation ones. The allocation of money for conservation was in competition with other projects. It was felt among some residents that the City Council was not doing enough for conservation. The Chairman of the Conservation Advisory Committee felt that the £70,000 allocated by the City Council for conservation in 1978 was:

> "not enough. And it is money being spent in the nick of time. For I believe that Canterbury has played fast and loose with its heritage over the last thirty years. How was it that so little was spent in the years before re-organisation? How was it that - to take only two examples - the Longmarket development was permitted with material suited to a prefab designed to stand only ten years, or that Gravel Walk car park was allowed to rise inside the city walls, casting a blight with its size and shape over an entire section of our city centre?" (P. Williams 2)

On the other hand, some traders felt the Council was not doing enough for them by providing car parks and thereby facilitating an increase in Canterbury's trade. The Vice Chairman of the Canterbury Chamber of Trade was concerned about car parking:

> "It is the lifeblood of Canterbury. We have more visitors here than any other provincial city, who spend an estimated £7 million to £10 million a year. There's all this talk about conservation, but unless we make the city more prosperous, we just can't afford it." (D. Thomas 1)

The advent of local government re-organisation also saw the introduction of corporate management techniques which had important implications for the articulation of interests in the local political decision making process.

The key committee was the Policy Review Committee which was composed of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of each Council Committee and the Council Leader. The senior offices of each Council Department also attended its meetings. This Committee provided the general policy framework within which the other Committees operated. Its deliberations provided the basis for discussions in other Committees. As the City Architect explained:

> "There is a tendancy for dialogue to take place between the Management Team and the Policy Committee. It is hard to say where the ideas come from." (P. Jackson 4)

The Management Team consisted of the senior officers from each Council Department and met weekly to discuss the agenda for the Policy Review Committee and other Council Committees. Rarely did the other Committees question the recommendations of the Policy Review Committee.

The key figures on the City Council now became the senior Council officers such as the Chief Executive, the City Architect, the City Engineer and the City Treasurer; and certain councillors such as the Council Leader, the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Chairman of the Estates Committee, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, and the Chairman of the Town Planning Committee.

Therefore, the committee system of local government operating with corporate management techniques tended to create a decision making clique of senior officers and committee chairmen within the majority party (the Conservatives in this case). This gave the other councillors a subservient role in the local political decision making process. "The trouble with Canterbury," said the Treasurer of the Whitstable Ratepayers Association, "is that they have got no damned opposition." (T. Boreham 1)

So far we have discussed the party control and representation of interests on the City Council. We now turn to the crucial distrinctive feature of the post-1967 period, namely, the mushrooming of pressure groups.

The Canterbury Society was the oldest amenity society in Canterbury. It had between 500-600 members who were mostly home owners and residents of Canterbury. It had gained legitimacy and respect from both the City Council and the residents of Canterbury. It was very conscientious about its role as the "amenity society" in Canterbury. It commented on town planning applications and issues and organised lectures and exhibitions. Its comments on town planning matteres reflected its "establishment" image. The Chairman of the Canterbury Society explained:

> "We are not in perpetual opposition to the City Council. The idea is to co-operate as far as we can in any way we can." (K. Pinnock 3)

The Society was criticised in some quarters for its lack of dynamic leadership and tactics on conservation issues. Its broad coverage and established image were important factors in the emergence of the other groups.

The Civic Action Group was formed in February 1968 to oppose the proposed multi-storey car park at Gravel Walk. The group held several public meetings in conjunction with the Canterbury Society to mobilise opposition to the plan. The meetings had the effect of augmenting the opposition, but the Council remained steadfast in its plan though it reduced the planned height by one storey. In April 1968, the Minister gave approval for the multi-storey car park, but reduced its height by two stories from the original proposal. The Group disbanded immediately afterwards.

The Stour Valley Society was formed in May 1969 to protect the Stour Valley. The Society was concerned about town planning matters in the Stour Valley. It is still active today.

The Whitehall Action Group was formed in June 1970 to fight the City Council's plan for a link road between Rheims Way and Whitstable Road. The plan would involve the demolition of seven houses. The group was mianly composed of residents from the area who would be affected by the plan. Opposition to the plan gained momentum and in January 1973, the Highways Committee approved a revised plan for the link road. It would be a single carriageway without a roundabout and would involve no demolition of houses. It appeared the Highways Committee had changed its mind after talks with the DoE. The decision was hailed as a victory for the Whitehall Action Group who fought the scheme.

In the spring of 1973, the Whitehall Action Group fought the City Council's road proposals for the St. Dunstan's area - the railway route or the subsurface route under the Westgate Towers. Opposition to these proposals grew. In October 1973, the City Council decided to shelve indefinitely the ring road extension for the St. Dunstan's area. The Whitehall Action Group and others were disappointed the Council did not make a firm decision on the St. Dunstan's

route. They maintained town planning blight still existed and therefore the proposal could be returned to at any time. After this, the Whitehall Action Group faded into obscurity.

The Northgate Association was formed in mid 1973. At first it was called the Alma, Clyde and Notley Streets Association because these were the streets which marked its area of demarcation. Out of a possible membership of 620, 270 people are members. The majority are owner occupiers. Apparently it was difficult to get Council residents interested in the Association.

The Association was mobilised because of the area's concern over the City Architect's Report in July 1973 on routes for the northeast section of the ring road. The routes involved Northgate, Broad Street, and Military Road. The two routes proposed were:

1. Route A which was the route on the 1970 Canterbury Development Plan along Broad Street.
2. Route B which was the route proposed by the Buchanan Report along Military Road.

In October 1973, the City Council approved the completion of the northeast section of the ring road by using Route B. The Northgate Association held a public meeting to discuss the proposal and to press for the declaration of the area as a General Improvement Area. The Association was concerned over the Council's failure to improve the area and to reduce town planning blight. The City Council did not declare the area as a General Improvement Area.

The Association (with the help of the Neighbourhood Design Unit from the School of Architecture and the North Lane Area Group) submitted a plan for the residential use of the St. Radigund's area. This plan was not taken up by the City Council.

The Northgate Association was also opposed to any further development in central Canterbury and continued to be active in commenting on town planning matters as well as encouraging community feeling, for example - commenting on the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe redevelopment proposals, the plan for an office block at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane, and office development in general. The Chairman of the Northgate Association felt:

> "very strong about central things in the city centre. The City Architect makes verbal slush about participation and does damn all about it." (C. Simpson 3)

The St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society was formed in the spring of 1974. At its heyday, the Society had 400 members but now has around 200 members drawn almost exclusively from the area bounded by St. Mildred and St. Margaret's Churches. Its main aim was to conserve the amenities of the area as well as Canterbury in general. This concern was generated by the City Architect's 1973 plan for the southern central area of the city. The plan proposed a multi-storey car park, health centre, new roads, etc. for the area and was received favourably by the City Council. However, public feeling was against the Stour Street plan and this eventually led to the Society's formation.

The residents of Stour Street and other residents of Canterbury objected to the plan on the grounds that the area concerned was a sensitive, historic area of the city and the plan would encourage and generate more traffic in the area and the city centre. It would have a detrimental effect on the Stour as an amenity and it would involve the the demolition of houses when it was felt that residential use should be encouraged in the city centre.

The City Architect devised a new plan for the area that catered for residential use. However, the actual implementation of this plan was held in abeyance until after the re-organisation of local government. The new district council had different ideas for the area and eventually proposed that a multi-storey car park was needed at Rosemary Lane.

The Society still exists today and comments on town planning matters. It was one of the amenity societies that objected to the further development of office blocks in the city centre as well as to multi-storey car parks. The Secretary of the St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society said:

> "The Society is concerned with the whole of what is within the city walls. We need more houses and people living in the centre - to have small communities within the city walls. It is a living place - not just for office blocks." (A. Coleman 1)

The Canterbury Planning Action Group was formed in May 1974. At its peak, the Group had just under 200 members who were mostly home owners in Canterbury. It aim was to prevent massive commercial redevelopment in Canterbury. It felt that this redevelopment had been encouraged by certain councillors. The Group attacked three main proposals: ring road, multi-storey car parks, and office blocks.

The Group was concerned with Canterbury in its entirety. The Chairman of the Group stated:

> "The Group was originally against speculative office blocks, multi-storey car parks and ring roads. But now we want to stop the encroachment of commercial interests. The Council gives lip service to amenity societies." (G. Fowler 1)

The Group chose to be more aggressive and dynamic than the Canterbury Society. Its tactics were more radical than those of the Canterbury Society and were criticised by other amenity societies. The Chairman continued:

> "The Canterbury Society has a hot line into the City Council - some of their members are councillors. It exists to preserve ancient monuments. It is not very aggressive in its approach. It tends to be conciliatory and it tends to compromise. It won't support our Group if they get too aggressive." (G. Fowler 2)

The Group also tried to achieve greater public participation in town planning matters. It held public meetings, organised exhibitions, stimulated discussion and made reports. The Group helped to increase the interest in conservation and town planning matters in Canterbury. The Canterbury Planning Action Group had more of an impact along those lines than its attempts to influence the City Council's decisions on town planning and conservation matters. By 1979, the Group had lost its momentum and quietly disbanded.

The Oaten Hill and District Society was formed in June 1974 when the residents became concerned about future development in their area. The majority of members were home owners and middle class in composition. They felt development would destroy the area's village character. The Society wanted to preserve the area and prevent further office encroachment. The Society was quite active in commenting on town planning matters. It is still actively involved with town planning and conservation today.

The North Lane Area Group was formed in November 1974 when there was a demolition threat to two listed buildings in North Lane. Membership was restricted to residents in the area bounded by North Lane, Pound Lane, and Kirby Lane. The Group had a good mix of rented and owner occupier members (50%/50%). The aim of the Group was to work with the City Council on the designing of any scheme for the improvement/redevelopment of the area. "We are concerned over road proposals," remarked the Chairman of the North Lane Area Group. "Also we are worried about empty houses in our area. You are never going to involve everyone in planning. Those who are interested and care will get involved." (P. Osborne 1)

The Group helped to sponsor exhibitions, meetings, etc. It still exists today and its main concern is with the traffic flow along North Lane and its effect on the area.

The Black Griffin Lane Residents' Association was formed in September 1975. The Association's area is restricted to three streets: St. Peter's Place, Black Griffin Lane and St. Peter's Grove. There are about 300 houses on these three streets. The membership is approximately 80 households, making it the smallest residents association in Canterbury. The Association is composed of about 70% working class and 30% middle class. The area had been considered by the City Council as a clearance area in January 1974. A petition was signed by 250 residents in the area that called for a complete ban on the demolition of homes in the area. The petition maintained there was a strong community spirit in the area and the houses were structurally sound. The aim of the Association was to look after the area and interests of residents because little had been done by the City Council to keep the area looking nice. The Chairman of the Black Griffin Lane Residents' Association commented:

> "Amenity societies should exist when things are bad as well as having no crisis (eg demolition threat). They should be a constant watchdog." (R. Gates 1)

The area was declared a General Improvement Area by the City Council. The Association is not as active today as several of the other amenity societies in the city.

Action for Rosemary Lane was formed in August 1976 to fight the City Council's plan for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. It was an umbrella organisation composed of amenity societies and individuals who opposed the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane emphasised:

> "Local residents are horrified that there is a possibility of the car park going up on their doorsteps. How can a car park of this size be justified in view of the traffic congestion that already exists in the area?" (A. Bateman 1)

The group tried to pressurise the DoE for a public inquiry. Although town planning permission has now been officially granted for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane by the City Council and Kent County Council has also granted a Section 28A Certificate, the group still exists. In October 1979 the group made a complaint to the Ombudsman against the building of the multi-storey car park, but the case was rejected.

Canterbury Cares was formed in January 1979. It was composed of amenity societies and interested individuals. Its aim was to assess how the local candidates in the upcoming local election felt about conservation in the old city of Canterbury. "We are anxious, simply," stressed the Chairman of Canterbury Cares, "that all citizens who care about Canterbury and about the decisions being taken that will affect the future of this historic city, shall have the opportunity to consider carefully each candidate's view on certain specific issues, before they decide to vote." (P. Williams 3)

It was an explicit attempt to take party politics out of local elections. The group hoped to make the future of Canterbury a major election issue at the May 1979 local election by using the tactics of a published questionnaire and public meeting. As the Chairman of Canterbury Cares explained:

> "The question of nominating independent candidates for the election has been discussed. At the moment, we feel that it is more important to discover how the existing candidates feel on various issues and it is to that we are devoting our energies. We are determined that the future of this city shall be a major issue at this election. It is - and it should be - an election not about national political infighting, but about past records and future promises on local issues. The word conservation is not a word to fear. It means to protect and enhance what is best in this city, in the interests of us all, whether we are residents, visitors, or tradesmen." (P. Williams 4)

The future of Canterbury and conservation did not become a major election issue, although it did become a point of controversy and debate. The group disbanded after the May 1979 local election.

Finally, the St. Stephen's Road and Close Residents' Association was formed in March 1979. It was formed to protest against the City Council's questionable treatment of a town planning application in the area. The City Council had given permission for increased development on a site in this area which would generate more traffic in a narrow, small road, and contravene the City Council's previous planning conditions restricting further development. The Association is still active.

These thirteen groups were all active for some of all of the post 1967 period. Only one of them, the Canterbury Society, traces its origins back to the previous period. Thus there were was a transformation in the level of public dissent from council plans and one can say that the period saw a new and more hostile relationship between council and electorate.

As we have seen, the emergence of these groups is usually precipitated by the announcement of a redevelopment proposal for a part of Canterbury. In some cases the response was localised; in others more broadly based. A first factor in the mushrooming of pressure groups therefore was the level of activity by the council affecting the physical environment which was relatively high in the period in question.

However, this is not a sufficient explanation. In addition we need to emphasise the increase in public concern over the environment throughout the country in the same period. To some extent that general phenomenon is fuelled by localised threats to the environment throughout the country. However there is evidence that the public was becoming more conservation-minded than before. (Lowe 1977)

The rise of environmental protest is also a phenomenon of the middle class. Many of the pressure groups in Canterbury are in fact middle class in composition and it has been argued that the mushrooming of environmental protest nationally coincided with the building of roads near and the demolition of houses in middle class areas. Thus it may be that the level of environmental change and social composition (and hence protest potential) of the areas affected both and contributed to produce the higher level of pressure group activity in the post-1967 period.

The final element in understanding the new relation of hostility between the City Council and citizens in Canterbury in this period is the formal political system. In principle, voting provides a means of expression of dissatisfaction with Council policy, and parties are capable of expressing the views of the varied electorate. However, in practice, we would argue, the growth of pressure groups is partly due to the failure of the formal political system to act as a vehicle for communicating dissatisfaction with environmental policy. We would argue that the formal political system is selective against the articulation of such interests within the Council, thus in Canterbury the pattern of party dominance, social background of councillors, the extent of intra-party discipline in Council voting, the committee system and corporate management techniques of local government, all combine to help exclude amenity-related interests.

To sum up, we have seen in this chapter that there was a dramatic change in the relations between the Council and electorate in Canterbury between the pre and post-1967 periods. In the immediate post-war period the issue of compulsory purchase provoked a movement which led to the replacement of the existing council. Apart from this, the period was one in which there was a high degree of consensus between the Council and electorate, or at least an absence of overt conflict.

This general consensus disappeared in the late 1960s and in its place there was a growth of pressure group activity which can be taken as a barometer of the level of conflict between the Council and electorate. Parties and elections cease to be capable of expressing the rising level of protest against Council redevelopment policy. Amid a national and international increase in environmental awareness and protest, the Council is faced by considerable hostility

expressed in numerous pressure groups. This is the context in which the Council put forward its plans for the Rosemary Lane car park and Marlowe commercial development. In the next chapter we shall consider these plans, the reaction to them and how the Council sought to manage the discontent they provoked.

C H A P T E R N I N E

THE LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING PROCESS OF CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

THE ROSEMARY LANE AND MARLOWE SITE DECISIONS

In the present Chapter, we will outline the City Council's proposals for the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites and the response to them. They will be analysed in terms of the concepts discussed in Chapters five, six, seven and eight - the context within which the Council acts as well as the active economic and political roles it undertakes. Section I looks in detail at the City Council's proposal for the Rosemary Lane site - a 654 space multi-storey car park. Section II investigates in depth the City Council's proposal for the Marlowe site - a shopping development. Section III analyses the two cases by examining the contextual constraints operating on the City Council and the extent to which it had freedom to carry out its development proposals. It will discuss the reaction and outcome of both proposals.

I. THE ROSEMARY LANE SITE

The proposal for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane goes back to January 1970 when it was first mentioned as a site for a multi-storey car park in the Buchanan Report. The City Architect drafted a plan for the Stour Street area two years later, but the City Council abandoned this after public opposition to the schemes. This was followed by a new report that proposed to turn the Stour Street area into a quiet, residential district. This plan met with approval from the residents and amenity societies who welcomed the rezoning of Stour Street for residential use.

Several years passed that saw the re-organisation of local government and a new City Council. In January 1975, the Public Works Committee commissioned detailed reports for Rosemary Lane and Rhodaus Town as prospective sites for a multi-storey car park. This resulted in the Committee putting forward (in December of that year) a scheme to provide a maximum number of car parking spaces on the Rosemary Lane site. In March 1976, the Council revealed a plan for a 654 space multi-storey car park ringed by housing on three sides. The Chairman of the Estates Committee agreed that:

> " Rosemary Lane is the best site for a car park. Its highest point is 10 feet above the road level, so it could provide basement, semi-basement and semi-first floor levels." (T. Castle 1)

Throughout the next few months, public opposition grew in strength.

The City Council held a meeting with amenity societies in July 1976 to explain the Rosemary Lane proposal. This was the first attempt by the City Council to control opposition to the scheme by imposing its definition of the situation upon the amenity societies. Two different impressions of the meeting were taken away by the City Council and the amenity societies. The amenity societies did not call the meeting a discussion. They simply heard the Council's answers to questions that had been previously submitted by them. On the other hand, the City Council described the amenity societies as having "closed minds" because they did not agree with the City Council's point of view that the scheme would benefit the majority of the citizens of Canterbury. The effect of this meeting was to mobilise opposition to the City Council's proposal and put pressure on the DoE to call a public inquiry.

As the opposition to the scheme grew, there were continual complaints about the lack of provision for public participation. The Secretary of Action for Rosemary Lane asked the question:

> "Is it only the personal dislike of underparking by a few council officials that has prevented any serious discussion of this most logical and satisfactory solution to the whole of Rosemary Lane and Marlowe car park redevelopment row? I gather so." (F. Woodman 1)

The main channel of information about the Council's activities and intentions was the local press. The City Council supplied the press with selected information. The general public's lack of information about the City Council's actions on the Rosemary Lane scheme helped the Council to control the level of public opposition.

A pressure group calling itself Action for Rosemary Lane was formed in August 1976. It was basically an umbrella organisation for amenity societies and individuals who were against the plan. The amenity groups who sponsored Action for Rosemary Lane were: Canterbury Society, St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society, Northgate Association, Oaten Hill and District Society, North Lane Area Group, Stour Valley Society and Black Griffin Lane Residents' Association. (The formation of these pressure groups was discussed in detail in Chapter Eight.)

In October 1976, Action for Rosemary Lane intensified its campaign. On Saturday 9th October it collected 2,571 signatures on a petition asking for the Rosemary Lane scheme to be dropped. It also organised a public meeting that was well supported. Four hundred people attended to show their opposition to the plan.

Shortly after this public meeting (which was successful from the group's point of view because it reinforced opposition to the scheme), the City Council issued a report on Rosemary Lane. It served as the Council's justification for the proposal. The Council stated Rosemary Lane was a "positive step towards prosperity" and was a prerequisite for the redevelopment of the Marlowe site. The City Council listed several of the scheme's favourable points: All the necessary land was in Council ownership so there would be no compulsory purchase; it would provide a reasonable amount of car parking spaces; and it was near to the ring road which would facilitate traffic movement. The report was another attempt by the City Council to impose its definition of the situation on the local electorate to mask the sectional interests within Canterbury. The Council Leader maintained:

> "the site will be greatly improved, having been neglected by the former City Council for decades. What we have done is to clear it up and what we are going to do is build very much needed residential accommodation in small units in the centre of the city and park 654 cars out of sight near enough to the centre of the city for women shoppers with children to be able to use it and far enough from the centre of the city so it will not aggravate the problems we have in the heart of the city." (A. Porter 2)

Informal meetings were being held at individual homes in Canterbury to discuss the Rosemary Lane site. These meetings were organised by the Chairmen of the amenity societies who belonged to Action for Rosemary Lane. What was very significant about these meetings was that the Chairman of the Town Planning Committee and its Vice Chairman were present in their official capacity as councillors. The purpose of these meetings was to find out information from the councillors, to discuss the implications of the Rosemary Lane site, and to persuade the councillors to abandon the proposals.

The group heavily attacked the economic aspect of the Council's case. It said that the city could not afford a multi-storey car park with the particularly high escalating construction costs and other priorities. It also agreed that the car park would be a traffic generator throughout the city centre and that it would also cause problems on the Wincheap roundabout that was already heavily congested. The group also drew attention to the detrimental nature of carbon monoxide pollution on the people living in the housing that would ring the car park on three sides.

These meetings tried to make the councillors look at alternative sites for car parking facilities and to make the best use of existing resources. The Urban Studies Unit at the School of Architecture had just completed a report that said the existing car parks in Canterbury could be used more efficiently to give an extra 600 or so spaces. An agreement could be worked out with the offices for the use of their car parks on Saturdays.

In November 1976 a panel hearing (which was not a statutory requirement) on the Rosemary Lane proposal took place. The hearing was held in order to influence the DoE not to exercise its power to call a public inquiry on the proposal. The City Council saw it as a way of demonstrating that it was a "responsible" authority because it took into account the local electorate's view. The Council Leader said:

> "The Council sees the panel hearing as a further extension of the process of gauging public opinion. Anyone can air their views and ask questions about the scheme." (A. Porter 3)

The DoE stated that it would announce whether or not to hold a public inquiry after it had received the report of the panel hearing. The amenity societies thought the final decision rested with the Environment Secretary as he would be the final arbitrator in the matter.

The panel hearing was also used by the City Council to dampen public opposition to the scheme by giving amenity societies and other individuals a chance to air their views. Action for Rosemary Lane was suspicious about the City Council's motives for holding the panel hearing and its Chairman warned:

> "The panel hearing on Tuesday and Wednesday can be viewed as a poor man's public inquiry and the City Council's Planning Committee is not bound to accept its recommendations. It lacks the essential ingredient of such an enquiry, namely an independent inspector or chairman. The honesty and integrity of the proposed panel memebers is not in any way in question but the fact remains that the Chairman has publicly defended this proposed scheme both at the public meeting and on subsequent occasions. The City Council will be the judge and jury in its own action. The group will appear at the hearing, but it will still press for a public inquiry and campaign until this misconceived scheme is abandoned." (A. Bateman 2)

The panel hearing, held under the auspices of the City Council, lasted for two days (16 and 17 November 1976) in the course of which eighty-seven out of a total of eighty-nine participants spoke <u>against</u> the scheme for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane; only two spoke in favour of it. The Vice Chairman of the Canterbury Society asserted that:

> "No convincing case has been amde out that there is a need for car park of ths size. The Canterbury Society is worried about the cost which represents £10 a year for every family in Canterbury and £3.30 a year for those in the rest of the area. I imagine Canterbury shopkeepers will make a bomb. If you allow the profit motive to become entirely dominant, you end up with environmental disaster." (A. Haigh 1)

However, the director of a major local department store, one of the two who spoke in favour of the scheme reiterated:

> "Canterbury shopkeepers are not making a bomb. I hope my views will not be taken as those of a money grabbing trader. The proposal must not be viewed in isolation. They are the key to redevelopment in Canterbury which is an incomplete shopping centre." (D. Riceman 1)

The City Council employed several different types of "management" tactics during the course of the panel hearing. (I observed these during the two days of the panel hearing.) We shall now discuss them briefly.

Firstly, the physical layout of the panel hearing was important. Objectors(or supporters) of the Council's policy whose views were being heard sat alone facing the Council and the officers. This physical siting of the individual, in some cases, had the effect of alienation because one was sitting apart from the audience and placed in direct confrontation with the Council and officers.

Secondly, the procedure and conduct of the panel hearing helped to "manage" the opposition to the scheme. For example, questions from participants were discouraged by the panel. The panel continually stated that they were there to listen and not to enter into any discussion with the participants. Therefore, attempts by objectors to bring out the inadequacies in the Council's homework on the implications of the proposals were cut short. Also, the Council only very reluctantly gave certain information away that was previously unobtainable, eg the financial information concerning the construction costs of the multi-storey car park and the eventual cost to the ratepayer. Even this information was very sketchy, and for those who did not understand local authority finance, the further implications of the Rosemary Lane development could not be assessed.

Individuals had to book in order to speak and a timetable was strictly followed. This had the effect of preventing some individuals from speaking because they could not get time off from work though some sent in written representations. The timetable of the panel hearing and the breaks for lunch and dinner were never advertised. Thus some individuals arrived

at Westgate Hall only to find that the panel were out to lunch/dinner and lost the opportunity of speaking. The introduction of a new traffic management scheme on the first day of the hearing made the majority of the objectors focus almost exclusively on the merits and/or demerits of this scheme. Briefly, the new traffic management scheme was to make Castle Street one way from the Wincheap roundabout to the entrance of the car park and all traffic leaving the car park would be directed through Castle Row and then onto the ring road. The amenity societies were concerned about the effects this would have on the Wincheap roundabout which they identified as one of Canterbury's "traffic black spots". The scheme had to be submitted to Kent County Council (the highway authority) to obtain a Section 28 A Certificate. Attention was thus diverted from the central issue, ie whether or not there was a need for a multi-storey car park. The Chief Engineer of the Highways Division of the City Council said:

> "The car park will not bring extra traffic into the city. The way in and out will be controlled by a mini-roundabout." (K. Abrams 1)

The objectors ranged from local residents to local amenity societies to local representatives of national organisations. They were: residents of Castle Street, Blean Parish Council, Whitstable Ratepayers' and Residents' Association, students from University of Kent and the School of Architecture, Kent Union of Liberal Students, Herne Bay Residents' and Ratepayers' Association, Canterbury Young Liberals, Church Council for City Centre Parishes, Bridge Parish Council, Age Concern, Stour Valley Society, Action for Rosemary Lane, St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society, Northgate Association, Canterbury Society, Oaten Hill and District Society, Black Griffin Lane Residents' Association, and local residents of Canterbury and the surrounding district. All of the objectors, except for the Canterbury Society, were opposed to the siting of a multi-storey car park on the Rosemary Lane site. The Canterbury Society was the only objector who wanted to see a modification of the proposal, ie the halving of the multi-storey car park.

The objectors employed several tactics of their own in order to combat those of the City Council. Firstly, as many groups and individuals as possible were encouraged to appear in order to give weight to their objections, therefore having the effect of amplifying them. Eighty-seven individuals came to state their case against the scheme. The Chairman of St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society emphasised:

> "This hearing is unnecessary - the City Council must already be aware of the strength of opinion against the proposal. About 720 people have written to the DoE calling for a public inquiry and 2,500 have signed a petition. If most people are against the scheme and the application was still passed, would the hearing have been an exercise in democracy or a mere charade?" (A. Bateman 3)

Secondly, the opposition collectively concentrated on many issues relating to the development, eg cost, noise, traffic flow, pollution, vandalism, housing etc. Due to the lack of resources, one group or individual would not have been able to deal with all these points, but there was no systematic demarcation of issues and groups. This tactic was thought to be a better way of using limited resources. (However, this broadening into different issues can have the adverse effect on the articulation of the objectors' interests.) The Chairman of the Stour Valley Society remarked:

> "Car parks within the old city walls are strategically undesirable and this one will cause traffic congestion because it is so close to the Wincheap roundabout. Extra traffic generated by the roundabout will cause atmospheric pollution." (R. Paine 1)

Thirdly, the Council was asked questions to gain access to information that previously had not been made available. The Council did give the objectors an answer, but it was usually very sketchy and ambiguous.

Finally, attempts were made to encourage the panel to enter into a discussion of the implications of the development in order to expose the inadequacies of the Council's argument, in the hope of weakening the Council's case. The Chairman of the Black Griffin Lane Residents' Association emphasised:

> "You are setting yourselves up as prosecutor, judge and jury on your own irresponsible scheme. You are immorally planning to push this scheme through in the face of fierce opposition from the residents." (R. Gates 2)

Not only is it important to look at what the objectors said, but why they came to the panel hearing at all. The several reasons for this are listed in order of their relative importance. The most direct reason why objectors appeared at the panel hearing was to emphasise the detrimental effects of the proposal and to state their objection to the scheme. They did not want to jeopardise the chances of having a public inquiry called.

The other reasons for appearing at the panel hearing were ancillary and indirect. Some objectors used the panel hearing as a platform to state their grudges against the Council whether or not they were directly related to the proposals. The views expressed not only embraced the effects of the multi-storey car park, but other issues affecting Canterbury and the nation at large such as the lack of housing, public transport facilities, social security and facilities for the aged and young. The aim was to draw attention to these issues and their importance. A further reason for appearing at the panel hearing was to gain publicity for particular groups and to legitimate their activities in order to acquire a bigger audience and support. Groups wanted to achieve or maintain credibility in the eyes of the general public.

Paradoxically therefore, the panel hearing had the effect of heightening public feeling against the plan and continual pressure was exerted by the amenity groups to call a public inquiry. The panel hearing was thus counter-productive from the City Council's point of view vis-a-vis the local opposition because it served to unite and intensify the opposition to the scheme.

The report of the panel hearing was published in January 1977. Against all the evidence the panel had heard, the report came out in favour of the plan for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The report stated:

> "It is at a lost to understand the weight of objection over the use of the site for a multi-level park. The panel considers that the proposed development is a suitable use for the site bearing in mind the present and previous uses of the site, the care involved in the design of the proposal and that the site will bring cars and parking from a site to the heart of the city centre to a more peripheral location, adjacent to the ring road, but within limits that shoppers will be prepared to walk."
> (Canterbury City Council 1977)

The panel had adopted a narrow frame of reference in its assessment of this town planning application. Thus, several arguments that had been advocated by the objectors were dismissed as being irrelevant. Cost arguments were dismissed because they were not considered to be directly relevant to the question of whether or not planning consent should be granted. Arguments that concerned vandalism and disturbance caused by the work were also excluded from consideration. One of the report's recommendations was that a traffic management scheme should be published and the opportunity be given for public consultation before the development could be approved and built.

The amenity societies and other opponents of the scheme disagreed vehemently with the report's findings. They queried the status of the panel itself and its findings. They stated the Council was "its own judge and jury". "This is a sad day for democracy in Canterbury," said the Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane. "Considering at the hearing 87 people stood up and opposed this scheme and only two people recommended it, I find the report of holding a panel hearing absolutely unbelievable. What was the point of holding a panel hearing when the majority of opinion has been disregarded." (A. Bateman 4) The Chairman of the Northgate Association wanted to know:

> "what on earth is wrong with that lot? They have not taken notice of a fraction of the opinion put forward at the hearing. To ignore such a large body of opinion is disgraceful. This shows it is essential for a public inquiry to be held and that it is what we will fight for." (C. Simpson 4)

The report was submitted to the Environment Secretary for his consideration and for him to determine whether or not to call a public inquiry.

On the 21st January 1977, a new traffic management scheme was devised by the City Council for submission to Kent County Council. There was a total lack of public consultation over the different traffic management schemes of the City Council. The great majority of the schemes originated from discussions between the County and City officers. The Council's secrecy over these schemes was an attempt to prevent public opposition which might delay their approval.

February saw the publication of the Canterbury Traffic report which was produced jointly by Kent County Council and Canterbury City Council. The report concluded that the Wincheap roundabout was over-loaded by DoE design standards and was the cause of traffic delays. (See Appendix A for general map of Canterbury.) This conclusion had an important

implication for the Rosemary Lane proposal. It pinpointed the Wincheap roundabout as already constituting a traffic "black spot" without the additional of another traffic generator such as a multi-storey car park. Therefore, the traffic at the Wincheap roundabout would have to be dealt with first before a traffic management scheme for Rosemary Lane could be agreed.

A Public Relations Officer was appointed by the City Council in March 1977 at the height of public discontent to help improve the Council's image. His main function was to influence the presentation of the City Council's case to the local electorate. Defending the City Council's decision to appoint a Public Relations Officer the Council Leader said, "The Council would be in a better position to put its views to the press and public." (A. Porter 4) The Council felt the newspaper articles that appeared both in the local and national press were "extremely biased" against the Council. Through the appointment of a Public Relations Officer, the City Council felt the "right" information would be reaching the local electorate.

During the same month, Kent County Council refused to grant the City Council a Section 28A Certificate. Said a County Council spokesman:

> "We think the car park proposal is premature in that such a substantial change affecting the city centre should not be agreed in advance of a plan for the city centre. The plan would have to be based on the transport study and whatever the Kent Structure Plan finally says about Canterbury. Any alternative scheme to provide access to the car park other than the Wincheap roundabout would be environmentally totally unacceptable and raise issues of strategic conservation significance." (Kent County Council 1)

Even after this refusal, consultations on a suitable traffic management scheme for Rosemary Lane still occurred between the County and City Councils. These consultations took place in the utmost secrecy. The majority of Canterbury's local electorate thought the car park plan had been stopped by Kent County Council on traffic grounds. The Council's secrecy and lack of disclosure of information to the electorate contributed to this impression of Rosemary Lane being a "dead" issue pending the decision of the Environment Secretary.

In May 1977 the DoE informed the City Council that its proposal for Rosemary Lane was a "local" issue. Therefore, it was the responsibility of the City Council to determine the matter. This meant that a public inquiry need not be called. The panel hearing had thus been a successful "management tactic" for the City Council vis-a-vis the DoE because it had demonstrated to the DoE that it was a "responsible" authority. It showed the DoE that it was capable of taking into account views different from its own.

All the amenity societies, and Action for Rosemary Lane in particular, felt demoralised by the Environment Secretary's decision. However they did not give in and began to concentrate their efforts even more forcefully on Kent County Council to refuse the granting of the Section 28A Certificate. Traffic management issues relating to the Rosemary Lane proposal assumed greater importance.

The City Council revived its proposal for Rosemary Lane in July 1977 by publicly announcing that its officers would re-examine the traffic management schemes. The City Council was encouraged to resubmit its traffic plans to Kent County Council by the Environment Secretary's decision not to call a public inquiry. The new traffic scheme involved the blocking of all traffic into Castle Street except for that using the car park. (See Appendix A for general map of Canterbury.)

The amenity societies and individuals who had opposed the scheme were shocked and horrified. They had been under the impression that the matter had been settled because of Kent County Council's refusal of a Section 28A Certificate. This revelation revived the intense opposition to the scheme. The Chairman of the Oaten Hill and District Society could not understand why the DoE:

> "does not criticise the Council for, in our view riding roughshod over the majority view of those residents as expressed at the panel hearing? The view was that the disadvantages of such a development outweighs the advantages." (P. Williams 5)

The Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane stated:

> "We are amazed the City Council is still attempting to revive this discredited scheme. We thought it would have been made abundantly clear that Canterbury would have none of it."
> (A. Bateman 5)

The Chairman of the Canterbury Society pressed for an inquiry because:

> "It would bring fully into focus the question of traffic management, environmental impact and financial profitability which objectors have raised and to which no adequate answers have been given." (K. Pinnock 4)

In addition the objectors pointed out that the traffic management schemes were being considered separately by the City Council and Kent County Council despite official Council policy that they and the car park had to be considered together for approval. The report of the panel hearing had said:

> "The panel should accept in principle the proposed development, but before planning permission can be recommended, a suitable traffic solution, acceptable from the environmental and traffic viewpoints should be published for public comments and considered by the relevant committees of the Council and adopted by the Council, to be considered concurrently with the proposed development." (Emphasis added)
> (Canterbury City Council 1977)

It was at this point that the Council Leader lashed out at the opponents to the scheme by calling them "Council bashers" and "environmental terrorists". He said they did nothing but criticise. The Council tried to discredit the views of those who opposed the plan for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane.

In September 1977, the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee was formed under the auspices of the City Council. Its membership was composed of various sectional interests in Canterbury such as amenity societies, commercial interests, architects, surveyors and representatives of national bodies to advise the City Council on town planning matters. (I was Secretary to this Committee from September 1977 to August 1979.) The Council Leader said:

> "We have decided to set up an advisory body representing local community groups and businessmen which the council can consult."
> (A. Porter 5)

The Committee was a forum for debate on town planning issues. However, the City Council was not statutorily bound to consider its views and recommendations. As the Chief Executive maintained later:

> "The committee was set up to give advice on planning applications which would affect the look or appearance of the city's conservation area and make positive suggestions for enhancing it. But there are limits on its area and the topics on which it could advise and expect to be heard, which it has not always adhered to." (C. Gay 2)

The Advisory Committee was, in effect, used by the Council to channel and institutionalise the demands of conservation interests in Canterbury. The City Council, in setting up the Committee, also tried to show to central government that it was a "responsible" authority because it considered the views from all sections of the community. In Circular 141/74, the DoE stated its justifications for such advisory committees: "to obtain local knowledge and expertise and more understanding and co-operation between authorities, amenity groups and the public."

The amenity societies questioned the effectiveness of the Advisory Committee. The Canterbury Society cautioned that:

> "It remains to be seen how far these discussions have any influence on the Council's views and actions, but the establishment of the Conservation Advisory Committee may turn out to be an important step towards educating and involving the public in planning." (K. Pinnock 5)

The establishment of the Advisory Committee was generally indicative of the tension between the local electorate and the City Council. The conflict between the two was generally seen in terms of an "us" and "them" dichotomy. This denoted a general lack of trust on both sides. There was more tension between the local electorate of Canterbury and the City Council than between other areas of the district and the City Council for several reasons. Firstly, the Cathedral was a historical focal point. Secondly, commercial interests were concentrated in the centre of Canterbury. Thirdly, there were historical reasons, ie the past between amenity groups and the City Council. Also, the Advisory Committee was formed to deal only with the Canterbury conservation area. This was partly

due to the fact that the main concentration of political opposition lay in Canterbury and not the outlying areas.

The membership of the Committee was determined in part by the bodies represented on it - eg resident associations, Chamber of Commerce, Trade Councils, amenity societies, local members of national bodies (RIBA, RTPI) and councillors. But the actual composition of the Advisory Committee (ie what groups were to be represented as opposed to actually naming names) was determined by the City Council. The Council tended to chose those groups whom it saw as being "responsible" in that they had gained legitimacy and recognition from the City Council.

The Committee's membership was kept down to between ten and fifteen members. The Council's reasons for this were: to help productive discussion because small numbers were more "manageable" and provided for better discussion; because a small number would be less likely to produce an administrative bottleneck; and because a small number would be cheaper to administer.

The geographical area of the Committee was restricted to the old city area of Canterbury. (There is a total of twenty-seven conservation areas in the Canterbury District. The old city area comprises two of these twenty-seven conservation areas.) This is because the Advisory Committee was limited in its effectivness in influencing the Council's decisions on town planning matters by a number of constraints imposed upon it. The City Council controlled the flow of information to the Committee. The Committee's terms of reference were limited to conservation matters and within this framework, the City Council imposed further restrictions by limiting the planning applications circulated to it for discussion to those applications that would affect the character or appearance of the conservation areas. Therefore, the discretion of the City Council in this matter was important.

The Advisory Committee was under no obligation to agree or disagree with the town planning decisions of the City Council. Its agreement with the Council was not essential, but it could occur for several reasons. Pressure was exerted by the City Council on the Committee due to the Committee's dependence upon the Council for finance, information and co-operation.

But the Committee did have some impact on the City Council. Its discussions on tourism helped it to be recognised as a problem by the City Council and deserving attention. Also, the Committee was able in some cases to obtain information from the City Council faster than if it had to go through the ordinary channels - eg over St. Radigund's garden, a proposal for two houses in St. John's Lane, and the Kings School planning application to build in the Precincts.

Despite the Council's aims in setting up the Committee, it was not controlled by the City Council and could demonstrate its potential for opposition, eg the Committee created new relationships within the community by mobilising different groups into an alliance. By forming links between the amenity societies and the local representatives of national bodies therein lay its potential for augmenting public opposition to the City Council.

Throughout the remainder of 1977 and into 1978, the preparation of traffic management schemes continued among the City Council officers. The Advisory Committee, at its monthly meetings during this period, asked the City Council to keep it closely informed of the progress with the plan for the Rosemary Lane site and to defer any decision on it until the Transportation Study was published. "The Committee wishes to reiterate to the County Council the point which it has tried to make to the City Council: that publication and public disucssion of the Transportation Study must precede any decision regarding the Rosemary Lane car park." (Prof. Keith-Lucas 2)

However, the City Council was anxious to proceed with its controversial plan. It was frustrated by the lack of progress especially with respect to Kent County Council's deferment of its decision on the Section 28A Certificate. The Council Leader emphasised this frustration:

> "Discussions with the County Council are a bit like a vote of thanks to the staff. We have already had plenty of discussions. I have been up to Maidstone and told them what we want to do in Canterbury. I have written to them, I have explained to them in detail." (A. Porter 6)

In February 1978, the Council was again looking at the traffic flow around the Wincheap roundabout. The plan was for the experimental closure of Castle Street which enraged the traders there and the Chamber of Trade. The City Council did not pursue this scheme but devised another scheme for the roundabout the following month. The roundabout would be made smaller in order to increase its capacity.

Throughout the next several months, amenity societies opposed the changes to the Wincheap roundabout. The objections were based on the excessive amount of money involved, the disruption and inconvenience to traffic, and the greater hazard of a smaller and faster roundabout. More importantly, the amenity societies were asking why these changes were being made. They feared the eventual outcome would be a suitable traffic management scheme for the Rosemary Lane proposal. They knew that the development for an acceptable traffic management scheme would remove the major obstacle to obtaining a Section 28A Certificate from Kent County Council for Rosemary Lane. However, the changes to the Wincheap roundabout were implemented on an experimental basis.

By November 1978, the City Council had made another application to Kent County Council for the Section 28A Certificate. From the discussions between the two councils, Kent County Council hinted that the building of a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane could proceed before the results of the Transportation Study were published if the City Council would reduce the car park's capacity by two-thirds. Kent County Council indicated that "if the City Council was to submit an application for 415 vehicles this could be considered favourably." (Kent County Council 2)

The amenity societies and individuals who opposed the plan were distressed by this development. The Chairman of the Northgate Association said:

> "If this plan goes ahead, it will be a tragedy for Canterbury. This is far too special a site to be used for parking cars and to have the same structure and loss of land for even fewer cars is even more terrible." (C. Simpson 5)

The Chairman of the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee added: "Obviously we are disappointed." (P. Williams 6)

After a year in which there had been no public disclosure of Kent County Council's and the City Council's consultation on traffic management schemes, the opposition had been caught unprepared and had to remobilise. There were some feelings of hopelessness amongst the opposition about their likely success in preventing the scheme. The opposition felt that the situation was fast becoming one that was beyond their control. The Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane said that "the Group had been on its knees with dispair." (A. Bateman 6) The Chairman of the Northgate Association added:

> "I feel it is terrible that present day Canterbury is in the hands of people who have so little appreciation of its beauty and its past and the nature of small historic towns." (C. Simpson 6)

The effects of the City Council's "management tactics" were beginning to show. The level of conflict over the Rosemary Lane proposal decreased because the opposition became demobilised for lengthy periods. The amenity societies and individuals who opposed the scheme urged Kent County Council to refuse the City Council the Section 28A Certificate. The Chairman of the Northgate Asssociation stated:

> "Years ago the City Council should have started talking genuninely about other sites. Let us hope that at last the County Council will look at other possible sites and ditch Rosemary Lane once and for all." (C. SImpson 7)

In February 1979, the City Council applied for a Section 28A Certificate for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. It did not submit a traffic management scheme for public consultation. The Council Leader was determined the car park would be built. He reiterated:

> "Eventually we are going to build it because we believe it is the best spot in Canterbury to put a car park. If we wanted to be bloody minded we could build. Unless they put someone on the gate and stopped people going in, it would be awfully difficult to stop us." (A. Porter 7)

The City Council maintained that the Section 28A Certificate was not needed to <u>build</u> the car park. It was only needed to <u>use</u> the car park! (emphasis added) The Council Leader emphasised that:

> "the Section 28A approval is a technicality. The car park can legally be built without it." (A. Porter 8)

The amenity societies and individuals who opposed the scheme were aghast that the City Council contemplated spending over £1 million of the ratepayers' money on something it might not be able to use. The Secretary of Action for Rosemary Lane concluded:

> "Clearly Rosemary Lane will be a constant drain on the rates and if it is also to cripple the city's rates bill while it is being built is it not the time to ask whether it should be built at all?" (F. Woodman 2)

Again, the Council's intentions were not made public until it was absolutely necessary as required by the statutes.

Once again, Kent County Council refused to grant a Section 28A Certificate for the car park. This angered the Council Leader who confirmed that:

> "the City Council will continue with the scheme. Eventually we are going to build it because we believe it is the best spot in Canterbury for a car park. Because of the costs we want to get the car park built as soon as possible." (A. Porter 9)

On the other hand, the amenity societies were jubilant. The Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane explained:

> "After last week's shattering decision, this is marvellous news. We are delighted to hear the County's decision and feel sure it is in the best interests of everyone in Canterbury." (A. Bateman 7)

The Chairman of the Northgate Association agreed:

> "This is excellent. I'm very happy the County has maintained its position on Rosemary Lane and refused it again." (C. Simpson 6)

Kent County Council suggested that more discussions should be held with the City Council on this proposal. It said there was the possibility of a smaller car park on the site. A County Council spokesman said:

> "Obviously more car parking provision has to be found in the city and our discussions with the City Council could include the possibility of a smaller car park at Rosemary Lane." (Kent County Council 3)

The Council Leader categorically stated that the Council would proceed with the scheme. he emphasised:

> "It must be built. It is desparately needed. All we are seeking to do is to get on with the building to save ratepayers' money. Costs are rising all the time." (A. Porter 10)

The amenity societies and individuals were afraid the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park would be built by the City Council without the necessary Section 28A Certificate. They thought the City Council was trying to get the scheme through before the May 1979 local election. The Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane queried:

> "Do we have to suffer the building of this enormous concrete monster on the mere chance that the traffic problem will somehow disappear? " (A. Bateman 8)

Some individuals and groups who advocate conservation interests tried to turn it into a local election issue, but met with limited success because of the contextual constraints that operate upon the local political decision making process. (See Chapters six, seven and eight for a discussion of this context and Chapter eight in particular for a discussion of Canterbury Cares.)

After meetings with Kent County Council, the City Council agreed to reduce the use of the car parking spaces from 654 to 415 . This was passed by the City Council before the May local election. The Council Leader hoped:

> "to persuade the County Council to allow the development of the £1 million building in three stages. It would be acceptable if there was a condition that only one level would be used for cars at the start, probably the basement, then permission could be obtained for use of a second deck for cars fairly quickly." (A. Porter 11)

The plan for a 654 space car park (again with no traffic management scheme and with only 415 of those spaces to be used) was submitted to Kent County Council for the granting of a Section 28A Certificate. In August 1979, Kent County Council granted this Certificate but placed a condition that of the 415 possible spaces, 204 cars could not leave or enter the car park between the hours of 4 pm and 6pm! The County Council's Powers Sub-Committee said:

> "The City Council can build a car park on three floors for over 600 parking spaces but only 415 spaces on the ground and first floors can be used. Also, 204 vehicle spaces cannot be vacated between 4 pm and 6 pm." (Kent County Council 4)

This angered the opposition and plans were made to take the issue to the Ombudsman. The Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane exclaimed:

> "This is the most depressing thing to have happened in Canterbury for years. I just hope they realise what they are doing and letting us in for both in financial costs and the costs to the environment of the city. This is a total disaster." (A. Bateman 9)

In December 1979, the City Council's Town Planning Committee approved a revised design for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The changes were not of a fundamental nature. This planning application had been left off the list of planning applications that was regularly sent to amenity societies and conservation groups. Two letters were written by amenity society leaders protesting against the changes and were sent to each member of the Town Planning Committee two days before it met. The Chairman of the Northgate Association claimed that:

> "the lack of consultation is another chapter in this disreputable saga. The Council knows full well that amenity societies rely on the list of planning applications. No one has had a chance to see the new plans and comment on them." (C. Simpson 9)

The Council Leader confiscated the letters before the Committee members could see them, let alone read them. The Council Leader pointed out that:

> "Councils are being warned against being cajoled into the practice of consulting everyone on every occasion. We are falling into a great trap if we say that because something is not done by courtesy of the press, we should defer it." (A. Porter 12)

Once again, the opposition to the Rosemary Lane car park felt thwarted in its attempts to stop the car park from being built. The Chairman of the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee stated:

> "The Council's view is that it has fulfilled its statutory obligation in advertising the design scheme once. But in my view, and in the views of many others, this does not constitute public consultation, particularly on a controversial public issue." (P. Williams 7)

In January 1980, the residents of Castle Street, Action for Rosemary Lane and the Conservation Advisory Committee wrote to the Local Ombudsman requesting her to investigate the City Council over the way it had handled the plan for the Rosemary Lane site. Allegations of injustice and the City Council's cynical disregard of the Advisory Committee's and Action for Rosemary Lane's opinions formed the main basis for their complaint. In his letter to the Local Ombudsman, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee said:

> "The Advisory Committee was set up as a consultative body paid for by ratepayers money to fill a void that the City Council eventually recognised. The failure to inform it of this matter comes at a time when the highly important transportation study, that will have a crucial impact on the city, has been discussed in secret - albeit in a truncated form - by the City Council without sending a copy to us or telling us of any plans to discuss it with us . . . I would urge these matters to be taken into consideration when you assess the argument on this vexing issue. Surely the job of the advisory committee is to advise?" (P. Williams 8)

In February, the Canterbury Society urged the Under Secretary for the DoE to call in the Rosemary Lane plan for a public inquiry in order "to compel a reconsideration of them". The Society maintained that the established planning procedures had been ignored and that the new design for the housing (December 1979) to clothe the car park was unsatisfactory. The Society felt that opportunities for public participation from the start had been totally inadequate.

At the end of the month, the Local Ombudsman decided after making preliminary enquiries, that it would not take any action on the car park because it felt that there was no complaint it could formally investigate. Both the Local Ombudsman and the DoE felt they could not interfere with the City Council's decision to allow the building. The Chairman of the Conservation Advisory Committee commented on this decision:

> "Obviously we are disappointed. But it is not a question of whether or not we approve of a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. It is actually to make the wheels of public participation turn rather more smoothly. Either we are a Conservation Advisory Committee or we are not. If we are, we should be actually part of the Council's process and also we should be able to advise. Things must improve from now on, otherwise the whole purpose of the committee and the usefulness it serves must be called into question." (P. Williams 9)

In June 1980, the work on the £2¼ million Rosemary Lane car park began. It took about fifteen months to build and was opened in October 1981. Right up until the present time (1983) the car park has remained under-utilised and income from parking charges has been very low (£20,000 per annum).

This has been the object of debate. Its opponents have said this justified the stand they took while its supporters attribute it to a lack of signposting and to the success of the design in concealing the car park behind a terrace of houses! At the present time, it is unclear whether or not the car park can be fully used. Signs have indicated that the car park can be fully used in the winter months, but only two stories (capacity 380 cars) can be used in the summer months which seems rather extra-ordinary in that the need for car parking in the summer months is the greatest.

II. THE MARLOWE SITE

We now turn to the Marlowe site and the response to the Council's proposal to develop it. The conflict that was generated over the City Council's plan to redevelop the Marlowe site for commercial use was not as overt or intense as the conflict that occurred over the Rosemary Lane site. There were two main reasons for this. Firstly, the amenity societies and conservationists opposed the Marlowe proposal only in three respects: its lack of underground car parking, the demolition of the Marlowe Theatre, and the physical design of the redevelopment scheme. They did not, however, question the basic idea of commercial development for the Marlowe site as they did with the Rosemary Lane proposal. No specific pressure group was formed to fight the proposal as in the case of Rosemary Lane. Therefore, the level of opposition was very different for the two sites.

Secondly, the City Council was more successful in controlling the conflict over the Marlowe proposal than the conflict over Rosemary Lane. The main "management tactics" the City Council used to contain the conflict over the Marlowe proposal were secrecy and delay in disclosing its intentions over the site. They had been the most successful in containing the conflict over the Rosemary Lane proposal and proved to be successful again in containing the conflict over the Marlowe site.

This Section will explain the different types of "management tactics" the City Council used to control the politically threatening implications of the conflict that was generated over its proposal for the Marlowe site.

The idea for redeveloping the Marlowe site for commercial purposes first originiated as official Conservative policy in 1973. As discussed in Chapter eight, the Conservatives gained control of the City Council after local government re-organisation. The new Estates Committee in May 1974 recommended the redevelopment of the Marlowe and Watling Street car parks "to be treated by the Council as matters of urgency."

In March 1975, the City Council appointed the agents Healey and Baker to investigate the feasibility of commmercial use of the Marlowe and Watling Street sites. The report was received by the Council in September of that year. Healey and Baker suggested two schemes for each of the two sites. The Marlowe site was designated primarily for shopping and the Watling Street site was designated for some shopping, a library, a theatre and a hotel.

The City Council calculated that there would be an increased demand for car parking spaces due to the increased traffic that would be generated by the development, the loss of car parking on the Marlowe and Watling Street sites and the anticipated growth of traffic by 1981. Several sites were suggested to cater for this need by the construction of a multi-storey car park: Longport, Rosemary Lane and Rhodaus Town. Due to compulsory purchase complications with respect to the Longport and Rhodaus Town sites, Rosemary Lane was chosen by the Council as the site for a multi-storey car park. This site was the only one of the three in total Council ownership.

The City Council decided to press forward with its proposals for Rosemary Lane in December 1975 in order to satisfy the traffic and parking requirements of the Marlowe site development. The City Council concentrated its energies on obtaining permission to construct a 654 space multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane as seen in the previous Section.

In January 1976, the City Council decided to prepare a more detailed plan for the commercial redevelopment of the Marlowe site. In the spring of that year, the amenity societies began campaigning for full public knowledge and consultation on the Marlowe proposal. The Chairman of the Northgate Association was worried about the question of public participation and said:

> "The Council seems to have decided shops are going on sites and all that remains to be discussed is what they would look like. The public has been brought into the picture much too late." (C. Simpson 10)

The Chairman of the Canterbury Society stated:

> "There has been minimal publicity and public participation by the Council in this matter to date." (K. Pinnock 6)

The City Council did make the Healey and Baker report more accessible to the public. However, the details of the Council's intentions were not disclosed.

The City Council justified its proposal (which consisted of 83,000 square feet of shopping space broken into one large shop unit consisting of 43,000 square feet and 22 small units of approximately 1,800 square feet each) for the Marlowe site

on the basis that its commercial redevelopment would benefit the majority of residents in Canterbury. The Chairman of the Estates Committee emphasised that "shopping is recognised as an essential and acceptable city centre land use." (J. Wilkins 2) He saw the redevelopment as an improvement for Canterbury.

Not only did the Council try to impose its justification on the local electorate, but the language it used to do so masked the existence of sectional interests in Canterbury. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee stated that:

> "economic growth is a good thing within limitations. If it is done properly, it won't put pressure on historic sites. If the rates are to be held down, then we must get revenue." (T. Castle 2)

The Chairman of the Estates Commitee pointed out that:

> "the moment the Marlowe development opens, it should start bringing in money for the Council through it to the ratepayers. The development of the Marlowe site when it comes off will be to the public benefit. There will be a loss of central car parking but the rental value to the Council will be to the good of the ratepayers. I am sure there will be increased income from the moment the building is finished." (J. Wilkins 3)

In August 1976 the Estates Committee approved the £1,700,000 redevelopment scheme for a shopping complex on the Marlowe site as described above. The development was to be built in two stages with the eventual demolition of the Marlowe Theatre. There was no great opposition to this decision from the amenity societies and other individuals. At this time, the full weight of the amenity societies' opposition was being pitted against the Council's proposal for the Rosemary Lane site. As discussed in the previous Section, Action for Rosemary Lane had just been formed and the opposition was

gaining momentum. For the next six months or so, the Marlowe proposal did not really come into the public eye and amenity society activity was mainly concentrated on opposing the Rosemary Lane proposal.

On the 7th April 1977, the City Council sought permission from the DoE to demolish the Marlowe Theatre before the new one was built. The demolition order was necessary because the Theatre was in a conservation area. The City Council stated that the demolition application was a technicality to redevelop the Marlowe site. The City Architect explained:

> "It is a technicality. As the Theatre comes within the development area, permission to demolish it must be applied for. But it will definitely not be pulled down until a site for a new theatre has been found and that theatre built." (P. Jackson 5)

This caused consternation among the amenity societies and other concerned individuals. Not only did they question the legal validity of the Council's guarantee (not to demolish the Marlowe Theatre until the building of a new one had begun), but they started to speak out against the proposal for the shopping complex on the site and about the lack of provision for underground car parking. The opposition said that this development would " fundamentally change the heart of the old city" and it had been approved before there had been any public discussion of it. The Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane thought:

> "It is only reasonable that the Council should defer any decision on the Marlowe development until it has firm guarantees and a site for the new theatre. This should be more than promises and good intentions; it should be figures in an agreed fixed budget." (A. Bateman 10)

The proposal to demolish the Marlowe Theatre caused the amenity societies to scrutinise the Council's proposal more closely. The Chairman of the Oaten Hill and District Society felt that:

> "There has been no attempt to include anything other than shops and a huge store on this key site. This, in our opinion, shows a sad lack of imagination to attempt to pack 22 shops and a store on this site which appears to be far too dense a development. If approved, it could further damage the trading prospects of those shops in the High Street below the Guildhall Street traffic lights. We are amazed that there is no provision for a car park in the development and we point out that we have persistently called for the Marlowe site to have a big, partially underground car park." (P. Williams 10)

The Council tried to justify its intentions of the Marlowe site by stating that it made a "full and frank disclosure" of them. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee pointed out:

> "We are not talking about the demolition of the Marlowe at this stage. We have merely shown our hand as regards the development of the site." (T. Castle 3)

The Chairman of the Estates Committee said:

> "It seems difficult to convince people that when we speak, we say what we mean." (J. Wilkins 4)

The Estates Committe said it would not give instructions to plan or design a new theatre until it could demolish the old one. On the 24th May, the Estates Committee approved the first stage of the shopping complex.

There was still opposition to the Marlowe proposal. Amenity societies and indiviudals who opposed the scheme maintained that public participation in the redevelopment plan had been "bungled". They felt the City Council had dismissed the suggestion of underground car parking too lightly. The Chairman of the Canterbury Society was worried:

> "about the lack of publicity for the plans and I also question what stage the development has reached. Our understanding is that the City Architect's department is preparing a design brief which will serve as a general guide to developers. The plan now exhibited appears to be a finished scheme." (K. Pinnock 7)

The Chairman was also worried "about the lack of plans for car parking" and suggested "a semi-basement car park". (K. Pinnock 8)

In September 1977, the Environment Secretary granted the City Council's application for the demolition of the Marlowe Theatre as a preliminary for the redevelopment of the entire site for shopping. At the end of the month, the Town Planning Committee gave the Marlowe site the final go-ahead despite over one hundred protest letters and petitions protesting the Council's plan to demolish the Theatre. The City Council continued to defend itself against allegations that it did not allow for public discussion of the scheme. The City Architect stressed that "the Council has gone well beyond its minimum requirements as far as public participation is concerned." (P. Jackson 6) It defended itself in the local press and through its Public Relations Officer.

As mentioned in the discussion of the Rosemary Lane proposal, the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee was instituted by the City Council to manage and control conservation interests,

ie to make them less of a political threat. During the spring of 1978, the Advisory Committee discussed the redevelopment of the Marlowe site. It wanted the Council to re-examine the provision of underground car parking on the site. It was at this time that the traffic management scheme for the proposed Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park came more into the public eye due to the discussions taking place between Kent County Council and the City Council regarding the size of the Wincheap roundabout.

June 1978 saw the Examination in Public of the Kent Structure Plan and as discussed in Chapter seven, the Marlowe site was seen as a "commitment" by Kent County Council. At its monthly meeting, the Advisory Committee again urged the City Council to rethink its plan for the Marlowe site.

A feasibility study of underground car parking on the Marlowe site had been done by Cementation Projects Limited at the request of the Oaten Hill and District Society. The Advisory Committee took the initiative in publicising the report despite the Council's objections that underground car parking would cause economic, structural and archaeological problems. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee felt that:

> "The site could make an important contribution to helping solve the city's car parking problems. The Council should explore realistically the possibility of underparking part of the site. Even if 100 cars could be parked underground it would make sense. On being pressed at the Advisory Committee meeting it was revealed that the City Council had never considered underparking on the Marlowe site. We believe that the initial findings of Cementation Limited indicate that it is feasible to consider underparking the Marlowe site. Surely it is not too late for the City Council to remain flexible at this stage. We welcome the Advisory Committee's decision to urge the Council to include the possibility of underparking when seeking tenders for the site." (P. Williams 11)

The City Architect said:

> "It is not impossible to build a car park under the site but the problems would be so great as to make it uneconomic. At present prices, I would imagine it would cost nearer £4,000 to £5,000 per space and would cause problems when building above. It would cause traffic problems and no one is sure what archaeological finds may be discovered on the site."
> (P. Jackson 7)

The Estates Committee did not consider the report until November 1978. The Committee decided the report was based on a number of incorrect assumptions. The City Architect added:

> "Along with the very small area under consideration and the high costs likely to be involved there is no way the Council can give a commitment on underground car parking at this time."
> (P. Jackson 8)

By using this delaying tactic, the City Council hoped amenity societies would have lost interest in its proposal and the plan for the Marlowe site would have progressed too far in terms of money and resources for any changes to be made. It was during this time that the City Council was concentrating its efforts in obtaining a Section 28A Certificate from Kent County Council for the Rosemary Lane proposal.

The amenity societies were concerned that the City Council had rejected the idea of underground car parking. They objected to the way the City Council had dismissed the report. They maintained the City Council had a "reputation for being stubborn, autocratic, and often wrong" and "the City Council had closed minds". The Chairman of the Oaten Hill and District Society stated:

> "We are not seeking a commitment to underparking the Marlowe site. We simply ask that it should be considered - something which, on the admission of the City Architect's own department, the City Council has not really done. We do not believe planning procedures are so inflexible that if at this stage in the Planning Committee there were a desire to ask would-be developers to consider an underground car park on the Marlowe site, this could not be taken into account. After all, copies of all the plans and information available to us were sent to the City Architect." (P. Williams 12)

In the final analysis, the City Council's policy did not change.

In January 1980, the City Council refused to grant the Marlowe Trust £23,000 to counter falling receipts. It caused the resignation of three key members of staff - the director, press officer and production manager. These developments prompted the renewal of public discussion about the Marlowe Theatre for the next several months.

In February, the Conservation Advisory Committee came up with a new idea for the Marlowe Theatre. The Committee proposed to run the stage around and build the seating for the Theatre towards Rose Lane. Shops and bars would be on the St. Margaret's Street frontage. This idea was enthusiastically received by the Committee, but the Council remained sceptical.

It was disclosed in April that the Marlowe Theatre was likely to lose £40,000 more than expected. The deficit of £72,275 on the year ending 31st March 1980 was a substantial increase on the original estimate of £32,275. In deliberations regarding its continued support for the Theatre, the Council concluded that it would have to retain a much firmer control over its finances.

In May the City Council won its appeal against the High Court's June 1979 ruling that it should provide car parking space at the rear of Slatters Hotel. The Court of Appeal allowed the Council's appeal against Slatters with costs. The June 1979 High Court decision upheld Slatters Hotel claim that the City Council was obliged to provide car parking spaces and access rights for the Hotel in the redevelopment of the Marlowe site.

The debate still continued about the new theatre, mainly concentrating on its ideal size. In June the Conservation Advisory Committee suggested that the Odeon Cinema could be converted and adapted to provide a theatre. The Committee maintained that this idea was worthy of further exploration. It also emphasised the City Council's assurances that the existing Marlowe Theatre would not be demolished until the new one was built.

In September, Council Treasury officers recommended to the Amenities Committee that the Marlowe Theatre should be closed because it was costing the Council over £1,500 per week to run. They also mentioned the lack of support for the Marlowe Theatre as evidenced by its poor attendance records. The Committee agreed to the Arts Council suggestion that its representatives should meet those from the City and County Councils to review and discuss the theatre and its finances.

During the same month, the content of the partnership agreement with the future developer of the Marlowe site was decided at the full Council meeting. The agreement assumed that the Council would guarantee to let all the shops in the complex. However, in the current economic climate, this assumption was risky because if none of the shops were let then the City Council would have to pay the developer the guaranteed rental income of £400,000. This decision brought into focus again the threat to close the Marlowe Theatre and public debate about its future continued.

In December, the Amenities Committee approved an additional £20,000 to keep the Marlowe Theatre going after Christmas. The Committee felt that a tighter grip should be kept on the Theatre's finances and believed that the onus for its survival should be placed on the general public.

Just before Christmas 1980, it was disclosed that the Marlowe Theatre would lose its £72,000 Arts Council grant for the coming year. This caused grave doubts to be voiced about the theatre's future. It came as a shock to many people in Canterbury. The Chairman of the Amenities Committee stated:

> "It has been a terrific shock. However it does look as though it is the end of subsidised reperatory at the Marlowe." (M. Steptoe 1)

The Council Leader was not encouraging either:

> "Your guess is as good as mine as to the degree of priority the Council will attach to the schemes before them. It is a damn bleak prospect all round." (A. Porter 13)

There was a confidential meeting of the Amenities Committee in January 1981 over the future of the Marlowe Theatre after the loss of the Arts Council grant but nothing was decided. At the end of the month, the Finance Committee met excluding the press and public and refused to grant £150,000 to the Trust for the running of the Marlowe Theatre. It recommended that the Council take over the theatre from the 1st of April and run it as part of the Amenities Department. In effect, the Marlowe Theatre lost its independence. On the same evening, a public meeting was held in the Marlowe Theatre to enlist the help of the media (radio, TV. and newspapers) and the general public to save it. This was the first

appearance of formal mobilisation around the specific issue of the Marlowe Theatre. The meeting was held under the auspices of the Marlowe Theatre Club. (Nothing really materialised out of this meeting or from this organisation.)

In February the City Council invited prospective developers to state their interest in the Marlowe site by the 11th of March. A short list would then be drawn up and invitations to tender would be sent to those on the list. The Council reserved the right to approve the letting of the shops. Regardless of whose tender was chosen, the developer would be required to make a capital payment of £1 million to the Council towards the cost of acquisition and clearing the site.

In March, the City Council voted to take over the running of the Marlowe Theatre from 1st April, merely formalising the Finance Committee's recommendation in January.

The City Council disclosed the short list of developers it had invited to tender in April for the Marlowe shopping centre scheme. Seven were chosen from a field of thirty-eight. They were the following:

1. British Home Stores and C & A Modes
2. Wimpey Property Holdings Limited
3. National Westminster Bank Pension Fund and Arthur Oakes Development Limited
4. Haslemere Estates
5. Prudential Insurance Company Limited
6. Heron Corporation Limited and Sir Robert McAlpine & Sons Limited
7. Sun Life of Canada

The Chairman of the Estates Committee commented:

> "We were very impressed by the extremely high standing of all the applications and the number received is an indication of the confidence of the investors in Canterbury." (T. Castle 4)

In July, anger mounted over the City Council's decision to demolish the Marlowe Theatre by June 1982. Theatregoers were shocked and accused the City Council's Policy Committee of "making a despicable decision to pull down the building before another theatre has been built." In the light of the Council's assurances regarding the retention of the Marlowe Theatre until a new one was built, the campaign to save the theatre gained new impetus. Suggestions were made that the Odeon Cinema should be purchased and used as a temporary theatre. The new theatre when built, could be partly financed by money from the Marlowe development and/or the developer could contribute to a replacement.

Again, the Conservation Advisory Committee spearheaded the movement for the Council to buy the Odeon Cinema and it also wanted the Council to put aside the value of the Marlowe building towards setting up a new theatre. The Chairman of the Committee maintained:

> "The opportunity presented by the Odeon Cinema being for sale must be explored to the full. Commercial considerations have got us in an acrimonious mess. The Council's determination to develop the Marlowe site commercially to the exclusion of all else led to the demolition order in the first place and the pledges that followed. The mounting losses at the Marlowe lent weight to the argument of those who wanted to close the doors and be rid of the theatre." (P. Williams 13)

The Council Leader admitted that the Council had broken its promise not to tear down the Marlowe until the replacement had been built. He justified the latest turn of events by saying:

> "Demolition is necessary to get the best from the proposed shopping development on site. To allow the existing theatre to stand while building went up around it would turn it into a white elephant." (A. Porter 14)

In August, the City Council revealed that a £1 million down payment would be required from the chosen developer to build on the Marlowe site. This down payment would be the first stage of any partnership agreement between the developer and the City Council. The building was expected to take two years and when finished, the developer would get a full repairing and insuring lease of the site and buildings for 125 years. The Council would be paid an annual rent, but the developer would be responsible for the site's management. However the Council would be represented on the management organisation.

In December 1981 it was announced that Prudential Pensions Limited had won the tender for the Marlowe site development which would entail a Burlington Arcade-style mall with twenty specialist shops, comprising 110,000 square feet of shopping space on 1½ acres. The final cost would be about £8 million. The building contractor was Higgs and Hill Building Limited and the joint letting agents were Healey and Baker and Edward Erdman. The Chairman of the Estates Committee said:

> "This development will provide a much needed addition to the existing central area shopping facilities and in our chosen partner we have a household name whose property expertise extends over 100 years and as such has unrivalled experience in development schemes of the calibre we are seeking for Canterbury." (T. Castle 5)

The Marlowe Theatre shut its doors in May 1982. It lost £42,650 in less than two months before it closed. Demolition of the theatre began and work on the archaeological dig commenced after demolition.

The Planning Committee gave its informal approval in July 1982 to a scheme which would turn the Odeon Cinema into a first class theatre. The Amenities Committee put its weight behind this scheme in August, and October saw the Planning Committee giving final approval for the £2¼ million scheme to convert the Odeon into a theatre giving a capacity of 1,000 seats.

After a year of talks between the City Council and the Prudential, contracts for the Marlowe site were signed in December 1982. It was also disclosed that British Home Stores would be the company taking the largest space in the development. The Mayor commented:

> "It has taken a long time to realise Canterbury's full potential. The city has been neglected for years, but at last it has the chance to catch up and provide the country's best shopping facilities." (A. Porter 15)

Work began on the Marlowe site in January 1983.

III. EXPLAINING THE ROSEMARY LANE AND MARLOWE SITE DECISIONS

In the previous two sections we have indicated how the City Council proceeded with its proposal for the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites. We will now analyse this process. To do so we will distinguish between the context within which the Council operated and the degree to which it was carrying out a freely chosen policy. The general nature of the context was discussed in Chapters six, seven and eight, and the way in which it impinged on these two decisions was evident in the earlier parts of the present chapter.

Our argument will be that the economic and political context set certain constraints on the City Council's proposals for development on the two sites, but that these proposals represented deliberate political choices which made use of the freedom allowed by the constraints and indeed involved challenging the precise limits of these constraints.

For convenience we will distinguish the economic and and political constraints on the Council and the Council's economic and political initiatives.

1. Economic Constraints and Initiatives

The major economic constraints on the Council were of two sorts: those deriving from Canterbury's position as a commercial centre in East Kent and those deriving from the local government finance system which affected its ability to finance new developments. Its initiatives in this area were firstly the promotion of commercial growth in Canterbury, and secondly its use of the opportunities allowed by the local government finance system and by its position as landowner to support this growth. These can be seen as initiatives since they represented choices to act within a given situation.

Considering the constraints first, Canterbury's position as a commercial centre in East Kent meant that it contained a powerful trading interest which supported further commercial growth in Canterbury. Existing commercial interests saw the promotion of growth in Canterbury as a necessity if Canterbury was to retain its commercial position vis-a-vis the other towns in East Kent. The Chairman of the Estates Committee remarked on the Marlowe proposal:

> "Attempting to further the overall propserity of the city and consequently those who are in and work in the district, my committee decided that shopping was the logical development for this valuable business area." (J. Wilkins 5)

Pressure from the traders was very visible in the local press and included support for new shopping developments, and especially for improvements in infrastructure such as more car parks, and lower parking charges. The Chairman of the Canterbury District and Chamber of Trade stated:

> "Any additional parking space within the town and in easy reach of the shopping areas has to be a big boon." (K. Waller 3)

Another member emphatically pressed the point that "trade is the lifeblood of this city and more car parking spaces are desparately needed." (E. Goodrich 1)

Canterbury City Council had no hesitation in responding to this pressure from the traders by adopting an active policy of promotion of commercial development.

However, tension existed between central sites and out-of-town sites for shopping. The out-of-town sites offered better access and on-the-spot car parking. During this time, a change of use was occurring on the Broad Oak and Wincheap Industrial Estates from light industrial/ warehousing to shopping. The late 1970s saw several developments being granted planning permission for out-of-town sites eg Key Markets on Sturry Road, Sainsburys in Northgate.

The second economic constraint on the Council was the need to lessen the negative consequences of the existing concentration of commercial activity in the centre of Canterbury. The City Council's commitment to further capital expenditure on the provision of roads and car parking increased during the 1970s because of this negative effect. the Council Leader felt that:

> "the Council has to make provision for the adequate parking of cars at a reasonable distance from the shops. Building a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane was the best solution for one of the biggest messes one could see."
> (A. Porter 16)

The third economic constraint on the Council was its dependence on government grants, rates and fee income, and loans to finance its development initiatives. Central government grants formed the largest proportion of income to local government. Within the past four years, the percentage of the Rate Support Grant of total local government income has decreased to 61%. (See Chapter four.) If the City Council wanted to finance its own development (as in the case of the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park), a certain amount of money could be absorbed from the resources element of the Rate Support Grant. Since it was a block grant,

every penny did not have to be specifically allocated by central government but spending had to be within central government guildines. In this way accumulated balances could be used to finance capital projects. Rates were seen to be a sensitive political issue, so they could not be increased dramatically. Loans for capital projects required outright central government approval.

Within these constraints, the City Council had the ability to initiate development and this was reflected in its redevelopment policy which sought to maintain Canterbury's position as the major commercial centre of East Kent. As was shown in previous chapters, this redevelopment policy (ie redevelopment of central sites for commercial use) was strongly supported by the Conservative Council just after the re-organisation of local government in 1974.

The proposals to develop the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites were very closely linked. The development of the Rosemary Lane site as a multi-storey car park for 654 cars was seen by the Chairman of the Amenities Committee as:

> "the key to develop the Marlowe site. Rates are the biggest problem the City Council has to deal with. More money is needed because of inflation and increased expenditure. The City Council will obtain more revenue in building a new development on the Marlowe site which will attract new industry and shopping." (M. Steptoe 2)

The Council Leader reiterated these statements:

> "As a City Council, we have to look after the well being of the ratepayers, insofar as the services for which we are responsible and concerned. Among these is the provision of car parks. It is not, perhaps generally known that 10% of the people who work in Canterbury depend for their livelihood on the tourists who visit the city. Obviously, tourists will not come to Canterbury unless they can find a place to park. The Marlowe site could be better developed for high class shopping, which will attract trade to Canterbury and will also keep the traffic out of the centre of the city, which is our long term intention. Before the Marlowe site can be properly developed, provision has to be made for car parking facilities." (A. Porter 17)

Three areas of discretion can be pointed out: the City Council's use of land to allow development, its use of its own funds to finance development, and its exploitation of ambiguities about planning responsibilities. The City Council as landowner is the first important area of discretion. As an agent in the development process, the City Council was part of the nexus of market based land institutions in that it acted as site assembly agent for fractions of capital and helped to restructure market forces by increasing the situational advantages of private commercial capital in Canterbury.

The City Council felt the commercial redevelopment of several of its centrally owned sites would also help to bridge the gap between revenue and expenditure. The City Council's income from such ventures would be in the form of ground rent and rates. This became one of the Council's main justifications for its plan to commercially redevelop the Marlowe site. In 1974, the Whitefriars site provided the City Council with £40,000 per annum - £20,000 as ground rent and £20,000 as rates. The amount that would be obtained from the commercial redevelopment of the Marlowe site had not been disclosed. The City Council was one among several landowners of the site who would share the ground rent.

Two of the main forms taken by this active policy of promotion of commercial development were of course the proposal to build the Rosemary Lane car park and to build a new shopping development on the Marlowe site. As we have seen in previous chapters, these were only two of the many initiatives by the City Council since World War II.

A second element of choice concerns the Council's ability to finance developments from its own resources. The provision of car parking comes under the jurisdiction of the City Council and is paid for out of the City Council's general rate fund. In the late 1970s, car parks were a £240,000 per annum loss to the rates, although a central government directive in 1976 had stated that car parks should be self-financing. The estimated cost for the actual work on the 654 space multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane was £2¼ million. Depending upon the rate of interest, the length of loan (if one was necessary), and the amount of money actually borrowed, estimates of the total cost of the multi-storey car park ranged from £4 million to £7 million. An important point must be made here. Financial information concerning the financing of the Rosemary Lane car park was always difficult to obtain. What was said in public by councillors and officers eg that a loan would be necessary contradicted what actually happened. It appears that the multi-storey car park was financed from accumulated balances set aside from the 1976/1977 financial year onwards.

Regardless of how the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park was to be financed (either by loan or from accumulated balances) pressure would be exerted on the rates. The Chairman of the Canterbury Society remarked that:

> "income from the Rosemary Lane car park will fall short of expectations and there will be many complaints that the park is a burden on the ratepayers, as it may well be in any case since its capital cost will be somewhere between £1 million and £5 million according to the extent to which current income or loans provide the finance." (K. Pinnock 9)

A third area of discretion arose out of the unclarity of town planning powers held by the different levels of government as described in chapters three, five and seven. This gave the City Council a certain amount of discretion in its manoeuvres for getting the proposals approved. This was a theme in the earlier part of this chapter where we showed how the City Council succeeded in its negotiations with Kent County Council over the granting of a Section 28A Certificate for Rosemary Lane, regarding the Marlowe site as a "commitment" in the Structure Plan and the holding of a panel hearing over the Rosemary Lane proposal to demonstrate to the Environment Secretary that it was a "responsible" authority.

In this section we have examined the economic constraints on the Council and its initiatives regarding commercial development. The constraints are the economic pressures from existing traders to maintain Canterbury's commercial position in East Kent, the need to overcome the negative effects of the existing concentration of commerce in Canterbury, and the Council's need to operate within the local government finance system. Within the constraints, the City Council has taken very active initiatory roles, making use of its own city centre land holdings, to build car parks and promote commercial development. One argument put forward for this combination of initiatives is that it leads to increased rateable values in the city.

2. Political Constraints and Initiatives

In chapters seven and eight, we saw that the City Council was subject to central government and Kent County Council constraints, and within Canterbury it had to face an electorate which had become far more organised around conservation issues since the late 1960s. It is in relation to this triangle of constraints that the City Council had to manage its commercial development policy. We will consider in turn the significance of these political constraints and the way in which the Council sought to deal with them.

Chapters three, five and seven illustrated the encroachment of central government on local activities as one of the contextual constraints operating on the City Council. In the case of the Rosemary Lane scheme, there was the possibility of central government "interference" in two respects. Firstly, there was the likelihood of a public inquiry being called and secondly, central government had to give loan sanction for any large amount of money borrowed by the City Council. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the City Council held a panel hearing on the Rosemary Lane proposal with a view to demonstrating to the Environment Secretary that it had taken into consideration all the different views in the community. The Environment Secretary said that he would not make a decision as to whether a public inquiry would be called until he had read the report of the panel hearing. As we have seen, the City Council was successful in its attempt to manage its relations with the DoE. It convinced the DoE that it could handle Rosemary Lane itself. With regard to the second, the financial aspect, the City Council had set aside every year approximately £300,000 since 1976/77. These amounts were placed in a building fund. The majority of the finance for Rosemary Lane came from the accumulated balances in this fund. This meant that the Council did not require central government sanction for a loan to build the car park.

But within this context, Canterbury City Council had very considerable success in pursuing its proposals. It was able to convince central government of its capacity to manage the Rosemary Lane proposal to avoid it being called in by the Minister; to persuade Kent County Council to allow it to build the car park and shopping development at a time when the Structure Plan advocated "restraint" in Canterbury, and to reconcile the pressures from trading and amenity interests through its use of "management tactics". By building the car park with accumulated balances, the City Council was able to avoid the need for central government approval of a loan for this purpose. And by using land which it already owned, the City Council was able to avoid a further possible source of constraint on its development ambitions.

The City Council made use of the support of the traders to present the two proposals as of benefit to Canterbury in general, a tactic which forced the amenity groups into the position of being a "sectional" interest. But what is interesting is perhaps how despite the public opposition of the amenity groups, the Council was able to make use of its formal political power to force through the two proposals. Amenity groups, despite their intensive activity, lacked power in the Council chamber and this is what enabled the City Council to go ahead against their protests.

The thesis can be seen as a study of the way one type of "pressure for change" is taken up, facilitated and pursued determinedly by a council, while another, voiced by amenity groups is successfully contained by the careful use of institutional power and conflict "management tactics".

On each such occasion the amenity societies believed that the car park proposal would be abandoned, but the City Council was extremely dogged in its pursuit of the elusive Section 28A Certificate. The stage was even reached in spring 1979 when the City Council maintained it could legally build the car park without the Section 28A Certificate; it just could not use it! A compromise was finally reached in that a 654 space multi-storey car park could be built, but only 400 spaces could be used with a restriction of use of a further 200 spaces between 4 and 6 pm. As of 1983, full use of the multi-storey car park is still restricted with only just under two-thirds of its capacity in operation.

The Marlowe redevelopment on the other hand, was acknowledged as a "commitment" by Kent County Council in the debate about the Kent Structure Plan as discussed in detail in Chapter seven. In other words, Kent County Council's general policy of restraint of commercial development in Canterbury did not apply to the Marlowe redevelopment. At one stage, Kent County Council was hoping to trade off the granting of the Marlowe proposal as a "commitment" with the refusal of the Section 28A Certificate but to no avail. These two examples show how the City Council was highly successful in its dealings with Kent County Council. It made full use of the ambiguity over the precise town planning powers of the county and district levels of government. In the end it shows how a determined district council could defeat a county council. The Kent Structure Plan recommended the restraint of commercial development in Canterbury in order to facilitate the growth of commerce in other towns in East Kent. But the City Council's success in obtaining approval of the Marlowe redevelopment and the accompanying car park in complete opposition to the Structure Plan can be seen as showing Kent County Council's ineffectiveness when faced with a single-minded council trying to exploit its "natural" economic advantages.

With regard to the plan for the Marlowe site, demolition consent was needed from the Environment Secretary for the Marlowe Theatre. It was therefore in the City Council's best interests to nurture relations with central government. A working party for the Conservation Advisory Committee was set up in spring 1977 (its first meeting was in September 1977), all of which was duly communicated to the DoE. In September 1977, the Environment Secretary gave demolition consent for the Marlowe Theatre despite public opposition and anxiety over the Council's guarantees that the existing theatre would not be demolished until a new one was built. (May 1977 also saw the Environment Secretary refusing to call a public inquiry on the Rosemary Lane scheme.) Thus, the City Council was successful in managing its relations with central government in this respect too.

Turning now to the Council's relations with Kent County Council, these focused on two issues: the granting of the Section 28A Certificate for the Rosemary Lane car park and the inclusion of the Marlowe redevelopment in the Kent Structure Plan.

The Rosemary Lane car park required a traffic management scheme so that it did not lead to an obstruction of the flow of traffic at the Wincheap roundabout, which at that time was on the main Dover-London road. (In 1981 the opening of the Canterbury by-pass meant that this ceased to be the case. However the A2 is still a very busy road.) As we have seen, negotiations about an acceptable traffic management scheme took a very long time, with Kent County Council repeatedly turning down the scheme proposed by the City Council.

Last but not least, the City Council had to "manage" its relations with the local electorate and especially with the amenity societies. As we saw in Chapter eight, the period since the late 1960s saw a mushrooming of amenity groups. This can be seen as a barometer of the state of tension between the City Council and the electorate. As was suggested in Chapter eight, the emergence of these groups reflects the growth of concern about the environment and the insulation of the electorate from the local political decision making process. These groups constituted a major political threat to the Council's ability to carry out the Rosemary lane and Marlowe proposals. The Council had therefore to devote considerable effort to controlling protest activity and its success in this respect is a pivotal element in explaining its success in getting the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe developments accepted.

To indicate the scale of the City Council's efforts to pacify amenity groups, it is useful to list the types of what we have called "management tactics" by which it "managed" its conflicts with these groups. Firstly as previously mentioned, the newly created post of Public Relations Officer was indicative of the City Council's attempts to regulate and channel the flow of information about its proposals for the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites to the local electorate. This post was established in spring 1977 when local opposition to the plans was at its height. The Council wanted a spokesperson who would be able to represent its position and its definition of the situation. Pressure groups were dependent mainly on the City Council for information on the plans and their stage of development. Sometimes they did not find out what these were until the Council was statutorily obliged to do so. For example, the public were unaware of the consultations occurring between the City and County Officers on the traffic management schemes for Rosemary Lane until a year or so later.

Secondly, the Council continued to discredit the views of the amenity societies. It undermined their existence by calling them names, eg "Council bashers" and "environmental terrorists", criticising them on the basis of their not offering viable alternatives and questioning their representativeness. This tactic probably had the effect of giving the amenity societies more press coverage in the local newspaper and aggravating the conflict.

Thirdly, the Council held several public meetings in order to explain its reason for advocating the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe developments. Of the meetings held to discuss the Rosemary Lane plan (July 1976, October 1976, November 1976), the most notable was the panel hearing in November 1976. The Council hoped that these meetings would assuage local opposition to the scheme but in fact only served to heighten it.

Fourthly, the City Council treated the issue of the erection of a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane as a technical matter in that if a suitable traffic management scheme would be found, then this would overcome all objections to the scheme. This was a successfulline to take because it forced the amenity societies to concentrate the majority of their limited resources in objecting to each new scheme that was devised and the corresponding changes in the Wincheap roundabout. The Chief Executive of the City Council said:

> "The solution of this problem is to be found in the 11 conditions to be imposed when the permission is granted. The number of car parking spaces to be operationally used, including those provided by requirements of condition (viii) - one parking space for each surrounding dwelling - shall not exceed the number at present available within the curtilage of the site (196) until such time as a traffic solution, acceptable from the environmental and traffic viewpoint, has been adopted in principle by the City Council after public consultation." (C. Gay 3)

This forced the opposition to focus on the traffic consequences of such a development. The Chairman of the Canterbury Society expressed this concern:

> "We are increasingly anxious about thie question of what traffic management systems there will be which will avoid tailbacks onto the Rheims Way and overloading the roundabout. We don't see how planning permission can rationally be given until or unless there are clear answers to the traffic question." (K. Pinnock 10)

With regard to the Marlowe site, the City Council placed an inordinate amount of attention on its guarantees concerning the Marlowe Theatre, its demolition and the question of underground car parking. Again, this achieved the desired effect of controlling the opposition though as we have seen, the level of opposition to this proposal was never as high as for the Rosemary Lane proposal.

Fifthly, the City Council set up the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee in order to contain the politically disruptive amenity society opposition to the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe plans. A working party was formed in the spring of 1977 which coincided with the formation of the post of Public Relations Officer and with the height of opposition to the Council's redevelopment plans. As shown earlier, the City Council was successful in controlling the potentially threatening implications of this conflict.

Sixthly, the Council's use of language helped it appeal to the general public beyond the amenity societies. For example, terms it used were "for the common good","for the general welfare" in its reports, its statements to the press and public and at its meetings.

The Chairman of the Public Works Committee explained:

> "We want this car park here. We hope to come up with something that will be for the benefit of the majority of citizens of Canterbury." (B. Porter 1)

It was particularly evident at occasions when the City Council was justifying its proposals for redevelopment of the two sites. The effect of this language was to mask the existence of sectional interests in Canterbury and to help impose the Council's definition of the situation.

Finally, the City Council delayed in letting the public know of its actions until it was statutorily obliged to do so. This was particularly evident with respect to the question of the traffic management scheme and the granting of the Section 28A Certificate for Rosemary Lane. Each time Kent County Council refused the Section 28A Certificate, the local opposition thought that this was the end of the matter until they discovered the City Council had been devising further traffic management schemes. This sequence of events happened over a period of several years (1977-1979) and each time the local opposition demobilised only to remobilise, thereby weakening it and draining its resources. Things did not happen as dramatically with regard to the Marlowe proposal. The important factor in this case was that it was difficult to find out at which Council/Committee meeting it would be discussed and what decision was made.

Different levels of conflict were generated over the Marlowe and Rosemary Lane site proposals. This was because there was less public opposition to the Marlowe proposal than to the Rosemary Lane one, and secondly, because there was better management of the Marlowe proposal by the City Council

partly because of the lessons it had learned in its handling of the conflict over the Rosemary Lane proposal. The most successful "management tactics" used by the City Council were secrecy and delay in disclosing its intentions for the Marlowe proposal. In the case of the Rosemary Lane proposal, the City Council used the "management tactics" of secrecy, delaying tactics, and a lack of information concerning its intentions.

3. Conclusion

In this Chapter, we have had two aims: firstly to outline the causes of the conflicts over the City Council's proposals for the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites, and secondly to identify the extent to which the City Council was operating under constraints and the extent to which it was "choosing" policy and ways of implementing it.

Taking the economic and political spheres together now, the main constraints involved were:

A. Governmental - due to the roles of central government and Kent County Council in the development process, and to the system of local government finance.

B. Social - due to the pressures from trading interests in favour of greater commercial development and from the electorate through the amenity societies against it (as in the Rosemary Lane case) or at least against its form (as in the Marlowe case).

C. Functional - due to the need to mitigate the worst effects of the existing concentration of commercial development in a medieval environment.

The overall effect of the City Council's policies in relation to the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites was to facilitate the private appropriation of profits by socialising the costs of the access problem. The profits obtained from the commercial redevelopment of the Marlowe site would be privately appropriated by the developer, landowner and the individual firms who leased the shops. The cost of the partial solution to the lack of access - the provision of a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane - would subsidised by the ratepayers.

These two sites studied were the last major ones to be redeveloped in the city centre. They were the final stage of the era of centre city redevelopment in Canterbury. Today, Canterbury is in a state of change with respect to the central concentration of commercial activities and out-of-town shopping. A new pattern of commercial activities is emerging. It is one of peripheral development outside the city centre with either on-the-spot car parking or traffic route improvements or both.

CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSION

Throughout this thesis I have sought to understand the relationship between centre city redevelopment, the local authority and the community. The stimulus to carry out a study of centre city redevelopment in Canterbury was my interest in the link between social processes and the built environment. Whilst so much research had been carried out in London, I felt there was a gap in research being undertaken in the provinces. When I decided to carry out my research (1976), several major central sites in Canterbury were being discussed (two of them being the Marlowe and Rosemary Lane sites) in terms of redevelopment.

The approach taken has been to draw together elements from previous work in the field. In particular, we have sought to pay attention both to the broad social and economic context as in Marxist research, and the empirical processes surrounding commercial redevelopment found in pluralist, elitist and neo-elitist research. In this way, we hope to have drawn from the strengths of both bodies of research. While avoiding some of their weaknesses, eg the excessively abstract nature of Marxist theory, and the treatment of the local political system as independent of the broader context in much of the other work.

The concepts used in this study are an attempt to build on this previous work. On the one hand, we have focussed on the context of local political decision making, and on the other, we have distinguished between the economic and political roles of the local authority. The advantage of these middle range concepts is that by stressing conflict they avoid the static approach found for example in structuralist research.

Thus the three elements of the context in which the local authority acts - the local economy, its relations with higher levels of government and with the local electorate - are each sources of conflict, and the economic and political roles the council plays also give rise to conflict. These conflicts and their outcomes also have the effect of changing the structural elements of the context. For example, the conflicts over land use generated by the local economy were responded to by the local council under pressure from the electorate. If we take the case of the Rosemary Lane car park, on the one hand, this was a solution to the need to provide the parking facilities required by future commercial development, itself due to the pressures within the local economy. On the other hand, this solution led to a new set of problems, in particular, the alienation of a section of the electorate who mobilised in the form of amenity groups. This changed the local political context in which the council acted - leading subsequently to the establishment of the Conservation Advisory Committee and the post of Public Relations Officer.

The third element in the context of local political decision making, viz higher levels of government is also both a constraint and a level undergoing change. It can be seen as changing at two speeds. Major changes in legislation are often the outgrowth of a series of local experiences. For example, the public opposition to slum clearance throughout the country eventually led to its decline as a national policy and its replacement by the central encouragement of housing improvement. Likewise, the public participation machinery the Canterbury City Council made use of was a response to widespread local pressure against slum clearance and road proposal schemes. On the other hand, lesser changes can occur without legislation. In particular, the eventual failure of Kent County Council to impose development restraint at Canterbury shows that the higher levels of government do not have unilateral power over the lower tier councils.

These examples show how our concept of the context of local political decision making both draws attention to an important dimension of social reality, and also to one which is itself changed by the conflicts it sparks off in conjunction with council policy under its "economic" and "political" roles. It thereby avoids any idea of a static structure, or of a city council as operating independently of its environment.

The structure of the empirical part of the thesis follows from these organising concepts. Chapters six, seven, and eight have in turn substantiated the development of the local economy in Canterbury, Canterbury City Council's relations with higher levels of government and its relations with the local electorate. They also indicated some of the conflicts they gave rise to and council policies in these areas prior to the late 1970s.

Chapter nine brought to bear the organising concepts in the light of the documentation of Chapters six, seven and eight on two key features of commercial redevelopment in central Canterbury. An understanding of the growth of Canterbury as a shopping centre, its particular history as a County Borough, and its changing relations with its electorate was a necessary preliminary to understanding the initiation, process and outcome of the Marlowe and Rosemary Lane proposals.

The analysis in Chapter nine made clear that the context in which the City Council acted did not determine its actions. They provided a context which was favourable in some respects eg Canterbury's potential for retail growth, and less favourable in others eg opposition to growth by Kent County Council and the local amenity groups. But in the face of this context, Canterbury City Council carried out a positive policy. This we split into its economic aspects (eg infrastructure provision) and political aspects (eg containment of political opposition). The amenity groups were less opposed to the Marlowe development than to the Rosemary Lane car park proposal. But we have documented how the Council's "management tactics" enabled them to contain and confuse the opposition. Secrecy and the control of information were key factors in this process.

The City Council's redevelopment policy supported commercial growth in Canterbury and its position as landowner reinforced this. The local government finance system gave the City Council the opportunity to finance the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park (through the use of accumulated balances) without interference from central government by way of loan sanction.

To return to the guiding ideas of the thesis outlined in the Introduction and presented in detail in Chapter five, we can summarise our argument. The local economy gives rise to a high demand for central land for commercial purposes. The concentration of shopping facilities led to difficulties of users (eg road congestion, insufficient parking spaces) and these threatened the future retail growth of the city. The commercial concentration also led to high building and land rents which encouraged the loss of residential floorspace, and to a clash with the medieval infrastructure. Both of these led to protest by amenity groups. The Council's solution was to expand the provision of parking spaces, and improve the road system. This of course increased the advantages of central locations for commercial development and once again produced the negative consequences it was designed to overcome. One new solution currently being tried is to allow very large stores to set up in peripheral locations, but still <u>within</u> the built-up area of Canterbury.

The political framework within which these development issues were handled included central government and Kent County Council, both of which retained major town planning powers over Canterbury City Council's development proposals. This was a factor both in constraining the Council's plans (though in the end, by very little) and in demobilising amenity groups for whom central government and Kent County Council were remote protest targets. It also meant that actual policies were relatively insignificant in relation to these issues.

The emergence of amenity group opposition therefore took place in a context which was far from favourable while the opposition of Kent County Council enabled amenity groups to treat it as an ally in some respects, and the medieval environment was a factor in discouraging development, the amenity groups faced a City Council whose assets were the favourable regional economic environment, central government support and its ability to mobilise its resources of land, finance and political management behind its policies.

In the end then,the City Council was able to carry out its economic role of stimulating commercial development and providing infrastructure, at the same time as its political role of managing the opposition to the proposals. But it did so at a price: to support private commercial growth by the socialisation of the costs of such growth. The residents bear both the physical impact of commercial expansion and the costs of paying for car park construction. Potentially this unequal solution could lead to strong protest against the City Council, but in fact neither amenity groups who are geared to specific local areas or political parties which have many other concerns as well as being more or less ideologically supportive, are likely vehicles for such protest.

This resolution of the pressures for change in the centre of Canterbury thus shows the balance of forces acting upon the council as town planner and promoter of commercial development. In the end, the pressures for development prevailed, but the pressures against development live on in the changes they imposed in the economic and political context in which Canterbury City Council now exists. It is this reciprocity between structure and action, and action and structure which we have tried to capture in this thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Quote References

CHAPTER SIX

(J. Brown 1 Formal Interview 24.3.1977)

(H. Deakin 1 Observation Examination in Public of the Kent Structure Plan 8.6.1978)

(L. Gage 1 Formal Interview 31.1.1977)

(C. Gay 1 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee December 1978)

(P. Jackson 1 Formal Interview 26.4.1977)

(K. Pinnock 1 Formal Interview 24.3.1977)

(K. Pinnock 2 Formal Interview 24.3.1977)

(A. Porter 1 Formal Interview 29.3.1977)

(C. Simpson 1 Kentish Gazette 24.12.1976)

(K. Waller 1 Formal Interview 5.5.1977)

(J. Wilkins 1 Formal Interview 23.4.1977)

(P. Williams 1 Kentish Gazette 24.12.1976)

CHAPTER SEVEN

(H. Deakin 2 Observation Examination in Public of the Kent Structure Plan 8.6.1978)

(H. Deakin 3 Observation Examination in Public of the Kent Structure Plan 8.6.1978)

(P. Jackson 2 Observation Examination in Public of the Kent Structure Plan 8.6.1978)

(P. Jackson 3 Observation Examination in Public of the Kent Structure Plan 13.6.1978)

(Prof. Keith-Lucas 1 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee February 1978)

(J. Owen 1 Kentish Gazette 5.8.1977)

(K. Waller 2 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee February 1978)

CHAPTER EIGHT

(A. Bateman 1 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee February 1978)

(T. Boreham 1 Kent Gazette 13.10.1978)

(A. Coleman 1 Formal Interview 8.4.1977)

(G. Fowler 1 Formal Interview 1.5.1977)

(G. Fowler 2 Formal Interview 1.5.1977)

(R. Gates 1 Formal Interview 28.4.1977)

(P. Jackson 4 Formal Interview 26.4.1977)

(P. Osborne 1 Formal Interview 29.4.1977)

(K. Pinnock 3 Formal Interview 23.4.1977)

(C. Simpson 3 Formal Interview 28.4.1977)

(D. Thomas 1 Kentish Gazette 10.2.1978)

(P. Williams 2 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Commmittee March 1978)

(P. Williams 3 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Cares March 1979)

(P. Williams 4 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Cares March 1979)

CHAPTER NINE

(K. Abrams 1 Observation Panel Hearing 16.11.1976)

(A. Bateman 2 Kentish Gazette 12.11.1976)

(A. Bateman 3 Observation Panel Hearing 16.11.1976)

(A. Bateman 4 Kentish Gazette 7.1.1977)

(A. Bateman 5 Kentish Gazette 15.7.1977)

(A. Bateman 6 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee December 1978)

(A. Bateman 7 Kentish Gazette 2.3.1979)

(A. Bateman 8 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee March 1979)

(A. Bateman 9 Kentish Gazette 24.8.1979)

(A. Bateman 10 Kentish Gazette 22.4.1977)

CHAPTER NINE (CONT.)

(T. Castle 1 Formal Interview 30.3.1977)

(T. Castle 2 Formal Interview 30.3.1977)

(T. Castle 3 Kentish Gazette 22.4.1977)

(T. Castle 4 Kentish Gazette 3.4.1981)

(T. Castle 5 Kentish Gazette 24.12.1981)

(R. Gates 2 Observation Panel Hearing 17.11.1976)

(C. Gay 2 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee October 1978)

(C. Gay 3 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee January 1979)

(E. Goodrich 1 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee April 1978)

(A. Haigh 1 Observation Panel Hearing 16.11.1976)

(P. Jackson 5 Formal Interview 24.4.1977)

(P. Jackson 6 Formal Interview 24.4.1977)

(P. Jackson 7 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee April 1978)

(P. Jackson 8 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee November 1978)

(Prof. Keth-Lucas 2 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee December 1977)

(KCC 1 Kentish Gazette 18.3.1977)

(KCC 2 Kentish Gazette 24.11.1978)

(KCC 3 Kentish Gazette 2.3.1979)

(KCC 4 Kentish Gazette 24.8.1979)

(R. Paine 1 Oberservation Panel Hearing 17.11.1976)

(K. Pinnock 4 Kentish Gazette 15.7.1977)

(K. Pinnock 5 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee November 1977)

(K. Pinnock 6 Kentish Gazette April 1976)

(K. Pinnock 7 Kentish Gazette 3.6.1977)

(K. Pinnock 8 Foraml Interview 24.3.1977)

(K. Pinnock 9 Formal Interview 24.3.1977)

(K. Pinnock 10 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee March 1979)

CHAPTER NINE (CONT.)

(A. Porter 2 Kentish Gazette 5.11.1976)
(A. Porter 3 Kentish Gazette 12.11.1976)
(A. Porter 4 Kentish Gazette 25.2.1977)
(A. Porter 5 Kentish Gazette 20.5.1977)
(A. Porter 6 Kentish Gazette 24.11.1978)
(A. Porter 7 Kentish Gazette 23.2.1979)
(A. Porter 8 Kentish Gazette 23.2.1979)
(A. Porter 9 Kentish Gazette 2.3.1979)
(A. Porter 10 Kentish Gazette 9.3.1979)
(A. Porter 11 Kentish Gazette 9.3.1979)
(A. Porter 12 Kentish Gazette 28.12.1979)
(A. Porter 13 Kentish Gazette 24.12.1980)
(A. Porter 14 Kentish Gazette 3.7.1981)
(A. Porter 15 Kentish Gazette 10.12.1982)
(A. Porter 16 Formal Interview 29.3.1977)
(A. Porter 17 Formal Interview 29.3.1977)
(B. Porter 1 Kentish Gazette December 19875)
(D. Riceman 1 Observation Panel Hearing 16.11.1976)
(C. Simpson 4 Kentish Gazette 7.1.1977)
(C. Simpson 5 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee November 1978)
(C. Simpson 6 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee December 1978)
(C. Simpson 7 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee January 1979)
(C. Simpson 8 Kentish Gazette 2.3.1979)
(C. Simpson 9 Kentish Gazette 28.12.1979)
(C. Simpson 10 Kentish Gazette April 1976)
(M. Steptoe 1 Kentish Gazette 24.12.1980)
(M. Steptoe 2 Formal Interview 29.3.1977)

CHAPTER NINE (CONT.)

(K. Waller 3 Formal Interview 5.5.1977)

(J. Wilkins 2 Formal Interview 28.4.1977)

(J. Wilkins 3 Formal Interview 28.4.1977)

(J. Wilkins 4 Formal Interview 28.4.1977)

(J. Wilkins 5 Formal Interview 28.4.1977)

(P. Williams 5 Kentish Gazette 15.7.1977)

(P. Willimas 6 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee November 1978)

(P. Williams 7 Kentish Gazette 28.12,1979)

(P. Williams 8 Kentish Gazette 4.1.1980)

(P. Williams 9 Kentish Gazette 29.2.1980)

(P. Williams 10 Kentish Gazette 22.4.1977)

(P. Williams 11 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee April 1978)

(P. Williams 12 Participant Observation Secretary to Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee November 1978)

(P. Williams 13 Kentish Gazette 10.7.1981)

(F. Woodman 1 Kentish Gazette August 1976)

(F. Woodman 2 Kentish Gazette 2.3.1979)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abell, P. 1977. 'The many faces of power', SOCIOLOGY 11: 3-24.

Agger, R.E., Goldrich,D., and Swanson,B.E. 1968a. 'A political decision making model', in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 217-226.

Agger,R.E., Goldrich, D., and Swanson,B.E. 1968b. 'Classifying power structures and political regimes', in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 322 - 342.

Agnew, J. 1978. 'Market relations and locational conflict in cross-national perspective', in URBANISATION AND CONFLICT IN MARKET SOCIETIES. Maaroufa Press, Chicago, Ill. pp. 128-143.

Aiken, M. 1970. 'The distribution of community power: Structural bases and social consequences', in THE STRUCTURE OF COMMUNITY POWER. Random House, N.Y. pp. 487-525.

Aiken, M. and Mott, P.E. (editors). 1970. THE STRUCTURE OF COMMUNITY POWER. Random House, N.Y.

Aldabert, E. 1976. 'Urban structure and state intervention', KAPITALISTATE 4-5: 141-157.

Alexander, I. 1974. CITY CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT. Pergamon Press, London.

Alford, R. 1968. 'The comparative study of urban politics', in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 299-306.

Alford, R. 1975. 'Paradigms of relations between state and society', in STRESS AND CONTRADICTION IN MODERN CAPITALISM. Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass.

Alonso, W. 1974. 'A theory of the urban land market', in READINGS IN URBAN ECONOMICS AND SPATIAL PATTERNS.

Ambrose, P. 1974. THE QUIET REVOLUTION. Chatto and Windus, London.

Ambrose, P. 1977a. ACCESS AND SPATIAL INEQUALITY UNIT 2. The Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Ambrose, P. 1977b. THE DETERMINANTS OF URBAN LAND USE CHANGE UNIT 26 . The Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Ambrose, P. and Colnutt, B. 1975. THE PROPERTY MACHINE. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middx.

Amery, C. and Cruickshank, D. 1975. THE RAPE OF BRITAIN. Elek Books, London.

Andrews, R.B. 1971. URBAN LAND ECONOMICS AND PUBLIC POLICY. The Free Press, N.Y.

Anton, T.J. 1968. 'Power, pluralism, and local politics', in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.Y. pp. 1980-188.

Arnstein, S.R. 1969. 'A ladder of citizen participation', AIP JOURNAL. pp. 216-224.

Ashford, D.E., Berne, R., and Schramm, R. 1976. 'The expenditure-financing decision in British local government', POLICY AND POLITICS 5: 5-24.

Association of County Councils, Association of District Councils, Association of Metropolitan Authorities, London Boroughs Association, Greater London Council. 1979. 'Review of Central Government Controls Over Local Authorities'.Published by the above, London.

Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M.S. 1962. 'Two faces of power', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 56: 947-952.

Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. 1963. 'Decisions and nondecisions: An analytical framework', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 57: 632-642.

Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. 1970. POWER AND POVERTY. Oxford University Press, London.

Baine, S. 1975. 'Community Action and Local Government'. Occasional Papers in Social Administration no. 59, G. Bell and Sons, London.

Balbus, I. 1971. 'The conceptof interest in pluralist and Marxian analysis', POLITICS AND SOCIETY 1: 151-177.

Banfield, E. 1961. POLITICAL INFLUENCE. The Free Press, N.Y.

Barlowe, R. 1972. LAND RESOURCE ECONOMICS: THE ECONOMICS OF REAL PROPERTY. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Barras, R., Broadbent, A. and Massey, D. 1973. 'Planning and the public ownership of land', NEW SOCIETY 24: 676-679.

Barras, R. and Catalano,A. 1975. 'Investment in Land and the Financial Structure of Property Companies'. Working Paper, Centre for Environmental Studies, London.

Batley, R. 1972. 'An explanation of non-participation in planning', POLICY AND POLITICS 1: 95-114.

Bauer, R.A. (editor). 1968a THE STUDY OF POLICY FORMATION. The Free Press, N.Y.

Bauer, R.A. 1968b. 'The study of policy formation: An introduction' in THE STUDY OF POLICY FORMATION. The Free Press, N.Y. pp.1-26.

Bell, R. Edwards, D.V., and Harrison Wagner, R. (editors). 1969. POLITICAL POWER. The Free Press, N.Y.

Bennington, J. 1975. 'Local Government Becomes Big Business - Corporate Management and the Politics of Urban Problems', Working Paper No. 7, Community Development Project, Coventry.

Bensmen, J. and Vidich, A.J. 1968. 'Small town in mass society' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Beyle, T.L. and Lathrop, G.R. (editors). 1970. PLANNING AND POLITICS: UNEASY PARTNERSHIP. The Odessey Press, N.Y.

Bhasker, R. 1975. A REALIST THEORY OF SCIENCE. Leeds Books Ltd., Leeds.

Blackburn, R. (editor). 1973. IDEOLOGY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE. Vintage Books, N. Y.

Bleddyn-Davies, P. 1975. 'On Local Expenditure and a "Standard Level of Service"', Working Paper, University of Kent, Canterbury.

Boaden, N.T. and Alford, R. 1969. 'Sources of diversity in English local government', PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 47: 203-223.

Bochel, J.M. and Denver, D.T. 1972. 'The impact of the campaign on the results of local government elections', BRITISH JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE 2: 239-244 .

Boddy, M. 1982. 'Planning, Landownership and the State' in C. Paris (editor) CRITICAL READINGS IN PLANNING THEORY. Pegamon, Oxford.

Bonjean,C., Clark, T.N., and Lineberry, R.L. (editors). 1971. COMMUNITY POLITICS. The Free Press, N.Y.

Bonjean, C. and Olson, D.M. 1971. 'Community leadership: Directions of Research' in COMMUNITY POLITICS. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 163-173.

Bradley, T. 1977. 'The Ideologies of Environmental Action Groups - Consensus or Conflict?', unpublished paper.

Bridges, A.B. 1974. 'Nicos Poulantzas and the Marxist theory of the state', POLITICS AND SOCIETY. 4:161-190.

Bridges, L. and Velba, C. 1976. 'Structure Plan Examinations in Public: A Descriptive Analysis', University of Birmingham, Institute of Judicial Administration.

Brier, A.P. 1970. 'The decision process in local government: A case study of fluoridation in Hull', PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 48: 153-168.

Broadbent,T.A. 1977. PLANNING AND PROFIT IN THE URBAN ECONOMY. Methuen and Co. Ltd., London.

Brown, T., Vile, M.J.C., and Whitmore, M.F. 1972. 'Community studies and decision taking', BRITISH JOURNAL OF POLITICS AND SCIENCE 2: 133-153.

Buchanan, J.M. 1968. THE DEMAND AND SUPPLY OF PUBLIC GOODS. Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, Ill.

Cantanese,A . J. 1974. PLANNERS AND LOCAL POLITICS. Volume 7, Sage Library of Social Research, Sage Publications, London.

Castells, M. 1976. 'An experimental study of urban social movements' in URBAN SOCIOLOGY: CRITICAL ESSAYS. Tavistock Publications, London. pp.147-173.

Castells, M. 1977a. THE URBAN QUESTION. Edward Arnold, London.

Castells, M. 1977b. 'Towards a political urban sociology' in CAPTIVE CITIES. John Wiley and Sons, London. pp. 61-78.

Castells, M. 1978. CITY, CLASS AND POWER. Macmillan Press Limited, London.

Central Statistical Office. 1976. 'National Income and Expenditure 1965-1975. Government Statistical Service, London.

Central Statistical Office. 1982. National Income and Expenditure. 1975-1982. Government Statistical Service, London.

Chambliss, W.J. 1973a. 'Introduction' in SOCIOLOGICAL READINGS IN THE CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., London pp. 1-39.

Chambliss, W.J. (editor). 1973b. SOCIOLOGICAL READINGS IN THE CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., London.

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy. 1974. 'Government Grants and Reimbursements Payable in England and Wales as at First April 1974'. Education and Training Panel, London.

Cherry, G.E. 1974a. THE EVOLUTION OF BRITISH TOWN PLANNING. Leonard Hill Books, Leighton Buzzard, Berks.

Cherry, G.E. (editor). 1974b. URBAN PLANNING PROBLEMS. Leonard Hill, London.

Civic Trust. 1976. THE LOCAL AMENITY MOVEMENT. Civic Trust, London.

Clark, T.N. 1971. 'The concept of power: Some overemphasised and under-recognised dimensions - An examination with special reference to the local community' in COMMUNITY POLITICS. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 26-35.

Clark, T.N. 1972. 'The structure of community influence' in PEOPLE AND POLITICS IN URBAN SOCIETY. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California. pp. 283-314.

Clark, T.N. (editor). 1974a. COMPARATIVE COMMUNITY POLITICS. Sage Publications, London.

Clark, T.N. 1974b. 'Community autonomy in the national system: Federalism, localism, and decentralisation' in COMPARATIVE COMMUNITY POLITICS. Sage Publications, London. pp. 21-51.

Clarke, S. 1977. 'Marxism, sociology, and Poulantzas', CAPITAL AND CLASS 2: 1-31.

Clelland, D.A. and Form, W.H. 1968. 'Economic dominants and community power: A comparative analysis' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Cockburn, C. 1974. 'Urban government' in URBAN PLANNING PROBLEMS. Leonard Hill, London. pp 213-242.

Cockburn, C. 1977. THE LOCAL STATE: MANAGEMENT OF CITIES AND PEOPLE. Pluto Press, London.

Cole, R.L. 1974. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND THE URBAN POLICY PROCESS. Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass.

Connerton, P. (editor) 1976. POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Connolly, W. (editor) 1969a. THE BIAS OF PLURALISM. Atherton Press, N.Y.

Connolly, W. 1969b. 'The challenge to pluralist theory' in THE BIAS OF PLURALISM. Atherton Press, N.Y. pp. 3-34.

Cowan, P. (editor). 1973. THE FUTURE OF PLANNING. Heinemann Educational Books, London.

Cox, K.R. 1973. CONFLICT, POWER, AND POLITICS IN THE CITY: A GEOGRAPHIC VIEW. McGraw-Hill Book Co., N.Y.

Cox, K. 1976. 'Local Interests and Political Processes in American Cities'. Working Paper in Public Policy no. 3, Centre for Social and Behavioural Science Research.

Cox, K. (editor). 1978a. URBANISATION AND CONFLICT IN MARKET SOCIETIES. Maaroufa Press, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Cox, K. 1978b. 'Local interests and urban political processes in market societies' in URBANISATION AND CONFLICT IN MARKET SOCIETIES. Maaroufa Press, Chicago, Ill. pp. 94-108.

Crain, R.,Katz, E., and Rosenthal, D.B. 1969. THE POLITICS OF COMMUNITY CONFLICT - THE FLUORDATION DECISION. The Bobbs-Merrill Co., N.Y.

Crenson, M. 1971. THE UNPOLITICS OF AIR POLLUTION. John Hopkins Press, Ltd., London.

Crew, I. (editor) 1974. ELITES IN WESTERN DEMOCRACY. VOLUME TWO. British Political Sociology Yearbook, Croom Helm, London.

Cripps, F. and Godley, W. 1976. 'Local Government Finance and Its Reform'. University of Cambridge, Department of Applied Economics, Cambridge.

Croft, M. 1974. 'Urban form and structure' in URBAN PLANNING PROBLEMS. Leonard Hill, London. pp. 9-34.

Cross, M. and Mallen, D. 1978. LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS. Longman, London.

Cullingworth, J.B. 1973. PROBLEMS OF AN URBAN SOCIETY. VOLUME TWO: THE SOCIAL CONTENT OF PLANNING. George Allen and Unwin, London.

Cullingworth,J.B. 1976. TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London.

Dahl, R.A. 1968. 'Who governs?' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 93-114.

Dahl, R.A. 1969a. 'A critique of the ruling elite model' in POLITICAL POWER. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 36-41.

Dahl, R. A. 1969b. 'The concept of power' in POLITICAL POWER. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 79-93.

Dahrendorf, R. 1959. CLASS AND CONFLICT IN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

Dahrendorf, R. 1968. ESSAYS IN THEORY OF SOCIETY. Stanford University Press, California.

Darke, R. 1975. 'The Context for Public Participation in Planning, South Yorkshire'. Sheffield Centre for Environmental Research, Occasional papers.

Davies, J.G. 1972. THE EVANGELISTIC BUREAUCRAT. Tavistock Publications Ltd., London.

Davison, W.P., Boylan J., and Frederick T.C. 1976. MASS MEDIA - SYSTEMS AND EFFECTS. Praegar Publishers. N.Y.

Dear, M.J. and Long, J. 1978. 'Community strategies in locational conflict' in URBANISATION AND CONFLICT IN MARKET SOCIETIES. Maaroufa Press, Chicago. Ill.

Dearlove, J. 1973. THE POLITICS OF POLICY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Cambridge University Press, London.

Dearlove, J. 1979. THE REOGRANISATION OF BRITISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Cambridge University Press, London.

Debnam, G. 1975. 'Nondecisions and power: The two faces of Bachrach and Baratz', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 69: 889-907.

Dennis N. 1970. PEOPLE AND PLANNING. Faber and Faber, London.

Dennis, N. 1972. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND PLANNER'S BLIGHT. Faber and Faber, London.

Dennis, N. 1974. 'Councillors, officers, and public participation in urban renewal' in THE MANAGEMENT OF URBAN CHANGE IN BRITAIN AND GERMANY. Sage Publications Ltd., London. pp. 161-170.

Dennis N. 1977. 'In dispraise of political trust' in PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND PLANNING. J. Wiley and Sons, London pp. 15-25.

Denver, D.T. and Hand, G. 1972. 'Turnout and marginality in local elections: A comment', BRITISH JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE 2: 513-516.

Dickens, P. 1977. 'Aspects of Class Fragmentation and Incorporation 1915-1946'. Centre for Environmental Studies, Urban Change and Conflict Conference Paper, 4-7 January, York University.

Dobby, A. 1978. CONSERVATION AND PLANNING, Hutchinson, London.

Donnison, D. 1973a. 'Micro-politics of the city' in LONDON: URBAN PATTERNS, PROBLEMS, AND POLICIES. Heinemann, London. pp. 383-404.

Donnison, D. 1973b. 'Planning and government' in THE FUTURE OF PLANNING. Heinemann Educational Books, London. pp. 93-112.

Donnison, D. 1975. 'The age of innocence is past: Some ideas about urban research and planning', URBAN STUDIES 12: 263-272.

Donnison, D. and Eversley, D. (editors). 1973. LONDON: URBAN PATTERNS, PROBLEMS AND POLICIES. Heinemann, London.

Downes, B. and Freedman, L. 1972. 'Local level decision making and public policy outcomes: A theoretical perspective' in PEOPLE AND POLITICS IN URBAN SOCIETY. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California. pp. 315-343.

Dunleavy, P. 1977. 'Protest and Quiescence in Urban Politics: A Critique of Some Pluralist and Structuralist Myths'. Centre for Environmental Studies, Urban Change and Conflict Conference, 4-7 January, York University.

Dunleavy, P. 1980a. URBAN POLITICAL ANALYSIS. Macmillan, London.

Dunleavy, P. 1980b. 'Social and Political Theory and the Issues in Central-Local Relations' in G. Jones (editor). NEW APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF CENTRAL-LOCAL GOVERNMENT RELATIONSHIPS. Sumer, London.

Duverger, M. 1972. PARTY POLITICS AND PRESSURE GROUPS. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., London.

Eisenger, P.K. 1972. 'The pattern of citizen contacts with urban officials' in PEOPLE AND POLITICS IN URBAN SOCIETY. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California. pp. 43-69.

Eisenger, P.K. 1973. 'The conditions of protest behaviour in American cities', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 67: 11-28.

Elcock, H. 1975. 'English local government reformed: The politics of Humberside', PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 53: 159-166.

Elcock, H. 1976. POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR. Methuen and Co.Ltd., London.

Elkin, S. 1974. POLITICS AND LAND USE PLANNING: THE LONDON EXPERIENCE. Cambridge University Press, London.

Elkin, S. 1975. 'Comparative urban politics and inter-organisational behaviour' in ESSAYS ON THE STUDY OF URBAN POLITICS. Macmillan Press, London pp. 158-164.

Etzioni, A. 1973. 'Mixed scanning: A "third" approach to decision making' in A READER IN PLANNING THEORY. Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Evans, A.W. 1974. 'Market forces and urban change in Britain' in THE MANAGEMENT OF URBAN CHANGE IN BRITAIN AND GERMANY. Sage Publications Ltd., London. pp. 53-75.

Eversley, D. 1973a. THE PLANNER IN SOCIETY. Faber and Faber, London.

Eversley, D. 1973b. 'Problems of social planning in inner London' in LONDON: URBAN PATTERNS, PROBLEMS, AND POLICIES. Heinemann, London. pp. 1-50.

Faludi, A. 1973a. PLANNING THEORY. Pergamon International, London.

Faludi, A. (editor). 1973b. A READER IN PLANNING THEORY. Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Fine, B. and Harris, L. 1976. 'State expenditure in advanced capitalism: A critique', NEW LEFT REVIEW 98: 97-112.

Fischer, C. 1978. 'On the Marxist challenge to urban sociology', COMPARATIVE URBAN RESEARCH 6: 10-19.

Flynn, R. 1977a. 'Planning After Re-organisation: The Politics of Co-operation and Conflict'. Paper presented at the P.S.A. Local Politics Group Meeting at London School of Economics, 2nd July, 1977.

Flynn, R. 1977b. 'Urban Managers in Local Government Planning: Project Methodology'. Paper presented to SSRC Workshop on Qualitative Data, University of Warwick, 14-16 September.

Flynn, R. 1978a. 'The Planning Policy System'. Working Paper, Urban and Regional Studies Unit, University of Kent.

Flynn, R. 1978b. 'Policy Implementation in Planning'. Working Paper, Urban and Regional Studies Unit, University of Kent.

Flynn, R. 1978c. 'Planning and the State: A Discussion and critique of Some Recent Marxist Writings'. Paper prepared for the Political Studies Association Annual Conference 1978.

Flynn, R. 1979. 'Managing Consensus: The Infrastructure of Policy Making in Planning'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies conference on Urban Change and Conflict at Nottingham University, 5-8 January.

Foley, D. 1973. 'British town planning: One ideology or three?' in A READER IN PLANNING THEORY. Pergamon Press, Oxford. pp. 69-93.

Forbes, J. (editor). 1974. STUDIES IN SOCIAL SCIENCE AND PLANNING. Scottish Academic Press, Edinburgh.

Fordham, R.C. 1975. 'Urban land use change in the United Kingdon during the second half of the twentieth century', URBAN STUDIES 12: 71-84.

Foster, C. 1973. 'Planning and the market' in THE FUTURE OF PLANNING. Heinemann Educational Books, London. pp. 132-165.

Fox Piven, F. and Cloward, R.A. 1979. 'State Structures and Political Protest: Notes Towards a Theory'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies Conference held at Nottingham University, 5-8 January.

Freeman, L.C., Fararo, T.J., Bloomber, W., and Sunshine, M.H. 1968. 'Locating leaders in local communities: A comparison of some alternative approaches' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 189-199.

Frey, F.W. 1971. 'Comment: On issues and nonissues in the study of power', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 65: 1081-1101.

Friedland, R., Alford, R., and Fox-Piven, F. 1976. "The Political Management of the Urban Fiscal Crisis'. Unpublished draft paper.

Friedland, R., Fox-Piven, F., and Alford, R. 1977. 'Political conflict, urban structure, and the fiscal crisis', INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF URBAN AND REGIONAL RESEARCH 1: 447-471.

Friend, J. 1976. 'Planners, policies, and organisational boundaries: Some recent developments in Britain', POLICY AND POLITICS 5: 25-46.

Friend, J.K., Power, J.M., and Yewlett, C.J.L. 1974. PUBLIC PLANNING: THE INTER-CORPORATE DIMENSION. Tavistock Publications Ltd., London.

Fry, B.R. and Winter, R.F. 1970. 'The politics of redistribution', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 64: 508-523.

Gamson, W.A. 1968a. 'Rancorous conflict in community politics' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 250-260.

Gamson, W. A. 1968b. POWER AND DISCONTENT. The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Ill.

Georing, J. 1978. 'Marx and the city: Are there any new directions for urban theory?', COMPARATIVE URBAN RESEARCH 6: 76-85.

Giddens, A. 1971. CAPITALISM AND MODERN SOCIAL THEORY. Cambridge University Press, London.

Giddens, A. 1974. 'Elites in the British class structure' in ELITES AND POWER IN BRITISH SOCIETY. Cambridge University Press, London. pp. 1-21.

Gill, R.T. 1967. EVOLUTION OF MODERN ECONOMICS. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Gladstone, F. 1976. THE POLITICS OF PLANNING. Temple-Smith, London.

Glasgow University Media Group. 1976. BAD NEWS VOLUME ONE. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

Glass, R. 1959. 'The evaluation of planning: Some sociological considerations', INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL 2: 393-409.

Gluckman, M. (editor). 1964. CLOSED SYSTEMS AND OPEN MINDS: THE LIMITS OF NAIVETY IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY. Oliver and Boyd, London.

Gold, D.A., Lo, C.Y.H., and Wright, E.O. 1975. 'Recent developments in Marxist theories of the capitalist state', MONTHLY REVIEW 27: 29-43.

Goodall, B. 1972. THE ECONOMICS OF URBAN AREAS. Pergamon Press, London.

Gosta, E.A., Friedland, R., and Wright, E.O. 1976. 'Modes of class struggle and the capitalist state', KAPITALISTATE 4-5: 124-186.

Gough, I. 1975. 'State expenditure in advanced capitalism', NEW LEFT REVIEW 92: 53-92.

Gouldner, A.W. 1970. THE COMING CRISIS OF WESTERN SOCIOLOGY. Avon Books, N.Y.

Greaves, B. 1976. 'Communities and Power' in COMMUNITY POLITICS. John Caldor, London. pp. 35-51.

Green, B.S.R. 1968. "Community Decision-Making in a Georgian City '. PhD Thesis, Bath University of Technology.

Greenberg, M.R. (editor) 1974. READINGS IN URBAN ECONOMICS AND SPATIAL PATTERNS.

Gregory, R. 1969. 'Local elections and the "rule of anticipated reactions"', POLITICAL STUDIES 17: 31-47.

Gregory, R. 1971. THE PRICE OF AMENITY - FIVE STUDIES IN CONSERVATION AND GOVERNMENT. Macmillan Press, London.

Greifer, J. (editor). 1974. COMMUNITY ACTION FOR SOCIAL CHANGE. Praeger Publishers, N.Y.

Griffith, J.A. 1966. CENTRAL DEPARTMENTS AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.

Griffiths, A. 1976. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION. Shaw and Shaw Sons Ltd., London.

Guardin, J.C. 1974. 'On the Marxist theory of the state', POLITICS AND SOCIETY 4: 193-223.

Gyford, J. 1976. LOCAL POLITICS IN BRITAIN. Croom Helm, London.

Habermas, J. 1972. KNOWLEDGE AND HUMAN INTERESTS. Heinemann, London.

Habermas, J. 1976. LEGITIMATION CRISIS. Heinemann, London.

Hahn, H. (editor). 1972a. PEOPLE AND POLITICS IN URBAN SOCIETY. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California.

Hahn, H, 1972b. 'Reassessing and revitalising urban politics: Some goals and perspectives' in PEOPLE AND POLITICS IN URBAN SOCIETY. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California. pp. 11-37.

Hain, P. (editor). 1976a. COMMUNITY POLITICS. John Caldor, London.

Hain, P. 1976b. 'The future of community politics' in COMMUNITY POLITICS. John Caldor, London. pp. 9-32.

Hall, P. (editor). 1965. LAND VALUES. Sweet and Maxwell, London.

Hall, P. (editor). 1973a. THE CONTAINMENT OF URBAN ENGLAND. VOLUME ONE. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.

Hall, P. (editor). 1973b. THE CONTAINMENT OF URBAN ENGLAND. VOLUME TWO. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.

Hall, P. 1976. URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Hamilton, R.N.D. 1975. A GUIDE TO DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING. Oyez Publishing, London.

Hampton, W. 1970. DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNITY: A STUDY OF POLITICS IN SHEFFIELD. Oxford University Press, London.

Hanson, N. 1977. 'The Emergence and Development of Zoning Controls in North American Municipalities: A Critical Analysis'. Paper on Planning and Design, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto.

Harloe, M. 1975. SWINDON: A TOWN IN TRANSITION. Heinemann, London.

Harloe, M. (editor). 1977a. CAPTIVE CITIES. John Wiley and Sons, London.

Harloe, M. 1977b. 'Introduction to Captive Cities' in CAPTIVE CITIES. John Wiley and Sons, London. pp. 1-47.

Harris, R. and Shipp, P.J. 1977. COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE MANAGEMENT OF LOCAL AUTHORITY EXPENDITURE. Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, London.

Harrison, A.J. 1977. ECONOMICS AND LAND USE PLANNING. Croom Helm, London.

Hartley, O. 1971. 'The relationship between central and local authorities', PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 49: 439-456.

Harvey, D. 1975. SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE CITY. Edward Arnold, London.

Harvey, D. 1976. 'Labour, capital, and class struggle around the built environment in advanced capitalist societies', POLITICS AND SOCIETY 6: 265-295.

Harvey, D. 1978. 'On countering the Marxian myth - Chicago style', COMPARATIVE URBAN RESEARCH 6: 28-45.

Hawley, W.D. and Wirt, F.M. (editors). 1968. THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Hayes, E. 1972. POWER, STRUCTURE, AND URBAN POLICY: WHO RULES OAKLAND. McGraw-Hill Book Co., N.Y.

Heap, D. 1973. AN OUTLINE OF PLANNING LAW. 6th edition. Sweet and Maxwell, London.

Heap, D. 1974. PLANNING INQUIRY PRACTICES. Sweet and Maxwell, London.

Heap, D. 1975. THE LAND AND ITS DEVELOPMENT. Stevens and Sons, London.

Heclo, H. 1969. 'The councillor's job', PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 47: 185-202.

Heclo, H. 1972. 'Policy analysis', BRITISH JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE 2: 83-108.

Heclo, H. and Wildavsy, A. 1974. THE PRIVATE GOVERNMENT OF PUBLIC MONEY. Macmillan Press, Ltd., London.

Heidenheims, A.J., Heclo, H., and Adams, C.T. 1976. COMPARATIVE PUBLIC POLICY: THE POLITICS OF SOCIAL CHOICE IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. Macmillan, N.Y.

Heinz, E. and Prewitt, K. 1973. LABYRINTHS OF DEMOCRACY: ADAPTATIONS, LINKAGES, REPRESENTATION, AND POLICIES IN URBAN POLITICS. Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., Indianapolis, Indiana.

Henerson, W.L. and Ledebur, L.C. 1972. URBAN ECONOMICS: PROCESSES AND PROBLEMS. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., N.Y.

Hepworth, N.P. 1970. THE FINANCE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT. 1st edition. George Allen and Unwin, London.

Hepworth, N.P. 1976. THE FINANCE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT. 3rd edition. George Allen and Unwin, London.

HMSO. 1909. Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1932. Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1940. Royal Commission on the Distribution of Industrial Population (Barlow Report). HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1942a. Report of the Committee on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas (Scott Report). Cmd. 6378. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1942b. Expert Committee on Compensation and Betterment (Uthwatt Report). Cmd. 6386. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1944. Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1946. Final Report of the New Towns Committee (Reith Report). Cmd. 6876. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1947. Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1954. Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1962. Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1968a. Civic Amenities Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1967b. Road Traffic (Regulations) Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1968. Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO. London.

HMSO. 1969a. Royal Commission on Local Government in England (Redcliffe-Maud Report). HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1969b. People and Planning: Report of the Committee on Public Participation in Planning (Skeffington Report). HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1971a. Memorandum on Part I of the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1971b. Town and Country Planning (Structure and Local Plans) Regulations. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1971c. Town and Country Planning Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1972a. Town and Country Planning (Amendment) Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1972b. Local Government Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1972c. DoE Circular 121/72, 'Allocation of functions in England'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1972d. The Bains Report. HMSO, London.

HMSO, 1974a. DoE Circular 147/74. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1974b. Land. Cmnd. 5730. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1974c. DoE Circular 86/74, 'Capital programmes'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1975a. Review of the Development Control System (Dobry Report). HMSO, London.

HMSO, 1975b. The Community Land Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1975c. DoE Circular 88/75, 'Local authority expenditure in 1976-77 - forward planning'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1975d. DoE Circular, 'Transport Supplementary Grant submissions for 1976/77.'HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1975e. DoE Circular,'The attack on inflation - renumeration, charges, and grants - implications for local authorities'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1975f. DoE Circular,'Transport Supplementary Grant submissions for 1977/78'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1975g. Report of the Advisory Group on Commercial Property Development (Pilcher Report). HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976a. Rates and Rateable Values in England and Wales 1974-75. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976b. DoE Circular 9/76,'The Dobry Report: Action by local planning authorities'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976c. DoE Circular 26/76, 'Community land - Circular 6 - Land for private development: Acquisition, management, and disposal'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976d. DoE Circular 45/76, 'Local authority current expenditure 1976/77'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976e. DoE Circular 66/76, 'Capital programmes'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976f. DoE Circular 71/76, 'Large new stores'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976g. DoE Circular 84/76, 'Local authority expenditure 1976/78'. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976h. Public Expenditure to 1979-80. Cmnd. 6393. HMSO, London.

HMSO. 1976i. Local Government Finance (Layfield Committee). Cmnd. 6453. HMSO, London.

Hochman, H.M. and Peterson, G. (editors) 1974. REDISTRIBUTION THROUGH PUBLIC CHOICE. Columbia University Press, N.Y.

Holden, M. 1972. 'The politics of urbanisation' in PEOPLE AND POLITICS IN URBAN SOCIETY. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California. pp. 557-599.

Holliday, J. (editor). 1973. CITY CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT. Charles Knight and Co., London.

Hewitt, C.J. 1974. 'Elites and the distribution of power in British society' in ELITES AND POWER IN BRITISH SOCIETY. Cambridge University Press, London. pp. 45-64.

Hill, M.J. 1972. THE SOCIOLOGY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. Weidenfield and Nicolson, London.

Holloway, J. and Picciotto, S. 1976. 'A note on the theory of the state', BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE OF SOCIALIST ECONOMISTS 14: JH and SP 1 - 9.

Holloway, J. and Picciotto, S. 1977. 'Capital, crisis, and the state', CAPITAL AND CLASS 2: 76-101.

Holloway, J. and Picciotto, S. (editors). 1978a. STATE AND CAPITAL: A MARXIST DEBATE. Edward Arnold, London.

Holloway, J. and Picciotto, S. 1978b. 'Introduction: Towards a materialist theory of state' in STATE AND CAPITAL: A MARXIST DEBATE. Edward Arnold, London. pp.1-31.

Hoover, E. 1974. 'Land use competition' in READINGS IN URBAN ECONOMICS AND SPATIAL PATTERNS.

Howard, L. and Wellman, B. 1974. 'Connections as Structure: Some Implications of the Social Network Approach to Sociology'. Mimeographed paper, Department of Sociology, University of Surrey.

Hunter, F. 1968. 'Community power structure' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 51-64.

Institute of Economic Affairs. 1974. GOVERNMENT AND THE LAND. Institute of Economic Affairs, London.

Jackman, R. 1978. 'Assessing rates needs', NEW SOCIETY 43: 72.

Jackson, W.E. 1966. THE STRUCTURE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND AND WALES. Longman Ltd., London.

Keat, R. and Urry, J. 1975. SOCIAL THEORY AS A SCIENCE. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Keith-Lucas, B. and Richards, P.G. 1978. A HISTORY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. George Allen and Unwin, London.

Kent County Council. 1975. 'Kent County Structure Plan - Report on Transport Issues'. County Surveyor, Kent County Council, Kent.

Kent County Council. 1977. 'Transport Programme and Policy 1977-78'. County Surveyor, Kent County Council, Kent.

Kessel, J.H. 1962. 'Government structure and political environment: A statistical note about American cities', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 56: 615-620.

Kimber, R. and Richardson, J.J. (editors). 1974. CAMPAIGNING FOR THE ENVIRONMENT. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Kirwin, R. 1973. 'The contribution of public expenditure and finance to problems of Inner London' in LONDON: URBAN PATTERNS, PROBLEMS, AND POLICIES. Heinemann, London. pp. 119-155.

Kornhauser, W. 1969. '"Power elite" or "veto groups"?' in POLITICAL POWER. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 42-52.

Kraushaar, R. 1979. 'Policy Without Protest: The Dilemna of Organising for Change in Britain'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies Conference on Urban Change and Conflict at Nottingham University, 5-8th January, 1979.

Kryzstoff and Ostrowski, H.T. 1974. 'Local political systems and general social processes' in COMPARATIVE COMMUNITY POLITICS. Sage Publications, London. pp. 395-404.

Lamarche, F. 1976. 'Property development and the economic foundations of the urban question' in URBAN SOCIOLOGY: CRITICAL ESSAYS. Tavistock Publications, London. pp. 85-118.

Lambert, C. and Weir, D. (editors). 1975. CITIES IN MODERN BRITAIN. Fontana, London.

Lane, D. 1976. THE SOCIALIST - INDUSTRIAL STATE. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.,London.

Law, S. 1976. PLANNING AND THE FUTURE. Royal Town Planning Institute, London.

Lean, W. and Goodall, B. 1966. ASPECTS OF LAND ECONOMICS. The Estates Gazette, London.

Lebas, E. 1977. 'Movement of Capital and Locality: Issues Raised by Study of Local Power Structures'. Centre for Environmental Studies, Urban Change and Conflict Conference, York University, 4-7th January, 1977.

Lessnoff, M. 1974. THE STRUCTURE OF A SOCIAL SCIENCE. George Allen and Unwin, London.

Levitas, R.A. 1977. 'Some problems of aim centred models of social movements', SOCIOLOGY 11: 47-63.

Lewis, C. 1975. 'Local Government Decision Making'. Paper in Community Studies, no.2, Department of Social Administration, University of York.

Lichfield, N. 1965. 'Land nationalisation' in LAND VALUES. Sweet and Maxwell Ltd., London. pp. 107-125.

Lichfield, N. Kettle, P. and Whitbread, M. 1975. EVALUATION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS. Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Lindberg, L.N.,Alford, R.,Crouch, C., and Offe, C. 1975. STRESS AND CONTRADICTION IN MODERN CAPITALISM. Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass.

Lineberry, R. L. 1971. 'Approaches to the study of community power' in COMMUNITY POLITICS. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 16-25.

Lipsky, N. 1970. PROTEST IN CITY POLITICS. Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, Ill.

Lipsky, M. and Levi, M. 1972. 'Community organisation as a political resource' in PEOPLE AND POLITICS IN URBAN SOCIETY. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California. pp. 175-199.

Lishman, G. 1976. 'Framework for community politics' in COMMUNITY POLITICS. John Caldor, London. pp. 78-96.

Lloyd, D. 1975. 'City of London - has its medieval past a future?', BUILT ENVIRONMENT 1: 66-72.

Lojkine, J. 1976. 'Contribution to Marxist theory of capitalist urbanisation' in URBAN SOCIOLOGY: CRITICAL ESSAYS. Tavistock Publications, London. pp. 119-146.

Lojkine, J. 1977. 'Big firms' strategies, urban policy and urban social movements' in CAPTIVE CITIES. John Wiley and Sons, London. pp. 61-78.

Lowe, P. 1975. 'The environmental lobby', BUILT ENVIRONMENT 1: 73-76.

Lowe, P. 1977. 'Amenity and equity: A review of local environmental pressure groups in Britain', ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING 9: 35-58.

Lowi, T. J. 1969. THE END OF LIBERALISM. W. W. Norton and Co., N.Y.

Luhmann, N. 1974. 'Sociology of political systems', GERMAN POLITICAL STUDIES 1: 3-29.

Lukes, S. 1975. POWER: A RADICAL VIEW. Macmillan Press, London.

Lukes, S. 1977. ESSAYS IN SOCIAL THEORY. Macmillan Press, London.

McAuslan, P. 1975. LAND, LAW, AND PLANNING. Weidenfield and Nicolson, London.

McCallum, J.D. 1976. 'Comparative Study in Planning: Explorations of the "Political Culture" of Planning in Britain and the United States'. Discussion paper no.7, University of Glasgow.

McClosky, H. 1964. 'Consensus and ideology in American politics', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 58: 361-382.

McCord, A. and McCord, W. 1977. URBAN SOCIAL CONFLICT. C.V. Mosby Co., St. Louis, Missouri.

McFarland, A. 1969. POWER AND LEADERSHIP IN PLURALIST SYSTEMS. Stanford University Press, California.

McLoughlin, B.J. 1973a. CONTROL AND URBAN PLANNING. Faber and Faber Ltd., London.

McLoughlin, B.J. 1973b. 'The future of the planning profession' in THE FUTURE OF PLANNING.Heinemann Educational Books, London.

Malcolm, J.F. and Aitken, P.C. 1977. 'The Impact of a Superstore: Fine Fare, St. Ninians, Stirling'. Discussion paper in Planning, no.11, University of Glasgow.

Marriott, O. 1967. THE PROPERTY BOOM, Pan Books, Ltd., London.

Marshall, A.H. 1969. LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE. International Union of Local Authorities, The Hague.

Marshall, A. H. 1974. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.

Mason, T. 1977. 'Community Action and the Local Authority: A Study in the Incorporation of Protest'. Centre for Environmental Studies , Urban Change and Conflict Conference, University of York, 4-7th January, 1977.

Massey, D. 1977a. 'The analysis of capitalist landownership: An investigation of the case of Great Britain', INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF URBAN AND REGIONAL RESEARCH 1: 404-424.

Massey, D. 1977b. INDUSTRIAL LOCATION THEORY RECONSIDERED. UNIT 25. Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Massey, D. and Catalano, A. 1978. CAPITAL AND LAND: LANDOWNERSHIP BY CAPITAL IN GREAT BRITAIN. Edward Arnold, London.

Maynard, A. and King, D.M. 1972. 'Rates or Prices?' Institute for Economic Affairs, London.

Mellor, J.R. 1977. URBAN SOCIOLOGY IN AN URBANISED SOCIETY. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Merelman, R. 1968. 'On the neo-elitist critique of community power', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 62: 451-460.

Miles, R. and Philzacklea, A. 1979. 'Racism in the Inner City'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies conference on Urban Change and Conflict at Nottingham University, 5 - 8 Jan. 1979.

Miliband, R. 1969. THE STATE IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY. Oxford University Press, London.

Miliband, R. 1973. 'The problem of the capitalist state' in IDEOLOGY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE. Vintage Books, N.Y. pp. 253 - 262.

Miliband, R. 1977. MARXISM AND POLITICS. Oxford University Press, London.

Miller, D. C. 1958a. 'Industry and community power structures: A comparative study of and English and American city', AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW 23: 9 - 15.

Miller, D. C. 1958b. 'Decision making cliques in community power structures: A comparative study of an English and American city', AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY 64: 299 - 310.

Miller, D. C. 1974. 'The institutional approach as a strategy for comparative community power' in COMPARATIVE COMMUNITY POLITICS. Sage Publications, London. pp. 383 - 393.

Mills, G. 1973. 'Paying for the public infrastructure in urban development - a review article'. Mimeographed paper, University of Kent.

Mingione, E. 1977. 'Theoretical elements for a Marxist analysis of urban development' in CAPTIVE CITIES. John Wiley and Sons, London. pp. 89 - 109.

Minns, R, and Thornley, J. 1977. 'State Shareholding: The Role of Local and Regional Authorities'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies conference on Urban Change and Conflict at York University, 4 - 7 Jan. 1977.

Mollenkopf, J. 1975a. 'Theories of the state and power structure research', INSURGENT SOCIOLOGIST 5: 245 - 258.

Mollenkopf, J. 1975b. 'The post-war politics of urban development', POLITICS AND SOCIETY 5 : 247 - 295.

Moore, R. 1979. 'Urban Development in the Periphery of Industrialised Societies'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies conference on Urban Change and Conflict at Nottingham University, 5 - 8 Jan. 1979.

Morton, J. 1970. THE BEST LAID SCHEMES? Charles Knight and Co. Ltd., London.

Muchnik, D. M. 1970. 'Urban Renewal in Liverpool". Occasional paper on Social Administration no. 33. G. Bell and Sons, London.

Murphy, D. 1976. THE SILENT WATCHDOG: THE PRESS IN LOCAL POLITICS. Constable, London.

Neutze, G. M. 1973. THE PRICE OF LAND AND LAND USE PLANNING: POLICY INSTRUMENTS IN THE URBAN LAND MARKET. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, France.

Newby, H. 1979. 'Urbanisation and the Rural Class Structure'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies conference on Urban Change and Conflict at Nottingham University, 5 - 8 Jan. 1979.

Newton, K. 1969a. 'A critique of the pluralist model', ACTA SOCIOLOGICA 12: 209 - 223.

Newton, K. 1969b. 'City politics in Britain and the United States', POLITICAL STUDIES 17: 208 - 218.

Newton, K. 1974. 'Community decision makers and community decision making in England and the United States' in COMPARATIVE COMMUNITY POLITICS. Sage Publications, London. pp. 55 - 86.

Newton, K. 1975. 'Community politics and decision making: The American experience and its lessons' in ESSAYS ON THE STUDY OF URBAN POLITICS. Macmillan Press, London. pp. 1 - 24.

Newton, K. 1979. SECOND CITY POLITICS: DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING IN BIRMINGHAM. Claredon Press, Oxford.

Northwest Professional Group. 1974. LOCAL AUTHORITY NEEDS AND RESOURCES - THE EFFECT OF THE RATE SUPPORT GRANT IN THE NORTH-WEST. Centre for Environmental Studies, London.

Offe, C. 1975. 'The theory of the capitalist state and the problem of policy formation' in STRESS AND CONTRADICTION IN MODERN CAPITALISM. Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass. pp. 125 - 140.

Offe, C. 1976. 'Political authority and class structures' in POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex. pp. 388 - 421.

Offe, C. and Ronge, V. 1975. 'Notes: Theses on the theory of the state', NEW GERMAN CRITIQUE 6: 137 - 147.

Olson, M. 1971a. 'The concept of power: A political scientist's perspective' in COMMUNITY POLITICS. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 40 - 43.

Olson, M. 1971b. THE LOGIC OF COLLECTIVE ACTION. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Oppenheim, C. J. 1965. 'Random thoughts on land values by a developer' in LAND VALUES. Sweet and Maxwell Ltd., London. p.. 42 - 52.

O'Riordan, T. 1977. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.UNIT 23. The Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Ossowski, S. 1963. CLASS STRUCTURE IN THE SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Pahl, R. E. 1974. 'Social processes' in THE MANAGEMENT OF URBAN CHANGE IN BRITAIN AND GERMANY. Sage Publications, London. pp. 27 - 41.

Pahl, R. E. 1976. WHOSE CITY? Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Pahl, R. E. 1978. 'Socio-political factors in resource allocation'. Unpublished draft, University of Kent.

Pahl, R. E. and Winkler, J. T. 1974. 'The economic elite: Theory and practice' in ELITES AND POWER IN BRITISH SOCIETY. Cambridge University Press, London. pp. 102 - 122.

Paris, C. 1977. 'Policy Change: Ideological Consensus and Conflict'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies conference on Urban Change and Conflict at York University, 4 - 7 Jan. 1977.

Parkin, F. 1971. CLASS, INEQUALITY AND POLITICAL ORDER. MacGibbon and Ree Ltd., London.

Pickvance, C. G. 1976a. 'Explaining State Intervention: Some Theoretical and Empirical Considerations'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies conference on Urban Change and Conflict at York University, 4 - 7 Jan. 1977.

Pickvance, C.G. (editor) 1976b. URBAN SOCIOLOGY: CRITICAL ESSAYS. Tavistock Publications, London.

Pickvance, C.G. 1977a. 'Marxist approaches to the study of urban politics: Divergences among some recent French studies', INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF URBAN AND REGIONAL RESEARCH 1: 219-255.

Pickvance, C. G. 1977b. 'Physical planning and market forces in urban development', NATIONAL WESTMINSTER BANK QUARTERLY REVIEW August1977: 41-50.

Pickvance, C.G. 1978a. 'Competing paradigms in urban sociology: Some epistemological issues', COMPARATIVE URBAN RESEARCH 6: 28-45.

Pickvance, C.G. 1978b. 'Urban Fiscal Crisis, Theories of Crisis, and Theories of the State'. Paper given at the Conference of the Research Planning Group on Urban Social Services, Bielefield, West Germany 7-11 August 1978.

Polsby, N. 1963. COMMUNITY POWER AND POLITICAL THEORY. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conneticut.

Polsby, N. 1969. 'How to study community power: The pluralist alternative' in POLITICAL POWER. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 31-35.

Poulantzas, N. 1972. POLITICAL POWER AND SOCIAL CLASSES. New Left Books, London.

Poulantzas, N. 1973. 'The problem of the capitalist state' in IDEOLOGY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE. Vintage Books, N.Y. pp. 238-253.

Poulantzas, N. 1975. CLASSES IN CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM. New Left Books, London.

Powell, M. 1970. 'Financing local current spending - how and why', GERATER LONDON COUNCIL INTELLIGENCE UNIT QUARTERLY BULLETIN 11: 3-10.

Presthus, R.V. 1968. 'Men at the top' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 200-210.

Preteceille, E. 1976. 'Urban planning: The contradiction of capitalist urbanisation', ANTIPODE 8: 69-76.

Public Money. 1981. December Issue.

Purdue, M. 1977. CASES AND MATERIALS ON PLANNING LAW. Sweet and Maxwell, London.

Rassmussen, D.W. L973. URBAN ECONOMICS. Harper and Row, London.

Ratcliffe, J. 1976. LAND POLICY. Hutchinson, London.

Rees, G. and Lambert, J. 1979. 'Urban Development in a Peripheral Regions: Some Issues from South Wales'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies Conference on Urban Change and Conflict at Nottingham University, 5 - 8 Jan. 1979.

Rex, J. and Moore, R. 1974. RACE, COMMUNITY AND CONFLICT. Oxford University Press, London.

Richards, P. G. 1973. THE REFORMED LOCAL GOVERNMENT SYSTEM. Unwin University Books, London.

Richardson, H. W. 1977. THE NEW URBAN ECONOMICS AND ALTERNATIVES. Pion, London.

Roberts, B. 1979. 'Mobility of Labour, the Industrial Economy and State Provision'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies conference on Urban Change and Conflict at Nottingham University, 5 - 8 Jan. 1979.

Robson, B. T. 1975. URBAN SOCIAL AREAS. Oxford University Press, London.

Ronge, V. 1974. 'The politicisation of administration in advanced capitalist societies', POLITICAL STUDIES 22: 86 - 93.

Rose, R. (editor) 1974. THE MANAGEMENT OF URBAN CHANGE IN BRITAIN AND GERMANY. Sage Publications, London.

Rose,E. A. 1974. 'The search for environment' in URBAN PLANNING PROBLEMS. Leonard Hill, London. pp 113 - 154.

Rossi, P. H. 1968. 'Power and community structure' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 307 - 313.

Roweis, S. T. 1975. 'Urban Planning in Early and Late Capitalist Societies (Outline of a Theoretical Perspective)'. Paper on Planning and Design no. 7, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto.

Roweis, S. T. and Scott, A. J. 1976. 'The Urban Land Question'. Paper on Planning and Design no. 10, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto.

Rush, M. and Altoff, P. 1971. AN INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY. Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., London.

Ryan, A. 1970. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES. Macmillan Press, London.

Saunders, P. 1975. 'They make the rules: Political routine and the generation of political bias', POLICY AND POLITICS 4: 31-58.

Saunders, P. 1979a. 'Community Power, Urban Manageralism, and the "Local State"'. Paper given at the Centre for Environmental Studies Conference on Urban Change and Conflict at Nottingham University 5-8 January 1979.

Saunders, P. 1979b. URBAN POLITICS: A SOCIOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION. Hutchinson, London.

Saunders, P. 1981. SOCIAL THEORY AND THE URBAN QUESTION. Hutchinson University Library, London.

Saunders, P., Newby, H., Bell, C., and Rose D. 'Rural Community and Rural Community Power'. Unpublished draft.

Sayre, W. and Kaufman H. 1968. 'Governing New York City' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. PP. 125-133.

Scarrow, H.A. 1971. 'Policy pressures by British local government', COMPARATIVE POLITICS 4: 1-28.

Schelling, T.C. 1975. THE STRATEGY OF CONFLICT. Oxford University Press, N.Y.

School for Advanced Urban Studies. 1976. COMMUNITY LAND TRAINING PROGRAMME. University of Bristol.

Schulz, M. 1948a. 'The Local Government Act of 1929 and subsequent legislation' in ESSAYS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 67-112.

Schulz, M. 1948b. 'Development of the grant system' in ESSAYS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. pp. 113-160.

Schumaker, P.D. 1975. 'Policy responsiveness to protest group demands', JOURNAL OF POLITICS 37: 488-521.

Scott, A.J. 1976. 'Land use and commodity production', REGIONAL SCIENCE AND URBAN ECONOMICS 6: 147-160.

Sedgemore, B. 1978, 'The Cambridge case against the Treasury', NEW SOCIETY 44: 6-7.

Senior, D. 1973. 'Planning and the public' in THE FUTURE OF PLANNING. Heinemann Educational Books, London.

Seymore-Ure, C. 1974. THE POLITICAL IMPACT OF MASS MEDIA. Constable and Co. Ltd., London.

Sharpe, L. J. 1975. 'Innovation in British land use planning' in PLANNING, POLITICS AND PUBLIC POLICY: THE BRITISH, FRENCH, AND ITALIAN EXPERIENCE. Cambridge University Press, London. pp. 316 - 357.

Shelter Community Action Team. PUBLIC INQUIRIES ACTION GUIDE. Shelter Community Action Team, London.

Shipman, M.D. 1972. THE LIMITATIONS OF SOCIAL RESEARCH. Longman, London.

Simon, H. A. 1968. 'Notes on the observation and measure of political power' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 21 - 35.

Simpson, R. L. 1971. 'The concept of power: A sociologist's perspective' in COMMUNITY POLITICS. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 36 - 39.

Simpson, R. 1977. 'For richer, for poorer', NEW SOCIETY 42: 299 - 301.

Smith, B. 1976. POLICY MAKING IN BRITISH GOVERNMENT. Martin Robertson, London.

Smith, D. 1974. AMENITY AND URBAN PLANNING. Crosby Lockwood Staples, London.

Smith, D. 1977. THE WELFARE APPROACH TO HUMAN GEOGRAPHY. UNIT 22. Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Smith, P. A. 1968. 'The games of community politics' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 134 - 145.

Smith, P. F. 1974. THE DYNAMICS OF URBANISM. Hutchinson Education Library, London.

South Glamorgan County Planning Department.(editor) 1975. THE URBAN CRISIS - ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND PLANNING. Royal Town Planning Institute, London.

Stacey, M., Batstone, E., Bell, C., and Murcott, A. 1975. POWER, PERSISTENCE AND CHANGE: A SECOND STUDY OF BANBURY. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Stanworth, P. and Giddens, A. (editors) 1974. ELITES AND POWER IN BRITISH SOCIETY. Cambridge University Press, London.

Stanyer, J. 1967. COUNTY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND AND WALES. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Stanyer, J. 1975. 'On the study of urban electoral behaviour' in ESSAYS IN THE STUDY OF URBAN POLITICS. Macmillan Press, London. pp. 25 - 51.

Stanyer, J. 1976. UNDERSTANDING LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Martin Robinson in association with Fontana/Collins, London.

Stephenson, C. 1975. TRANSPORT POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES. Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, London.

Stinchcombe, A. L. 1968. CONSTRUCTING SOCIAL THEORIES. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., N.Y.

Stone, P. A. 1965. 'The prices of building sites in Britain' in LAND VALUES. Sweet and Maxwell, London. pp. 1 - 18.

Szelenyi, I. 1978. 'Class analysis and beyond: Further dilemnas for the new urban sociology', COMPARATIVE URBAN RESEARCH 6: 86 - 96.

Taras, R. 1972. 'Communications and press relations in urban government', POLICY AND POLITICS 1: 115 - 130.

Telling, A. E. 1970. PLANNING LAW AND PROCEDURE. Butterworths, London.

Thoenes, P. 1966. THE ELITE IN THE WELFARE STATE. Faber and Faber, London.

Thompson, E. P. 1978. THE POVERTY OF THEORY AND OTHER ESSAYS. Merlin Press, London.

Thornhill, W. 1971. THE GROWTH AND REFORM OF ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Weidenfield and Nicolson, London.

Tucker, R. (editor) 1972. THE MARX - ENGELS READER. W. W. Norton and Co. Inc., N.Y.

Vance, J. 1971. 'Land assignment in the precapitalist, capitalist, and post-capitalist city', ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY 1971: 101 - 120.

Velba, C. 1976. 'A Survey of Those Taking Part in Two Structure Plan Examinations in Public'. University of Birmingham, Institute of Judicial Administration.

Verba, S. and Nie, N. 1972. PARTICIPATION IN AMERICA - POLITICAL DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL EQUALITY. Harper and Row, N.Y.

Wagner, R. H. 1969. 'The concept of power and the study of politics' in POLITICAL POWER. The Free Press, N.Y. pp. 3 - 12.

Walton, J. 1970. 'A systematic survey of community power research' in THE STRUCTURE OF COMMUNITY POWER. Random House, N.Y. pp 443 - 464.

Weber, M. 1958. THE CITY. The Free Press, N.Y.

Westergaard, J. and Resler, H. 1975. CLASS IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY. Heinemann Educational Books, London.

White, D. 1978. 'Are tourists really a blight?', NEW SOCIETY 23.3.78: 661 - 663.

Wildavsky, A. B. 1968. 'Leadership in a small town' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 115 - 124.

Willer, D. 1967. SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY: THEORY AND METHOD. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Willer, D. and Willer, J. 1973. SYSTEMATIC EMPIRICISM: CRITIQUE OF A PSUEDO-SCIENCE. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Willhelm, S. M. 1962. URBAN ZONING AND LAND USE THEORY. The Free Press, N.Y.

Williams, O. P. 1975. 'Urban politics as political ecology' in ESSAYS IN THE STUDY OF URBAN POLITICS. Macmillan Press, London. pp. 106 - 132.

Willmott, P. 1973. 'The tasks for planning' in THE FUTURE OF PLANNING. Heinemann Educational Books, London. pp. 10 - 23.

Wilson. C. H. (editor) 1948. ESSAYS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Wiseman, H. V. 1963a. 'The working of local government in Leeds. Part I: Party control of Council and committees', PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 41: 51 - 69.

Wiseman, H. V. 1963b. 'The working of local government in Leeds. Part II: More party conventions and practices', PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 41: 137 - 155.

Wolfe, A. 1974. 'New directions in the Marxist theory of politics', POLITICS AND SOCIETY : 131 - 159.

Wolfinger, R. E. 1968. 'Reputation and reality in the study of community power' in THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY POWER. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. pp. 159 - 170.

Wolfinger, R. 1971. 'Nondecisions and the study of local politics', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 65: 1063 - 1080.

Wolfinger, R. 1974. THE POLITICS OF PROGRESS. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Wolfinger, R. E. and Osgood Field, J. 1966. 'Political ethos and structure of city government', AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW 60: 306 - 326.

Wright, E. O. 1976. 'Class boundaries in advanced capitalist societies', NEW LEFT REVIEW 98: 3 - 41.

Wright, E. O. 1978. CLASS, CRISIS AND THE STATE. New Left Books, London.

Young, K. (editor) 1975a. ESSAYS ON THE STUDY OF URBAN POLITICS. Macmillan Press, London.

Young, K. 1975b. 'Metropology revisted: On the political integration of metropolitan' in ESSAYS ON THE STUDY OF URBAN POLITICS. Macmillan Press, London. pp. 133 - 157.

Zisk, B. 1972. 'Local interest politics and municipal outputs' in PEOPLE AND POLITICS IN URBAN SOCIETY. Sage Publications, Beverley Hills, California. pp. 231 - 254.

APPENDICES

MAP II

CODE

Residential

Shops, Restaurants,
Offices, Hotels

Warehouses, Builders Yards,
Garages, Industry

Schools and Other Public
Buildings

Vacant/Derelict

Public Houses

MAP III

CODE

East Kent Bus Company

Canterbury District Council

Tannery

Kent County Council

Post Office and Public Utilities

Ecclesiastical

Metro, Town and Central

A P P E N D I X B

HISTORICAL DATA FOR CANTERBURY'S CONTEXT OF LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING - 1940 TO 1969

Background

Before the start of World War II, Canterbury was a shopping centre in East Kent. Shopping was the main commercial activity of Canterbury and it had no less than 140 shops in the main street. There was free parking for cars, however there was a traffic congestion problem in its main street. The rateable value of the City had increased from £222,233 in 1936 to £241,801 in 1940 and the amount raised from the rates increased from £95,639 to £120,859 respectively. Loans had increased from £447,882 to £582,379 and the total capital outlay had increased from £839,213 to £1,072,647. Gross expenditure had risen from £295,094 p.a. to £368,243 p.a. Government grants had risen from £53,775 p.a. to £94,992 p.a. (City Treasurer's Report 1940).

1940

October

The first bombs fell on Canterbury on 11th October and caused considerable damage to a number of properties in Burgate. Canterbury was bombed again on the 17th October which destroyed about 8 domestic properties and caused a number of broken windows in the shopping area.

1941

March

Canterbury City Council's rate was increased by 7d to 10s 9d in the pound. This was hotly debated at the full Council meeting and the matter was decided by the casting vote of the Mayor.

1942

March

The City Council decided to fix its rate to 10s 6d in the pound due to the Council's balance of approximately £33,000.

June

The biggest bombing raid on Canterbury was on the first of June. Homes and businesses were demolished. The raid was seen as a reprisal for the bombing of Cologne. The chief damage was to shopping and business premises in 11 streets. Most of the south/east end of the City was demolished.

The debris was cleared about one and half weeks after the blitz. It was an attempt to restore the life of the City. The traders were anxious to become re-established as soon as possible. They were eligible for claims for War damage. (This covered bomb damage to land and buildings. War damage to a business covered its goods and equipment. War damage to a house covered its furniture, clothing, and other personal belongings.)

The City Council said that it would allocate premises to the most important and essential businesses. At the moment, the Council maintained it was not so concerned with the luxury traders.

1942 (cont.)

July

The debate had begun about the replanning of Canterbury. The City Council decided that the replanning of Canterbury was much more than a local matter and it would need the advice of a leading architect and town planner before it attempted to devise a plan. The Council saw itself as a "stopper" against "individual attempts at bad planning". The City Council decided to demolish the Corn Market to make this site (the Longmarket) available for the use of temporary shops and preference would be given to the small trader who had been destroyed by enemy action.

Replanning for some in Canterbury meant the recreation of many of the characteristic features of Canterbury - the Cathedral, the medieval style buildings, narrow lanes, etc. But for other, replanning meant the opportunity for introducing commercial improvements that had been hitherto constrained by the medieval infrastructure such as wide streets, broad vistas, taller buildings, etc.

In letters to the Kentish Gazette and the Times there appeared to be a consensus of views on two points:

1. the plans should be designed with the advice to "an artist with real vision"
2. private interests should be "subsumed to the public good".

The Chamber of Trade made a strong appeal to the City Council for full representation on any local committee that would be formed to discuss the future of Canterbury. The Chamber maintained that the traders' future "must be safeguarded and they have a right to priority consideration".

1942 (cont.)

St. George's Street had been completely devastated in the blitz. Previous to the blitz, it had developed into a valuable shopping area as evidenced by its high rateable value.

August

Much interest had been taken in the rebuilding of Canterbury as evidenced by the reports and letters in the paper and meetings held to discuss it. Some people were anxious that the working classes of Canterbury should be consulted as to their views which were the widening of the main street with wide footpaths and more shops and jobs.

The City Council said that it would have in mind the needs of all classes of the community. The following quote from the Mayor of Canterbury, Alderman LeFever, illustrated the Council's position:

> "We must really try to see the whole of the community and have their interests carefully watched. . . the responsibility rests entirely on the City Council and their responsible officer in this case is the City Surveyor. . . We shall have at a later date meetings with the representatives of various organised bodies. I imagine the Chamber of Trade will want to be consulted, but I also hope all other sections of the community will be given the opportunity of putting their views before the Committee before anything is decided," (KG 15/8/ 42)

September

The gross expenditure for Canterbury City Council in 1941 - 2 was £283,507. The City Council's income was from the following sources: 45% from the Exchequer, 41% from the ratepayers, and 14% from other sources (City Treasurer's Report 1942).

1942 (cont.)

An exhibition entitled "How Shall We Rebuild" was arranged by the Canterbury Branch of the Workers' Educational Association. It tried to demonstrate how other blitzed towns accomplished their rebuilding and replanning of the city centres. The comparison was then made with Canterbury. The exhibition was also supported by the City Council.

The City Council said that all the views on the replanning of Canterbury would be considered. The City Council thought its main problem was how it was going to reconcile the past with the present as well as developing successfully for the future. The Council maintained that a determined effort should be made to subjugate personal interests to the public welfare.

October

The City Council decided to set up an Advisory Committee on the replanning of Canterbury which would be composed of different groups within the community. The Committee would advise the Council on the replanning of Canterbury. The City Council would determine which groups would be represented and the total number on the Committee as well as determining the Advisory Committee's frame of reference.

The Chamber of Trade wanted to have two representatives on the Committee because the devastation was largely confined to commercial areas. The City Council said no; the Chamber was entitled to one representative like everyone else.

There was another bombing raid on the 31st October and considerable damage was caused to houses. Small residential properties were the chief targets.

1942 (cont.)

December

At its meeting of the 2nd December, the City Council decided on the organisations and interests to be represented on the Advisory Committee: Canterbury Chamber of Trade; Canterbury and District Trades Council; Dean and Chapter; Canterbury Archaeological Society; Canterbury Co-operative Women's Guild; East Kent Road Car Ltd.; Associated Road Operators Ltd.; Diocesan Re-organisation Committee; South East Society of Architects; and Architects Advisory Committee.

The City Council had received a letter from the Minister of Works and Planning which stated that Canterbury City Council had until the first December 1943 to prepare its draft plan.

1943

February

The Town and Country Planning Association held a conference at Canterbury called "Plan for Living". Canterbury's future was the main topic of discussion.

March

The Town Planning Committee approved in principle a preliminary report by the City Surveyor on the provision of an outer ring road to relieve traffic congestion in the centre of Canterbury. Several Councilllors were apprehensive that the Council was gradually being committed to proposals that would develop into a complete scheme of which they would not have knowledge. The Town Clerk maintained that the proposals in principle did not commit the Council to any actual work or to the actual position of the road.

1943 (cont.)

May

According to the Chamber of Trade, the City of Canterbury should be replanned from the traders' point of view, ie the restoration of Canterbury as a shopping centre for East Kent. The traders felt that this would be in the best interests of the City to ensure its future life and prosperity. The Chamber of Trade had formed a special sub-committee for the purpose of closely monitoring their interests. The traders maintained that the commerce of Canterbury would be paying for its redevelopment; therefore they felt they were entitled to "their fare share of rights and demands". (The cost of redevelopment actually fell on the ratepayers.)

Canterbury Civic Society was formed with a membership of 227. It made two suggestions regarding the redevelopment of Canterbury:

1. very new copies of very old buildings should be avoided
2. it would like to serve in an advisory capacity to the Council in collaboration with other organisations with regard to the redevelopment of Canterbury.

July

The South East Society of Architects presented its ideas on the redevelopment of Canterbury. It felt that transport was the number one priority. There should be only one railway station for Canterbury because the two station system produced confusion. The Society felt that a ring road should be constructed along the lines of the City walls in order to solve the internal traffic problem. This would then leave the centre of the City undisturbed.

1943 (cont.)

August

The Rotarians discussed the replanning of Canterbury. Traffic was thought to be the chief problem and this congestion could be overcome by "ringing the City with one or two roads" and the need for consultation with the railway authority about the St. Dunstans level crossing. Within the group, there was a divergence of views concerning the predominance of shopping for Canterbury's central area.

The City Surveyor (Mr. Enderby) gave a talk on "Canterbury's Planning Problem". He identified nine problems in Canterbury and their solutions:

PROBLEM	SOLUTION
1. excess through traffic	by-pass road on an outer ring road
2. congested local traffic	inner ring road
3. sprawling shopping centre	main shopping street with all amenities including car parking to attract trade
4. over-concentrated central building	removal of light industries from centre
5. difficulty of finding sites for housing	land is mostly agricultural
6. increasing the amenity of medieval buildings	keep open views of ancient buildings
7. the development of river amenities	facilities for parks, fishing, boating, etc.
8. the retention of Canterbury's traditional atmosphere	in harmony with the needs of 20th century, do not want a museum piece
9. the inadequacy of building organisation	building has to be enlarged to cope with reconstruction

1943 (cont.)

The Surveyor outlined the stages of town planning:

1. the survey and factual analysis including historical research. This formed the basis for the land utilisation map on which areas of blight would be indicated.
2. investigation into the various aspects such as traffic, housing, recreation, shopping, and the solutions offered
3. publication of the plan
4. the final plan which would be the result of criticism and/or approval of the published plan.

September

The City Council started to make inquiries about consultants to help it with a plan for the redevelopment of Canterbury. The Council stressed that the plan would take time.

At this time, there was an undercurrent of opinion in Canterbury about the delay concerning the redevelopment of its City centre. The question was: When was the City Council going to do something? The City Surveyor said that the plan had been drafted several weeks after the June blitz, but no one in the community had the opportunity to see them. Residents were becoming impatient and they did not want to have to keep guessing what the Council's plan was.

October

This undercurrent of opinion continued. Several people wanted the basic outline of the proposed plan to be made public.

1943 (cont.)

From the letters written to the Kentish Gazette, there appeared to be a general consensus on the retention of the characteristic features of Canterbury and that shops should be recreated on their old sites in St. George's Street and elsewhere.

The City Council gave permission for the City Surveyor to explain his proposals for the redevelopment of Canterbury to any group of interested individuals on the understanding that he emphasised none of the proposals had been approved or adopted by the City Council.

The City Surveyor addressed the Chamber of Trade and gave an outline for this suggested plan for the rebuilding of Canterbury. The City Surveyor thought it was necessary to"formulate a plan which would aim at co-ordinating the material and social welfare of the whole community by taking into account the central area and outlaying areas". He maintained that the problem of traffic congestion could be "solved by the drastic remedies of newly constructed wide roads through the heart of the City or by having the main traffic outside the built-up area, the practical application of which was the ring road". He hoped that the views of the Cathedral (which had been made possible by the bombing) would be retained. His plan catered for a through road from Burgate and Rose Lane to the civic centre (on the Watling Street site); the widening of St. George's Street to 50 ft.; the adaptation of Whitefriars as an open space and car parking ringed by a shopping area; and an open space from Butchery Lane to Longmarket.

1943 (cont.)

November

There was a lively and animated discussion of the City Surveyor's proposals by the Chamber of Trade. The discussion centred on the following points:

1. what sort of town they wanted Canterbury to be - either a shopping centre or a "sleepy Cathedral City"
2. whether they wanted a new, modern city or a city to follow its old, traditional lines.

Most of the traders agreed to the concentration of shops, a ring road around the City, and the retention of the traditional character of Canterbury.

The City Surveyor emphasised that there would be a tremendous traffic increase after the War and that the only way of dealing with this was by widening the road and constructing a parallel road to the main road.

December

The City Council approved the report of the City Surveyor on the history of Canterbury and its relation to the present infrastructure of the City. The City Council agreed to have a model constructed of the City Surveyor's plan and again emphasised that this plan had not been approved by the Council. The City Council decided to appoint Dr. Charles Holden as its planning consultant to collaborate with the City Surveyor on the replanning of Canterbury.

A large body of citizens of Canterbury thought Canterbury should be redeveloped along these fundamental lines:

1943 (cont.)

- preservation of its medieval character and ancient lay-out
- no broad vistas, open spaces, and cafes as on the Continent
- the devastated shops shouldbe rebuilt on their same frontages
- St. George's Street should remain as the main shopping street
- the sites of old premises should be retained by their present owners who would re-establish their old businesses
- the congestion of narrow streets could be alleviated by a ring road and by-pass.

1944

February

The contrasting views on the replanning of Canterbury became more apparent: On the one hand, there were those who wanted Canterbury to become a tourist, market, and shopping centre with architecture in the modern style, and, on the other hand, there were those who wanted a reproduction of what had stood before. They did not want wide streets or plate glass and chromium fitted shops. They were apprehensive about the enthusiasm of the town planner. The physical element of design was emphasised. What was stressed was not the type of activity that went on in the buildings, but their appearances.

April

The City Council's rate was still 10/9 in the pound. The City Council said the rate would have been below 10s if it had not been for the blitz. The councillors noted the City Council was paying out more and dissipating its reserves which had been built up over the years.

1944 (cont.)

May

The case for the retention of the medieval scale within the City walls was increasing in intensity. It was maintained that narrow, winding streets were not the place for heavy traffic, hence the need for a by-pass and ring road.

July

Councillor Young criticised the Council's practice of co-opting retired businessmen to vacancies on the City Council. (There had not been any local elections since 1938 due to wartime restrictions.) He did not think that these men "could make an effective contribution" and that the Council "would perpetuate itself in a narrow orbit". He thought the Council should take steps to ensure that there were representatives of other interests on the Council.

September

The City Council decided that Dr. Holden, in preparing the plan for Canterbury, could assume that the main through traffic would be diverted from Canterbury and therefore, he did not need to make provision for the construction of roads in the City for through traffic. (The by-pass road that would cater for the through traffic was implemented approximately 35 years later. The ideas in his report that were based on this assumption and their implementation, were affected by this time gap.)

November

The City Treasurer's Report to the City Council stated the rateable value of the properties destroyed by emeny

1944 (cont.)

action since the start of the War amounted to £29,000. Of this amount, 40% were shops and commercial premises, and 60% were residential and other properties. The annual loss to the City had been over 12% of its total rateable income. The report noted there had been a marked decrease in the expenditure on roads and other maintenance works which would mean a heavy future liability. Central government had not yet indicated how the schemes of post War reconstruction would be financed. It was apparent that local rates raised under the present system would be inadequate to meet the cost of post War reconstruction.

December

The Town Planning Committee said the plan for Canterbury within the City walls would be available in the New Year. Dr. Holden had acknowledged the proposals of the Chamber of Trade on the replanning of Canterbury and said not one of them conflicted with his plan.

1945

January

The Government White Paper, Local Government in England and Wales During the Period of Reconstruction (Cmd 6579), advocated the adjustment of local government boundaries and the reduction of the status of small county boroughs.

February

As a result of the Government White Paper, the City Council wanted to enlarge the present area of Canterbury so as to retain its county borough status.

1945 (cont.)

A deputation of traders was received by the Town Planning Committee. The traders expressed their concern about the present congestion of shop facilities in Canterbury and asked the Council to erect temporary shops on the blitzed sites. The Council assured the traders that it was concerned about the inadequacy of shopping facilities and it was determined to maintain Canterbury's pre-War position as the shopping centre in East Kent. However, the Council said it could not make a decision on this until it had received the replanning proposals of Dr. Holden and Mr. Enderby; only then could the Council determine its policy under the powers of the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act.

March

The draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby) was completed. Briefly, it was as follows: The Cathedral was thought to be the dominant feature and the"charm and intimacy of the narrow streets" as well as the City walls and the ancient and historic buildings must be preserved. The report dealt with the first stage of reconstruction of the City centre (that covered 10 to 15 years from the end of the War). Traffic congestion in the City centre was perceived to be a major problem because of the number of main roads that ran through the centre of the City. The draft plan perceived the solution in two parts:

1. the outer ring road that would cater for the through traffic and it would be located within a radii of two miles from the City centre
2. the inner ring road that would relieve the City centre of all "but the most essential traffic". There would be a roundabout at St. George's Gate and also at Wincheap Grove.

1945 (cont.)

Within the City centre, the draft plan proposed a parallel road to the existing shopping street. The two streets "would be linked together at frequent intervals by wide crossways which would provide good shop frontage". The total effect would be of "dual carriageways carrying one-way traffic in contrary directions with central islands of shops". The bus station would be moved from St. Peter's Place to possibly St. George's Place or any other suitable site off the ring road.

The new civic centre would be located on the Watling Street site and an 80ft. dual carriageway, following the lines of Marlowe Avenue and Rose Lane would link the civic centre with Burgate. This area would be zoned for business and office use, making it distinct from the shopping area in St. George's Street. Provision had been made for car parking in the central area: Two large car parks were planned at each end of the main street.

The draft plan said that "great care had been taken to avoid any interference with ancient or historical buildings and in many cases, interesting views of them have been opened up by the replanning of the streets".

The City Council approved the resolution that the Minister of Town and Country Planning and interested groups and citizens should be invited to offer their criticims, suggestions, and observations on the draft Canterbury Plan. The City Council maintained that uniform ownership of land was necessary for the comprehensive redevelopment of the City centre. (Under the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act, a local authority could apply to the Minister within five years of the appointed day of the Act for a declaration of an area to be compulsorily purchased. The Act applied to areas of extensive War damage, but could also include land

1945 (cont.)

adjacent to these areas as well as areas of blight.) The Council said that municipal ownership of central area land was going to benefit the City in the "long run and would ensure a saner and more consistent plan in the years to come".

The Council made the following resolutions:

1. The City Council accepted the principle of compulsory purchase of the areas of extensive War damage as defined in Section 1 of the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act.
2. Early steps should be taken regarding the acquisition of land (approximately 75 acres) for comprehensive redevelopment.
3. The Council Officers should enter into immediate consultation with the Minister of Town and Country Planning on compulsory purchase.
4. The Officers should submit reports to the Council as soon as possible on the results of these consultations as well as the financial and other aspects of the proposals.

Several criticisms of the draft plan (Holden-Enderby) were made by the residents of Canterbury:

1. There was a strong feeling against compulsory purchase. It was felt that those who had lost their businesses would not have the right to rebuild on the same site. In other words, it was maintained there was no free choice.
2. The new road proposals contradicted the report's wish to retain the "charm and intimacy of the narrow streets".

1945 (cont.)

3. The proposals were too grandiose and ambitious.
4. Compulsory purchase was too costly and it would impose an enormous financial burden on the present and future ratepayers. (The War Damage Act only compensated property owners for damage done by enemy action and it did not cover street improvements that involved the knocking down of buildings.)
5. The proposals that would do most damage to the character of the City were the parallel road, the civic avenue, and compulsory purchase.
6. The draft plan was not understandable and more information was needed.

Suggestions were made that property owners should combine to protect their interests. Of the 24 members on the Council, 10 were nonelected. Due to wartime regulations, the last Council election had been held in 1938 and 10 of the Council members had been co-opted in the interim. Allegations were made that the electors would not have a say with respect to the draft plan because of the proportion of co-opted members.

April

Objections to the draft Canterbury Plan grew. The City Council justified compulsory purchase on the basis that it was a good investment for the City and it was the only way redevelopment of the City could be done satisfactorily. The compulsory purchase area that was designated by the Council not only covered the blitzed area but also the remainder of the commercial area in the City centre - 75 acres in total. Compensation would be at 1939 site values as fixed by the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act. The Council would get the ground rent from the sites that would be leased for 99 years. The ground rents would be related to the current value of the sites

1945 (cont.)

and would be based on the amount paid for the site by by the City Council plus any improvements to the site. The Council maintained if it was the ground landlord, it would be in a position to encourage new firms to the City by offering "favourable terms which no private landlord had the incentive to pursue". The City Council argued that redevelopment of the City would be more expedient with the Council as the owner of land because it could by-pass the restrictions imposed under the Town Planning scheme that was applicable to the single private trader. It felt that the rehabilitation of Canterbury must get underway at the earliest possible time when the labour and materials become available.

The City Council had not yet applied to the Minister of Town and Country Planning for an order declaring the land to be subject to compulsory purchase. If the Council did, it would still not bind it to buy the land. If the Council did not take advantage of the order within the statutory time limit, then the power of compulsory purchase would lapse.

May

Mr. W. J. Jennings suggested that a property owners' defense committee be set up to oppose the compulsory purchase of central land. He felt that in order for the protest to be effective, it must be organised and be able to obtain professional advice so their interests could be protected. The committee would be formed for the purpose of furthering the interests of those property owners who wished to retain their property and businesses in Canterbury's central area. Many of the owners of property in St. George's Street responded to this appeal.

1945 (cont.)

At its full Council meeting, the City Council decided that notice should be given that the "City Council was considering applying to the Minister for permission to designate the area for compulsory purchase". If this was confirmed by the Minister, the City Council would then have the right to enforce compulsory purchase powers on the area, but it was not legally obliged to do so. Only six Council members were allowed to vote. The other members were excluded from voting because they had financial interests in some part of the area proposed to be compulsory purchased. All six Council members voted for compulsory purchase.

This decision of the City Council heightened the opposition to compulsory purchase which stressed the point that only one quarter of the Council made this decision and five of the six were co-opted members. It was felt that the opinion of the electorate would not be taken into account with respect to Council decisions on the redevelopment of Canterbury that concerned land and property worth approximately one million pounds. The opposition felt that the Council were indifferent to the wishes of the electorate.

June

Opposition to the draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby) continued. Several alternative proposals were made:

1. The owners of the blitzed sites should be allowed to retain their property and would set their frontages back for road widening and would have the elevation of their buildings approved by the local authority.

1945 (cont.)

2. Instead of a parallel road, Watling Street could be extended and Beer Cart Lane would be widened and the road could be continued over the Stour River.

The first meeting of the Canterbury Citizens' Defence Association was held on June 15 and over 100 people attended. There was considerable apprehension about the cost and financing of the redevelopment scheme. It was felt that the burden would fall on the ratepayers. It was urged at the meeting that the people of Canterbury should fight the Council at every possible stage in its efforts to obtain compulsory purchase powers. Local elections were going to be held in November and it was felt that the redevelopment of Canterbury should become the local election issue. The Association was going to appeal to the Minister against compulsory purchase and wanted him to call a public inquiry. The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Association and sent to the City Council:

"This meeting of citizens, while approving of the proposal to provide inner and outer ring roads for the relief of traffic now passing through main thoroughfares, is strongly opposed to the central Development Plan for the City on the ground that it would destroy the traditional character of Canterbury. This meeting of citizens feels that the proposal of the Council to acquire all the lands and property in the central development area should be vigourously resisted. It is a gross injustice that while the rest of Canterbury should remain unaffected, this one section of citizens, many of whom have suffered severe losses and hardships, should be compelled to sell their freeholds."

1945 (cont.)

The City Council called a public meeting at the end of June to "find out the views of the citizens on the draft Canterbury Plan". The meeting was very well attended and the majority of those present were opposed to compulsory purchase. The City Council was queried on the cost of the scheme. The Council said it did not have the figures for compulsory purchase but its cost would be set against the estimated revenue from the sites once they were redeveloped. The Council realised that redevelopment would cost money and the that the rates would inevitably rise, but compulsory purchase was an investment which would yield a good return in the future. The City Council was also queried on the democratic legitimacy of its decision for compulsory purchase when only six out of the twenty-four Councillors and alderman voted. The Council responded that if the citizens of Canterbury did not agree with these views, they could change the Council at the local election in November.

July

Dr. Holden and Mr. Enderby officially replied to the criticisms of the draft Canterbury (Holden-Enderby) Plan in a report. The report was criticised on the grounds that the Council had "erected straw men for the purpose of knocking them down".

The City Council called a public meeting on the 17th July to discuss the "planning and reconstruction of Canterbury". The meeting was very well attended and there was considerable opposition to the proposed parallel road, the civic avenue, and the cost and financing of the scheme. The inner ring road met with general approval. It was maintained that if the inner ring road

1945 (cont.)

was made number one priority, less internal traffic would be generated, thus eliminating the need for a parallel road and civic avenue. The City Council made the following justifications of its policy in the draft Canterbury Plan:

1. parallel road: An axiom of good planning was that one way traffic in each direction was essential. Watling Street had been ruled out because it was too far away and would involve the demolition of buildings which would make it too expensive.
2. civic avenue: It would give dignity to the City.
3. cost and financing of the scheme: The Council had to first satisfy the Minister that it had a feasible scheme, and only then could the probable cost be estimated.

At the end of the meeting, the Mayor gave assurances that the Town Planning Committee would give full consideration to all the points that had been raised.

August

The Canterbury Citizens' Defence Association (CCDA) held a public meeting on August 27th when widespread dissatisfaction of the draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby) was expressed. The following resolution was passed:

"This meeting protests against many of the proposals of the Council as shown in the public plans for the redevelopment of the City, involving the acquisition of large areas of land by compulsory purchase. Such extensive proposals are unnecessary and will impose a crushing burden on the ratepayers

1945 (cont.)

> and are against the true interests and traditions of Canterbury. This meeting, therefore, requests that the City Council abandon its present plan (with the exception of the principle of ring roads) and to prepare an entirely new plan based on the views already publicly expressed."

The CCDA expanded their interests not only to those of the blitzed traders, but to anyone concerned about the redevelopment of Canterbury.

September

The Chamber of Trade also opposed the principle of public ownership of land. It maintained that the City Council only needed to acquire land for essential development and public facilities.

The Minister of Town and Country Planning finally answered the City Council's March 1945 letter by giving his comments on the draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby): He recognised the difficulty of reconciling modern needs with the historical development of a city like Canterbury, and in his view, "the submitted plan provided, in broad lines, an admirable way of overcoming these difficulties, although he appreciated that the plan was susceptible to alteration in detail". The Minister approved the idea of a parallel road and noted "with satisfaction that the Council had accepted the principle of compulsory acquisition and considered that the time had come for submission by the Council of a formal application for a declaratory order, so that the necessary procedure which might involve a public, local inquiry could be set in motion without delay".

1945 (cont.)

There was a stormy debate at the meeting of the Whole House Committee of the Council on the 27th September when it discussed the draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby). The Committee voted (by nine votes to five) to recommend to the full Council that application should be made to the Minister of Town and Country Planning for a compulsory purchase order for seventy-five acres. Those against said that the Council should wait until after the November election to see what the citizens wanted. The local electorate had been told over and over again that they would have the full opportunity to express their opinion. Thus far, only two public meetings had been held - one by the City Council and the other by the CCDA. Those for the recommendation said that the redevelopment of the City should get underway as soon as possible so the traders knew their position.

The decision by the Whole House Committee created an uproar. Its action was alleged to be undemocratic before the November local election. It was pointed out that practical suggestions had been made and not one had been adopted by the City Council. People were worried about why the Council was pressing forward with this scheme.

October

At its meeting on the third October, the City Council decided it would postpone its application for compulsory purchase until after the November local election. It appeared that the redevelopment of Canterbury had become a local election issue.

Candidates, supported by the CCDA, were contesting all the seats in the three wards of Canterbury. There were two unaffiliated candidates standing for re-election. At this time, there were no Conservative candidates contesting seats at the local election in Canterbury.

1945 (cont.)

On the 17th October, the City Council put on a "Canterbury Plan Exhibition" at the Beany which was well attended. On the 24th October, the CCDA sponsored its own exhibition in Burgate on the draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby). This was also well attended, but was thought to be less grandiose and pretentious than the Council's. Citizens were asked to support the CCDA candidates who pledged to press for a modified plan for the redevelopment of Canterbury.

November

The CCDA candidates won their seats in the local election. Turnout was forty percent. The CCDA said that the "sweeping result" was not to be regarded as a political victory, but as a measure of the electors' dissatisfaction with the draft Canterbury Plan.

December

At the first City Council meeting of the new council, the City Council decided to reject the application for a declaratory order that seventy-five acres be subject to compulsory purchase. For the purpose of discussion, the Minister of Town and Country Planning had issued a dispensation to enable those who had any financial interest in the area to take part in the discussion.

1946

January

The City Council received a communication from the Minister of Town and Country Planning which stated that the Minister "is anxious to acquaint himself with the progress made to date in dealing with the reconstruction

1946 (cont.)

and redevelopment of towns that have suffered extensive war damage and to ascertain how far action under the Town and Country Planning Act of 1944 has proceeded". The new City Council was going to incorporate the wishes of the local electorate of Canterbury (as evidenced by the local election result) into a new draft of the Canterbury Plan. The Town Planning Committee hoped to present its completed scheme in the next few weeks.

A case was being made against compulsory purchase on the grounds that the relevant clause in the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act dealing with the compulsory purchase of war damaged areas used the permissive "may" and not the obligatory "shall". This meant that the decision for compulsory purchase rested entirely with the local town planning authority. Also, the owners of the central area land were willing to give part of their land for street widening and improvements. It was felt that this negated the need for taking advantage of the permissive clause on compulsory purchase in the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act.

February

The City Council approved the erection of temporary shops in the Longmarket.

March

The City Council approved the following sites for use as temporary car parks: Rose Hotel yard, the site of the Fountain Hotel, St. George's Street between Terrace and Iron Bar Lanes, the Friars between the bridge and Best Lane, and a North Lane site.

1946 (cont.)

The pressure of the Ministry in forcing the City Council to accept compulsory purchase was becoming a local issue. It was hoped that the City Council would resist this pressure.

Pressure was being exerted on the City Council to get some shops built (whether they be temporary or otherwise) for the benefit of the rates.

April

At its full meeting on the third April, the City Council approved a general rate of 13/6 in the pound which was an increase of 2/9 over the previous year.

This provoked a public outcry and this increase was termed "the greatest in living memory". The City Treasurer said that the methods which the City Council had been able to maintain the rate for the past three years at 10/9 were through financial assistance from the Ministry of Health and by the Council liquidating all its revenue balances and by meeting the first £10,000 of the rate fund deficiency by a bank overdraft. He further continued: "The conditions attached to financial assistance have led to a serious weakening in the finances of the Council, and in the year ending 31st March 1946, the Council was left with a deficit of about £5,000. The total rate requirement is estimated at £170,031 which would be equivalent to a rate of 16/1 in the pound. The Minister has agreed to afford financial assistance of £32,500 'in recognition of the need to rehabilitate the finances of the City and to make up for the loss of rate productivity.'"
The financial commitment of the Council had become heavier due to the legislative responsibilities with regard to housing, education, health, and social welfare.

1946 (cont.)

The CCDA changed its name to Canterbury Citizens' Association (CCA) at its meeting. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the desirability of maintaining the Association and to continue on with its activities. When the Association was formed about eight months ago, its chief aim was to protest against the draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby). Some felt that the battle had been fought and won at the local election. It was agreed at the meeting that the Association still had an important part to play in the affairs of the City as a "forum for expressing citizens' desires and aspirations".

The Town Planning Committee's draft Canterbury Plan differed from the original draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby) in two main areas:

1. the parallel road to the High Street
2. the compulsory purchase of seventy-five acres.

These two elements were not included in the new draft.

June

On the 5th June, the City Council approved the amended plan for the City of Canterbury. The main differences from the original draft Canterbury Plan (Holden-Enderby) were:

1. no parallel road; the construction of an inner ring road would relieve the City centre of most traffic. Other measures of relief were the removal of the bus station to St. George's Street and the construction of a loop road to relieve the traffic at King's Bridge. If more relief was needed, Watling Street could be widened and extended.

1946 (cont.)

2. the civic avenue would be reduced by thirty-six feet to being only forty-four feet wide, thus in keeping with the traditional character of Canterbury.
3. no compulsory purchase.

The Council saw the amended plan as a definite attempt to solve the problem of traffic and rebuilding in Canterbury. The main assumption of the amended plan was that building could only occur after the roads had been planned and built. The plan would now be submitted to the Ministers of Town and Country Planning and Transport for their endorsement. The City Council invited comments from the citizens of Canterbury.

Throughout the summer, several criticisms were made of the amended plan by the local electorate:

1. there was no need for the widening of Butchery Lane
2. there was no need to widen St. George's Street by ten feet
3. a smaller roundabout at St. George's Gate would be more suitable
4. Watling Street and Burgate should be used as relief streets to the main street with one-way traffic in opposite directions
5. the new proposed road from Pound Lane to Best Lane would be too costly and would not give the desired relief to St. Peter's Street.

October

At its meeting on the 4th October, the City Council passed the resolution by thirteen votes to eleven that between eleven to twelve acres should be acquired by compulsory purchase in order to redevelop Canterbury's

1946 (cont.)

central area. The City Council felt that this did not conflict with its policy on compulsory purchase which was: "Compulsory acquisition of private property should not be entered into except for good and sufficient reasons affecting the welfare of the City."

Public amazement was expressed at this decision of the Council. Some of the CCA supporters were disillusioned and saw it as an abandonment of the local election pledges and promises. It was maintained that the Councillors had promised that they would not, under any circumstances, consider compulsory purchase. The CCA said that the Council's proposal of compulsory purchase conflicted with its aims and it did not have its support. The CCA hoped that the Council would abandon this proposal and permit the owners to retain their land freehold. At its end of the month meeting, the CCA reiterated its three main aims:

1. to preserve the architectural character and layour of the City
2. to ensure that no crushing financial burden was imposed on the ratepayers
3. to protect owners from the compulsory purchase of their property by the City Council, unless the property was needed for some immediate, specific purpose in the public interest.

The meeting was closed by stating unanimous opposition to the civic avenue and compulsory purchase.

November

In his report, the Town Clerk estimated that the rebuilding of Canterbury would roughly cost about £3 million. He said that the resources of the City Council were gravely deficient for the proposed projects. Therefore, he thought it was important that revenue producing

1946 (cont.)

projects should proceed immediately.

The City Council approved the removal of St. George's Tower because of its proposal to widen St. George's Street. Canterbury Archaeological Society wanted the Tower to be retained.

Labour attacked both the CCA and the City Council. It stated that the CCA was established to protect the interests of the landowners and it was now trying to further its own narrow, vested interests. Labour criticised the City Council in taking its time with the reconstruction of Canterbury. It maintained that it was not right that the plan for the rebuilding of Canterbury should be held up indefinitely by such a small number of people (about 12) who were affected by compulsory purchase.

Six seats were contested in the local election. The system of partial renewal (one third of the seats to be contested every year) was instituted. Labour failed to obtain a seat and this was the second year running without Labour representation on the Council. All the candidates who were elected were CCA sponsored. There was less than a 30% turnout.

1947

February

The City Council accepted a £17,439 tender for the erection of pre-fab shops in St. George's Street, Butchery Lane, and Burgate Street. Completion of the pre-fab shops should occur in May.

1947 (cont.)

The City Council has increased the rate by 3s, making the new rate 16/6 in the pound. The City Council decided on its 3 year capital expenditure programme totalling £3,043,295:

AREA	£ 1947-8	£ 1948-9	£ 1949-50
Education	112,925	134,500	219,000
Housing	717,200	497,500	485,000
Highways and Irrigation	19,920	50,250	20,000
Development	116,000	202,000	200,000
Electricity	49,000	37,000	26,000
Allotments	6,550	-	-
Finance	16,000	11,950	-
Markets and Parks	-	28,000	58,000
Public Health	10,000	6,000	-
Social Welfare	-	7,500	-
Visiting Committee	-	12,000	-
Watch Committee	600	200	200
Totals	1,048,195	986,900	1,000,200

May

The City Council approved another modification of the original Holden-Enderby plan for Canterbury by fourteen votes to six with little enthusiasm. The modifications were:

1. a relief road from St. George's Gate to Westgate.

1947 (cont.)

2. two roundabouts at St. George's Gate and at the other end of the relief road
3. reduction to a sixty foot civic avenue.

The parts which had suffered from the strongest criticism such as compulsory purchase, the parallel relief road, and roundabouts were approved. The City Council had suggested to the Minister alternative proposals: an inner ring road, the removal of the bus station to a site on St. George's Street, the widening and extension of Watling Street, a loop road from the Friars to Best Lane to relieve King's Bridge, and the compulsory purchase of eleven to twelve acres of central land. The Minister disagreed with some of the proposals. Because any proposed scheme had to be approved by the Minister, no progress could be made on the redevelopment of Canterbury. The City Council was faced with two courses of action:

1. preparation of a new plan. Opponents of this said further delay and expense would be incurred. At the Boundary Commission in June, it was felt that if Canterbury did not have a plan, it would be seen that Canterbury could not plan for itself.
2. agreement to a compromise. The Minister said he would agree to:
    a. a relief road taking two way traffic instead of a parallel road and provision of two way traffic on the main street
    b. the reduction of the civic avenue to thirty feet each way.

1947 (cont.)

The Council had thus acknowledged that any proposed scheme would involve some measure of compulsory purchase. The Minister of Town and Country Planning was proposing to introduce amendments into the Bill (which eventually became the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act) that would ensure dispossessed owners would receive proper market value of compulsorily acquired property. The 1944 Town and Country Planning Act did not permit the local authority to sell back to the original owners after replanning. The argument which swayed the City Council was the urgent need for the redevelopment of Canterbury to make Canterbury the business and shopping centre of East Kent, this it was argued, could not go ahead unless the Council approved of some plan.

A meeting of the CCA was called and these latest developments were the subject of critical discussion. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee justified the City Council's position by saying that the City Council could do nothing without the approval of the Minister and the Council had been met with stubborn refusals from the Minister. He maintained that the City Council could do nothing without the Minister's approval and the City Council was also unable to get loan sanction without the Minister's approval. The CCA said that "the Council was being driven back to the old plan". Labour criticised the Council because it was going to adopt the plan that it had been elected to oppose. Labour stressed that these councillors should retire and stand on a new mandate.

July

A meeting was held on the 22nd July between the City Council and the CCA on the implementation of the central area proposals. The Association submitted to the Council an agreement it had reached with the owners of the sites for redevelopment - ie for redevelopment to occur

1947 (cont.)

on a freehold basis. However, this agreement had been rendered void in light of the proposals adopted by the City Council. The Association was anxious as ever for redevelopment to proceed on a freehold basis in spite of the revised basis of compensation. The Association asked for another meeting with the Council when it had decided on the areas necessary for compulsory purhcase.

August

The pre-fab shops opened in the Longmarket.

September

The full City Council refused (by ten votes to nine) to accept the proposal of the Development Committee which was that steps should be taken to acquire the powers of compulsory purchase in the central area of the City.

The situation was further complicated by the fact that two Acts of Parliament had been passed dealing with the development of blitzed areas: the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act and the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act. All actions of the Council thus far had been under the powers conferred to it by the 1944 Act. The Town Clerk said that if the Council did not take advantage of its powers under the 1944 Act, it might find that it had lost them and would therefore have to operate under the 1947 Act. The Council had been informed by the Ministry that it was"likely to be many years before anything concrete could be done under the 1947 Act". There was conflict in the Council because some Councillors maintained that the Council, as a body, had refused to accept the obligation to redevelop the town, whereas other Councillors did not want compulsory purchase.

1947 (cont.)

November

Labour had contested two seats in the local election and lost again. All of the Independent candidates (6) won. They were backed by the CCA.

December

The Minister of Town and Country Planning wrote to the City Council on the redevelopment of Canterbury. He thought it was a "matter of national as well as local interest and is particularly anxious to be satisfied that the Council is dealing with the redevelopment problem on sound lines". The Minister indicated that the original Holden-Enderby plan was generally sound, but could be subject to certain modifications. He suggested further discussion with the Council and the deferment of any steps under consideration until he had the opportunity to fully discuss the matter with the Council.

The City Council met with the Minister and discussed the amended plan. The Council stated that the lastest amended draft had been approved by the majority of the Council and was supported by the Chamber of Trade and the CCA. The Council maintained that the inner ring road would give relief to the central area by keeping traffic out of the narrow streets. The Council wanted to know why development should not occur on a freehold basis. The Minister pointed out that the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act required local authorities to acquire and redevelop blitzed areas (except for small pockets of blitzed land). The Minister interpreted the permissive "may" as an obligatory "shall". The Minister felt that if replanning was to proceed in the

1947 (cont.)

best manner, then it should be done by the local authorities, not by individual owners. He agreed with the Town Clerk that redevelopment under the local authority would mean a financial loss to the City. The City Council asked what would his attitude be if the Council allowed owners to rebuild on a freehold basis. He replied that he had the powers under the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act to issue an order instructing Kent County Council to carry out the preparation of the plan for him. The Minister requested that the redevelopment plan be submitted to him as soon as possible.

1948

March

The Chamber of Trade said that its hopes concerning the redevelopment of Canterbury were being continually frustrated and that it was necessary to safeguard the interests of its members.

April

The new rate for Canterbury was 19s in the pound. It was an increase of 2/6 over the previous year. The Council said that the main reason why the rate was increased was mainly due to the 1942 blitz which destroyed the most highly rated property in the City. However, the City Council had depleted its reserves and had been faced with a steady rise in the cost of materials, salaries, and legislative responsibilitites. It appeared that local authorities were having to cope with an increase in the centralisation of bureaucratic control and authority. Of the 19s rate, the City Council controlled 10/5 which was 54% of its total expenditure. The other 46% was attributed to the legislative responsibilities under central government control.

1948 (cont.)

In 1939 the position was different because then the City Council controlled 70% of its own expenditure. The trend of the legislation since World War II had given the local authorities less and less control.

The Boundary Commission Report recommended that Canterbury should lose its county borough status because its population was 25,000. This was considered to be too small for the Council to be efficient in its job.

October

The Council's long term plan for industry was that the Northgate area of the City would be for the establishment of light industry. Of the thirty acres designated for industry throughout the City, four and half acres had been reserved for warehouses and light industry.

At a meeting of the Minister of Town and Country Planning and the City Council, the Minister stated that the main street was only to be used as a shopping precinct and that King's Bridge should only be used for single lane traffic. Therefore, in his estimation, a relief road must be provided. If Canterbury did not submit a redevelopment plan quickly, he would ask Kent County Council to do it.

After the deputation returned from the Ministry, a special meeting of the City Council was held and the new road plan, as discussed with the Minister,was passed. The plan would be carried out in five stages:

1. the rebuilding of the blitzed areas
2. commencement of the ring road from St. Peter's Place to Wincheap Grove

1948 (cont.)

3. work on the inner ring road from Westgate to St. Radigund's which would involve the widening of Pound Lane and improvements at Northgate and a roundabout to be built at Riding Gate
4. work on the relief route which would entail the widening of Hawkes Lane and a new link road from Stour Street to St. Peter's and also a new road for the bus station would be built
5. Simon Langton Boys' School would be transferred to a new site and Gravel Walk and St. George's Lane would be widened to complete the relief route system as well as including a roundabout at St. George's Gate.

The Council stated that the rebuilding of the City should begin next year.

November

Labour criticised the City Council on its new road plan. Labour advocated planning for a modern city; one should not "go back to a medieval city'. It also criticised the CCA by stating that the CCA was not interested in any plan against its own interests and would "do anything to sabotage a plan".

The Council published its new road plan and held an exhibition at the public library.

1949

February

At the City Council meeting of the 2nd February, the Chairman of the Town Planning Committee (Councillor Barrett) declared that he had an interest in numbers 14, 15, and 16 St. George's Street and a piece of land

1949 (cont.)

at the rear of those sites. In light of this declaration and of the other long-standing interests of Councillors in the central area, the Council decided that a special committee should be formed called the Central Area Planning Committee. This Committee would consist of those Councillors who had no pecuniary interest in the central area sites that had been designated for redevelopment. This Committee would report and recommend directly to the full Council.

March

The City Council reduced the rate by 3d in the pound, but stated that there would be an inevitable rise in expenditure once redevelopment got underway. In 1949, the City's rateable value was just over £230,000. The rate-borne expenditure increased due to the expansion of the social services (mainly education and health), road improvements, an increase in the cost of labour and materials, and the loss of Exchequer grants. A comparison of rate-borne expenditure for 1945-6 with corresponding expenditure for 1949-50 showed an increase of 87%.

On the 14th March, the City Council decided to accept in principle the plan for the redevelopment of Canterbury.

This plan turned out to be a modified version of the original draft plan (Holden-Enderby) for the redevelopment of Canterbury. One major change was the reduction in area for compulsory purchase from 75 acres to 11-12 acres. Another major change was the road plan that had been discussed by the City Council and the Minister of Transport.

1949 (cont.)

The Council pledged to consult the Chamber of Trade and the ratepayers by holding a public meeting before it took any steps to implement the plan through designation of the central area for compulsory purchase. It decided that if no alternative to the plan is presented within one month after the public meeting, then the Council would proceed by designating the land for compulsory purchase. The section of Canterbury that was affected was the area bounded by Burgate Street, Butchery Lane, the Parade, St. Margaret's Street, Watling Street, Upper Bridge Street, St. George's Place, Lower Chantry Lane, Ivy Lane, Lower Bridge Street, and adjacent areas. The area involved was about 11-12 acres. The Council admitted that it was "inevitably driven to the conclusion that the only solution to the problem of implementation of the plan is the designation of the blitzed area as subject to acquisition by the City Council". Under compulsory purchase, the development costs would be subject to a maximum grant of 90% on loan charges up to five years from central government. After the five year period, the loan charges would fall on the rates. This grant would not have been available to private enterprise. Compensation for compulsory purchase had been increased to 60% above 1939 values. In particular, compensation on blitzed property was based on the value of the property if it had been rebuilt.

The Council had considered the alternative of a development corporation, but had decided against it on the following grounds:

1. It would not be eligible for a grant on the development loan charges.
2. It would take a long time before any corporation could get started.
3. An enormous amount of consultation would have to occur before an agreement could be reached on a redevelopment plan.

1949 (cont.)

A public meeting was held on the 23rd March to discuss the plan for the rebuilding of Canterbury that was recently approved by the City Council. It was very well attended. The main topic was the question of compulsory purchase and the amount of ground rent that would have to be paid if the owners wanted to lease the land. It was also pointed out that "how the members of the City Council could, after three years, come back to the City and ask them to accept the principle of compulsory purchase when they were returned and others had lost their seats because they had agreed to compulsory purchase".

The City Council argued the case on the following grounds:

1. Three years ago, compensation was at 1939 values under the 1944 Town and Country Planning Act. Today, compensation was greater and fairer.
2. Under the old plan, seventy-five acres of the City was involved, now it was only 11-12 acres for immediate redevelopment.
3. Before loans could be approved, the Minister had to be satisfied that the return from the ground rents was reasonable in relation to the capital outlay. Therefore, ground rents would be based on the principle of supply and demand, ie the current market value.
4. The rateable resources of the City would be substantially increased when the schemewas completed. The rateable value of the area would be 50% higher which was the equivalent to 1/6 in the pound.
5. The Minister would not give the Council loan sanction for redevelopment unless it agreed to compulsory purchase.
6. No development charges were payable by the developers whose sites were compulsorily purchased. If the area was developed privately, the developers would have to pay development charges.

1949 (cont.)

The City Council maintained that the present scheme was the best for the ratepayers and developers. It classified the plan as modest because it only involved the area that had been blitzed.

May

The Central Area Planning Committee recommended that the approved redevelopment plan for designation of land for compulsory purchase should be implemented because the one month target date had lapsed and no alternative plan had been presented. However, the Council decided that it would meet with the Minister first in order to get more specific assurances from him regarding the payment of blitz grant and the 90% grant on loan charges up to five years.

The officers from the Ministry of Town and Country Planning said that the "area proposed was a reasonable one to submit as an area of extensive war damage, but a formal decision classifying the area as one of extensive war damage so as to attract blitz grant, could only be given by the approval of a Development Plan (under the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act) containing a provision for the designation of the area for such a purpose". The officers did note that "in order to enable the Council to proceed expeditiously, the Minister would be prepared to entertain an application for compulsory purchase orders for that part of the central area which is to be developed in the next two to three years without waiting for the approval of the Development Plan". With regard to more specific assurances on the payment of blitz grant, the officers said that the Council and the Minister should meet again to discuss this.

Out of the ten new candidates standing for election, four were Conservative, four were Independent, and two were Labour. (It was still a system of partial renewal,

1949 (cont.)

but four seats were vacant due to either ill health or retirement.) This was the first appearance of the Conservatives standing for election to the local council. Some of the Independents had switched to the Conservative party.

July

At its meeting on the 27th July, the City Council unanimously agreed to the compulsory purchase of central area land. It would now apply to the Minister of Town and Country Planning for confirmation. The City Council held an exhibition at the public library which explained the compulsory purchase area.

September

The City Council was informed that the Minister of Town and Country Planning had agreed to Canterbury City Council "taking a short cut" in its plan for redevelopment of the central area - compulsory purchase would proceed (pending the outcome of the public inquiry) in advance of the preparation and approval of the Development Plan. Under the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, local authorities had five years in which to prepare and submit their Development Plan. If this procedure was applied to Canterbury City Council, the first step would be to prepare a Development Plan which would designate the particular areas of the City that were classified as extensivly war damaged. Once the Development Plan had been approved, the Council would then submit to the Minister the details of the areas to be compulsorily purchased. However, in this particular case, the Minister agreed that Canterbury City Council could submit its compulsory purchase order prior to the submission of its Development Plan. The intended effect was to expedite the rebuilding of the St. George's area.

1949 (cont.)

November

The Development Plan was nearing the completion of its survey stage.

December

A public inquiry was held on the 14th December on the compulsory purchase of Canterbury's central area land. Nine of the thirteen objections had been withdrawn at the last moment. (Some of the objectors who withdrew were: Kent Brewers' Union, National Provincial Bank, Barclays Bank, W. H. Smith and Sons, and F.Woolworth and Co.) The four objectors who remained were: Burton Ltd., Canterbury Club, Sun Insurance Office Ltd., and Society of Friends. They all wanted to retain freehold interest in their property.

The City Council's case for compulsory purchase was based on the grounds that it would be able to redevelop the central area quicker and better than anyone else. The Council would be able to obtain £200,000 worth of building licences every year for five years, totalling £1 million worth of investment. It further maintained that no satisfactory proposals had been prepared by the freehold land owners for redevelopment. The Council had considered that it was not possible to deal with isolated properties. The Council stressed that the small number of objections indicated the agreement or acquiesence with the majority of the Council's proposals.

1950

January

A row was beginning to brew over the removal of the St. George's Tower. It was delaying the rebuilding of Canterbury. The City Council wanted to demolish it for

1950 (cont.)

its street widening scheme. The Ancient Monuments Board declared that the Tower was worthy of preservation. The Minister of Works would not agree to the Tower's demolition. The decision of the Minister of Town and Country Planning on the compulsory purchase order was delayed because the City Council had not given an undertaking to the Ministry of Works to preserve the Tower.

February

The City Council met with a deputation from the Ancient Monuments Department from the Ministry of Town and Country Planning. The Ministry officials were emphatic that the Tower should be preserved. The City Council decided to wait until after the general election, when an approach could be made to a possible new Minister of Town and Country Planning.

March

The City Council increased the rates for the coming financial year (1950-1) to 20/- in the pound. The main reasons for the increase were:

1. the growth in expenditure of the welfare services (education, health, care of the old and sick, and care of children) as a consequence of policies embodied in the Acts of Parliament
2. Canterbury, as a county borough, did not qualify for the new equalisation grant as its rateable value per head of the weighted population was slightly above the average for the country. Its rateable value per head of population was 7s 10d.

1950 (cont.)

A plan was drawn up by the Dean and Chapter for the redevelopment of the blitzed Burgate properties that had previously housed shops and flats. The plan would replace these shops and flats. It was hoped that they would be completed by the spring of 1951. This was the first major piece of permanent reconstruction to be carried out in Canterbury.

May

At the Council meeting on the third of May, the Mayor said that he had received an intimation from a very high level that the Minister would probably approve the Council's scheme for compulsory purchase for central Canterbury. The Council was informed that the St. George's Tower had been definitely scheduled as an Ancient Monument. It would have to be maintained by the ratepayers although the Ministry of Works would make the initial outlay to restore it to a reasonable condition. The financial implications of the compulsory purchase scheme had been drawn up by the City Treasurer, but they were not available publicly. One reference was made to the financial aspect of compulsory purchase at the Council meeting. The cost of the acquisition of the land was estimated at £369,000.

The Minister of Town and Country Planning confirmed the compulsory purchase order for the redevelopment of Canterbury. The order applied to an area of between 11 to 12 acres which roughly covered both sides of St. George's Street. It also included St. George's Tower which was being preserved.

At the local election, little enthusiasm had been generated and there was a low turnout. Labour was the only party to contest a seat and it lost.

1950 (cont.)

June

The traders in Canterbury expressed their concern over the level of ground rents that would be charged for the sites that were being compulsory purchased. Rumour had it that rents for moderate frontage would be in the region of £1,000 p.a. On top of that, one would have to add the cost of erecting a building which would cost about £20,000. If this amount was borrowed at 5%, another £1,000 p.a. would be added plus rates. It appeared that the local traders would be faced with an annual expenditure between £2,000 to £3,000 p.a. For most local traders, this sum was too high; they could not afford it.

August

Canterbury City Council began holding preliminary negotiations with interested firms such as National Providence Bank, Barclays Bank, and Dolcis. The purpose of the negotiations was to see which firms were interested in the redevelopment of Canterbury and would be ready to build soon.

1951

March

The City Council's Development Plan (under the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act) included the provision for an industrial estate of 54.75 acres to the north of Canterbury. The report on industry and employment stated that a case could be made for increasing the amount of industry to the borough in order "to provide a reasonably balanced community". The report did not want Canterbury to become an industrial town as this was thought to conflict with its medieval character. The report noted that the

1951 (cont.)

timber yard and the mill in Blackfriars would be moved to the industrial estate so the Blackfriars area could be developed for a residential use. The report stated that the tannery and the gas works were badly sited but it did not appear possible, under the present circumstances, to move them.

The City Council agreed to increase the rate by 6d to 20s/6d in the pound for the financial year 1951-2.

May

The results of the local election were that four Conservative, 1 Independent, and 1 Labour candidate were elected. Labour did try to make a bid to weaken the Conservative - Independent control, but failed.

June

The City Council said that five developers were ready to erect 15 shops. It hoped that the first shop would be trading by Christmas. The Council was optimistic that the increase in rateable value would help to keep the rates "at a reasonable level".

August

At a special meeting of the 14th August, the City Council approved a scheme for new buildings on St. George's Street (the Ravenseft colonnade and other buildings with respect to their architectural treatment).

October

There was a stormy debate in the City Council when the Councillors were asked to reconsider their decision of August 14 on the basis that the approval was rushed and

1951 (cont.)

and nine members were absent at the time. Some of the Councillors did not like the colonnade treatment, whereas other Councillors said that if the scheme was to be referred back, then the redevelopment of Canterbury would be further delayed thus having a bad effect on trade and the amount of revenue to the City. The Council agreed that the plan for the Ravenseft block and three other "specified exceptions" would be referred back. The City Architect said that if the building was held up, then it would cost the Council up to £158,000 worth of building licences that year.

November

The Minister announced that Canterbury's allocation of £210,000 worth of building licences would lapse if they were not taken up before the end of the year. The Council approved the Ravenseft colonnade scheme after a lively debate. The debate focused on the physical details of the structure.

A public meeting was held by the Council on the 19th November about Canterbury's Development Plan (up to 1970) which had been submitted to the Minister. The City Council stated that there was nothing new in the plan. The main points were as follows:

1. the aim of the City Council was to retain the old medieval character of Canterbury
2. the rebuilding of the blitzed, central area of Canterbury
3. the provision of an inner ring road
4. the provision of a relief road
5. industrial development to occur outside the City walls.

1951 (cont.)

The City Treasurer stated that roughly £10½ million worth of works would be carried out over twenty years under the auspices of the City Council. Of that amount, £5 million would be spent on housing, education, and other services that would be implemented through a partnership with central government; and the remaining £5½million would be work carried out by private enterprise in co-operation with the City Council on a 50/50 basis. The City Treasurer continued by saying once the central area development had been completed, the City Council would accure an increase in rateable resources amounting to a 3 -4s on the rate.

The debate mainly centred on why the public meeting had been called in the first place when the plan had already been passed by the City Council and submitted to the Minister. It was seen to be a fait accompli by some of the local electorate. The plan was crticised on financial grounds because the cost of redevelopment was going to be borne by the ratepayers. The Ravenseft colonnade was criticised because it detracted from the medieval character of the City. The buildings were deemed to "be a lasting horror".

A public meeting was held by the CCA on the 23rd November. The meeting criticised the City Council and the Development Plan on several aspects:

1. More land would be subject to compulsory purchase, thus making the total number of acres thirty-three.
2. The cost would be borne by the ratepayers.
3. The medieval character of Canterbury would be destroyed.
4. The lack of information from the Council was criticised. It was felt that a public meeting should have been called months ago before the Plan had been sent to the Minister.

1951 (cont.)

The meeting agreed to write to the Minister asking him for a public inquiry to be held on Canterbury's Development Plan.

1952

February

On the 13th February, the public inquiry on the Canterbury Development Plan started. The Plan covered approximately twenty years and £10½ million in capital expenditure. The two main subjects which were discussed were:

1. redevelopment of the war damaged central area
2. the problem of traffic congestion.

Two hundred and thirty-two objections were lodged.

The City Council's case was based on the following points:

1. Many years had been spent in the preparation of this Plan.
2. One of the Plan's "cardinal features is to preserve everything that is worthy of preservation".
3. The Council wanted Canterbury to be the shopping centre of East Kent.
4. The cost of redevelopment would not fall on the ratepayers.
5. Of the thirty-three and one third acres of land to be designated for comprehensive redevelopment, the Council already had the power to acquire eleven acres.

The QCs for Lyons, Marks and Spencer, Hepworths, Randalls, and Burtons argued against compulsory purchase. They tried to dispute the need for compulsory purchase on the ground that the companies were going to redevelop their own sites.

1952 (cont.)

The remainder of the opposition was mostly CCA sponsored. (The group was then eight hundred strong.) The CCA maintained that the scheme "would vandalise Canterbury" and the City Council "was wrecking the work of centuries". The group said that it was formed for the purpose of protecting the City and citizens in relation to redevelopment and planning. The CCA felt that the scheme was too ambitious and costly and the burden for redevelopment would fall on the ratepayers. The groups pointed out that the public had not received any substantial information on the cost of redevelopment. It stressed the need to preserve the character of Canterbury which consisted of the small, narrow lanes, historic buildings, and the pedestrianisation of streets.

May

An appeal fund for the preservation of the clock on St. George's Tower was started.

Seven seats were contested at the local election. The Independents won six, and Labour won one.

June

Woolworths on St. George's Street was opened on 26th June. It was the first commercial building on Council owned, central land to be completed since the blitz.

September

The first meeting of the Canterbury Preservation Society was held. This group had no connection with the CCA. The main objects of the Society were:

1952 (cont.)

"1. to ensure the preservation of features of historical and architectural value
2. to compile and preserve records and photographs of such buildings and features
3. to take all possible steps to see that future development in the City harmonises and blends with its existing character
4. by means of lectures, exhibitions, discussions, and films to interest as large a circle as possible in the antiquity and history of Canterbury
5. to aim at safeguarding its character and charm."

1953

April

Whitehall advocated the reduction of county boroughs that have a population of less than 75,000. Canterbury's population was 27,779 and this was seen as a direct threat to Canterbury's county borough status. The City Council maintained that it "will fight the scheme tooth and nail".

The Ravenseft colonnade and Dolcis were completed.

May

Only one seat was contested in the local election for Canterbury. The turnout was low - less than 30% and there was no change in the political composition of the City Council.

July

In his report, the City Treasurer stated that public expenditure in Canterbury had increased at roughly twice the rate of increase in its rateable value. The City

1953 (cont.)

Treasurer said that the redevelopment of the central area and other works would increase the rateable resources of the City. He continued: "but on present trends, it is difficult to forsee the time when expenditure and rateable resources will be brought into equilibrium. Last year, with a rate of 20s/6d in the pound, it was necessary to take £5,000 out of the balances. The increasing rate burden is a matter of widespread concern throughout the country. A large part of the expenditure is sponsored by Government in post-war legislation, and unless local authorities can obtain new sources of revenue, there appears to be no immediate prospect of stabilising the rates".

August

The problem of traffic congestion in Canterbury came into the public eye again. The sensitive areas were: the level crossing at St. Dunstans, the main street and King's Bridge. The volume of traffic increased yearly.

Sales of over £5 million were made annually in Canterbury by 392 retail establishments.

September

Ten new buildings were going up in St. George's Street. It appeared that the amount of shoppers was increasing.

October

On the 16th October, the Minister approved Canterbury's Development Plan which was a statutory requirement under the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act. The Plan was subject to revision every five years. The Minister

1953 (cont.)

agreed to all the road proposals - inner ring road, radial road links, and the relief road parallel to the main street. The modifications made by the Minister were of minor significance. They were:

1. extension of the City boundaries to include the London Road Estate
2. reduction of the area of comprehensive redevelopment from 33 and 1/3 acres to about 31 acres.

The basis for the Minister's modification on comprehensive redevelopment was that the Minister was only able to approve land that could be redeveloped within the twenty year time span.

1954

January

Alderman Mrs. Hews (Mayor of Canterbury from 1947-9) was concerned about the apathy and lack of interest being shown in local government affairs as evidenced by a less than 30% turnout at local elections. Her remedy was for a strong ratepayers' association in every locality.

June

The City Council was determined to subvert the threat to its county borough status. (Canterbury had been a self-governing unit since 1234.) The City Council based its argument on historical data and as Canterbury being the economic centre for East Kent.

1954 (cont.)

July

The City Treasurer reported that Canterbury gained more than twice its rateable value it had lost in the 1942 blitz - £69,500 gained to £29,000 lost. All the rebuilding was expected to be completed in another five years.

November

The shops around St. George's Tower were constructed.

December

New shops were opening in Canterbury. The City Council wanted Canterbury to recover the position it had before the war as a shopping centre.

1955

March

The City Council asked the Ministry of Transport to allocate about £40,000 for major road improvements in its 1955-6 programme. The roads had already been approved by the Minister in the Development Plan. The £40,000 would mostly have been spent on road widenings and a roundabout at Riding Gate. The Council also requested that work start on the inner ring road in the 1956-7 road programme. Work was estimated to cost £319,000.

The City Council rate remained unchanged for the third successive year at 21s/6d in the pound. The City's loan debt had increased to more than £3 million which was equivalent to £104 per head of population as compared with the average of all county boroughs of £84 per head of population.

1955 (cont.)

April

There was criticism of the new architecture on the blitzed sites. The buildings were seen to be "slabs of plate glass, solid blocks of concrete". It was also maintained that the City "was being sacrificed to motorists".

The Chamber of Trade "hoped that close contact with the Council would continue". In the past, "the opinions and differences of the traders became known to the City Council who shaped its policy accordingly." The Chamber of Trade was optimistic about Canterbury's future.

May

St. George's Tower was fully restored.

At the local election, all candidates were returned because there was no opposition. There were fifteen Conservatives, nine Independents, and no Labour.

June

The Saracen's Head was threatened to be demolished due to the ring road plans that were designed to relieve traffic congestion in the centre of the City. A campaign to have it saved began.

In the rebuilt area, eighteen shops, offices, and a newspaper office were now completed. Work was now in progress on another eighteen shops, two banks, a new bus station, and a church. Schemes had been agreed for another twenty shops, a department store, insurance offices, and a public house. Work would be started on these projects within the next few months. Since World War II, £5 million worth of building had been completed or was in progress.

1955 (cont.)

The traffic within central Canterbury continued to increase and cause congestion.

October

The City Council discussed Canterbury's "acute traffic problem" and asked the Minister of Transport for immediate construction of either the inner ring road or the parallel relief road. The Council maintained that these road improvements were designed to relieve traffic within central Canterbury and were part of the Development Plan which did receive Government approval.

1956

May

Canterbury's new £80,000 bus station was opened. The Council saw the relocation of the bus station as part of the solution to relieving traffic congestion in central Canterbury.

The price of land in Canterbury was described as "exhorbitant" and "fantastic". Land in Canterbury was in great demand.

June

Canterbury's "ever topical talking point", traffic congestion in central Canterbury, was discussed by both the traders and residents. It appeared that the traders were disturbed at the increasing congestion of traffic that had resulted from Canterbury's resurgence as a shopping centre. The Chamber of Trade stated: "We do not want to see this develop to a point where the question of where to park and how long to park, almost force a decision not to stop here at all." The traders wanted to cater for the motorists. Some of the residents argued for pedestrianisation.

1957

January

The Westgate traders wanted the old bus station in St. Peter's Place to be re-opened for north-bound buses. They complained that the relocation of the bus station atthe top of the town helped business activity to be concentrated in the newly built area of St. George's Street. They considered it to be unfair that one end of the town should benefit from the location of the bus station and not the other.

Another threat was made to Canterbury's county borough status. The Council wanted to retain its self-governing rights on the ground that it was an efficient county borough.

March

The Chaucer Hotel opened. Over £100,000 had been spent on modernising the building.

May

The new shops in St. George's Street were creating the busiest trading area in the City's history. Most of the local family businesses had disappeared. Mayor Bean answered the critics of the design and architecture of the new shops by saying "much has been said about the type of building which has been erected, but at the same time, one must agree that the shops are providing a very good service to the customers".

Canterbury had more car parking spaces for its size than any other town in East Kent.

1957 (cont.)

November

The traffic problem in Canterbury was growing, and the City Council saw its road schemes (improvements to the radial road system, the inner ring road, and the parallel relief road) as a matter of urgency. It had been several years since the Minister approved them. It appeared that public funds had not been available. The Council decided that it would make another approach to the Minister for grants and loans for the road schemes.

1958

January

Requests were being made to the Minister of Works and to the Minister of Housing and Local Government to save the famous 600 year old Fleur-de-Lis Hotel. It had been empty for several years and was in the hands of a firm of London developers who wanted to build a department store on the site. The City Council approved the demolition scheme. Some of the residents of Canterbury and national bodies tried to save the hotel.

February

The plan for Longmarket was approved by the City Council. It included a four storey block.

March

Canterbury City Council decided to increase the expenditure on roads from £21,000 to £36,000. The rate income showed a steady increase due to the building of new shops, offices, and houses. The Council rate remained at 16s/4d for the second successive year.

1958 (cont.)

April

The Fleur-de-Lis Hotel was demolished. The attempts at saving it had failed.

May

The main topic of discussion within the Chamber of Trade was the growing traffic problem in Canterbury. It suggested a combined committee of the Chamber of Tade and the City Council to deal with the traffic problem in the centre of the City. The Chamber of Trade thought that "weekend shoppers were being put off because of the congestion and difficulty of knowing where to park their cars". In its eyes, the City was now largely rebuilt, but the building of new roads that were so urgently needed had hardly begun. For the traders, the increase in the volume of traffic was considered to be the "life-blood of trade".

Canterbury still had more car parking spaces per head of population than any other town in East Kent.

1959

February

Opponents of the Longmarket plan said that the view of the Cathedral would be spoiled by the four storey block of offices which would replace the pre-fabricated shops.

The City Council decided to hold a special meeting to reconsider the proposal for the redevelopment of Longmarket although the scheme had been approved in principle about nine months ago and the Fine Arts Commission had given

1959 (cont.)

its approval. Some Councillors felt that the view of the Cathedral would be improved if the four storey block was not included. The Council decided to accept the original scheme by a vote of nine to five.

March

The controversy over the four storey block - "the upended matchbox" - at Longmarket continued.

May

There was no change in the local election. The Council was still Conservative controlled with a few Independents and no Labour Councillors.

October

The old Simon Langton Boys' School was demolished and the site was used temporarily as a car park. The Council hoped that it would be made available for redevelopment as soon as possible.

The City Council discussed Canterbury's traffic problem. The Council felt that as more cars came into Canterbury, Canterbury will have to "face up to more desparate measures such as a multi-storey car park".

1960

March

The controversial Longmarket shops were constructed.

1960 (cont.)

The Canterbury Preservation Society called a special meeting about Canterbury's moat. The moat was a point of controversy at the moment because half of its width over an 800 yard section would be used for the inner ring road.

The Canterbury Preservation Society opposed the Council's proposals to demolish several listed buildings in St. Dunstans' Street and Broad Street. The Society termed this action of the Council as "vandalism" and maintained that prospective purchasers should be given help by the local authority in the form of grants. The City Council said that the houses should be demolished because they were substandard and in disrepair.

May

Labour contested every seat at the local election but to no avail. Out of the six available seats, the Conservatives were elected to five and the Independents were elected to one.

After two years of negotiation, the City Council approved a seven storey department store to be built across from the bus station (Ricemans).

The traders maintained that trade would decrease unless adequate car parking spaces were provided.

July

Lenleys opened in the Buttermarket and its building was classified as one of the finest examples of early 15th century architecture.

1960 (cont.)

November

A public meeting was arranged by the Chamber of Trade and the Canterbury Society (formerly the Canterbury Preservation Society) urging the consideration of the Norwich plan (which involved a facelift and spring cleaning) for St. Peter's Street. The City Council thought it was a good idea, but it would have to determine whether or not the Norwich scheme was applicable to Canterbury.

December

The Canterbury Society decided to form a committee to investigate the rehabilitation of St.Peter's Street along the lines of the Civic Trust scheme for Magdalen Street, Norwich. A representative from the Chamber of Trade was appointed to the Committee.

Concern was being expressed over Turnagain Lane which was one of the oldest medieval areas of Canterbury. This Lane had been allowed to deteriorate and this was attributed to a "disadvantage of progress". Twenty years ago, it had four permanent residents, and now in 1960 it only had one.

1961

March

The Civic Trust prepared a scheme for the reconditioning of St. Peter's Street. The Chamber of Trade was a bit concerned because it had not received any comments from the City Council on this.

1961 (cont.)

April

In response to critics, the City Council said that it was not its fault that the new shopping area was composed of multiples. The influx of the multiples was an unintended result of the redevelopment of Canterbury via compulsory purchase.

May

A joint committee of Councillors, Chamber of Trade members, and Canterbury Society members was formed to promote the Civic Trust scheme for St. Peter's Street.

The Council remained Conservative controlled after the local election. Seven Conservative candidates were elected for the seven contested seats.

June

Another threat to Canterbury's county borough status was made and the City Council was still determined to protest against it.

The Council maintained that the number of car parking spaces was becoming inadequate and that provision must be made for 4,000 cars which might entail the building of a multi-storey car park.

August

At a special meeting of the City Council, the Council decided to accept the £710,000 tender for the construction of Canterbury's A2 diversion and the inner ring road. The City Council accepted the lowest tender which was from Cementation Co. Ltd. It was now subject to Ministerial approval. The City Council was the highway authority for

1961 (cont.)

Canterbury and the Council felt that the construction of these roads was essential to solving the internal traffic problem of Canterbury. The City Treasurer estimated that the annual maintenance costs and loan charges (taking into account an 85% grant from the Ministry of Transport) would roughly come to a five penny rate in the pound.

The Chamber of Trade issued the following statement on the facelift for St. Peter's Street:

> "Many of the frontages in St. Peter's Street are due for redecoration and if the property holders concerned will agree to redecorate their individual premises as part of the comprehensive plan, the street can be transformed into a more attractive shopping centre. The cost of redecoration will fall on the property holders concerned, but by dealing with the property on a group basis, costs will be kept down."

October

A start was being made on the ring road with the demolition of houses in Wincheap Grove, so approval had been secured from the Minister of Transport.

November

The City Council decided that:

1. parking facilities, free of charge in the central area for a limited waiting period for shoppers, could be controlled by mechanical means
2. car parking charges would be graded according to the period of waiting in one or more of the large car parks in the central area

1961 (cont.)

3. large free car parks should be provided on the periphery of the central area.

At present, there were 1350 car parking spaces in the City and the City Council wanted provision for another 4,000.

1962

March

The City Council's rate went up by 1s/3d to 18s/9d. The increase was blamed on the rising costs which affected the Council's activities in every area. The product of a penny rate had not risen commensurately.

April

A start was being made on the A2 diversion for Canterbury. It was expected to take two years to complete. The A2 diversion and the ring road were estimated to cost £580,000 excluding the price of land. The price of the land was estimated to cost £130,000.

July

The City Council approved the outline design for the "long delayed" civic centre on the Watling Street car park site. It then had to go to the Royal Fine Arts Commission for its approval and then to the Minister of Local Government and Housing for his approval.

October

W H Smiths opened in St. George's Street.

1962 (cont.)

November

Representations were being made to the Minister of Housing and Local Government to save the 400 year old "Beehive" building in Dover Street.

1963

January

The revaluation of property in Canterbury increased the rateable value by two and half times.

May

After the local election, the City Council was still Conservative controlled. Of the six seats contested, five Conservatives and one Independent were elected.

A questionnaire was issued by the City Architect (Mr. J. Berbiers) to householders on their opinion concerning the future planning of the City. The questionnaire dealt with recreation, entertainment, and shop facilities. The survey would form the basis for the review of the Development Plan.

June

The A2 diversion (which was a dual carriageway) was partly opened.

The Council expected work on the nine storey civic centre to start in less than five years.

1963 (cont.)

July

The City Architect's impressions of Canterbury in the future were - a civic centre on Watling Street, Whitefriars development for commercial and recreation purposes, public car parking of over 700 spaces, and the segregation of pedestrians by an elevated deck and bridge across Gravel Walk.

1964

February

The City Council and Property Investments Consolidation Ltd. discussed plans for a £1 and 1/4 million redevelopment scheme on a 4½ acre site at Whitefriars. Provision was being made for a car park of 750 spaces, a filling station, showrooms, an entertainment centre, a roof top restaurant, offices, and a pedestrian bridge to link the new shopping centre with the bus station.

May

Labour contested all the Council vacancies in the local election and gained two seats from the Conservatives. The Conservatives still had the majority on the City Council.

June

The Canterbury Society urged the City Council to preserve the medieval street plan of the Blackfriars area (bounded by the Borough, Palace Street, Orange Street, Best Lane, King's Bridge, The Friars, and St. Radigund's Street).

1964 (cont.)

The Society asked the city Council for it to be consulted at the earliest possible stage of planning for this area. The Society maintained that the nearness of this area to the River and the Cathedral would make it a good residential area in the centre of the City. The Society felt that major traffic flows should be kept out of the area which should only cater for local traffic. Part of the area had been bombed in the war and the Council considered some of the houses to be of substandard quality.

September

The Canterbury Society placed commemorative plaques on former sites of historic buildings in Canterbury, eg the site of the Fleur-de-Lis Hotel.

October

The City Entertainments and Publicity Officer's Report on Tourism stated that the number of tourists had greatly increased over the past few years which meant prosperity to Canterbury. The Report said that the main benficiaries of this influx of tourists were the shops, hotels, and restaurants.

November

The annual retail turnover for Canterbury in 1951 was £5,005,000. By 1961, the figure had increased by 119%. In comparison with other towns in East Kent, Canterbury had the largest increase. For the same period, Ashford's retail turnover increased by 83%, Dover by 69%, Hythe by 62%, and Folkestone by 48%.

1964 (cont.)

The Canterbury Society made a plea for the preservation of ancient Canterbury. The Society did not see itself as constantly waging war with the City Council or as an "organisation of reactionary vigilantes". The Society had 265 members. The Society saw its proposals to preserve ancient Canterbury as being constructive and not detrimental.

December

A public inquiry was held with respect to a building preservation order by the Council on five cottages in North Lane. East Kent Road Car Co. wanted to demolish these cottages because it was expanding its works at the back of these properties. The City Council, the Canterbury Society, and other bodies made representations to save these cottages.

1965

January

Trade increased for Canterbury and traffic congestion still remained a problem.

February

The Norman Castle was allocated a £8,000 grant from central government to strengthen its walls.

March

The City Council's rate rose by 9d to 9s/10d in the pound. Capital expenditure for 1965-6 would exceed over £1 million, of which £200,000 would be allocated towards a multi-storey car park for 733 cars. The other capital

1965 (cont.)

projects were - a technical college, a swimming pool, a multi-storey car park, and the Wincheap industrial estate.

May

The new City Council was still Conservative controlled, although Labour had won two seats. The Conservatives had won six seats. Eight seats in total were contested.

October

The latest review of the Canterbury Development Plan was submitted to the Minister of Housing and Local Government. This was the second five year review of the Development Plan. The review expected the population to increase by 20,000 over the next sixteen years. The major highway proposals remained unaltered, but provision was made for four multi-storey car parks at "principle points of entry into the central area". The review saw the Whitefriars development as the most important development in the immediate future. It stated that negotiations were "well advanced" between the Council and a development company and it was hoped that work would be started next year. It was not expected that there would be any large scale expansion of industry during the review period, but an area around Wincheap was allocated for light industry and warehousing.

The Canterbury Society was still trying to preserve the medieval setting in Blackfriars and King Street from demolition. The City Council had made a compulsory purchase order on 24 and 25 Blackfriars, 10,11, and 12 King Street, and 19, 20, and 21 Mill Lane in 1963.

1965 (cont.)

Labour's three seats on the City Council were reduced to two when they lost the by-election in the Westgate ward.

December

The City Architect prepared a redevelopment plan for the Blackfriars area which catered for a residential use of the area. Private plans had also been prepared in a similar vein.

The City Council was heavily committed to its capital investment programme.

1966

January

Criticism was made of the City Council's demolition of properties in the 1950's and 1960's. The City Council was accused of "finishing off what Hitler started in the 1940's". Examples of the City Council's actions were the houses in Mill Lane and Blackfriars that were threatened with demolition, also those in St. Radigund's Street that were threatened with demolition because of the road proposals.

February

The Canterbury Society presented its plan for the River Stour which took into account the amenity, recreational, and conservationist points of view. The Study was presented to the City Council in the hope that positive action would result.

1966 (cont.)

March

The Canterbury Society replied to its critics (some of them were Councillors) who have called the Society "a collection of cranks and busybodies".

May

At the local election, six seats were contested. The Conservatives were elected to five of the seats and a Liberal candidate was elected to one.

June

The Canterbury Society discussed whether or not the multiple firms that have taken over the shopping centre of Canterbury cared about anything except increasing their profits every year. It was pointed out that not one multiple supported the Canterbury Society. One solution to making Canterbury alive again after 6 p.m. was the formation of different societies similar to the Blackfriars Association. The Canterbury Society was against the demolition of Saracen's Head for the ring road. The Society was also against the parallel relief road in the centre of the City. The Society maintained that too much of Canterbury had already been destroyed.

July

A three day public inquiry was held on the alterations and additions to the Canterbury Development Plan. The Canterbury Society made the following objections:

1. It objected to the parallel relief road on the ground that it would incur the demolition of well preserved buildings in Hawkes Lane.

1966 (cont.)

2. It objected to the next stage of the ring road because it would be located too close to the City walls and it would cause congestion in Old Dover Road.
3. It wanted the removal of the hand operated railway level crossing gates at St. Dunstans and St. Stephens.

Other objectors included various societies concerned with the preservation of listed buildings.

September

A public inquiry was held on the Council's plans to to demolish homes in Notley Street, Alma Street, Artillery Street, and Artillery Gardens. The City Council wanted to demolish these houses because they were classified as being unfit and substandard. The City Council felt that room was needed for residential development. Eighty occupants made objections and maintained that their homes could be satisfactorily improved if grants were made available for that purpose.

October

The Canterbury Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, and the Ancient Monuments Society were trying to save a medieval building at Wincheap that was threatened with demolition due to the construction of the ring road.(It was the Man of Kent public house.) Saracen's Head, a public house on Lower Bridge Street had been planned for demolition because it was in the path of the projected ring road.

1966 (cont.)

November

The City Council gave evidence to the Royal Commission on Local Government in favour of its retention of county borough status. If this could not be retained the City Council presented another alternative: a local government unit with an area encompassing a population of 135,000 by 1981 of which Canterbury would be the centre for shopping, administration, and education.

1967

February

The City Council decided to build the multi-storey car park as part of the Whitefriars redevelopment scheme as soon as it received Ministerial approval to borrow the money - £400,000. The multi-storey car park would have the capacity for 600 - 700 cars and would be built on a Council owned surface car park. The City Council said it had worked out the traffic flow for the multi-storey car park.

A public inquiry was held on the next section of the ring road from Wincheap Green to St. George's Place. The ring road would be a dual carriageway and would involve partial filling of the moat. Two roundabouts were planned at Wincheap Green and Riding Gate. Properties in Wincheap Green, Lower Bridge Street, St. George's Gate, and St. George's Place were to be demolished. It would cost nearly £600,000. There was only one objection and that was with respect to access.

The Local Government Act (that would take effect from the first of April) made several changes in the central government grant aid system to local authorities.

1967 (cont.)

The general grant, the rate deficiency grant, the school milk and meals grant, the major improvements to highways grant, and the maintenance and minor improvement grants would disappear and be replaced by the Rate Support Grant. The three elements to the Rate Support Grant were:

1. resource element - this would replace the Rate Deficiency Grant, but would be a predetermined sum.
2. domestic element - there would be a reduction of the rate in the pound for domestic purposes.
3. need element - this would be similar to a general grant, but it would be larger.

The resources element would be payable to all local rating authorities that would qualify for the grant - ie if their rateable value per head of population was below the specified level. The domestic element would be payable to the rating authority. The needs element would be payable to the county authorities and the county boroughs.

March

The Minister of Housing and Local Government approved a compulsory purchase order for 76 houses on Notley Street, Alma Street, Artillery Street, and Artillery Gardens. Fifty-one of the properties related to slum clearance and the remainder would give additional land for comprehensive scheme of redevelopment for City Council housing. The Minister agreed with the Inspector that the best method of dealing with the condition of the houses in that area was to demolish them. The Minister thought that the Council was justified in undertaking the clearance for comprehensive redevelopment.

1967 (cont.)

The Chamber of Trade said that the present commercial position of Canterbury was of vital importance to it. It thought that car parks had been a major factor in Canterbury's development as a leading shopping centre. The Chamber of Trade maintained: "We now have magnificent stores and attractive shops, but these businesses need customers and many of us have grave fears that if vehicle congestion goes very much further and is perhaps unnecessary aggravated, then many of customers who come in by road and who have hitherto spent their money here and enjoyed our amenities, will be lured away to other places or will not venture from their own domain."

The City Council said that it had been delayed on starting the multi-storey car park by the national economic position.

The Council still remained Conservative controlled after the local election. Seven seats were contested and the Conservatives won all of them.

The students at the technical college carried out a survey on Canterbury as a shopping centre. They found that the majority of the people interviewed expressed satisfaction with the range of shops and their merchandise. The main criticism was the high cost and infrequency of car parks that were easy to find and in good condition. The majority of the people realised that there were problems in simultaneously retaining historic Canterbury and the redevelopment of Canterbury as an adequate shopping centre. The students thought there were two possible courses of action in trying to solve the transportation problem:

1967 (cont.)

1. either the main shopping centre should be developed as a pedestrianised precinct with multi-storey car parks provided near the ring road and cheap or free public transport to bring people in from these peripheral car parks to the bus stations; or
2. to cater for the car with centrally situated multi-storey car parks, even if "they dwarfed the Cathedral" and the introduction of a one-way system.

June

The Canterbury Society expressed concern over Stage three of the ring road and the effect it would have on Broad Street, Northgate, and Blackfriars. It asked the City Council for full consultation before a final decision was made on the actual route. The Society also asked the Council if the third stage was really necessary because it felt that no definite answer could be found in the facts. It suggested that a study should be made of present and future traffic demands. In the absence of this, it felt that the ring road was an out-moded concept.

August

The City Council said that its main concern with respect to the provision of car parks was to provide a public service and not to make a profit from them.

September

The Chamber of Trade and the City Council met to discuss car parking. It appeared that the City Council had sympathy for the points that the Chamber of Trade

1967 (cont.)

raised, but financial restrictions imposed certain constraints on the Council in its attempts to relieve the situation. The Council decided that the Chamber of Trade should be provided with copies of the Council's minutes and the Councillors (some of whom were also members of the Chamber of Trade) would keep the Chamber of Trade fully informed.

October

The City Council's plans for Canterbury were criticised as a "blatent example of national failure to deal with this country's historic towns". The plans were seen as "the destruction and complete subservience of the town to the motor car" and "it is a nasty shock to find that the plans are the result of deliberate policy by the Council". It was felt that the Council's policy was directed towards the maintenance of Canterbury as a shopping centre with development within its medieval core having no regard to environmental considerations.

The Council said that the entire blame should not be put on the City Council. The Council maintained that it could not implement some of its proposals because of Ministerial restrictions on spending. The Council stated that it would like the support of national bodies.

1968

January

The Ministry of Transport approved the City Council's proposals for the ring road from Wincheap Green to Burgate. It would be a dual carriageway that would encircle the City walls for 3/4 of a mile. The Minister approved a grant of £200,094 to the City Council towards the total cost of £266,792 for the works. The grant for

1968 (cont.)

the purchase of land would be made later. The scheme would take two years to complete.

After a meeting with the Blackfriars Association, the Canterbury Society, and the City Council, the City Council decided to keep the Blackfriars' residents informed about future development plans for the area. The Council refused a development for fifteen houses and garages in the area because it would have resulted in an over-intensive use of the site. The Blackfriars Association was skeptical of the Council's promise to keep them informed. It said: "They seem to have ignored the promise. There is still talk of pulling down more houses and widening Mill Lane. If they are going to go on pulling things down, almost none of this district's original character will be left." The Canterbury Society was against any road widening schemes at King Street and Mill Lane.

February

The Royal Fine Arts Commission suggested that the size of the Council's proposed multi-storey car park be reduced by two stories in order to protect the views of the Cathedral. After a special meeting of the City Council on the 14th, the Council decided to reduce the height of the multi-storey car park by one storey. The Council felt that a reduction of two floors would entail a six month delay (contract tenders had already been accepted by the Council). There would be space for only 604 cars instead of 706 car parking spaces with one floor removed.

1968 (cont.)

The next day, a public meeting was held entitled "Canterbury in Danger" by the newly formed Canterbury Civic Action Group in association with the Canterbury Society. The groups said that they knew nothing about the car park until now. They stressed that its size and details had been kept secret. They accused the Council of acting in a devious and secretive way. They felt that the Council's proposal to reduce the multi-storey car park by one storey was "a sop" to the Royal Fine Arts Commission.

On the 21st February, the Council decided to proceed with its plan for the multi-storey car park with a reduction of one storey. The public gallery was mostly filled at this meeting with those who opposed the scheme. The Civic Action Group told the Council that it was "voting on a building which you know will do great harm to the appearance of the City which still retains many unique features".

Another public meeting was called by the Civic Action Group and the Canterbury Society to discuss the multi-storey car park. The meeting overwhelmingly opposed the idea. More than 300 people attended which demonstrated public interest in the Council scheme. It was felt that the building of the car park "would do irrefutable harm to the City". The Group maintained that its argument was not just about the multi-storey car park; its argument was based on where it should be located. The City Architect said that if the opponents wanted an alternative, they would have to pay "a great deal more in their rates". He tried to undermine the legitimacy of the opposition by stating that "criticism without knowledge is cheap".

1968 (cont.)

The Minister of Housing and Local Government invited the City Council to visit him and discuss the multi-storey car park. They met on the 7th March and no final decision was made about the multi-storey car park. The suggestion was made that further consultation should take place not only with respect to car parking policy in the City but also with respect to the Council's road programme and the establishment of Canterbury as a Conservation Area. The multi-storey car park would be considered in the perspective of these wider discussions.

The Council was criticised that it was continuing a "disgraceful tradition of demolition and ruin to the historic parts of the City". The Council felt that "this car park would facilitate the redevelopment of further parts of the City that suffered in the war and it will bring to an end much of the present surface car parking that so disfigures the City centre". The City Council maintained that car parking was needed to meet the present demands and that the multi-storey car park had been carefully designed so "as not to conflict with the Cathedral". The Council felt that a multi-storey car park would control and contain car parking inside the City and prevent the "chaos of surface car parking". The Council said that the increase in the rate was vital in order to get the Whitefriars site operative and to have commercial development on surface car parks in the central area.

The Royal Fine Arts Commission said that it placed a high importance on the historic centre of Canterbury. It wanted the areas within the City walls to be designated as a Conservation Area within the meaning of the Civic Amenities Act 1967. It also wanted the Council to give full aesthetic considerations to the multi-storey car park. If, following this review, it was agreed that a

1968 (cont.)

parking garage should go ahead on the Gravel Walk site, the Commission still urged that this and indeed any other parking garage within or close to the City walls should be limited to a maximum of five parking floors above the ground level. The Commission recognised that financial considerations were involved and that a reduction in height must add to the cost per space provided, although it believed that there could be a change in other directions, eg a reduction in congestion which should be made possible by spreading car parking over a wider area. But in the Commission's view, in a City of national importance such as Canterbury, there should be no reluctance in facing additional cost involved in reducing the height and bulk of a car park on this site as to avoid permanent damage.

The controversy over the multi-storey car park was turning into a local political battle in that attempts were being made to pressurise the Canterbury Society to put up candidates for the May local election on a conservation platform. It was felt that the time had come for opposition on the City Council.

April

The Minister of Housing and Local Government gave his approval for the controversial multi-storey car park but limited its height to only four stories. This was a reduction in height of two stores. The Ministerial spokesman said: "There are to be discussions between the Minister and Canterbury City Council about the terms of employing a consultant to advise on planning problems including the siting of car parks and the ring road. In the meantime, the Minister has accepted that a multi-storey car park will, in any event, be needed for their new shopping area on the Whitefriars site and that

1968 (cont.)

there should be no advantages from a planning point of view in seeking to site this car park other than at the place proposed by the Council."

The decision of the Minister followed a series of discussions and meeting on the planning problems of Canterbury with the City Council. The Minister suggested that a Conservation Area policy should be prepared by the City Council under the Civic Amenities Act 1967. The City Council assured the Minister of its desire to co-operate with the Ministry and said that it had already decided to seek the Minister's advice on the future road pattern and car parking policy in the City.

On the first April, the City Architect outlined the following scheme to the residents of the Blackfriars area: The creation of pedestrianised precincts in parts of Mill Lane and Blackfriars Street and the building of houses on the vacant sites that were in keeping with the area. The scheme met with the general approval of the residents. The following day, the City Council's Planning Committee agreed that negotiations could start with the developer.

May

Six seats were up for election at the local election. The Conservatives won all six seats. Thus, there was no change in the party composition of the Council as a result of the local election. The Conservatives held twenty-three seats and Liberal held one seat. (One of the founders of the Civic Action Group, Mr. Haigh, stood as an Independent for the Westgate ward and lost.)

1968 (cont.)

A Councillor suggested that another Councillor should not be appointed to the Town Planning Committee because there would then be two estate agents on the Committee and it would be seen as a conflict of interest. The Town Planning Committee was the only Committee to have executive powers and the Press was not admitted to its meetings. The Council agreed that no further discussion would take place and it threw out the Councillor's suggestion concerning membership to the Town Planning Committee.

June

Work was started on the multi-storey car park at Gravel Walk. Each car parking space now costed £482 instead of the original £410.

September

The City Council was given full grant approval for the second stage of the ring road. Work on the £532,000 project started this month. The grant approval was for the compulsory land purchases. (£120,000 in compensation was paid to the owners of a department store in St. George's Gate.)

1969

February

A public meeting was held for the purpose of quizzing the Councillors on a variety of local issues. The meeting was well attended. There were four main areas of discussion:

1. a suggestion that all City streets be made one way with unilateral parking. On this matter, the Council replied by saying the multi-storey

1969 (cont.)

car park would take the cars off the streets.

2. on the redevelopment of land around the new St. George's Place roundabout, the Council said that plans for private redevelopment had already been approved. The Council said it would be watching the position carefully.
3. the City Council outlined proposals for further public walks and open spaces on the River Stour.
4. the Council said that no further major redevelopment would go ahead until the results from the Buchanan Report on the City's traffic were known.

March

The general rate of the City Council was increased by 1s/7d in the pound. The Council's capital works scheme would cost £2,400,000 for next year and on completion, that figure would rise to £8,500,000. The Council maintained that it was giving good value for money to the rate payers which respect to better education, houses, health services, car parking, and industrial development. The Council said that at the same time, it was preserving the historic parts of the City.

The Chairman of the Council's Finance Committee termed the £8½ million as "a vast sum for a tiny city". He contined:

"It seems to me that we should have a breathing space to allow us to get these schemes completed before we embark on any fresh ones, however desirable they may be. Apart from the financial strain, the City Architect's and Engineer's Department are fully occupied on these current schemes. The Whitefriars shopping development scheme has had a

1969 (cont.)

> chequered career. We appointed developers over four years ago and we had hoped to have it in operation by now. Unfortunately, when it came to the crunch, the developers dropped out and we had to start again almost from scratch. New developers have been appointed and I hope that they are being given every facility in the preparation of working drawings so the building operations may start immediately the multi-storey car park is finished."

The Council invested £300,000 in the Wincheap Industrial Estate. It was hoped that the Estate would be occupied by March 1970. The Council also saw the occupation of the Vauxhall Estate and other commercial developments as essential to its light industrial policy.

April

The Minister of Housing and Local Government approved the second five year review of the Canterbury Development Plan. This Plan was thought to shape Canterbury in the 1970's. The Minister deleted from the Plan the parallel relief road in the centre of the City. At the public inquiry on the review which was held in July 1966, the Canterbury Society had opposed the parallel relief road. It was glad to see that it was omitted by the Minister.

The Buchanan Report on traffic was to be ready next year. The City Council decided to put it out for public consultation before any final decisions were taken.

1969 (cont.)

May

The inaugural meeting of the Stour Valley Society was held. Two hundred and fifty members were present. The Society was formed to prevent pollution turning the Stour into a "stinking ditch". An embryo of interested individuals arose from the "Save the Stour" campaign that cleared up parts of the Stour with voluntary help. The four aims of the Society were:

- to stimulate public interest
- to ensure conservation, development, and improvement of the Stour Valley
- to have regular meetings, exhibitions, and lectures
- to investigate and promote desirable schemes under the Countryside Act.

Of the six seats that were being contested at the local election, the Conservatives won four seats, the Liberals won one seat, and Labour won one seat. There was still no major change in the local party composition of the new Council after the local election.

June

The Redcliffe-Maud Report on Local Government proposed that Kent be part of a South East province composed of seventeen unitary authorities. Kent would be divided into two main unitary authorities: East and West Kent. county boroughs, noncounty boroughs, urban councils and rural districts would be replaced by local councils with reduced powers. The Report outlined four basic faults in the existing structure of local government:

1. the failure of local government areas to match the patterns of life and work in modern England

1969 (cont.)

2. the impossibility of planning development and transport properly when the local government units were separated into town and country
3. the splitting up of services within each county between county council and the number of district councils
4. the small size of many local authorities prevented them from employing the highly qualified manpower and technical equipment that modern services need.

The Report said that the new proposed system would offer four gains: better services, better use of resources, adaptability, and the strengthening of democracy. The provincial council would be responible for the overall regional and planning strategy. Whereas, the unitary councils would be responsible for the day-to-day running of housing, education, and transport matters. The Report saw one of the most important functions of the unitary local councils to represent local opinion. The office of the Mayor would be retained, but the office of aldermen would be abolished.

July

There were two schools of thought who advocated change in the structure of local government:

1. those who wanted to take matters out of the arena of local politics and leave them to the professionals
2. those who wanted to realise the same efficiency but wanted to retain the democratic control of local government.

The growing dissatisfaction with the present system was indicated by the increase of pressure groups.

1969 (cont.)

November

Canterbury's multi-storey car park was officially opened on the 7th. It had been a source of controversy not only between the Council and some of the residents of Canterbury, but also between the different levels of government. Six hundred and four car parking spaces were provided at a cost of £340,000.

December

The City Council decided to leave it up to its discretion as to whether or not the Press would be permitted to stay at Council meetings. One Councillor said: "It is a meeting of the Council and not the ratepayers. Twice a year, there is a forum at which people can ask written and verbal questions."

A P P E N D I X C

HISTORICAL DATA FOR CANTERBURY'S CONTEXT OF LOCAL POLITICAL DECISION MAKING - 1970 TO 1979

1970

January

The Buchanan Report was commissioned by the City Council in 1969 to plan a new road system for traffic in Canterbury. The draft Report was published on the 16th January and cost £30,000. One of the main assumptions of the Report was that the population growth of Canterbury would be 50,000 people. The draft Report primarily stated that congestion caused poor accessibility in the form of traffic hold-ups and the shortage of car parking spaces. The effects of traffic were thought to be the following: noise, fumes, vibrations made by vehicles, unsightliness, and inconvenience and accidents to pedestrians. They were termed the"environmental consequences" of motor traffic. The draft Report maintained that the traditional medieval streets were unsuited to accommodate the movement of a large number of vehicles. It maintained that Canterbury should lead the demand in the country for government subsidies for building multi-storey car parks in historic cities. It endorsed the City Council's policy of providing multi-storey car parks. The draft Report increased the number of multi-storey car parks from four to seven and this would provide room for 5,800 cars by 1984. The draft Report stressed that this was the only way to safeguard both the prosperity and the "tightly knit character of the central area". The seven sites for prospective multi-storey car parks were the following:

1970 (cont.)

Stour Street (Rosemary Lane) - 600 spaces
St. Mildred's Tannery - 600 spaces (the land was presently being used for a primary school)
Black Griffin Lane area - 250 spaces
St. Radigund's area - 500 spaces
Longport coach park - 250 spaces
Canterbury West Railway Station goods yard - 950 spaces

With regard to the flow of traffic around Canterbury four alternatives were presented in the draft Report. The draft Report favoured the sub-surface route which would link Rheims Way and the Kingsmead area by a tunnel underneath the Westgate Towers. The draft Report maintained that the sub-surface route would least interfere with the functions and amenities of the City. Its cost of £2,200,000 did not seem to be costly "if a value was put on the quality of life". The draft Report maintained that the benefits would be a safer, quieter town and the buildings would be unmarred by vehicles.

The Canterbury Society submitted its own report to the Buchanan team. The Society's report suggested that the Westgate area of Canterbury should be a focal point of a new tourist attraction that included shopping. The report suggested that a mini-bus service from the multi-storey car parks outside the City centre could carry shoppers to the centre. Suggested sites for future multi-storey car parks were: the corner of St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane, near the St. Peter's Place roundabout on Rheims Way, next to the Norman Castle, West Station, and in the St. Radigund's area. The Society maintained that a new Town Map should be drawn up,with the following three basic objectives:

1970 (cont.)

1. the maintenance of the historic character of central Canterbury by stopping the decline of the changing use of areas from residential to commercial which were thought to be essential to the City's character.
2. the enhancement of the City's character and prosperity through new development that would emphasise not only the City's role as a major tourist attraction but as a commercial and residential centre.
3. the creation of areas in which traffic would either be physically excluded or severely restricted.

The Society objected to the completion of the ring road scheme. It maintained that the narrow part of Broad Street should be protected and that traffic should be removed from the City centre.

The draft Buchanan Report received a lukewarm reception from the City Council when it was presented to the Council on the 14th January. Many Councillors thought the proposals were dependent on finance and that it would be difficult to get a grant from the Minister of Transport. Some Councillors thought the draft Report gave too much consideration in the central area to shoppers and pedestrians and not enough to motorists. The draft Buchanan Report re-opened the debate on road planning within the City. The draft Report was a more sophisticated version of the ring road concept.

A public meeting was held on the draft Buchanan Report on the 19th January. The meeting was well attended with an audience of 750 people or more. Dr. Buchanan said the traffic problem in Canterbury was difficult and that the Report had not produced any radical propositions.

1970 (cont.)

It was the first time that the Buchanan team had held a public meeting on its proposals. For the team, it was an experiment in public participation. The draft Report's main objective was to improve the circulation of traffic as well as the environment.

February

On the 3rd February, there was another public meeting to discuss the draft Buchanan Report. Ratepayers were urged to pressurise the government to help solve the traffic problem in Canterbury by the construction of an A2 by-pass.

The Canterbury Society, the Civic Action Group, and the Canterbury Liberal Party appeared to be in favour of the less controversial Northern route proposal of the draft Buchanan Report. The groups thought there were too many difficulties in building the sub-surface route under Westgate. Both the Canterbury Society and the Liberals reserved their final judgement until further details were published by the Buchanan team. The Canterbury Society was very concerned about the draft Report's treatment of the Westgate area. The Civic Action Group firmly rejected the sub-surface route because it was too damaging to the environment. However, the Group endorsed the draft Buchanan Report's suggestions on the limitation of traffic and its movement in the City centre and the provision of multi-storey car parks. The Canterbury Labour Party was in favour of the sub-surface route, providing the above ground area could be kept free from noise and the Westage area would be unaffected by the traffic vibrations. The Labour Party favoured the growth in Canterbury's size and prosperity. It said the growth in population should be matched by a corresponding growth in jobs. The Labour Party said that the sub-surface

1970 (cont.)

route would be part of a better central road system thus avoiding the division of areas to the north and west of the City. The Labour Party wanted all through traffic removed from the City centre. It accepted the recommendations about the siting and building of multi-storey car parks and about the limitations on office car parks and kerbside parking in the central area. All four groups rejected the City Council's Development Plan that supported the completion of the ring road around the lines of the City walls and Buchanan's southern alternative route.

March

The Canterbury Labour Party decided to contest seats in two City wards in the May local election after an absence from the City Council polls since 1969. This was due to a lack of cash and the inability to find candidates. The membership to the Labour Party had doubled in the past five months. The Labour Party felt that opposition was needed on the Conservative controlled City Council. It said that people were fed up with a Council that ignored local public opinion. The Conservatives were contesting all the seats in the May local election.

The Minister of Housing and Local Government scheduled a row of houses in Hawkes Lane as being of special architectural and historic interest.

At its annual meeting, the Canterbury Chamber of Trade deplored the lack of support by the City's multiple stores. It said that the multiples were loath to support the activities of the Chamber. Membership to the Chamber of Trade had fallen slightly to 625 at the end of last year.

1970 (cont.)

On the 25th March, the City Council fixed a rate of 15s/- which was an increase of 1s/- more for domestic ratepayers and 1s/5d for businessmen. The Chairman of the Finance Committee warned that at least another 3s/6d would have to be added to the rates over the next three years. Since 1966, the rate in the pound had gone up by 4s/-. The City Council said the increase was due to the general increase in prices, wages, and salaries, and the "penal rate of interest the Council had to pay".

Central government refused office development certificates for Canterbury. The City Council said that the government blocked any attempt to provide extra employment in the City. However, at St. George's Gate, permission had been granted for an office development certificate.

Work was supposed to have started on the Whitefriars development in April, but negotiations between the Council and the developers proved much more difficult than anticipated. The Council could not anticipate any income from this development for two years. The income should be at least £40,000 p.a. in rent and rates. The Council felt that it had done its best to make the City a regional shopping and service centre for East Kent. The Council felt that it must retain this position by replacing central area surface car parks with multi-storey car parks on the periphery of the centre which would then release central area land for further commercial development. The Council said "it is from commercial development that our real income comes; car parks are now a £30,000 p.a. charge on the rates".

1970 (cont.)

April

The Canterbury Liberal Party named four candidates for the local election in May.

On the 8th April, the Highways Committee approved measures to reduce the amount of traffic using the main streets in Canterbury. This included the re-introduction of a one-way system to avoid the Westgate and making traffic entering the City at the St. George's Gate end turn left into St. George's Lane. This would be a summer experiment and be introduced in three stages.

May

The local election was held on the 7th May and the Conservatives lost several seats to Labour and Liberal candidates. Two seats were contested in each of the three wards. The results were as follows:

Dane John Ward - 1 Conservative, 1 Liberal
Westgate Ward - 2 Conservatives
Northgate Ward - 1 Conservative, 1 Labour

The Committees of the Council were: Children's, Development and Estates, Entertainments, Festival 1970, General Purposes, Health, Highways, Housing, Library and Museums, Markets and Recreation, Policy and Co-ordination, and Town Planning.

June

The General Election was held on the 18th June and the Conservative MP for Canterbury was re-elected.

On the 17th June, the Council passed a recommendation from the Town Planning Committee for approval of a link road between the Whitstable Road and Rheims Way. The

1970 (cont.)

link road had been approved by the Highways Committee which had instructed that all necessary steps be taken for it to be included in the Ministry of Transport construction plan. The Whitehall Action Group was formed to fight the scheme. It was mainly composed of residents in the area who would be affected by the proposal.

July

A by election for the City Council was held on the 2nd July. In the Dane John Ward, one Liberal was elected and in the Westgate Ward, one Conservative and one Labour were elected.

On the first July, the Westgate was closed to traffic as part of a summer experiment to reduce the traffic flow on the main shopping street in the City centre.

The Strategic Plan for the SouthEast was published. (It was commissioned in 1968.) The Plan said that Canterbury had developed a momentum for growth which could exert undesirable pressure on its historic City centre. The Plan saw conflict between urban development and the need to safeguard the landscape, agricultural, recreational, and mineral interests.

October

There were more warnings from local amenity groups and conservationists that historic buildings like the Westgate and Eastbridge Hospital would suffer if they continued to be exposed to the pounding of heavy traffic.

At the City Council meeting on the 7th October, the City Council was urged to continue with its traffic experiment by closing St. Peter's Street to traffic. This was

1970 (cont.)

defeated because the final version of the Buchanan Report was due to be put before the City Council on the 21st October. The partial closing of St. Peter's Street was suggested by the three Liberal Councillors. The City Engineer advised that it would be wiser to wait and follow up any experiments that the Buchanan Report might suggest rather than to try something on their own. The Civic Action Group called on the City Council to impose a Saturday ban on all traffic except for buses on the main shopping streets. The Group would like a ban to be applied to St. Peter's Street for a three month experiment.

The final version of the Buchanan Report was published on the 23rd October. One of the main features of the Report was a traffic-free City centre where shoppers and tourists could walk about in comfort and safety. The Report was jointly commissioned by the City Council and the Minister of Housing and Local Government. The Council was critical of the Buchanan Plan in its proposal for six smaller multi-storey car parks. The Councillors thought it would be uneconomic. The Council continued to believe that its own scheme for four multi-storey car parks was more viable. The cost of the sub-surface route for the Westgate increased to £3,376,500. The Council received the Report with mixed feelings. Some Councillors welcomed it; some Councillors thought the proposals were too costly. The Council and the Buchanan Report did not agree on what type of multi-storey car park would be most suitable for Canterbury.

The Gravel Walk multi-storey car park was losing £22,000 p.a. and it was unlikely that at the present rate it would ever break even.

1970 (cont.)

November

It was revealed at the full Council meeting on the 18th November that the Council was preparing detailed reports on the ban of traffic in some City centre shopping streets and the building of two more multi-storey car parks. This followed from the consideration of the Town Planning Committee of the final Buchanan Report. The Council approved the following three point recommendation from the Town Planning Committee:

1. detailed report on the inner sub-surface route beneath St. Peter's Street and the sub-surface rail route (St. Dunstans')
2. detailed report on the provision of multi-storey car parks in Stour Street and Longport
3. detailed report on the implementation of the pedestrianisation of streets put forward by Buchanan.

December

Contracts were signed on the 17th December between the City Council and Ravenseft Property Ltd. for the development of a new shopping precincts on the Whitefriars car park. The work was to start soon. The shopping complex would provide the City Council with £20,000 p.a. in ground rent and about £20,000 p.a. in rates.

1971

January

The City Council rate was increased for the financial year 1971-72. The reasons given for the increase were the following: salary rises, big increases in the spending

1971 (cont.)

of the Highways and Education Committees, and that many costly schemes had already been started and now the full weight of interest on the loans was being felt.

The City Architect told the Canterbury Society at its 28th January meeting that it would most likely be two years before the City Council would make any final decision on the Buchanan Report. He said that the Stour Street, St. Radigund's, and Black Griffin Lane car parks could all be associated with commercial redevelopment schemes on adjoining sites; the car parks could be used to stimulate such development. He continued that all three could be tucked away out of sight behind existing or reconstructed frontages.

March

The Civic Action Group endorsed the warning that historic buildings on St. Peter's Street were being seriously endangered by the traffic.

The City Council increased the rate by 12½p to 87½p. The new scheme of central government approval for certain capital spending schemes would begin to operate from the first of April. The City Council would not be able to get enough money allocated from central government for all the schemes in its budget. Therefore, some of the schemes in the capital budget had to be deferrred in order for the City Council to keep within its allocation of borrowing power.

On the 24th March, the City Council introduced a plan to keep all but the essential traffic out of parts of Burgate, Sun Street, Mercery Lane and Butchery Lane. This was the first step in implementing some of the

1971 (cont.)

suggestions that had been put forward in the final Buchanan Report. Only a limited scheme could be implemented because the Council said not all the shops had rear access.

April

The Canterbury Society wanted immediate action over the City's traffic problem because "the needs and opportunities of Canterbury can be seen and argued now with clarity that may never occur again due to the eminence of local government reform". The Society warned that unless full compensation is paid for the property that the Council compulsory purchases, the public would oppose all changes. The Society urged for traffic experiments in the central area to start immediately and that government aid should be requested. The Society originally favoured the northern route, but now it had decided to go for the sub-surface route in the St. Dunstans' area. The Society thought that the consideration of traffic access had been stressed too much and that the consideration of the environment had been stressed too little. The Society said the Castle Street car park should be kept small so as not to overwhelm the Castle and maintained that tall car parks could be accommodated in Canterbury but with difficulty. The Society did not like the type of multi-storey car park at Gravel Walk and suggested that multi-purpose ones (car parks integrated with shops, flats, and offices) would make the building less obtrusive.

At the local election in May, there were nineteen candidates contesting eight seats. The Conservative Party was the only party to contest all eight seats. The Liberals had four candidates, Labour had four candidates, the Independents had two candidates, and there was one Independent Liberal.

1971 (cont.)

May

The local election was a crucial one for the Conservative Party in that if it lost all eight vacant seats, then it would lose control of the Council. The Conservative Party had full control over the Council since the 1950s. The Conservative Party organisation was, at election time, full of activity and canvassing.

The local election was held on the 13th May and all the opposition candidates had a landslide victory. This was the biggest election upset since the 1945 local election. The new composition of the Council was: 12 Conservative aldermen and councillors and 12 opposition members - 5 Labour, 6 Liberals, and 1 Independent. The Mayor had the casting vote if any issue resulted in a level vote. The Labour Party said it had broken the Conservative Party and that next year it would gain control of the Council. At the moment, it felt that it was an effective opposition.

The Precinct traffic plan confused motorists and pedestrians. The Burgate - Sun Street area turned out neither to be traffic free nor a place where pedestrians had the right of way. The Council said it was too early to know if the plan was a success.

The Government White Paper on local government reorganisation stated that Canterbury should lose its county borough status. The City Councillors voted to support making East Kent a separate county with Canterbury as its head of administration. They also decided to press the government for greater powers than those already proposed for district councils.

1971 (cont.)

In May a five storey office block was approved for a site in Rhodaus Town. A car park for 200 cars would be provided at the rear of the development (Clarksons).

July

The Government said that Canterbury would have its by-pass within the next ten years. The MP for Canterbury said that this was important breakthrough in the stalemate situation that had so long existed over a by-pass decision.

August

The Telephone Exchange was planning to build a five storey office block with parking facilities on Rheims Way.

There was the general feeling amongst some of the local electorate that the Conservatives (if they had been elected) would have done little about the traffic problem and the conservation of the environment in Canterbury. However, there appeared to be the "naive" expectation that the present composition of the Councillors would be able to solve these problems better than the Conservatives.

September

Despite police objections, the City Council decided to impose a 5mph speed limit in the Burgate pedestrianised area.

There was an important by-election in the Westgate Ward on the 30th September. It was a straight battle between the Conservative and Labour Parties. Labour won the election, so the Conservative Party no longer controlled the City Council. The Labour Party saw this an indication that the people of Canterbury wanted more "imaginative" local government.

1971 (cont.)

October

On the 20th October, the Highways Committee decided to carry on with its traffic experiment in the Burgate area for another six months and to extend the pedestrianisation scheme from Iron Bar Lane to the Buttermarket. The Councillors thought the experiment had been a success.

November

The City Council lost its fight for Kent to be split into two counties when local government was to be reorganised.

The Canterbury Society continued its work on the preservation of Canterbury's historic buildings, on Canterbury's traffic problem, and on Canterbury's environment in general. Sometimes its views have carried weight with the City Council, the Buchanan team, and the Civic Trust.

DoE policy stressed the importance of maintaining traditional town centres for shopping because they provide facilities which could not be duplicated in the out-of-town areas. Central sites catered for people who do not use cars. Developers who would be interested in out-of-town sites would have to satisfy the main condition that they would be fulfilling a need that could not be met by an existing town centre. They would also have to show that they could be accommodated within the area they intended to serve taking into account the local road system, population distribution, and existing shopping provision. The DoE would discourage any tendency for new centres to develop especially those based on a cash and carry warehouse basis. Any new local

1971 (cont.)

shopping centre should be located and laid out specifically to serve only the area they were meant to serve. The Canterbury traders and many City Councillors disliked the concept of out-of-town shopping areas.

A new attack was launched on the City's post war planning and its effect on the Cathedral. It was termed as "willful damage to the City". It was argued that Canterbury had become considerably commercialised.

December

On the first December, the Highways Committee considered a report of its working party that had been briefed to devise a system to reduce the traffic in the central shopping streets. The system included one-way traffic from Best Lane to St. Peter's Place, one-way traffic from Rose Lane to St. George's Lane, and a proposal to widen the pavements at King's Bridge. The report concluded that a total ban on traffic in the main streets was not a practical proposition until the rest of the road system in the Buchanan Report had been provided.

1972

January

The Highways Committee (which had delegate powers) decided to make Canterbury's main street one-way from the first of March. The main street from Best Lane to St. Peter's would be one-way and would last for an experimental six months. Some Councillors felt it was a definite move towards the complete pedestrianisation of the main street.

1972 (cont.)

The City Architect had devised a new plan for the southern/central area of the City. It included a new road from St. Peter's roundabout to Stour Street, a multi-storey car park, a health centre, a meals-on-wheels centre, and a new road across the Marlowe car park and the pedestrianisation of parts of St. Margaret's Street and Castle Street. The plan was largely based on the recommendations of the Buchanan Report. On the 12th January, the City Highways Committee was shown the plan which had already been seen by the Town Planning Committee. The plan was based on the idea of routes that would limit traffic access into the City centre through a system of loops with a multi-storey car park located on each loop. How the recommendations would be implemented would depend on the redevelopment policies of the Council and on the financial resources available. The City Architect said this about his plan: "When considering the cost of constructing new roads, it should be always taken into account that these roads will be opening up parts of the central area which have never had adequate car access before. Investment in such roads is bound to increase the rateable value and property value in the central area. This investment makes sites attractive to potential developers and contribute to the material propserity of the City as a whole." The City Architect maintained that the price of keeping Castle Street with its 100 listed buildings was the sacrifice of Stour Street. Most members of the Highways Committee thought it was a good plan.

February

The Labour Party thought traffic must be banned from the main street of Canterbury if the central area was not to become intolerable for both shoppers and motorists.

1972 (cont.)

The Labour Party formed its own special working party in order to devise a plan for clearing traffic from the City centre. The plan would be put before the Highways Committee.

The City Architect's Report on the new road system was going to be looked at by the general public and amenity societies before it would be finally approved by the City Council. The Stour Street area would be the first to be developed after the opinions had been expressed on the plan and the City Council approved it. On the 23rd February, the Highways Committee approved the City's one-way system despite the protests from several sections of the community including the Hotels and Caterers' Association.

March

The City Council hoped that the new one-way system would reduce congestion in the shopping streets. The one-way experiment created problems: delay and congestion. The Council saw the experiment as a major step to reduce the volume of traffic in the City centre.

Public feeling was against the Stour Street plan that had been devised by the City Architect. Residents of Stour Street and other residents of the City objected to the plan. The objections were based on the following reasons:

1. It was a sensitive, historic area of the City.
2. It would encourage and generate more traffic.
3. It would have a bad effect on the Stour River as an amenity area.
4. It would involve the demolition of houses and residential uses should be encouraged.

1972 (cont.)

The objectors questioned whether the plan was progress. They were afraid that Stour Street would be turned into a motorway and urged that pedestrianisation should be the traffic policy for the area.

The City Council put the rate up by 6p to 94½p in the pound. The rise was due to three main reasons according to the Council:

1. pay awards and rise in prices
2. full year's cost of schemes and commitments previously approved
3. cost of new schemes and the extension of existing services and new services.

The Mayor said that the City Council had made great efforts to attract commerce and business development to the City in order to improve its prosperity.

April

On the 5th April, the Highways Committee let its working party analyse two plans for the pedestrianisation of the central area. (One was by the Liberals and the other was by Labour.) The Liberal plan entailed the closure of St. Peter's Street to traffic from 11 am to 4 pm.

The May local election was the last election before the reorganisation of local government. The Conservative and Labour Parties were contesting all six vacancies. The Liberal Party were putting up four candidates. The Conservative Party membership had grown - over 1,000 people had joined in the past year.

1972 (cont.)

Opposition continued to grow against the threat to demolish properties in Stour Street. The objectors said the plan was biased in favour of the shopkeepers on the High Street and it was a departure from the Buchanan Report. There was protest against the Council's handling of the public participation for a scheme of this importance within a conservation area. The Council was criticised for the lack of information being supplied to the public. It was about this time that the St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society was formed. Its main aim was to conserve the amenities of its area and also of Canterbury in general.

May

At the local election on the 4th May, Labour gained control of the City Council. All six Labour candidates won. (There were two seats in each ward: Westgate, Northgate, and Dane John.)

On the 3rd May, the City Council decided that it may abandon its controversial plan to widen Stour Street that had been designed to improve the traffic flow in the southern/central part of the City. (There were 54 written objections.) The demolition of houses was particularly attacked. The Council asked as a matter of urgency for a new investigation into the car parking and traffic problem. The City Engineer and the City Architect were instructed to draft a report. The Council approved a further six month traffic experiment in Burgate and approved a loading ban from 11 am to 4 pm.

On the 26th, the Boundary Commission confirmed that Canterbury City Council would be linked with Bridge-Blean, Herne Bay, and Whitstable councils in the local government reorganisation scheme.

June

A new office block of 30,000 sq ft at St. George's Place was going to be constructed soon (Sun Alliance House). Provision would be made for 38 car parking spaces at the rear.

On the 21st June, the City Council approved the guidelines for assessing future building heights in Canterbury. The City Council hoped it would be of value to the public and developers. The report stated that the height of the Cathedral, which it was felt was a dominant feature, must be the major factor in considering new development. The report drew attention to the Buchanan Report and its statements on the visual effects of multi-storey car parks on the City's character and suggested that they be designed in relation to the buildings and space surrounding them. On the 28th June, the Highways Committee decided to extend the one-way traffic system in St. Peter's Street for another six months. The Chamber of Trade protested against the unloading ban in Burgate.

July

Protests were made over the proposed eight storey civic centre to be built near the Dane John to house the new district council. St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Conservation Society opposed this plan.

On the 17th July, the Policy Co-ordination Committee decided to support the Rheims Way/Whitstable link road. This recommendation was to be discussed at the full Council meeting on the 25th. At this meeting, the Liberal and Conservative Councillors tried to have the link road reconsidered, but failed. The Labour group also voted in favour of the controversial roundabout at the

1972 (cont.)

Whitstable Road end of the link road. This was also opposed by the Liberals and the Conservatives.

August

Opposition grew against the Council's decision to build a dual carriageway link road from Rheims Way to Whitstable Road. The objections were based on the following reasons:

1. its great expense
2. the demolition of seven houses and the waste of land
3. the destruction of trees and grassed areas.

The objectors said that the City Council "bulldozed through the decision on the link road after inadequate consideration and publicity".

September

On the 6th September, the Highways Committee decided to make permanent the experimental pedestrian precinct in the Burgate and Sun Street areas.

October

On the 4th October, the City Council looked at a revised report by the City Architect on the Stour Street area which planned to turn it back into a quiet residential district. The plan could have a significant effect on future traffic plans for the area. The Town Planning Committee had recommended the rezoning of the area after studying the City Architect's Report. The Report advised a complete change from the 1970 Development Plan that had zoned the area primarily for business use and the

1972 (cont.)

former gas works site as a multi-storey car park. Since 1970, Stour Street had become attractive to developers for office building. One office block had been completed and two others were under construction. Due to the 1967 Civic Amenities Act and the 1971 Town and Country Planning Act, 21 buildings had become listed on Stour Street. The Report said Stour Street was becoming an increasingly popular area in which to live. It noted the strong community spirit in the area as evidenced by the formation of the St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society. It was formed in order to express residents' views on development proposals. The area proposed for rezoning was 7.9 acres of which 2.4 acres were already occupied by dwellings. The Report said this area should be developed for purposes that were compatible with residential zoning such as housing, a health centre, and a public car park for the needs of the immediate locality. The Report advised a reconsideration of the future of Stour Street area for housing before "irreparable damage was done to its character by further commercial development". The Street was in the Conservation Area. The Report stated that the Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to preserve and enhance its character and appearance. Some Councillors were concerned about the lack of provision for car parking in the area. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee said that the Council Officers were looking at alternative suitable sites for multi-storey car parks.

The Chamber of Trade criticised the multiple stores for their lack of concern for the towns in which they trade. The Chamber said the multiple stores were only concerned about their profits.

1972 (cont.)

The City Architect put forward to the City Council a new plan for solving Canterbury's central traffic problem. The report was based on the Buchanan Report and proposed pedestrianisation of precincts and a system of loop roads for traffic. The report was to be published for public discussion and comment. Then the proposals would be reviewed by the City Council in the light of the public's comments. The Canterbury Society and St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society welcomed the proposals for pedestrianisation.

December

The Canterbury Society said the City Architect's plan to reduce traffic within the City centre seemed "well calculated" to achieve this main objective. The Society urged that while the plan focused attention on the central area, consideration should also be given to its wider implications for Canterbury's road system , ie pressure on the ring road. The Society said the Canterbury by-pass had to be seen as an "indispensable corollary" to these road proposals for the central area.

The City Architect's conservation report was published the week of December 11th. The report proposed the creation of more pedestrian precincts and took a close look at Canterbury's architectural aspect. The report stated: "If conservation is to have any meaning, there is an urgent need to rid the historic streets of nonessential traffic and for the creation of precincts primarily for pedestrian use." The report assumed the construction of a Canterbury by-pass and extensions to the ring road. The conservation report was linked very closely to the recent traffic network plan that was currently being discussed. The report looked at the value of buildings in their street setting. The

1972 (cont.)

City Architect warned in his report that the buildings most liable to destruction or mutilation were those that were located in established commercial areas. These areas have been diluted of their residential qualities. He said the rezoning of Stour Street from business and industrial uses to residential was a step in the right direction. He recommended that the report be accepted as a broad statement of intent and as a basis for investigation. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee said the report was a further step forward for more positive action on conservation. He added the report was inter-related with the recent reports on traffic networks, building heights, and the rezoning of Stour Street.

The St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society welcomed the rezoning of Stour Street for residential use. However, the Society made several points:

1. There was a lack of intention in the report to limit the size, weight, and number of vehicles entering the City walls. The Society thought this should be number one priority.
2. The beauty of the River Stour as an amenity should be held inviolate.
3. There should not be any multi-storey car parks located within the City walls.

1973

January

At the City Council meeting on the 3rd January, the Chairman of the Town Planning Committee welcomed the recent report on conservation in Canterbury drafted

1973 (cont.)

by the City Architect. He said a historic city like Canterbury could not afford to ignore the urgent needs of conservation and hoped it would have as wide circulation as possible. He said it was an attempt to give the Council guidelines on the visual aspects of conservation. He maintained that "in planning the road network around Canterbury, we have to give the conservation of the City in all its aspects priority and ensure that development of the motor car does not remove the heritage left to us".

On the 8th January, the Library and Museum Committee decided that a new public library should be built on the Marlowe car park.

On the 10th January, the Highways Committee approved a revised plan for the link road from Rheims Way to Whitstable Road. It would be a single carriageway and no roundabout. This meant a reprieve for the seven houses that had previously been threatned with demolition. The Committee changed its mind after talks with the DoE on this road proposal. The decision was hailed as a victory for the residents who opposed the scheme and for the Liberal Councillors who had fought the scheme since June 1970. A revised plan had been submitted in December 1972 by the City Engineer following the talks with the DoE. The DoE had received a large number of objections to the original plan.

A plan for a £310,000 multi-storey car park on the coach park at Longport was revealed on the 10th January to the Highways Committee. The multi-storey car park would be a concrete frame building that would hold about 395 cars. If the scheme was approved by the

1973 (cont.)

DoE, work could start as early as March 1974. Road works would be needed in order to meet the needs of the car park. They would cost about £7,000. The scheme was submitted to the DoE for its approval.

February

Election for the new Kent County Council (as part of the reorganisation of local government) was going to be held on the 12th April.

April

A new £22,000 road report was published by Brian Colquhoun and Partners. The report proposed a new road to run from Rheims Way, to tunnel under St. Dunstans' Street, and to join up with the Sturry radial at Kingsmead Road in order to ease the traffic pressure on the City centre (railway route). The Council was to mount a massive public participation exercise and said it would not made a firm decision until September 1973. A storm of controversy was about to break over the report and its findings.

On the 11th April, the Highways Committee accepted in principle the complete closure of St. George's Street between the junctions of Rose Lane and Canterbury Lane. The City Engineer said that such a scheme was possible because the shops had rear access.

The City Architect produced a report on the River Stour and the Riverside Walk. The report advocated tree preservation orders, large scale planting, bridge building, and the extension of a footpath system along the River. The report was warmly welcomed by the Canterbury Society that had worked for six years

1973 (cont.)

for improvement in the riverside area. The Society said the report was an indication of a real desire for partnership between the City Council and local amenity societies. Several of the Society's recommendations were included in the report.

May

On the 2nd May, the City Council welcomed the plan for the pedestrianisation of St. George's Street between Rose Lane and Canterbury Lane. Before putting the scheme into operation, however, the Council planned to have talks with East Kent bus company, taxi firms, and shop tenants who would be affected by the scheme. The majority of Councillors thought the pedestrianisation scheme would be a considerable amenity to the City. The Council now had to ask the DoE to make an order banning traffic from the street.

Controversy occurred over the Longport coach park plan. The plan was attacked by the Canterbury Society who said that it had fundamental shortcomings in its design, but the City Council approved the project in principle. The Canterbury Society said the design conformed to the height regulation, but it was not happy about the remaining visual aspects. The Society was concerned about them more than any other aspect. The Society reiterated the suggestion that "the proper way to deal with this park would be to clothe the Longport facade with small shops and offices, thus introducing a variety of frontage, roofline, and height." The Society said it appeared that the prime concern of the plan was to obtain the maximum number of spaces at all costs.

1973 (cont.)

The St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society opposed the subsurface ring road proposals as found in the Colquhoun Report.

June

The new district council election was held on the 7th June. One hundred and nine candidates fought for forty-eight seats. Three of the fifty-one seats had already been filled by Councillors who were returned unopposed. The Conservative platform was based on solving the traffic problem in Canterbury. The Conservatives maintained that a Conservative controlled City Council had always provided sufficient car parking spaces before development occurred. The Conservative Party said car parks should be built prior to development. It said the present Council was taking too long over Longport and Castle Street as sites for multi-storey car parks; these sites should be decided immediately. The Conservative Party said if people want to keep shopping in Canterbury, then the motorist must be accommodated through the construction of multi-storey car parks. It criticised the Labour Council by saying if any protest occurs about a project, the Labour Council drops the proposal and then discusses the next one. The prime example given was the proposal for a multi-storey car park at Castle Street (Rosemary Lane).

At the local election on the 7th June, the Conservative Party gained control of the new district council. The composition was: Conservatives 33 seats; Labour 7 seats; Independents 5 seats; Liberals 2 seats; and Ratepayers 3 seats.

1973 (cont.)

The Whitehall Action Group said it would fight to stop the City Council's road proposal through the St. Dunstans' area (the railway route). It described the road as "ridiculous" and "totally unnecessary" and maintained that it was designed "to please the whims of a few people on the Council". For the past three years, there had been rumour and planning blight on many homes, particularly in the Whitehall area due to the road proposals.

The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee said that there would be a public meeting on the 9th July to discuss the route. He said the decision on the route would not be taken in isolation from the wider aspects of the plan. He stressed that the decision had to be seen as part of the total needs of Canterbury. He warned that if nothing was done about the traffic problem, Canterbury would seize up in the 1980's - there would just not be enough space in the City to cope with the traffic demands being placed on it.

There was growing support for the Canterbury Society's objections to the Longport multi-storey car park.

The Canterbury Society gave its official backing to the controversial £2 million road across the St. Dunstans' area (the railway route). The Canterbury Society did not favour the subsurface route underneath the Westgate Towers because of its effect on the environment. The Society said in a report to the City Council that it is conscious of the environmental problems caused in St. Dunstans and North Lane by the railway route. The Society recognised the necessity to implement the central area traffic scheme as drafted by the City Architect before the completion of the railway route. It stressed the need for the Council to inform the public on the question of compulsory purchase at the

1973 (cont.)

earliest possible stage.

July

There was growing objections to the St. Dunstans' road (the railway route). The objectors said it would "mutilate" Canterbury, demolish listed buildings, and reduce amenity areas. Several objectors were disturbed to hear that the Canterbury Society had backed the route.

On the 9th July, a public meeting was held on the road proposals. The protests from residents were led by the Whitehall Action Group. Councillors, officers, and representatives from Brian Colquhoun Partners answered questions from the public, but they did little to satisfy the distress of the residents in St. Dunstans, Whitehall, and Pound Lane. The Council said the views of the residents would be borne in mind when the Council made its decision in October 1973. Twenty-four houses were scheduled for demolition on the railway route, whereas on the inner route (subsurface route for Westgate Towers) it could be approximately fifty-four to seventy-eight houses. The residents argued it would be better to wait until the by-pass was built in order to ascertain whether or not an east/west route was needed. They asked the Council if it was prepared to hold a referendum on the road proposal. The Council said the prime consideration was to ensure that people who lived in various parts of the town and who were affected by the different schemes would not have to suffer planning blight for any longer. The Council was against the holding of a referendum because it would take a lot of preparation and organisation.

1973 (cont.)

The Whitehall Action Group said the meeting had been held to placate the opposition. It said the meeting had been poorly advertised and it had been handled deplorably. The Canterbury Society said those who had attended the meeting had not truly been representative of Canterbury; there was a higher proportion of residents from the St. Dunstans' area than any other in Canterbury. The effect of the meeting was to heighten the opposition to the road proposal. Attempts had been made by the Council to turn the meeting into a technical affair. A petition of 612 signatures was presented to the Council against the proposal.

Another ring road row was brewing over the City Architect's report on routes for the northeast section of the ring road that involved Northgate, Broad Street, and Military Road. The Town Planning Committee received the report on the 17th July. The two proposals were: the Canterbury Development Plan line along Broad Street (Route A) and the Buchanan proposal along Military Road (Route B). The Town Planning Committee heard these two proposals would have "a widespread and destructive effect on the historic streets and residential areas". The Committee decided to circulate the report among amenity societies for their comment.

August

The Whitefriars shopping development opened.

The Conservative MP for Canterbury attacked the ring road plan for St. Dunstans. He had an hour long meeting with the Whitehall Action Group. Opposition to the St. Dunstans' road proposal still grew.

1973 (cont.)

The Canterbury Society reviewed its position on the east/west route (railway route) for the St. Dunstans' area. It said it had been asked to comment on the two routes -the subsurface route for Westgate Towers and the railway route for St. Dunstans and to point out which one was better. Due to the public debate on the road proposals, the Society wondered whether there was a need for the east/west route (the railway route). The Society suggested that a do-nothing policy might be the best for now. The Society pointed out that the petrol shortage might make the Buchanan Report obsolete.

September

The Steering Committee for the new district council decided there would be nine committees and their composition reflected the Conservative domination of the Council.

The railway route and the Broad Street route were on the agenda for the full City Council meeting on the 3rd October. The chief officers compiled another report that analysed these proposals. The report also included the views of the public. (The report itself was contentious.) The report made the following recommendations: The railway route should be abandoned because it involved the demolition of property in St. Dunstans. This route had been favoured by Brian Colquhoun and Partners. The officers were firmly in favour of the ring road going through Broad Street which involved some demolition of property. The officers stated firmly that their report was only a basis for discussion. The officers said two important conditions should be fulfilled: Full consultation should occur with the new Kent County Council and the route of the City's by-pass should be established. As of the first April 1974, Kent County Council will become responsible for the City's transport policy. It did not have to adopt the schemes that had been put forward by the existing Council.

October

At its full meeting on the 5th October, the City Council, after a two hour debate, decided to shelve indefinitely the ring road extension that would either cut across St. Dunstan's Street or St. Peter's Street near the Westgate. The Council decided to step up its campaign for an A2 by-pass for the City. Despite moves by two Labour Councillors, the Council refused to choose either the St. Dunstan's railway route or the St. Peter's Place/ Westgate/Pound Lane subsurface route. However, the Council approved the completion of the northeast section of the ring road through Broad Street, Clyde Street, and Military Road (Route B). The proposal for a Wincheap radial road was suspended until after the route of the Canterbury A2 by-pass had been announced. The Council's final decisions were:

1. To press strongly for the completion of the by-pass. The completion of the ring road would be deferred indefinitely. These decisions were in conjunction with the Council's transport policy.
2. To press for the completion of the northeast section of the ring road as suggested by the City Architect.
3. To adopt the strategy outlined for the central area traffic network as drafted by the City Architect. It would be subject to any alterations as necessary as a result of the decision taken in number one above.
4. To confirm the line on the Development Plan for the Sturry Road radial.
5. To defer the proposal for the Wincheap radial pending the confirmation of the A2 by-pass.

All of the above decisions would be referred to the new Kent County Council.

1973 (cont.)

The Whitehall Action Group and other residents were disappointed that no firm decision had been made by the City Council on the completion of the ring road. It thought the situation was very unsatisfactory and maintained that blight still existed in the area. It said to postpone the plans indefinitely meant they still could be re-opened at a future date. It hoped the Kent County Council, when reviewing the plans, would make a firm decision on the matter.

The newly formed Alma, Clyde, and Notley Streets Association objected to the City Council's decision for Route B to complete the northeast section of the ring road. The Association said the social costs had not been considered and objected to the motorway which would bisect the area. The Association said it would prepare an alternative road proposal for the area.

The Conservatives took all the top posts in the new district council such as Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Council Committees.

On the 23rd October, the Public Works Committee decided to send an all-party deputation from the Committee to meet with the Minister of Transport to discuss the City's traffic problem. The Minister had written to the Chairman of the Committee requesting a meeting. The Committee accepted the Minister's invitation.

November

On the 9th November, a public meeting was called by the Alma, Clyde, and Notley Streets Association. Over sixty residents attended. The Association said the Northgate area of Canterbury was a very close residential

1973 (cont.)

community that had neighbourhood feeling. It felt this feeling should be encouraged and improved. It asked the City Council to declare the area a general improvement area. This would mean the Council would spend money on improving the homes and facilities in the area for the residents of the area. The Association was formed because of the proposed extension of the City's ring road. The area suffered from planning blight due to the City Council's proposed extension of the ring road for Northgate. The Council was unwilling to declare the area a GIA until it had made a final decision about the roads in the area. The Association said houses had been demolished and nothing had been done about making the area attractive. It felt the area was a close community and had neighbourhood feeling and strength. The Northgate area was not officially declared a GIA. The final decision would be made by the new City Council in April. The meeting agreed that the Council should press for a decision to relieve Northgate of planning blight. It decided to ask the Council to support the one-way system,or failing that, the Berbiers road strategy for the area. The Association agreed to investigate what was needed for the area in order for it to be designated as a conservation area.

Several residents said the Whitefriars shopping development was a tragedy. It should have catered for pushcarts, wheelchairs, and supermarket trolleys. They said the development was out of proportion and scale in comparison to the remaining development in the City.

The City Council gave a clearance order for houses on Black Griffin Lane (numbers 41 to 48).

1973 (cont.)

Three routes had been named for the Canterbury by-pass by the Ministry of Transport. It was said the routes were the result of pressure by the City Council because of its threat to ban lorries from using the A2. The routes were published on the 7th November and immediately caused controversy. There was no indication in the DoE report when work on the by-pass was to begin. It was felt the lack of a definite date for the by-pass made the report inadequate. The general expectation was there would be a public inquiry.

The Minister of Transport came to talk to the City Council on the 17th November. His visit was felt by some Councillors and residents to be part of a "whitewash campaign" to placate the City Council over its plan to ban lorries from using the A2. The Minister made a veiled warning of what might happen if the City Council went ahead with its order to ban lorries from using the A2. He said the Government had residual powers. They might be used if it became clear that there was a real conflict of interests between the City Council and central government. A public inquiry could be called under the direction of the Secretary of State.

December

The Public Works Committee (which was the instigator of the A2 ban) decided to press for the introduction of the ban on heavy lorries going through the City. The Committee decided to continue its pressure on the Minister for a by-pass. It was felt the City Council was unlikely to enforce its controversial ban on lorries from using the A2 because of the personal intervention of the Transport Minister when he visited Canterbury last month.

1973 (cont.)

On the 3rd December, the Housing and Health Committee accepted a recommendation that the houses in Black Griffin Lane could be improved. The threat of demolition was removed from the houses in the area. The Committee agreed that grants should be made available to home-owners for the improvement of their properties.

Plans for a four storey office block in Hawkes Lane were publicised. Conservation and amenity societies objected to the development that would involve the demolition of three cottages (nos. 13, 14, 15 Hawkes Lane). The Canterbury Society, the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society, St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society all objected. They said Canterbury already had too many office blocks. The Town Planning Committee decided to put the plans on display and to have discussions with the conservation societies before they made a decision.

1974

January

On the 3rd January, the Council decided on a majority of one vote to ban lorries using the A2. The Conservative MP for Canterbury described the decision as "a great mistake". On the 10th January, the Minister of Transport stopped the City Council from imposing its ban on lorries using main road through the City. This was effective from the 1st March. He issued a directive prohibiting the Council from making the order without his consent. He said a decision on the route of the Canterbury by-pass would be made soon. The City Council feared the by-pass would be affected by the government cuts in spending.

1974 (cont.)

On the 8th January, the Town Planning Committee held a discussion on the status of the Wincheap Industrial Estate. Some councillors saw the Estate as a threat to the City's shopping area. They were afraid that the Estate would turn into an out-of-town shopping centre and would do "irreparable harm to the City centre". They maintained it was an industrial estate and not a retail one. The Committee agreed to recommend to the DoE the demolition of 13, 14, 15 Hawkes Lane for office development.

On the 10th January, the Housing and Health Committee gave an assurance to the residents of the Black Griffin Lane area about the future of their area. A petition had been signed by 250 residents in the area. It called for a complete ban on the demolition of homes in the Black Griffin Lane, St. Peter's Grove, and St. Peter's Place. The petition said the residents were against houses being pulled down for three reasons:

1. There was a strong community spirit in the area.
2. The houses were structurally sound.
3. Most importantly, the houses that had been demolished in the past left areas of untidy car parks.

The Committee said it was not the intention of the Council for any general demolition in the area. The Committee thought it was important that the houses should be brought up to standard condition. The Committee said only two houses would be demolished (nos. 25 and 25A) in the area.

The Public Works Commitee on the 22nd January recommended the City Council drop the ban on lorries using the A2.

1974 (cont.)

The decision was made in secret and the press was barred from the meeting. The decision was carried by a majority of one vote. There had been strong opposition from the Transport Minister on this and he had threatened a public inquiry. The Committee also recommended to seek an assurance from the Minister that the City's by-pass would not be delayed due to the government's cutbacks in spending.

February

By a majority of one vote, the City Council asked the Minister for a public inquiry into its controversial plan to ban heavy lorries from the A2 within the City.

Kent County Council blamed the takeover of many of the City Council's functions for the 8p increase in the rates. The overall county rate went up from 29p to 37p in the £.

March

The Queen granted Canterbury the retention of its 525 year old Mayoralty tradition despite the re-organisation of local government.

There was a growing feeling among residents that there were too many office blocks in Canterbury and they were not to the benefit of Canterbury.

The new City Council faced massive rate rises. The Council said the main causes were because of rising prices and salaries and increases in services. The Council decided not to introduce a blanket charge for the whole of the district, but a separate rate for each of the old council areas. For Canterbury, the full rate was increased from 36p in the £ to 59.1p in the £ which was an increase

1974 (cont.)

of 23.1p in the £. Domestic ratepayers would pay 41.6p in the £ which was an increase of 11.6p in the £.

A report by the City's Museum Curator warned that important parts of the City's history could be lost without a record unless adequate provision was made for archaeology in Canterbury. The report called for the employment by the Council of qualified, full-time archaeological staff, more effective liaison between the Council and archaeologists, and adequate financial backing. The report was presented to the City Amenity's Committee and the Town Planning and Development Committee. On the 18th March, the Policy and Resources Committee decided (subject to full Council approval) to give the Canterbury Archaeological Society a £1,500 grant following a discussion of the archaeological report.

On the 12th March, the Town Planning Committee turned down a massive redevelopment plan in the City centre for Hawkes Lane. The Committee considered the plan to be premature, out of character, and too ambitious. The proposed scheme included basement car parking for 208 cars, 25 small shop units, and 2 large shop units linked to the High Street by pedestrian access on the ground floor. There would also be 15 small shops and 2 large shop units within an arcade. The scheme would mean the destruction of the enclosed aspect of Hawkes Lane.

April

From the 1st April, the new City Council took over as part of the reorganisation of local government. Protests were made over the huge increase in the rates. Some people said it was time to form a Ratepayers Association. (However, nothing developed.)

1974 (cont.)

May

The Council Leader stressed the new City Council must be welded into a single unit if it is to succeed. He said it would not be good if each member thought only in terms of what was best for his ward, town parish, or village.

At its annual banquet, the Chamber of Trade warned the City Council that some small Canterbury traders may have to close as they were fighting a losing battle against rising overheads. They had been especially worsened by the massive rise in the rates.

There was more opposition to office blocks, not only because of their monolithic appearance, but because of the changes of use from residential to office in Canterbury's central area. St. Mildred's and St. Maragaret's Society said people needed homes, while the Council was giving serious consideration to a number of planning applications for redevelopment which entailed more office blocks. It said that the City Council should get its priorities right and say no to any more office blocks.

The Alma, Clyde, and Notley Association held its first annual meeting and changed its name to the Northgate Conservation Association. The Association felt it had only been "moderately successful" in achieving its two major mandates. They were: the northeastern part of the proposed Canterbury ring road and declaring a GIA for Northgate.

The City Council announced it was looking into the possibility of building another theatre to replace the Marlowe that may be demolished as part of the St. Margaret's

1974 (cont.)

Street car park redevelopment scheme. The Council said it would find another site for the Marlowe theatre if the current site is redeveloped. It was possible that a developer might want to incorporate the Marlowe theatre into a new development elsewhere.

Towards the end of the month, the Canterbury Planning Action Group was formed "to keep a close eye on the planners". It distributed 5,000 leaflets inviting people to a public meeting at the Westgate Hall on the 18th June. The Group said its aim was to "prevent the massive commercial development that has been encouraged by certain members of the Council and replace their plans with a new strategy for the future". The Group wanted Canterbury to be given more prominence in regional planning. It maintained there should be limits on commercial development and these limits should be explicitly stated. The Group attacked three main areas: ring road, multi-storey car parks, and office premises. The Group was trying to achieve fuller public participation in town planning matters. It said it was not in opposition to existing conservation and amenity societies.

June

On the 4th June, the City Council's Policy Committee decided that the number one priority of the City Council was the redevelopment of the Marlowe and Watling Street car parks. This would have far reaching effects for Canterbury. The closing of the Marlowe theatre and the building of new civic offices for the Council were linked with any development on these sites. It was doubtful that this decision of the Policy Committee would receive much opposition from the full Council. The Council Leader said the first task was the redevelopment of central Canterbury. He said it was valuable real

1974 (cont.)

estate that was being under-used for car parking which operated at a loss. He maintained that by developing the two high value sites in the City centre, improvements to the City's amenities would occur and income to the City Council would increase. The Chief Executive warned the Committee that talking about the redevelopment of the City centre fell "into the category that could make some loud bangs in the wrong direction". The Finance Chairman said the over-riding interest was one of finance. The Chairman of the Estates Committee said "we have only one priority and that is to produce capital and income". The Committee agreed the Council's first priority would be the development of the two sites and instructed the management team to produce a plan that would cover the preliminary work of the development of the sites and their associated effects.

The opposition to office blocks and development in the centre of Canterbury grew.

On the 12th June, the Town Planning Committee discussed office development. One councillor spoke up about his concern over office development in the centre of Canterbury. He put forward 14 suggestions which he asked the Committee and the Council to note when looking at future office building in the City. He said there appeared to be many actual and potential sites for office development and this concern was reflected in the number of conservation societies and planning action groups which had been formed. He questioned whether office development should be allowed inside or outside the City centre. He asked the Council to consider a maximum height and size restriction for offices. He also wanted the City Council to consider housing in the City centre.

1974 (cont.)

The Council Leader pointed out that the new Council had not granted planning permission for any new offices, but had inherited many applications from the old City Council.

There was opposition to the Council's policy of redevelopment of the Marlowe and Watling Street car parks. The Council was described as being "greedy". It was thought there was no need to demolish the Marlowe theatre which was considered to be a public amenity. The opposition said the emphasis on the value of the Marlowe and Watling Street car parks as real estate capable of providing additional income to the City was a one-sided view and a poor basis for the City's planning. The opposition maintained that the factors which made these sites valuable in cash terms also made them highly valuable in terms of the life of the City. It was said the stage was set for another Whitefriars development and the overall result would be a poorly designed no-man's land.

On the 18th June, a public meeting was held by the newly formed Canterbury Planning Action Group. Over 200 people attended and they agreed to lobby the Council in an attempt to make it publicly accountable for its views and decisions on planning matters. The Group also agreed that no further conversion of residential accommodation to offices should be allowed and there should be full public participation on local planning issues before any decisions were made. It also agreed that the concept of Canterbury as an amenity centre should be promoted by the increase in the provision of open spaces and other amenity elements. The Group maintained that haphazard development had been going on since World War II and had resulted in

1974 (cont.)

an acute imbalance in the City centre. The Group said a large number of houses had been demolished. These sites had then become vacant and outside developers had found them attractive. The Group stressed that office conversion decisions were often irreversable. The Group said car parks were owned by the public, and not by the Council. The Group stated that an immediate study on office development should be made in order to determine how much more office development should be allowed in the City centre.

The residents of the Oaten Hill area feared that future development could destroy the village character of Oaten Hill. This led residents to form an association to preserve the district. About 80 people attended a meeting on the 19th June. At the meeting, it was agreed to form an association and steering committee was selected for that aim. The beginnings of the association had started about two months previously when people became aware of planning activity in the area. They had discussed the matter and met with the City Architect to put forward their views. He told them it would be better if he could deal with a Society rather than a number of individuals. The individuals wanted to preserve the area and prevent further office encroachment. They wanted to preserve the area's village character. The formation of the Society was seen to be a community effort. Individuals were afraid of the danger of a residential area turning into a commercial one.

The response to the invitation to form a Ratepayers Association was very discouraging. There were only six letters and a few telephone calls. Nothing came out of this limited interst.

1974 (cont.)

Inflation had pushed up the cost of the multi-storey car park in Longport to nearly £500,000. The original estimate was £310,000 and it was now £465,000. These figures were revealed at the Public Works Committee meeting on the 24th June. The Council Leader wanted to know whether there was any possibility of getting the National Car Parks Association interested in building the multi-storey car park. The Council Officers said the cost was too great for a multi-storey car park, but since the redevelopment of the Marlowe and Watling Street car parks were the Council's number one priority, the Officers said they had to find appropriate sites for multi-storey car parks. The Committee agreed for the matter to be considered by the Policy Committee.

July

The Estates Committee told the Council that redevelopment of the Marlowe and Watling Street sites should be treated as a matter of urgency. On the 9th July, the Amenities Committee agreed to recommend to the Estates Committee that the plans for redevelopment of the Marlowe, the building of a new theatre, and the consideration of associated uses should proceed with the greatest urgency. The Amenities Committee also wanted the Estates Committee to report on possible sites for a new theatre. The Theatre Trust urged the Amenities Committee that public assurances should be given that work on a new theatre would start before the Marlowe Theatre was pulled down.

Ratepayers faced more rate rises of increases up to 20% in the old county borough of Canterbury. An immediate cut in spending plans had gone out to all Council Committees.

1974 (cont.)

The City Architect produced an interim report on offices and office development. On the 17th July, the Town Planning Committee called for a temporary freeze on applications for office development in Canterbury The Report said Canterbury had developed as an office centre in two ways:

1. pre 1961 to 1971 offices primarily developed in buildings that were already in existence and had been used for other purposes such as shopping.
2. in addition, 6 purpose built new office blocks had been constructed, 5 of these 6 office blocks were located in the area between the Old Dover Road and Lower Bridge Street. From 1971 to 1974, nine new office blocks had been built. The 10th was now under construction.

The Report said the new pattern that had emerged from this development was the number of new blocks that had been constructed in the old City centre. The Report mentioned that, at present, there were 12 valid town planning permissions for office development that had not yet been taken up, totalling floor space of 190,300 square feet. Also, there were eight outstanding change of use approvals for office and commercial use totalling 31,503 square feet. Of the 12 new office blocks, 7 of those were in the City centre, with 5 of those seven in the Stour Street and Beer Cart Lane area.

East Kent traders called for a national investigation in an attempt to get a fairer rating system for small business premises. The traders said with spiralling costs, many were going out of business. They decided to urge the government to reform the present rating system. It was suggested that the Chamber of

1974 (cont.)

Trade should put forward candidates for election on the City Council.

August

The Oaten Hill and District Society decided to fight the plan for a 6 storey office block and car park at Lower Chantry lane. A 440 signature petition opposing the office block was sent to the Council by the Society. The Society protested on the grounds that the building and car park would increase the traffic in an already congested area; that it would be a new development in the midst of listed buildings; and that it would be a further intrusion of offices in an area where the balance between residential and business buildings was already delicate. The Town Planning Committee had deferred the application for the 6 storey office block pending the highway recommendations from Kent County Council. An application for change of use from homes to offices in the Oaten Hill area was turned down by the Town Planning Committee. The Society said its aim was to promote a balance between business and residential interests in the area.

September

The Canterbury Planning Action Group said the people of Canterbury now had a chance to suggest how the Stour Street area should be developed. This was because developers said they would not, at the moment, build on some of the sites and were open to suggestions for alternative plans. Controversy had surrounded office development in the area of Stour Street, Beer Cart Lane, and Castle Street. This would have involved five

1974 (cont.)

large projects that would have totally changed the area from a residential district to a commercial one. The Canterbury Planning Action Group said it was going to prepare a scheme and asked for imaginative and practical suggestions from anyone interested in the City's environment. The Group had sent this information from the developers to the City Council.

On the 25th September, the Town Planning Committee considered a report on the riverside as a public amenity. The Report included a plan to provide a continuous path along the River. When the 1970 Development Plan was reviewed, large areas of riverside land had been allocated for public open space. The Report was based on a report done by the former City Architect that was approved by the City Council before local government re-organisation. The Town Planning Committee also agreed that prospective developers in the City of Canterbury should be allowed to pay the Council a sum of money instead of providing car parking spaces. Although developers had to provide one space for every 400 square feet of floor space, the Town Planning Committee heard that it was sometimes to the advantage of both the developers and the public if nearby public car parks were used instead. The developers would be asked to pay £1,550 for every car parking space in lieu of providing it themselves.

The Council considered the planning application for 70,000 square feet of office development at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane. Residents were worried about this application. The area was zoned for residential use, so they could not understand why an application for office use should be considered. They were afraid that the Council had already made up its mind for office development on the site.

1974 (cont.)

October

It was thought that pressure by the Canterbury Planning Action Group was successful because the County and City Councils produced an immediate interim study on the effects of office and shop development. The Chairman of Kent County Council's Planning and Transport Committee said the Action Group's representation resulted directly in talks between the planning departments of both Councils. The letter said: "It is recognised that the present town map for Canterbury does not by itself provide a sufficient guide for dealing with the many pressures for offices and shops in the City and that the Structure Plan now being prepared which will deal with these subjects will not be ready in time to affect immediate problems".

The Canterbury Planning Action Group said a 6 storey "temple of bureaucracy" planned for Canterbury should be the subject of a public inquiry before its approval by the City Council. The huge block was planned on the corner of St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane. The Canterbury Planning Action Group started a campaign to oppose the block. The Group said the office block would threaten the historic character of the City. The Town Planning Committee had debated the office block development on the week of 14th October, but deferred its decision until the report on office development had been completed. The Council Leader thought that the plans were an improvement for the site and said "nothing else could go there". The Action Group listed the following arguments against the plan:

1. The office development was contrary to the Council's own policy.

1974 (cont.)

2. The zoning of the area on the Development Plan was for residential use of the site as opposed to commercial.
3. The impact of the office development's visual amenity was negative.
4. There was a total lack of public participation.

The Canterbury College of Architecture formed a Neighbourhood Design Unit composed of staff and students. The Unit offered its services to any organisation in the City. Its aim was to act as a service to local amenity groups and local interest groups who needed the expertise the Unit could offer - graphics, drawings, etc. Some of its work would be on display at an exhibition organised by the Northgate Conservation Association in November. The Unit tried to be imaginative in its proposals.

On the 30th October, a public inquiry was held on the demolition of 77 Castle Street, a listed building. The preliminary sketch plans showed a mock Georgian front.

November

There was some criticism of the Canterbury Planning Action Group. Some residents disagreed with its tactics which they thought would stifle the future prospects of the City. They said it was strange for a group who wished to "save" Canterbury. They did not know whom the Canterbury Planning Action Group claimed to represent. The critics said the Group's attack on the proposed office block at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane appeared to be an unwarranted one on the City Council. Some saw the Group as competition against the Canterbury Society, ie trying to usurp its position as the leading amenity society in Canterbury, destroying the favourable trends and delicate balance that the Canterbury Society had established.

1974 (cont.)

The Canterbury Society attempted to distance and distinguish itself from the Canterbury Planning Action Group. It said the Group's contentions were "emotional" and criticised the Group's terminology of the"temple of bureaucracy" to the proposed office block at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane. The Canterbury Society thought the Group was too vigorous and militant for an organisation.

Some residents backed the Canterbury Planning Action Group and said the Group was doing something that the Canterbury Society was not. They said the Group was doing a fine job in pressing for a proper balance of residential occupation in the City centre which would complement the shops and offices. The methods of the two groups differed, but their aim was similar - to preserve the character of Canterbury.

The exhibition held by the Northgate Conservation Association was termed a success. The Association said Northgate had become derelict because of the lack of real planning or action by the City Council in the area. The exhibition attracted over 300 people. The Association enlisted the help of the Neighbourhood Design Unit and put forward positive proposals on how the locality could be improved. Most of the derelict land was owned by the City Council and the Association said the City Council's failure to do anything discouraged those people who lived in the area from doing anything. The Association was prepared to help in a general clean up of Northgate and to start on a public garden for the area.

Kent County Council wanted comments on how its County Structure Plan was to be produced. It was the first stage of public participation for the Kent Structure Plan.

1974 (cont.)

Towards the end of November, there was a demolition threat to two listed buildings in North Lane. This threat prompted residents to form a conservation society - the North Lane Area Group. The aim of the Group was to work with the Council in implementing any schems of improvement of redevelopment on which residents were agreed. The Group said it would oppose any plans that it felt were detrimental to its historic area.

December

On the 18th December, the Town Planning Committee decided to plan for regular informal talks with amenity societies and members of the Town Planning Committee. All the amenity societies were contacted and were in favour of the idea.

The Canterbury Society opposed the 5 storey office block for the GPO on Rheims Way. The model and plan of the office block were put on show by the GPO because of an approach by the Canterbury Society. The work on the office block would begin in early 1975. The majority of the Council was delighted with the plans. However, the GPO did not need planning permission from the City Council to build the office block because of its Crown connections.

The Oaten Hill and District Society opposed the St. George's Place office block. The Society said it would ruin the residential aspect of Ivy Lane and called for a public inquiry. The Canterbury Planning Action Group continued its campaign against the office block. It urged people to write to the DoE and to Canterbury's MP.

1975

January

Both the rates for Kent County Council and the City Council were expected to rise between 20-25% for the financial year 1975/76.

On the 22nd January, the City Council heard a recommendation from the Public Works subcommittee on car parking that Canterbury would need three multi-storey car parks by 1980 to meet the predicted demand. The subcommittee also recommended that a detailed study should be made of two sites - Rosemary Lane and Rhodaus Town - for a multi-storey car park. One councillor (from the Labour group)wanted the Rosemary Lane site dropped but the move was defeated. At the meeting, it was heard that more car parking spaces would be needed if the Marlowe and Watling Street car parks were redeveloped. Anyway, it was argued that more car parking spaces would be needed for this redevelopment to occur. The Rosemary Lane site had been considered by the City Council prior to local government re-organisation, but it had been rejected because of access problems; the cost of new road works that would be needed and the nearness to the Castle, an ancient monument. The City Council accepted the Public Works subcommittee's recommendations.

A report on office development was published by the City Architect. The report said no new offices should be allowed in the City centre in order to protect valuable areas from intrusive and traffic effects. The report was expected to be welcomed by the City's amenity societies who had been anxious about office development. The report was accepted by the Planning Committee on the 21st January. It was then circulated among amenity societies and other organisations. The Council said this interim office policy would restrict office development in the City centre until

1975 (cont.)

formal approval of the Kent Structure Plan. However, this policy would not affect any applications for changes of use of old buildings or extensions to existing office buildings.

February

There was a 30% rise in the rates for the ratepayers of the old City Council. Kent County Council blamed the increase on spiralling inflation. Kent County Council issued a warning to all district councils to be ruthless in cutting back on prestige projects. The new Kent County Council rate was 46.27p in the £ which was a 9.27p increase over the current year. In Canterbury, ratepayers were faced with an increase of 11.37p in the £. Canterbury City Council's rate rose 13¾% for domestic ratepayers and 19¼% for comercial ratepayers. The commercia full rate was 79.5p this year (last year it was 59.1p) and the domestic rate was 61p (last year it was 41.6p). The reasons given for the increase was "unprecedented" inflation and the re-organisation of local government.

The Town Planning Committee on the 19th February decided not to cut grants for historic buildings. The proposed reduction was to be from £18,000 to £10,000 pa.

There was continued opposition to office blocks and multi-storey car parks. It was said the Council was still planning multi-storey car parks and granting planning permission for office development. The Canterbury Planning Action Group, the Canterbury Society, and the Oaten Hill and District Society criticised the office report by saying it did not go far enough to restrict office development. They said it failed to recognise all the far reaching effects of new office

1975 (cont.)

development in the City centre. There was a growing public fear about the effect on the City of ever-increasing office development. The groups said the City Architect was not firm enough with the problem and he used out-of-date information which seriously affected his conclusions. The Canterbury Planning Action Group accused the City Architect of being superstitious in his assumption that Canterbury must have more offices to survive. The Group said if the report was adopted, then Canterbury would have more offices. The Group expected to see a flood of applications for change of use from residential to commercial.

A report from the New Theatre subcommittee was considered by the Amenities and Recreation Committee on the 11th February. The report recommended that a new theatre should be built to replace the existing Marlowe and not to spend money on the existing theatre on costly conversions. The sites considered were the old mill on the Causeway, Westgate Gardens, and Dane John gardens. The Committee wanted the new theatre to be located in the centre of Canterbury.

March

On the 5th March, the City Council deleted from its budget new development costing £1 million, but the rates still increased (some up to 34.5%). The cutback in spending affected services. The domestic element of the Rate Support Grant was increased from 13p to 18½p in the £.

Planning consent was given for 7,500 square feet of offices and 4,050 square feet of showroom space in the redevelopment of 77-79 Castle Street. The second phase of development was planned for additional office area of about 7,500 square feet.

1975 (cont.)

The Chamber of Trade maintained that if Canterbury was to retain its position as Kent's premier shopping centre, a solution must be found to its parking and traffic problems. The Chamber was concerned with the City's traffic problems.

The Neighbourhood Design Unit of the College of Architecture completed a scheme for the St. Radigund's area to turn it back into a living community. The scheme was on show at the Sidney Cooper Centre on the 11th March. The exhibition was jointly arranged by the Canterbury Society, the Northgate Association, and the North Lane Area Group. It was an experimental project which had been concerned largely with public participation. The Unit said that the idea of participation was something that had only recently been introduced into urban design.

The Canterbury Society and the Canterbury Planning Action Group criticised Kent County Council's plans to demolish two listed 18th century buildings on Broad Street (nos. 9 and 10). The Secretary of State (DoE) had to confirm any demolition consent. The groups saw it as hypocracy when Kent County Council said it was in favour of conservation.

The Canterbury Society, at its annual meeting, decided that Canterbury's first priority must be to get the traffic out of the City centre. In reviewing the year, the Society adopted the roles of agitator, critic, and objector.

1975 (cont.)

April

Changes were made to the City Council's policy to control office development in the City centre following comments from amenity societies. Most of the individuals and organisations who commented on the interim policy welcomed the need for an office policy that had been recognised by the Council but they were concerned that office development could cause serious problems outside the immediate centre of the City. The policy had been criticised as being too narrow and neglectful of the social considerations and other factors concerning the City centre. There was a fear that increased pressure would occur for changes of use from residential to offices as a result of the policy.

The City Architect added that the policy emphasised the need to retain residential uses within the central area of Canterbury. The amended policy was that new office development within central Canterbury would not generally be permitted except for two conditions:

1. Planning applications primarily for changes of use or extensions to existing office buildings would be considered on their merits.
2. In cases of an application for office use for a bank, building society, estate agents, or other use generally considered compatible with the character of the area within the City walls, this use would be considered. But any planning application would be subject to a condition that the premises would not subsequently be used for general office use within a particular schedule of the 1972 Town and Country Planning Act.

1975 (cont.)

The policy stated that outside the City walls, new office development should be sited on land already allocated for business purposes near to the ring road. In cases where new office development was proposed in the City centre and thought to be acceptable in the light of suggested policies, the following general design criteria would apply. The City Council would not generally grant permission for demolition or alteration that involved a great change in the physical environmental character of a listed building. The detailed design would be judged against 6 things:

1. the siting of buildings in relation to the adjoining buildings and spaces and to the existing building lines
2. the use of approporiate building material
3. the form and size of the building should not exceed more than three stories
4. the scale and proportion of windows and shopfronts
5. the fall and massing of the roof and roof materials
6. landscaping and treatment of paved surfaces, boundary walls, street furniture and signs.

There was public opposition against the rise in rates. This was mostly from domestic ratepayers of Canterbury.

May

Stour Valley Society criticised the Kent Structure Plan because it was already out-of-date. The Society complained about the deterioration in the Valley which it thought was due to a lack of decisive action and money.

1975 (cont.)

The City Council proposed the building of new council offices at the Chaucer Barracks site. A panel hearing was to be held on the proposal in order to save the cost of a public inquiry. The Council reasoned that as the Secretary of State (DoE) became familiar with decisions taken by a council that held panel hearings, he would begin to trust its capacity to make fair decisions. Therefore, he would be less likely to call a public inquiry on town planning issues. The justification for the new council offices was based on the need for more efficiency in Council business.

The Boundary Commission reviewed the wards of the City of Canterbury. Both Labour and Conservative parties called for a review of how the new wards were devised. If their representations were strong enough, then a local inquiry would be ordered by the Commission.

The Town Planning Committee on the 21st May gave planning permission to the controversial plan to build a six storey office block on the corner of St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane. The Committee recommended to Kent County Council to grant planning permission for the block. The press and public were barred from the meeting "in order to permit a proper and thorough discussion to be possible" and "to make such a discussion fruitful and comprehensive".

The building of a link road between Rheims Way and Whitstable Road now seemed unlikely to get approval from the City Council. The scheme would have cost about £600,000 when first put before the old City Council. Two committees of the new City Council agreed the road would not be needed now.

1975 (cont.)

June

Opposition continued against the office block at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane. The opposition was still pressing for a public inquiry. It urged Kent County Council to reject the recommendation from the City Council to approve the office development. There was concern that the City Council took its decision in a closed session. It was felt the City Council's approval of the office block contradicted its office policy. The Canterbury Planning Action Group did not think there were any justifications for such a block. The Group had carried out its own opinion poll on planning. It was a survey of 250 people. The majority said the present size of Canterbury was the best. Sixty percent said more parks and open spaces were needed and favoured pedestrianisation in the City centre. The majority said there were too many offices in the City. Sixty-six percent said their Council representative should keep in touch with public opinion on big issues. Twenty-five percent said they had no faith in the town planners. Seventy-five percent said they would like a bigger and better say in town planning matters.

The DoE was to give more cash for old buildings in order to stop their deterioration. The City Council was to contribute £8,000; Kent County Council £2,000; and the DoE £10,000.

A professional archaeologist backed by government money was hired to investigate the Canterbury area and to set up a full-time archaeological unit.

1975 (cont.)

The Northgate Association and the North Lane Area Group opposed the continuing presence of the Broad Street - St. Radigund's section of the proposed ring road on the Development Plan. The North Lane Area Group supported the action taken by the Canterbury Society by referring the effects of traffic vibration upon the Westgate to the DoE.

On the 30th June, 30 demonstrators pressed the City Council to build a link road between Rheims Way and Whitstable Road. They blocked off Orchard Street. The Council had given the scheme a low priority. The protestors wanted the road to be built to take heavy vehicles away from the roads near their homes. The protestors were mostly residents of Orchard Street. The demonstrators said they were planning to form an action committee.

July

Opposition to the City Council grew over the lack of a link road.

August

On the 6th August, the Town Planning Committee approved a plan to prevent the development of hypermarkets and supermarkets outside the town centre. The decision to prevent more retail units on industrial estates go to the full Council in September for approval. The decision tightened up the policy that was agreed in June. The City Architect said changes in shopping trends since World War II had led to the development of pressure for hypermarkets, discount warehouses and cash and carry stores. His report pointed out the

1975 (cont.)

problems created on the site, such as inadequate car parking and street lighting and the possible detrimental economic effect on the existing town centre as a result of the changing pattern of shopping.

September

The Finance Committee agreed on the first of September that up to £3,000 should be put towards archaeology for Canterbury.

The Black Griffin Lane Residents' Association was formed. The area had once been considered by the old City Council for a clearance area. Its aim was to look after the area and the interests of the residents. Little had been done by the Council to keep the area presentable. The Association was to concern itself with all the environmental and housing problems in the area.

The Urban Studies Centre became a reality in Canterbury after a £11,500 donation. The Centre would cover Canterbury, Herne Bay, Whitstable and villages. It had taken two years for the Centre to become a reality since it was first proposed. The Centre was to provide an experimental programme of environmental education that would be open to all. There would be films, lectures,visits, meetings, and opportunities for architecture and planning students to carry out projects in the Canterbury area. The Centre was to deal with all the aspects of the environment.

1975 (cont.)

On the 17th September, the City Council decided the new Council offices would be its number one priority. The Conservatives defeated a move by Labour to send back for reconsideration the Policy Committee's list of priority projects to put housing on the top of the list. There was public opposition to the new proposed Council offices.

October

The Town Planning Committee decided to hold a panel hearing over the civic offices. The Committee decided to save money by holding a panel hearing. The Chief Executive warned against setting a precedent of panel hearings for every planning issue that raised objections. He hoped it would be appreciated that panel hearings were a genuine effort by the Council to obtain the public's view without unnecessary legal or technical representation. The Council Leader defended the proposal for the civic offices as top priority on the basis of the need for corporate efficiency. The offices would be just outside the City centre and therefore be in accordance with the Council's office policy.

There was continued opposition to the civic offices. The Canterbury Planning Action Group saw it as a way of releasing the Dane John offices for speculative office development. There was opposition from other residents. They saw the Council as alienating itself from the people it represented by giving approval to grandiose schemes such as the civic offices. Opposition to the civic offices was also expressed because of the cost.

The Healey and Baker Report on the feasibility of the commercial redevelopment of the Marlowe and Watling Street sites was made public. The Policy Committee

1975 (cont.)

considered the report at its next meeting. One problem facing the Committee was the provision of more car parking if the sites were developed. The Chief Executive said there was a need to plan for major additional car parking provision in the City if the redevelopment proposals were to proceed.

Kent County Council dropped the ring road scheme for Canterbury partly because of the City Council's insistence. The decision was hailed as a triumph for the amenity societies who had objected to the road plans since their introduction in 1970. The new decision would lift planning blight from Broad Street, St. Dunstans Street, St. Radigunds Street, Pound Lane, and St. Peters Place. The City Architect said pressure from the amenity societies and other groups had brought about this change in policy. The amenity societies hoped the areas could be rehabilitated for residential purposes and this would help to preserve the life of the City.

The proposed office block for St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane was referred to the Environment Secretary. He would decided whether or not to call a public inquiry because the proposal was a departure from the Development Plan. The amenity societies still pressed for a public inquiry.

On the 28th October, the Policy Committee approved in principle the plan to redevelop the Marlowe and Watling Street car parks. The plan would now go to other Committees so the project could be finalised. The Committee approved the idea for the Marlowe site to be redeveloped on a phased basis.

1975 (cont.)

On the 29th October, the Town Planning Committee decided to give a £36,000 facelift for the empty owned Council houses in North Lane, St. Radigunds and Pound Lane after the ring road plans had been dropped. The decision delighted the amenity groups who had been campaigning to bring life back into blighted areas.

November

The Labour group on the City Council criticised the way two different Council Committees made different recommendations which removed planning blight one week and restored it the next. The Town Planning Committee removed the blight that had resulted from the ring road proposals and the following week the Public Works Committee had recommended to reconsider the railway route. The Labour group said people did not know where they stood due to this ambiguity in the Council's thinking.

December

The Public Works Committee put forward Rosemary Lane as a site for development as a multi-storey car park. It was based on the justification that if Canterbury was to maintain its place as a premier shopping Centre, another 1,934 car parking spaces must be found urgently. The Committee thought a car parking problem would arise when the Marlowe and Watling Street sites were redeveloped. Parking spaces would be lost and additional spaces were needed to accommodate shoppers who would be coming into the City. The Chief Executive said the redevelopment proposals had major

1975 (cont.)

implications for car parking and if the Council wanted to start the redevelopment of the Marlowe car park as a priority, then provision would now have to be made for at least 308 car parking spaces. A feasibility study of the Rosemary Lane site showed it would give a further 373 spaces. Rhodaus Town had been suggested as a site, but it was rejected because land would have to be bought for access roads. The task of the Committee was to recommend a car parking strategy. The Council had to satisfy Kent County Council's commercial development requirements for car parking before planning permission could be given for the redevelopment of the Marlowe and Watling Street sites.

On the 17th December, the Town Planning Committee discussed car parking. The City Engineer said if not enough spaces were provided, shoppers would go elsewhere. The Committee decided a new car park at Rosemary Lane should have as many spaces as possible, even if it would be two decks high. Three schemes were discussed: Scheme A - 150 car parking spaces; Scheme B - 220 car parking spaces; and Scheme C - 373 car parking spaces.

The majority of the Committee favoured Scheme C. The present site provided room for 220 cars. The Council Leader thought the environmental considerations were important and maintained that the car park would be screened and there would be two storey buildings around it. The Council Leader noted that there was no one from the public at the Committee meeting. He said all the amenity socities did was to write letters.

1975 (cont.)

There was an inquiry into ward changes for Canterbury. Both Labour and Conservative parties called for the inquiry. The proposals would reduce the City Council's membership from 51 to 49 and there would be five three member wards: Wincheap, Northgate, Westgate, Barton Court, and St. Stephens. It was now up to the Home Secretary to decide on the ward boundaries.

1976

January

The Canterbury Society said it did care about Canterbury as shown in its 15 years of existence.

The Canterbury Urban Studies Centre opposed the Rosemary Lane site for a car park. It hoped the Council would reconsider its decision. There was opposition from residents in Castle Street for Rosemary Lane as the proposed site for a multi-storey car park. They did not care if Canterbury was not the premier shopping centre in East Kent. They said that the only people who did care about that was a handful of shopkeepers. The Castle Street residents said that a multi-storey car park would incur a tremendous cost in terms of money and the environment. They maintained the City should be a place in which to live and not to house office blocks, cars, and shops.

On the 14th January, despite protests by the Labour member, the City Council agreed to the first stage in the redevelopment of the Council owned car parks in the central area. The City Council decided to design plans for a shopping complex on the Marlowe car park and for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane.

1976 (cont.)

The Labour members complained the public had not been given enough time or facilities to make proper comments about the scheme. They wanted the schemes to go back to the Policy Committee for a rethink, but the move was defeated. The Labour members said there had been insufficient discussion on the Council. Some Conservative Councillors said they were all for consulting the amenity societies, but reminded the members that in the final analysis, it was the Council that made the decisions. The Council Leader again pointed out the lack of the public at Council meetings. (There were only seven members of the public present.)

February

The City Council's rate increased by 11.6% The City Council did not raise its rates, but Kent County Council's precept rose by 5.82p in the £. The new rate for the old City was now 68.08p. The differential between Canterbury and Herne Bay-Whitstable-Bridge Blean would be phased out in 1977. The domestic element of the Rate Support Grant was 18.5p in the £.

The Canterbury Planning Action Group said Canterbury must not compete with Ashford in a "greedy dash for mediocrity". The Group protested over the plan to build more shops. The Group told the City and County planners that they could devastate the City's heritage. The Group maintained that Rosemary Lane should be used for houses instead of a multi-storey car park. They said that a large scale increase in shops would spoil the City's atmosphere and additional traffic generated in the Rosemary Lane area would only worsen a terrible situation in the area. The

1976 (cont.)

Group could not understand why multi-storey car parks were considered to be the answer to car parking problems.

The panel hearing on the proposal for civic offices at the Chaucer Barracks site was held. The opponents to the scheme said it was too costly; it was located in the wrong place; and extra traffic would be generated in an area that would not be able to cope. The Council said the panel hearing was to measure public feelings about the scheme and to help the City Council make a decision.

March

A plan for a 654 space multi-storey car park at Rosemary lane was revealed on Monday the 15th March at the Public Works Committee meeting. The multi-storey car park would be composed of three decks with one and half decks below ground. Housing for young and old people would ring the car park on three sides: Gas Street, Castle Street, and Rosemary Lane. Twenty-five car parking spaces would be reserved for these residents. The multi-storey car park was estimated to cost around £1 million. The Public Works Committee approved the plan and gave the City Architect the authority to work out a full design and to start consultation with interested bodies (such as the Royal Fine Arts Commission, the DoE, and the amenity societies). The main entrance and exit of the car park would be on Castle Street. It appeared the City Architect equated conservation with the external treatment of buildings, ie the physical aspect. The project would have to be referrred to the Housing and Town Planning Committees for their approvals.

1976 (cont.)

The Council said it wanted to start full public participation exercises as soon as possible. It wanted the plan to be published at an early stage and to hold a panel hearing on the proposal (which was seen as a substitute for a public inquiry). The Council saw the proposal as an "excellent solution to a difficult problem", ie Rosemary lane would meet the requirement for car parking spaces that would be needed as a result of the proposed new shopping complex on the Marlowe site. The Council wanted to develop the Marlowe and Watling Street sites because they were not producing income. At the moment, the City Council was losing £265,000 on car parks, despite central government's directive that car parks should be self-supporting.

The traders maintained that Canterbury needed more car parking spaces, otherwise, it would be in grave danger of losing some of its present trade through the lack of car parking facilities close to the City centre.

At its annual meeting, the Canterbury Society discussed its change of focus on town planning issues over the years. At first, the Society was concerned with the preservation of listed buildings and tried to stop their demolition. Whereas today, its main concern was planning and conservation. The Society's main achievements were the changing of the views of the local authority on town planning matters to recognise "the subtleties of Canterbury" and making the local authority aware "that Canterbury has to be treated sympathetically". When the Society first started, people had viewed it with suspicion and thought a conservation society was against everything because it did not want changes. The Society felt today that it

1976 (cont.)

was a respected organisation, that the local authority listened to it, and that it had status. The Canterbury Society was campaigning for full public knowledge and consultation of the plans for the centre of Canterbury - the Rosemary Lane, the Marlowe and Watling Street sites. The Society had persuaded the Council to put the copies of the Healey and Baker Report in the library. The Canterbury Society saw Canterbury as a magnet for shopping, but it was concerned how far this expansion could be accommodated without harming "the essential nature of Canterbury". The Society saw the Kent Structure Plan as the main outline for what would happen in planning terms at the local level. The Society was concerned about the deplorable state of repair of listed buildings, many of which were owned by the Council.

The City Council approved in principle Healey and Baker's Plan 1 of the Marlowe site which called for the demolition of the theatre in order to obtain the maximum floor space for shopping.

April

The Planning Committee approved the City Council's plan to build a civic centre and 140 homes at the Chaucer Barracks site. The civic centre was estimated to cost £3 million. The decision followed a panel hearing held by the Council on the proposal. The panel was composed of three councillors - the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and an ordinary member of the Town Planning Committee. The principle of a panel hearing was praised by the City Council. The panel hearing on the Chaucer Barracks site was the first one to be held in Canterbury. The Council said its purpose was to test public reaction to major plans before their

1976 (cont.)

approval by the Council. The Council stressed the panel hearing was unbiased and thought it was "an invaluable exercise".

The City Council said it would do full scale public participation exercises (including a special meeting with amenity societies to explain the proposal) over its plan for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. Several amenity groups objected to the proposed multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. These groups were the Canterbury Society, St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society, and the Canterbury Planning Action Group. The objections focused on two main areas:

1. the traffic implications for the Wincheap roundabout and the narrow lanes in the City centre
2. the need for housing to restore the balance and life of the City.

Labour Councillors thought the Rosemary Lane site was the wrong place for a multi-storey car park.

At the Town Planning Committee meeting, the City Architect said commercial growth within the old City of Canterbury could continue and still be compatible with the conservation of its historic character as stated in the draft Kent Structure Plan. The City Architect believed the aim of a balanced prosperity could be achieved. The Town Planning Committee agreed with these views and agreed that they be communicated to Kent County Council.

1976 (cont.)

May

The local election was held on the 6th May. (Canterbury wards: Dane John 4 seats, Northgate 5 seats, and Westgate 6 seats.) One hundred and twenty-two candidates were seeking election for 51 seats in the Canterbury District. There were 51 Labour candidates, 50 Conservative candidates, 15 Liberal candidates, 3 Ratepayers Association candidates, 2 Independent candidates, and one Communist candidate. The Conservatives retained control of the City Council - they won 46 of the 51 seats. The remainder of the seates were thus allocated - 2 Herne Bay Ratepayers Association councillors, 2 Independent councillors, and one Labour councillor. There was a 46% turnout of the local electorate. The previous Council had a Conservative majority of 37 to 14.

At its annual dinner, the Canterbury Chamber of Trade members were urged to take more interest in its affairs. The Chairman maintained the Chamber had a voice that could be heard, but it was not as powerful as it had been in the past when the Council of the Chamber was practically the City Council. The Chairman termed this "a useful combination". The Chamber emphasised that car parking was of paramount importance if the traders were going to survive. The traders wanted more car parking spaces and lower car parking fees.

Graves were going to be removed from part of the site of the Church of St. Mary Bredin, Rose Lane, in preparation for the redevelopment scheme for the Marlowe site which the Council proposed to turn into a shopping centre.

1976 (cont.)

A public inquiry was to be held in July over the proposal for a six storey office block at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane. The Oaten Hill & District Society tried to get other amenity societies interested in order to acquire a united effort of representation at the public inquiry. There were two main objections to the scheme from the Oaten Hill & District Society:

1. Cities were for people to live in and the Society did not want Canterbury "to be a wasteland after dark".
2. An office block would be a generator of traffic and it would place intolerable pressure on the roads south of Canterbury.

June

The objections to the City Council's proposal for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane grew. The objections are summarised below:

1. The proposal appeared to be fait accompli because the City Council was already inviting tenders for Rosemary Lane to start in May 1977.
2. Rosemary Lane was not the right location for a multi-storey car park. It seemed the Council was rushing it through "with unseemly haste".
3. Insufficient attention had been given to alternative sites for a multi-storey car park, eg Longport or behind Clarksons. Also, new signs indicating where existing car parks were located would be helpful and they would try to alleviate congestion in the Gravel Walk area, especially on Saturdays.

1976 (cont.)

Car parks not required at peak periods could be brought into use on the weekends.

4. There was the belief that housing should be a priority in the conservation area inside of the City walls.
5. There was the archaeological value of the site in relation to the Norman Keep and Bailey Walls.
6. There had been a lack of public discussion about the scheme.
7. A multi-storey car park for over 600 cars would have a blighting effect on the environment of the entire area though increased noise, air pollution, and stress from traffic.

The Royal Fine Arts Commission gave its approval for the Rosemary Lane scheme. The Commission said it generally held the principle that car parking should be outside the walls of historic cities, but "it appreciated the special nature of the situation".

The Chief Executive, in his report, said the City Council had been depicted in a good light by the local newspaper. He mentioned the possibility of the Council producing its own newspaper every three months as well as the full-time appointment of a public relations officer.

July

The protest over the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park was growing in strength and intensity. The Canterbury Society was not particularly concerned about the location, but thought 600 spaces were too many and this number should be halved. The amenity societies suggested the alternative of underground car parking on the Marlowe site. They maintained Rosemary Lane was an area of great historic and

1976 (cont.)

archaeological importance and that a multi-storey car park would be out of scale with the surrounding residential community. They were concerned that the commercial expansion of the City should not be at the expense of its historical heritage and community life. It was thought that the multi-storey car park would cater for the out-of-town shoppers who wanted to get as close to the City centre as possible. It was stated "that their wish for maximum personal mobility must not be allowed to over-ride the need to maintain Canterbury's residential localities". The amenity societies tried to pressure the Council to call a public meeting to discuss the Rosemary Lane proposal.

The Labour party opposed the plan for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. It maintained the site should be residential and the proposal would increase the traffic in the area and would operate at a loss. It wanted all of the 8 acre site in Stour Street for housing and not just the three acres as suggested by the City Council.

The amenity societies felt they were being led by the Council to believe that the informal process of changing the Development Plan in 1973 for the rezoning of Rosemary Lane for housing did not happen at all, or if it did, it did not matter. The amenity societies felt the amendment of 1973 still stood and the proposal to build a multi-storey car park on the Rosemary Lane site constitutied a major departure from the amended 1970 Town Plan. At the end of July, the City Council tried to reschedule the Rosemary Lane site from housing to car parking. Little time had been left for objections to be made.

1976 (cont.)

On the 6th July, the City Council and the amenity societies met to discuss the proposal for the Rosemary Lane site. Two different impressions of the meeting were obtained. On the one hand, the amenity societies did not call the meeting a discussion as did the Council; they were there to hear the Council answer their questions that had been sent by letter. On the other hand, the Council labelled the amenity societies as having "closed minds". The City Council saw itself as encouraging public participation, but criticised those who did not agree with it. The City Council defended its proposal for the Rosemary Lane car park on the basis that the scheme would benfit the majority of the citizens of Canterbury. The City Council maintained it was developing the bomb sites of the City for its improvement. The City Council did not think there would be a traffic problem at the Wincheap roundabout because the Canterbury by-pass would remove 60% of the traffic from the ring road. The Council stressed that Rosemary Lane had many advantages but it was also looking for other sites to build multi-storey car parks. The Longport site would cost 60% more than Rosemary Lane. The Council said if it was "going to develop the Marlowe site, then we have to provide a car park". The City Architect, the City Engineer, the Council Leader, and the Chairman of the Public Works Committee represented the Council at this meeting.

The public inquiry on the proposed office block at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane was held in July. The proposal was for the largest block in the City centre - it would be six stories had have 68.500 sq ft. of office space on a two acre site.

1976 (cont.)

The land was owned by three parties - Anglo-American Property Company - 40%; City Council - 35%; and another party - 25%. The arrangement would be a ground lease of the site's owners to the City Council. The City Council would then grant to an interested developer an over-riding lease on all the land involved. The Council and Wiltshiers (who would finance the scheme and carry out the work) would have complete control of the site if the planning application was granted. Originally the site was earmarked by the City Council for business use, but later the DoE had decided the area should be zoned for residential purposes. Apparently, the City Council did not really accept the DoE's decision because it supported this application for office use. It was revealed at the public inquiry that the property company, Anglo-American Property Company (based in London) had gone into liquidation. The objections to the office block were: it was too big; it would generate traffic; and it would harm the quality and vitality of the nearby residential areas.

Kent County Council, in its preparation of the Kent Structure Plan, said Canterbury's future development may be hampered by the need to preserve the City's historic chracter. It said Canterbury and Ashford were being considered as possible areas for growth. It said Canterbury was a dominant subregional centre in East Kent and had experienced high rates in employment growth and employment structure. Therefore, Canterbury had good prospects for growth. Kent County Council was in a dilemna in that a decision to increase the City's economic growth would conflict with Kent County Council's other important objective of conserving the county's environmental resources.

1976 (cont.)

August

Anger and opposition grew over the proposal to build a multi-storey car park on the Rosemary Lane site. A new group, calling itself Action for Rosemary Lane, was formed to fight the plans for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. It was composed of Canterbury amenity groups and individuals who opposed the proposal. Its aim was to prevent the construction of the City Council's £1 million scheme for car parking and housing. If the application for the car park is approved, the group would try to pressurise the DoE for a public inquiry. The group maintained that the Stour Street report and its recommendations was approved by the DoE and they had not been reversed. The group said there had been an "almost total lack of public participation in the Planning Committee's decision in December 1975, to site the car park in such a sensitively historic area". The group maintained the plan was premature because it came before any long term traffic and car parking policies for the City and before the local plan for Canterbury. The group pointed out that the City Treasurer said the income from the car parking charges would not cover the cost of the car park and the deficit would have to be met from the rates. The group said although part of the cost would be met by a loan, the loan charges on the total car park would be in the order of £100,000 per annum for 30 years.

The Oaten Hill and District Society claimed that decisions on planning applications were made before the end of the statutory time allowed for objections. The Society also pointed out, that in its area, too many homes were being converted into offices and this seemed to be indicative of a general trend in the City centre.

1976 (cont.)

The Policy Committee decided the press and public should be allowed into the meetings of its finance decision-makers. The Committee retained the right of excluding the press and public for confidential business.

The City Council's Estates Committee approved a £1,700,000 redevelopment scheme for a shopping complex on the Marlowe site. The plan included room for large national stores, small shops, and a sheltered walk from Rose Lane to St. Margaret's Street. The Estates Committee said the plan did not affect the Marlowe theatre itself because any decision about moving the theatre would not be made until the Watling Street car park had been developed, possibly with a new theatre. The Estates Committee decided the development could be built in stages: Stage 1 would consist of the Rose Lane stores and one side of the mall; Stage 2 would consist of the rest of the mall and infill on St. Margaret's Street. The Council would not have a direct part in the building of the scheme. The Council would design a detailed plan of what the buildings would look like and then accept tenders for it.

September

Action for Rosemary Lane organised a public meeting at the end of the month in order to voice opposition to the scheme. The meeting was packed which was an indication of the extent and size of the opposition to the scheme. At the meeting, it was emphasised that multi-storey car parks were not wanted within the City walls; there were better locations outside the City walls and underground car parking could be incorporated on the Marlowe site. The people who attended the meeting wanted a public inquiry into the Rosemary Lane car park. Apparently, the City Council was given

1976 (cont.)

a tough time over the scheme. The planning application for the scheme had not yet gone to the Town Planning Committee.

Traffic schemes were worked on for the Rosemary Lane proposal with the County and District Officers. This co-operation continued until January 1977 when a new traffic management scheme was introduced.

The City Council published a report on Rosemary Lane which served as a justification for its proposal. The basis of the Council's argument for the proposal was that the Rosemary Lane scheme was seen "as one of the City Council's positive steps towards prosperity", ie the car parking scheme fitted into the City Council's strategy for the prosperity of Canterbury. The car parking project had been part of the Council's overall strategy since 1973. This overall strategy was the redevelopment of central area sites in order to bring income into the City, the report stated. However, the redevelopment of these sites would incur the loss of car parking spaces that needed to be replaced. The report maintained the loss of car parking spaces without replacement "would have serious effects on the prosperity of the City by making it less attractive to the private vehicle borne visitor, be they visitor or resident, for shopping, business, or recreational purposes". The car parking study by the City Engineer in 1974 showed the need for "substantial additional car parking provision in the City centre irrespective of the need to replace any car parking loss on the Marlowe and Watling Street sites". Therefore, the report continued, the prerequisite for the development of the Marlowe and Watling Street sites was the provision

1976 (cont.)

of new car parking facilities elsewhere either in or adjacent to the City centre. The Council had intended in April 1975 to use the Longport site for a multi-storey car park. The site was to be the first in a series of multi-storey car parks. However, certain complications arose: delays in the purchase of the necessary land by the City Council and delays due to further negotiations with Kent County Council as the highway authority in order to secure the necessary road improvements. Because of these delays, the City Council reconsidered the planning of car parking and the priorities in the provision of multi-storey car parks. In the Council's opinion, Longport became uneconomic because its construction was not possible until the 1980's. The City Council felt it was essential in 1975 to bring forward an alternative site and plan for a multi-storey car park in order to make possible the development on the Marlowe site. The alternative site had to fulfill the Council's main criteria:

1. The site is Council owned and should be immediately available so there would be no delay in the acquisition of land.
2. The site should be able to provide a reasonable amount of car parking spaces.
3. The site should be near to the ring road in order to facilitate traffic movement.
4. The site, if it was within the City walls, should have its visual and physical impact concealed either partially or completely.

According to this criteria, the City Council said there were two possible sites:

1976 (cont.)

1. Rhodaus Town - However, the City Council needed to acquire some land which would cause the inevitable delays. The car parking gain, in the Council's estimation, was low and the access and egress problems posed difficulties for this site.
2. Rosemary Lane - The City Council accepted that the key to the development of the Marlowe and Watling Street sites was the prior construction of a major car park. The City Council felt it had two options open - either to delay the shopping development for several years or to accept the necessity of building a car park on "the only immediately available site at Rosemary Lane".

The City Council felt it was important to retain Canterbury's position as "premier shopping centre of East Kent" for the prosperity of the whole City. The City Council stated its aim was to maintain "Canterbury's dominant position and consequent prosperity".

The City Council's conservation policy consisted of the following points:

1. an increase in DoE grants for listed buildings under the Town Scheme of Grants
2. the allocation of money to the Canterbury Archaeological Trust for the archaeological excavations on the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe sites
3. the rehabilitation of buildings such as the Poor Priests Hospital and the Whitfield Monument
4. the increase of conservation staff to three full-time employees

1976 (cont.)

5. the encouragement of improvement to Sollys Orchard, Northgate garden, and St. Radigund's garden
6. the designation of the Black Griffin Lane area as a general improvement area
7. the reduction of the demolition of listed buildings
8. the rehabilitation of the St. Radigund's area which had previously been blighted by road proposals
9. the interim office policy
10. the encouragement of central area housing. However, the Council stressed there was a limit to this. The Council maintained that the limit of the allocation of land for housing was due to "certain prime nonhousing functions of the central area which dictate certain criteria in siting and are more demanding than those for the siting of housing and that in some circumstances, nonhousing uses must have priority if the central area is to be economically successful and workable in the planning and traffic senses".

The Council said its criteria for vacant sites was not judged according to their suitability for housing but "in the context of what is the best use for the general good of the central area and the City".

The City Council maintained it had carried out "extensive public consultation procedures well beyond the statutory requirements" for the plan of the Rosemary Lane site.

1976 (cont.)

October

The opposition to the proposal for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane still grew. A petition of 2,564 signatures protesting against the Rosemary Lane car park was handed to the City Council on the 12th October. The members of Action for Rosemary Lane had gathered the signatures from the Longmarket on Saturday. Opponents to the proposal asked the question whether a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane was really in the best interests of the City.

The Public Works Committee recommended to the Council for car parking charges to be increased by 5,10 and 15 pence and for an increase in season tickets. It was revealed that the ratepayers this year were subsidising car parking in the district by £265,000. The Public Works Committee said the proposed increases were an attempt to balance the increases in the running expenses of the car parks.

The City Council announced that a panel hearing for Rosemary Lane was going to be held on the 16th November. The panel would be composed of three Councillors - the Chairman of the Town Planning Committee, its Vice-Chairman, and an ordinary member of it. The amenity societies were wary of the idea of a panel hearing and warned that people should not be fooled it would be like a public inquiry.

The campaign to stop the car park from going ahead was gaining momentum. Over 650 people in the area signed pamphlets objecting to the plan. The amenity societies continued to stress that people should press for a public inquiry into the scheme, although the DoE had said a panel hearing must occur first. Action for Rosemary Lane hoped the campaign would develop along national lines. It wanted to know what

1976 (cont.)

more could it do to prove to the Council that the people of Canterbury did not want the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane.

Informal meetings were held at individual homes in Canterbury to discuss the Rosemary Lane site. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee and its Vice-Chairman were present at these meetings in their capacity as Councillors. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss with the Councillors the implications of the Rosemary Lane site and to persuade them to abandon the proposal. Individuals criticised the plan due to its cost. They said the City could not afford a multi-storey car park that would have high and escalating construction costs. They also said the car park would be a traffic generator in the City centre and it would cause congestion problems on an already congested Wincheap roundabout. The group tried to pressurise the Councillors to look at alternative sites for car parking and to make the best use of existing resources. It was difficult to determine at the time the impact these meetings had on the Councillors.

November

At the beginning of November, a report was completed by the students at the School of Architecture on car parking in Canterbury. The report said the building of multi-storey car parks in Canterbury "would devastate its attractiveness as a historic place". The report found the Council car parks to be badly signposted, in need of repair, and wasting space. If the existing car parks were properly marked, then 400 more vehicles could be parked.

1976 (cont.)

The report recommended this should be done while a full traffic and parking study was carried out and before "expensive schemes like multi-storey car parks are built". The report made other recommendations such as a system of differential tariffs, using private car parks to cope with peak demand and better signposting and management. The report noted that many of these recommendations were put forward by the City Engineer in 1974, but they were never implemented. The report emphasised the practical, short-term alternatives to the car parking problem in Canterbury.

At the panel hearing, individuals would make statements and their views would be summarised in a report. The report would be considered by the Town Planning Committee before it decided on the planning application. The Town Planning Committee, however was not legally bound to accept the report's recommendations. The members of the panel were: the Chairman of the Town Planning Committee, its Vice-Chairman, and an ordinary member of the Committee. The panel hearing was not a statutory requirement.

The amenity societies saw the panel hearing as another opportunity to voice their opposition and to try to pressurise the Council to reconsider its views in light of the opposition. Almost every amenity society in Canterbury had written independently to the Council opposing the plan. The amenity societies saw the panel hearing as "a poor man's public inquiry" because it lacked the essential ingredient of an independent inspector or chairman. The amenity societies realised that their views could be disregarded irrespective of the merits of the arguments.

1976 (cont.)

They tried to instill a lack of confidence in the Council because it was prosecutor, judge, and jury in its own cause.

At the panel hearing itself, 70 objectors spoke and 2 individuals spoke in favour of the proposal. It was revealed that the loan charges would be £154,000 p.a. The estimated income was £70,000 p.a. and running expenses were £40,000 p.a. This would leave an annual net deficit of £124,000 p.a. for the first five or so years. The deficit would fall on the rates for this period. Two thirds of the annual deficit would be met from a 1p in the £ levy on the rates and the remaining one third would be met from the resources element of the Rate Support Grant. After the first five years, there would be extra rate income from the proposed Marlowe redevelopment which would be allocated towards the cost of the car park.

Rates were going to be increased by 18½% for domestic ratepayers in the old City of Canterbury. The variation of the rate levy within the District was due to the differential rating since the first of April 1974. For others the rates would increase by 16%. Kent County Council's rate was increased because of central government's decision to reduce the level of the Rate Support Grant and to continue its policy of redistribution of the Rate Support Grant in favour of urban areas.

Canterbury City Council increased its car parking charges: 5p to 10p rises for shorter stays in some car parks and up to 15p for over four hours. Season tickets would cost more from the first of April 1977, and there would not be any more free car parks. This

1976 (cont.)

action by the City Council exacerbated the car parking problem because it brought the issue into the news and increased the pressure on the Council for more car parking spaces from the traders. The small trader and the businessman started to become more vocal about the need for more car parking spaces.

December

Rates again became a big issue. The City Council said it should not be blamed for the big rise in rates because it was not responsible for it. The City Council maintained that the Kent County Council's rise in its precept and central government's cut in the Rate Support Grant were the culprits. The Rate Support Grant was decreased from 65½% to 61% of local government speding.

A general improvement area was declared for St. Peters Place, St. Peters Grove, and Black Griffin Lane.

The result of the five day public inquiry that was held in July 1976 on the proposal for offices at St. George's Place and Lower Chantry Lane was made public. The inspector recommended refusal and the Environment Secretary agreed with those recommendations. The Environment Secretary said the scheme would harm the area; it was badly located; and it was out of character with the surroundings. One of the main reasons for the Environment Secretary's decision (but it was not a highly publicised one) was the London based Anglo-American Property Company (who had put forward the scheme) had gone into liquidation.

1976 (cont.)

The amenity societies were overjoyed at the news and immediately compared the situation to what was currently happening with Rosemary Lane. They were confident that a public inquiry would now be called for Rosemary Lane because of the degree of public opposition.

1977

January

The report of the panel hearing was published and the panel supported the scheme for Rosemary Lane. Action for Rosemary Lane said the panel was biased in favour of the project before the hearing even started. It said a public inquiry was the only hope of stopping the City Council implementing this proposal. The panel recommended in the report that planning permission should be granted providing a solution can be found to the problem of traffic access. The panel hearing report had the effect of augmenting public opposition to the scheme. Public opposition from amenity societies increased. They said "it was a sad day for democracy" and they found the report "unbelievable" considering only two indviduals expressed a favourable opinion of the plan. They could not understand what had been the point of holding a panel hearing when the majority of opinions had been disregarded.

The panel had adopted a very narrow frame of reference in trying to decide whether or not planning permission should be granted for the Rosemary Lane proposal. The panel dismissed several arguments as being

1977 (cont.)

irrelevant: Cost arguments were dismissed because they were considered not to be a matter of direct relevance to the question of whether or not planning permission should be granted. Arguments that concerned vandalism and disturbance caused by the work were also not considered when deciding upon the planning application. The question of pollution came under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and the panel said it was outside of its jurisdication. A copy of the report and its recommendations were sent to the DoE. The Environment Secretary would then decide whether or not to call a public inquiry.

On January 19th, the panel hearing's report was considered by the Town Planning Committee. The panel recommended to the Committee that it should accept in principle the proposed development for Rosemary Lane after a suitable traffic solution had been found.

The public inquiry for the Canterbury A2 by-pass opened on January 18th. The cost was estimated to be £9½ million for a 4½ mile route. There were three suggested routes: A, B, and C. The Department of Transport favoured Route B.

The Canterbury Society said the public should have been consulted at an earlier stage of the City Council's redevelopment proposals. The Society felt the Council encouraged a minimum of public participation. From the start, the Council assumed the Marlowe and Watling Street sites would have a commercial use which no one was allowed to question.

1977 (cont.)

City Councillors were not able to get copies of agendas for the Finance and General Purposes subcommittee or other committees on grounds of economy. The Councillors who wanted to know what the other committees discussed would have to get their information from the local newspaper.

The Mayor stated the amenity societies were "environmental terrorists". The amenity societies protested very strongly against this statement.

On 21st January, a new traffic management scheme for Rosemary Lane was publicised. It was produced by the County and District Officers. The City Council's Public Works Committee approved it. The next step was for the traffic scheme to be discussed at a full Council meeting, and if the Council agreed, then it would go to Kent County Council for its approval. Kent County Council was the highway authority and its consent was necessary with regard to Section 28A of the 1967 Road and Traffic Act before work could commence. Eight to nine different traffic schemes had been discussed between the Kent County Council and the City Council and this one was found to be the most suitable. The scheme was for Castle Street to cater for traffic from the Wincheap roundabout to the entrance of the car park and the remainder of the Street would be one way to the centre of the City. Rosemary Lane and Stour Street would also be on way to the centre of the City. The junction of Castle Row and the ring road would be closed. There would be a miniroundabout at the entrance to the car park. An implication of the scheme was that the traffic on the smaller roads

1977 (cont.)

in that quadrant of the City could be increased and that the traffic was encouraged to go through the medieval core of the City. There was a total lack of public consultation by the City Council on the different traffic management schemes. The Town Planning Committee accepted the panel hearing's report and its recommendations.

Rates were going to increase an extra 9½p in the £ for Canterbury City Council. For those in the old City area, there would be an additional increase of 1½p. Canterbury City Council said the increase was forced upon them by Kent County Council. The county precept was increased to 60.59p in the £, an increase of 16.3% over the previous year. Canterbury City Council's own rate would be 22p in the £ which was a 4½% increase over the previous year. The resources element of the Rate Support Grant would be reduced for 1977-78. Canterbury City Council would get £1,450,000 which was slightly lower than the amount for the current financial year. The precept for the Southern Water Authority was increased from 15p to 15.12p in the £. The domestic element of the Rate Support Grant (18.5p in the £) remained the same.

The amenity societies thought that spending money on the Rosemary Lane car park was extravagant and unjustifiable in such an atmosphere of severe local government cutbacks and increases in the rates.

February

Kent County Council drastically reduced its spending on county roads by 40%. However it would not affect important schemes that were already planned, but

1977 (cont.)

routine maintenance such as sweeping and cutting grass would be reduced.

The Canterbury Traffic Report was published by Kent County Council. It cost £55,000. The main conclusion of the Report was that the Wincheap roundabout was one of Canterbury's worst traffic black spots. Work on the Report had started in June 1975. The Report was produced in conjunction with Canterbury City Council and Kent County Council. It said the Wincheap roundabout was overloaded by DoE design standards and was the cause of traffic delays.

One of the owners of Slatters Hotel (an ex-councillor and ex-Mayor) was to sue the City Council over access rights to the Hotel over the Marlowe car park.

Kent County Council's latest stage of preparation for the Kent Structure Plan was finished at the end of February. Kent County Council wanted to restrain Canterbury's future growth in order for development to occur at other East Kent towns. Kent County Council just published a consultative document outlining its draft Structure Plan. The Structure Plan was going to be a guide for the local plan and was designed to protect the environment of Canterbury from the bad effects of economic growth. Kent County Council's strategy for East Kent placed emphasis on economic activity at Ashford but restraint at Canterbury.

1977 (cont.)

March

Another panel hearing for the Chaucer Barracks site was held on the 10th March. It only lasted 45 minutes. The Northgate Association said it had been a waste of time.

City Council secrecy was criticised by the Liberals who wanted more of the Council's business to be made public. Others agreed with this Liberal criticism and added it was "difficult for ordinary people to have any democratic control over the decision making process". It appeared that public criticism had been ignored. The amount of secret discussion at Council committee meetings was more than 150 items in the last six months of 1976. It was thought that Council business was conducted with undue secrecy. The City Council did not comment on these allegations.

Canterbury City Council saw the Kent Structure Plan as an insult to Canterbury. It started an all-out attack on the Structure Plan. The Council said the County was "jealous" of the City. City Council and County Council representatives met to discuss this matter. The City Council was still strongly opposed to the Structure Plan. The City Council did not understand what the County Council meant by "commitments". It wanted Kent County Council to define what it meant by commitments.

The amenity societies supported Kent County Council in its draft Structure Plan. They wanted a strong conservation policy for the City and strong proposals to restrict further commercial development. A meeting on the 17th March was held at the Westgate Hall by Kent County Council to explain the Structure

1977 (cont.)

Plan. Nearly 200 people attended the meeting. The amenity groups supported Kent County Council and attacked the City Council's policy. The City Council wanted no artifical restraint on Canterbury; it wanted "natural" restraint. The amenity societies attacked the City Council for its "hysterical" attitude towards the Kent Structure Plan.

On March 22nd, the County Council's Powers sub-committee refused the City Council's traffic application to carry out changes in Castle Street. Kent County Council thought the City Council's proposal was premature with respect to the local plan. Kent County Council said an alternative that would use the Wincheap roundabout would still be unacceptable: "Any alternative scheme to provide access to the car park other than the Wincheap roundabout would be environmentally totally unacceptable and raise issues of strategic conservation significance."

The Road Research Laboratory recommended the number of roads leading on the Wincheap roundabout should be reduced from five to three and Castle Street should be one of these roads to be blocked. The Laboratory argued it would be expensive and difficult to make alterations; therefore it would be cheaper to reduce the number of approaches.

The amenity societies thought this action by Kent County Council had put a stop to the City Council's plans for Rosemary Lane. Action for Rosemary Lane did not disband because it wanted to make sure the site would be put to a beneficial use.

1977 (cont.)

The Marlowe site was coming more into the public eye. The amenity societies encouraged the Council to sponsor an international design competition for the Marlowe site. They also wanted underground car parking on the site.

The general rate was 82.58p in the £, plus the Southern Water Authority precept which was 15.12p in the £ making it 97.7p in the £.

A public relations officer for the City Council was going to be appointed. It would cost £10,000 to cover the cost of the appointment and related expenses. The Council wanted to improve its public image. The Council Leader claimed the newspapers told lies and articles had appeared in the national press about Canterbury that were "extremely biased". The Council wanted to "put these truths right". This was the Council's justification for the appointment. The City Council's image was worse in 1977 than in 1974 and its policy had not changed. The City Council said it was because the information was not correctly reaching the public.

April

The City Council said it had made "full and frank" disclosure of its interest in the Marlowe car park site. The detailed plan for the overall redevelopment of the site was unveiled at the Estates Committee on 1st April. The project was approved by the Committee. The following evening the Town Planning Committee approved the plan and agreed it was not a departure from the Development Plan. The Council could now proceed and get planning permission for the scheme by the full Council. There

1977 (cont.)

was no plan for underground car parking on the site. An archaeological excavation of the site would happen before the building started and it would cost the Council between £50,000 to £70,000. The Council stressed it was not a special scheme and there was a need for more shops. Forty-five companies had shown interest in the site, some of which already had shops in Canterbury. The plan was for 22 small shops and one large unit of about 50,000 sq. ft.

There was a public outcry at the meetings of the Estates and Town Planning Committees on the Marlowe car park. Critics said a development that would "fundamentally change the heart of the old city" had been approved before there had been any discussion with the public about the scheme. The amenity societies said the Marlowe development was "speculative" and the present proposals posed a threat to existing shops, especially in the depressed Westgate section of Canterbury.

On the 7th April, the Council sought permission to demolish the Marlowe theatre before a new one could be built. This caused a controversy between the Council, amenity societies, and other individuals in Canterbury. They did not trust or believe the Council's intentions that the theatre would not be demolished until another site was guaranteed. They had expressed concern over the legal validity of this guarantee by the Council. The amenity societies did not want the theatre to close until another one was built. They said the Council's guarantee would be difficult to enforce if economic resources were short and new councillors were elected and the intentions of future Councils changed. The amenity societies wanted to know what would be the source of revenue for the new theatre. The Council stated the demolition order application for the Marlowe

1977 (cont.)

theatre was necessary in order for the application to develop the Marlowe car park site could be considered. It said the application was a technicality that had to be approved because planning permission could not be granted for only part of the scheme in a conservation area. The Council tried to make clear its intentions by stating money had been allocated in the budget estimates for a feasibility study for a new theatre. The Council could not understand what all the fuss was about. The Estates Committee was the sponsoring committee for the Marlowe development.

Seven amenity groups fought the Council's plan to redevelop the Marlowe site. They were angry about the proposal for a massive shopping complex. The societies involved were: Oaten Hill and District Society, Northgate Association, Canterbury Society, South Canterbury Preservation Society, Blean, Hackington and Tyler Hill Society, St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society, and the Stour Valley Society. They were worried about the lack of car parking. No provision for car parking could be found in the redevelopment design. The scheme consisted of 22 shops and a large store. The amenity societies thought it was a dense development and would put a strain on already congested roads; it would damage the Westgate end of the City; and there were no open spaces in the design. They thought the development was in direct conflict with the Structure Plan. They questioned the lack of publicity surrounding the plan. The amenity societies advocated a different use for the site such as a library, art gallery, conference centre, museum, etc. They maintained the people of Canterbury should be consulted before a decision was made concerning the development. The City Council still guaranteed that the Marlowe theatre would not be demolished until a new one was built.

1977 (cont.)

Consultantion on a traffic management scheme for Rosemary Lane still occurred between the County and City Councils. The great majority of individuals in Canterbury (and some Councillors) thought that the issue had been dropped by the City Council because of Kent County Council's refusal for road alterations to Castle Street. The County and City Councils co-operated on the Canterbury Transportation Study for the Kent Structure Plan.

The Canterbury Chamber of Trade protested to Kent County Council about its plan to halt the growth of the City as a major shopping centre. The Council was still worried about the impact of the Structure Plan. The City Council wanted the ambiguous areas in the Plan to be clarified. More amenity societies supported the Structure Plan.

Quite a few people in Canterbury were upset about the appointment of a public relations officer and they thought it was a waste of ratepayers' money.

May

Amenity societies said the Marlowe site had to be seen in conjunction with the Kent Structure Plan with its restraint for Canterbury. One hundred objections were lodged against the City Council's application to demolish the Marlowe theatre. (The theatre was not a listed building, but it was in a conservation area.) The Town Planning Committee said there had been considerable misunderstanding and unnecessary apprehension about the fate of the theatre. At the Town Planning Committee meeting of the 4th May, the Committee agreed to defer this application on the Marlowe site in order

1977 (cont.)

for consultations to be held with the neighbouring property owners and the County Council. The Estates Committee had promised space on the Watling Street site for a new theatre overlooking the Dane Jon. But, the Committee said, it would not give instructions to plan or design a new theatre until it knew it could demolish the present one. The Committee justified this on the basis that it was looking after the ratepayers' money. It appeared the City Council was having trouble in making people believe its justifications. The Chairman of the Estates Committee said the Marlowe was the "logical" site for shops. He added it would "add to the City's prosperity", but the "financial return is not our only objective". These comments could be found in the City Architect's Department brochure that explained the City Council's reasons for shops on the Marlowe site. He said "few would argue the site is perhaps the last and most important site available in Canterbury". He stated that shopping was a logical development in a valuable business area. He felt strongly about the design of the buildings. The Council said it would consider any positive and viable suggestions for the Marlowe site.

On 24th May, the Estates Committee approved the first stage of the Marlowe development. The City Council had written to the DoE for listed building consent to demolish the theatre to test the Department's reactions. Listed building consent for demolition was needed because the Marlowe theatre was in a conservation area. The members of the Committee approved the first stage of the complex.

Kent County Council elections were held on 5th May. The Conservatives won overwhelmingly: 94 out of 103 seats. Labour lost 19 seats; Liberals lost all 7 seats and the Independents lost 2 seats.

1977 (cont.)

The City Council received a letter from the DoE on 3rd May about the Rosemary Lane proposal. The following is an excerpt from that letter: "The Department has decided that on the evidence before it, it would not be justified in requiring your Council to make an application to the Secretary of State for planning permission for this Proposal (three level car park on the Rosemary Lane site) . . . It therefore remains the responsibility of your Council to determine the proposal. As you will see, we are assuming that your Council would not wish to resolve planning permission for the development unless they were satisfied that a solution of the outstanding highway aspects which was acceptable on highway grounds would not have unacceptable environmental effects. . . "

All those who had objected to the DoE about the City Council's plan for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane received a letter from the DoE on 3rd May. The following is an excerpt from that letter: "6. It appears generally accepted that the proposed development would be an improvement on the appearance of the existing car park. The design has been approved by the Royal Fine Arts Commission and the skyline of Canterbury would not be affected. The Department notes that there has been some criticism of the highway aspects of the proposal. After its public hearing the Council's Panel recommended that an acceptable traffic management scheme should be prepared before the planning permission was resolved. Kent County Council and some objectors have argued that the traffic from the development would overload the Wincheap roundabout; and the Department understands that the County Council have now on this ground refused consent under Section 28A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1967 to the provision of off street

1977 (cont.)

parking. The Canterbury City Council have the right of appeal to the Secretary of State for Transport against this refusal. The Department of the Environment assumes that in the circumstances the City Council would not wish to resolve planning permission for the development unless they were satisfied that a solution of the highway aspects which was unacceptable on highway grounds would not have unacceptable environmental effects.

"7. It appears that Kent County Council regard the proposal as a district planning matter and in all the circumstances the Department has concluded on the evidence before it that the planning issues raised are essentially local and we would not be justified in requiring the Canterbury City Council to apply to the Secretary of State for planning permission. We have informed the Council accordingly and copies of this letter have been sent to them and the Kent County Council."

During the months of April and May, the City Council decided to set up a conservation advisory committee for the old City of Canterbury.

June

The Mayor's Secretary said the critics of the Council do not present alternatives to plans. He defended the City Council's decision to appoint a public relations officer on the basis that the Council would now be in a better position to put its views forward to the press and the public. The new public relations officer was appointed as the head of the £10,000 public relations department. The department's function was to improve the Council's image.

1977 (cont.)

The amenity societies said public participation in the development plan for the Marlowe theatre had been bungled. There had been confusion over the period of consultation. It appeared to them the Council had thought very carefully about how to get the most profitable use of the site. However, they questioned whether or not this was the most desirable use. They felt the Council had dismissed the suggestion of underground car parking too lightly because it had over-rated the difficulties for its implementation.

The City Engineer said the Council needs a new car park due to the increased influx of tourist coaches. The suggested site for a coach park was Military Road. Protests were made against this suggestion because it was a densely populated area.

Kent County Council's Planning and Transport Committee on 15th June approved the policy to restrain the City's industrial, commercial and housing expansion. The Committee had considered comments on the draft Structure Plan and made its decision despite the City Council's protest of "unnatural" restraint. Kent County Council regarded the Marlowe site as a commitment; it already had planning permission. Any new development proposals would have to be assessed within the framework of the Structure Plan. The City Council accepted conservation in principle, but it did not want too much emphasis placed on it in the Structure Plan.

The Canterbury Chamber of Trade opposed the Structure Plan because it thought restraint would depress Canterbury's economic growth. The traders were the largest group of ratepayers in the City and maintained that conservation needed a healthy economic base.

1977 (cont.)

July

The proposal for the Rosemary Lane car park was revived again by the City Council. At the 6th July meeting of the City Council, it decided to give permission to officers to re-examine the traffic management proposals for Rosemary Lane so they could be resubmitted to Kent County Council in order to obtain a Section 28A certificate. The Council said it must go ahead with the Rosemary Lane proposal because it was essential to have a new car park to replace the spaces that would be lost when the Marlowe car park was redeveloped. The City Council was encouraged to resubmit the plan to Kent County Council because of the Environment Secretary's decision not to hold a public inquiry on the proposal. The new traffic scheme banned all traffic from Castle Street except the traffic using the car park. The County had suggested a three legged roundabout for the Wincheap roundabout. The Public Works Committee of the City Council approved the new scheme and agreed to ask Kent County Council for the Section 28A certificate. If the County felt unable to accept these plans, then the City Council had grounds to make an appeal to the Environment Secretary. The Policy Committee of the City Council had decided that the Rosemary Lane car park scheme was the priority for the coming year.

The amenity societies were shocked and horrified at these developments. They thought the Rosemary Lane proposal had been abandoned. They urged everyone to write to Kent County Council asking it to refuse to grant a Section 28A certificate. They maintained the Council was not listening to the views of the majority of its voters. Questions concerning traffic management, environmental impact, and finance had been raised by critics, but the Council was not giving any adequate answers.

1977 (cont.)

Public opposition had begun to mount with respect to the City Council's plan for a coach park in Military Road. The Brymore estate residents formed an action group to fight the scheme on the grounds of traffic dangers, extra pollution, noise, and litter. Thirty people signed a petition protesting the plan for a coach park in the area. Later in the month, the Public Works Committee deferred a decision about the scheme because the suitability of the site was questioned. The Committee decided to look at alternative ring road plans.

At the end of July, the final draft of the Kent Structure Plan was approved by the Policy and Resources and the Planning and Transportation Committee of Kent County Council. The City Council was the only one of fourteen local authorities not to support the plan. A clash between the City Council and Kent County Council appeared to be certainty at the Examination in Public of the Kent Structure Plan next year.

A working party was set up by the City Council to make a report on what a conservation advisory committee does and whom should its members be. It was composed mainly of chairmen of amenity societies.

August

A public inquiry was held concerning Key Market's application to erect a supermarket on Sturry Road. The City Council refused the application because it was thought to be premature in relation to the local plan. The City Council said the City centre would be "impoverished by the building of the store" from the loss of trade.

1977 (cont.)

September

The proposal for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane was in the news again. The City Council wanted to use 10 feet of old St. Mary deCastro's churchyard for its latest traffic management scheme. Action for Rosemary Lane asked that residents write to the County Surveyor instead of the City Council. They noted there had been a lack of public participation and consultation about the new car park traffic scheme for Rosemary Lane that concerned some alterations to the graveyard. They did not understand how much longer the residents of Canterbury could tolerate a Planning Committee that was so out of step with local opinion. They appealed directly to the County Council. The proposed test scheme was adopted by the Council despite its official policy that the road scheme and the car park should be considered together for approval.

Action for Rosemary Lane was termed "Council bashers" by the Council Leader. He said it did nothing but criticise the Council's actions. He realised the group was formed to fight the controversial proposal for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane which he thought would be a success.

On the 15th September, the Environment Secretary granted the Council's application for the demolition of the Marlowe theatre in order to develop the entire Marlowe site as a shopping centre. The following is an extract from the DoE's letter to the City Council: "In considering the application, the Secretary of State is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the conservation area concerned and it seems the general acceptance that the Marlowe theatre, as a structure, does not make a marked contribution to the visual character of the conservation area.

1977 (cont.)

"The majority of the objections appear to be concerned with the loss of the building's function as a theatre. However, the Secretary of State notes that the Council had given assurances that they do not intend to promote phase two (the part affecting the theatre) until a new thatre has been built to replace it."

Graylaw Ltd. was going to lease the land it owned adjacent to the Marlowe site to the Council under the condition that the Council could lease the total site to a developer. So far, the developer, the Council, and Graylaw Ltd. would get some revenue from the Marlowe site. Graylaw was currently asking for 30% of the total revenue in return for its participation in the scheme.

The cost of the archaeological excavations of the Marlowe site could be £119,000. The site covered the core of Roman Canterbury and was described as "an archaeological gold mine". The Environment Secretary said the site must be excavated before the development begins. The City Council hoped to get a grant of £68,000 from the DoE for the dig. The archaeological dig was to start February 1978 and to finish September 1979 before the development started hopefully in January 1980.

Work on the Canterbury A2 by-pass was to start in November 1977 and Route B was chosen.

On the 28th September, the Town Planning Committee approved the Marlowe scheme despite over 100 protest letters and seven petitions objecting to the Council's plans to redevelop the Marlowe site. The Royal FIne Arts Commission described the Marlowe designs as "over-whimsical and nearer to Disneyland than the Middle Ages". The objections were based on the following

1977 (cont.)

points: the loss of the Marlowe theatre, the lack of public participation in the preparation of the scheme, and car parking problems. The Environment Secretary did not object to the development. The Council said he had been sent every document, newspaper cutting, and letter. Kent County Council had termed the Marlowe as a commitment and therefore, the site would not come under the policy of restraint in the Kent Structure Plan. The City Council said the shops in the Marlowe development should be open by Christmas 1981. The City Council thought it had encouraged public participation well beyond the statutory requirements.

Slatters Hotel claimed car parking and access rights over the Marlowe site. It took the City Council to court to preserve these rights.

Kent County Council submitted the Structure Plan to the Environment Secretary.

The newly formed Conservation Advisory Committee had its first meeting at the end of September. It wanted a larger say in all major planning issues of the area and it would not hesitate to challenge the City Council if it disagreed with the Council.

October

The Cathedral authorities expressed concern over the increasing number of tourists to the Cathedral. They considered limiting the number of tourists who visited the Caethedral. There had been an large increase in the number of tourists to Canterbury this past summer (1977).

1977 (cont.)

The lack of facilities for tourists in Canterbury became apparent. The City Council and the Chamber of Trade wanted to encourage more tourists to come to Canterbury, whereas some amenity societies felt the City was already saturated with them. The Chamber of Trade felt if tourism was reduced, then high unemployment would occur. It argued there would be less money available for conservation.

The Conservation Advisory Committee held a meeting on the 27th October and talked about the City Council's views on the Kent Structure Plan. It tried to find out the difference between the City's and the County Council's views. A letter was sent to the DoE about the Kent Structure Plan that was officially recorded as an objection to it because the Committee said that "it broadly endorses the City Council's views" although it was intended to be one of support for Kent County Council's policies.

December

The amenity societies were still perplexed as to what was the difference between the City and County Councils' views on the Structure Plan, ie how restraintwas going to be interpreted in practice. The City Council's distinction between "natural" and "unnatural" restraint appeared somewhat false to the amenity societies.

The first issue of the City Council's own newspaper, Local Link was published.

1978

January

The examination in public of the Kent Structure Plan

1978 (cont.)

would be held in May. The City Council was still prepared to fight any move to restrain the City's economic development. The Council maintained that the policy of restraint would be a severe blow to the City's conservation programme and it would harm the City's prosperity.

The City Council appealed to the Environment Secretary about Kent County Council's deferment of a decision on the traffic management scheme for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane with regard to a Section 28A certificate. The Environment Secretary requested that both the City and County Councils submit written representations to him on the issue. This request was not made known until June 1978.

February

Canterbury City Council increased the rate by 1.08p in the £, from 21.99p to 23.07p in the £. The Southern Water Authority's rate was 13.60p in the £. Kent County Council increased its rate by 8.21p in the £. The total rate to Canterbury ratepayers was 106.10p in the £ for domestic ratepayers. The City Council said the increase was due to the rise in the county precept. Kent County Council said the rise was central government's fault because it was not allowing for the full cost of inflation and the Rate Support Grant was still biased to urban areas.

The Conservation Advisory Committee invited the deputy planner from Kent County Council to discuss the County's views on the Structure Plan. He said the City restraint row had been exaggerated. He maintained the County Council was not stopping Canterbury's growth, but that it was trying to prevent "too great of a growth" from occuring in the City. The City Council said it would still contest the County Council's views on restraint for Canterbury at the examination

1978 (cont.)

in public of the Kent Structure Plan.

The City Council wanted to close Castle Street as part of another traffic experiment on the Wincheap roundabout. It was needed in order to assess the effect of the traffic flow on the roundabout.

The traders in Castle Street and the Canterbury Chamber of Trade wanted to stop Castle Street from being closed. The Council said the Road Research Laboratory would monitor the experiment. The order would be for six months, but the work was only expected to last two weeks. Castle Row would still remain open. It appeared to the amenity societies and conservationists that the Council's sole purpose of the experiment was to assess the implications for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane.

At its meeting at the end of February, the Conservation Advisory Committee discussed the redevelopment plan for the Marlowe car park. It wanted a more imaginative scheme that would include open spaces, underground car parking, a heritage centre, housing, etc. It asked the City Council to re-examine the provision of underground car parking on the site. It was worried about the the impact of the development on the Westgate area of the City. It was evident from the design that the City Council had maximised the amount of shopping floor space on the site.

March

The City Council suggested an alternative to the traffic problem concerning the Wincheap roundabout - the layout of the roundabout could be redesigned and made smaller.

1978 (cont.)

By reducing the diameter and improving the approach and access roads, the capacity of the roundabout would be increased. The County agreed to pay the cost of this work. The Road Research Laboratory would monitor this latest experiment. However, this would still involve the closure of Castle Street for about twelve days.

The Council Leader said the building of the multi-storey car park on Rosemary Lane was the biggest solution for "one of the biggest messes one could see". He thought the building of the multi-storey car park was most desirable. As of 17th March, the Council Leader quoted the site value of Rosemary Lane as being £400,000.

April

The rates increased from the first of April. The Public Works Committee Chairman said that car parking costs accounted for a very large part of the Committee's total spending. He said little could be done to decrease this cost because it was essential to provide parking for visitors and shoppers. He believed the charges for car parking had reached the saturation point.

The Conservation Advisory Committee was thought by amenity societies to be a step forward for conservation in Canterbury. The Committee was a forum for debate for different groups within Canterbury - business organisations, amenity societies, and professional organisations. The Committee questioned its effectiveness in influencing the City Council on its planning decisions.

1978 (cont.)

At its monthly meeting, the Conservation Advisory Committee expressed the need to liaise with the Council and local businessmen over the tourist problem. It criticised the lack of facilitites for tourists and urged the setting up of a joint committee of representatives from the City Council, the Dean and Chapter, the Chamber of Trade, and other interests. The Advisory Committee wanted a tourist centre, a place where films could be shown, where information could be distributed, where literature could be made available, where exhibitions could be seen, and where individuals could relax, etc. The Committee thought the Marlowe site would be a good location for such a heritage centre but it appeared that the Marlowe site had been solely designed for commercial interests.

The Whitstable Ratepayers' Association said opposition was needed on the City Council. It made an appeal for people to offer their services as councillors. The Association did not get any response to this appeal.

Objections to the proposed changes in the Wincheap roundabout were based on the following: the amount of money involved which could be better spent; the disruption and inconvenience to traffic; and a smaller roundabout would be faster and more hazardous. The amenity societies asked why the changes to the roundabout were proposed. Their suspicions were raised that the changes were part of a new traffic management scheme for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The amenity societies knew that the development of a new traffic scheme might remove a major obstacle to the granting of the Section 28A certificate for Rosemary Lane. The amenity societies thought that the proposal for the Rosemary Lane site was "a travesty of town planning". They maintained the City Council should be sensitive to public opinion.

Work to the Wincheap roundabout was estimated to cost £43,000. As a result of the work, the roundabout's

1978 (cont.)

capacity could now be increased by 50% to 60%.

The City Councillors and Officers stated that they would continue to make applications to Kent County Council for a Section 28A certificate.

June

The new Mayor of the City Council said amenity societies should think first before criticising the City Council and they should also attend Council meetings.

At the moment, Kent County Council felt the proposal to build a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane was premature until the findings of the Transportation Study, the Kent Structure Plan, and the Conservation Study were made public. Kent County Council would continue to refuse to grant a Section 28A certificate.

The examination in public of the Kent Structure Plan was held in June. Kent County Council, in the Structure Plan, maintained the growth of Canterbury should be restrained to help the City's conservation. It said that vigorous economic growth would wreck the City. It added that the exact level of restraint would be settled in the District Plan because it would reflect the strategic principles of the Structure Plan. The implementation of these policies needed a high degree of co-operation between the two Councils. The City Council did not want restraint on economic growth in Canterbury and wanted to be able to determine its own measures of control. The City Council was concerned about the extent to which restraint could be applied to Canterbury. The City Council maintained that the details of Kent County Council's restraint

1978 (cont.)

policy were unknown. The City Council thought the Kent Structure Plan would have a detrimental effect on Canterbury. The City Council thought it was necessary to maintain modest economic growth which the City Council could channel to conserve the City's character. The amenity groups in Canterbury supported the Kent Structure Plan and its policy of restraint for Canterbury.

At its monthly meeting, the Conservation Advisory Committee wanted the City Council to rethink its plans for the Marlowe site in order to include underground car parking. The Committee felt this should be a binding feature on the developer. The Committee asked Cementation Projects Ltd. to do a feasibility study on underground car parking on the Marlowe site. The conclusion was that the comparative cost between surface and underground car parking was negligible. Therefore the Committee felt that a full scale investigation should be made on the feasibility of underground car parking for the Marlowe site. A space in a multi-storey car park (above ground) would cost £2,000 whereas a space in an underground car park would cost £3,000.

The City Council revealed at the meeting that it had never considered underparking for the Marlowe site. The City Architect said it was not impossible to build car parking under the site, but he estimated the problems would be so great that it would be uneconomic and the cost would be nearer to £4,000 to £5,000 per space. He also added that underground car parkingon the Marlowe site would cause traffic problems. He said the invitations for tenders would occur in autumn of 1978. He disclosed that payments in lieu of the provision of car parking spaces would be part of the contract with the developer.

1978 (cont.)

At the same Conservation Advisory Committee meeting, the Deputy Engineer said that one of Canterbury's biggest problems was where to park the cars. The City Architect said the Longport site had been ready for construction as far as finance and drawings in 1974-5, but there had been a delay because the City Council had to compulsory purchase some land. The Deputy Engineer said the City needed six new 600 space car parks to cope with the increase in traffic, three of which should be built by 1980. He said the City Council was having trouble in finding suitable sites.

July

A report on the City Council's public relations department was published. The report gave a glowing account of the City Council's public relations in the last 12 months. The Council Leader said there had been much opposition to the appointment of the Public Relations Officer and the Council had been accused of throwing £10,000 away (which was the cost of establishing the new department). He said it was difficult to imagine how the City Council had managed public relations in the past before the Public Relations Officer had been appointed. The function of the public relations department was to inform the public about the City Council's actions.

The St. Peters Street traders wanted traffic banned from St. Peters Street. Over 1,200 shoppers had signed a petition that campaigned for a banning of traffic from St. Peters Street. The signatures were collected in less than two weeks and the traders felt the number of signatures reflected the amount of

1978 (cont.)

support for a pedestrianisation scheme in the area. The idea of a pedestrianisation scheme for the area came after the Street had been closed for three weeks because a fire had seriously damaged two buildings. The petition was sent to the City Council and Kent County Council.

Canterbury's Labour Party branded the City Council's newspaper, Local Link, as "a propaganda sheet and white wash job". It said the urge of the Council to keep the people of Canterbury informed was not strong enough for the City Council to release to the public financial information about its projects. The Labour party said one function of councillors was the communication with the local electorate.

The Environment Secretary granted permission for a huge supermarket and restaurant complex on Sturry Road. The decision came a year after the public inquiry had been held. The Chamber of Trade had opposed the planning application because it argued that the construction of such a large supermarket would result in empty shops in the City centre. The Chamber maintained its sympathy was with the small traders who would be most affected by this development. The City Council had refused to grant planning permission and a public inquiry was held in July 1977. The City Council said "the store would strike a blow to Canterbury as a shopping centre". In his report, the Inspector said that by 1981, there probably was going to be a deficiency of food and convenience shopping floorspace in Canterbury. In his view, it was wrong to deprive the residents of Canterbury from more food shopping floorspace, the convenience of a supermarket, and the possibility of lower prices.

1978 (cont.)

The Estates Committee wanted to demolish the buildings on 10-16 Wincheap. These buildings were listed and owned by the City Council. The Committee agreed for the houses to be demolished.

August

The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee proposed a conservation rate for conservation work in the City. It would be an extra levy on the rates. He said the Town Planning Committee had already spent half the allocated money for grants to the repair of historic buildings.

September

At its monthly meeting on the 21st September, the Conservation Advisory Committee discussed the Rosemary Lane plan. The Committee asked the City Council to keep it closely informed on the progress with the multi-storey car park and not to make any decisions before the Transportation Study was published. The Committee asked why the City Council had again applied to build the multi-storey car park after it had been turned down by Kent County Council and the DoE. The City Architect said the Council had not applied again and it was frustrated at the lack of progress. One Councillor who was present at this meeting said many people wanted more car parking spaces and the Rosemary Lane site was easier to develop than other sites. The City Council and Kent County Council had discussed a park and ride system, but Kent County Council had said that Canterbury was too small for such a scheme. The Chamber of Trade said it was in favour of a multi-storey car park. It said

1978 (cont.)

that people were shopping in other towns because of the lack of car parking facilities. The Conservation Advisory Committee maintained that the policy to site car parks inside the City walls was in direct opposition to the policy of reducing traffic within the City. The Committee was worried about the expected tailback from the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park to the Wincheap roundabout. The City Architect said that a tailback would not occur because of the introduction of a pay and display system. He said Kent County Council would have to seriously consider a double level junction at the Wincheap roundabout in order to be able to cope with the extra traffic forecast for the 1980's.

The City Council was anxious to proceed with its controversial plan for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The Vice-Chairman of the Policy Committee said there was great concern about Kent County Council's deferment of a decision over the scheme. The City Council wanted a decision to be made soon. If Kent County Council turned down the plan, the City Council would appeal. Kent County Council had deferred a decision on the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park until the traffic studies were completed. The result of the traffic surveys on the Wincheap roundabout were expected in the autumn.

The Public Works Committee deferrred a decision on the experimental banning of traffic from St. Peters Street and the High Street. The City Engineer said permanent closure would be considered when the District Plan was prepared. He said the closure would increase the traffic on the smaller roads.

1978 (cont.)

The Estates and the Public Works Committees accepted an offer from Clarksons to use 120 of their 170 car parking spaces on Saturdays.

October

The amenity societies complained about heavy traffic (especially TIR lorries) in North Lane, St. Stephens Road, St. Dunstans Street, and Castle Street. A TIR had dumped its load at the Wincheap roundabout. The amenity societies and conservationist had warned that the smaller size of the Wincheap roundabout made it faster and more dangerous.

There was an increase in the number of visitors to the Cathedral. During one week in the summer, over 143,000 people visited the Cathedral.

The Oaten Hill and District Society urged amenity societies and residents who were interested in conservation to sponsor candidates for the May 1979 local election. The Oaten Hill and District Society unanimously decided to ask other societies for two representatives to form a working party. The working party would consider how to ensure that the interests of conservation would be adequately represented in the local election campaign. The Oaten Hill and District Society said such a working party was a matter of urgency: "if the Labour, Conservative, or Liberal Parties do not show signs of proper awareness of the importance of this subject, then we should perhaps consider sponsoring candidates who would".

The Oaten Hill and District Society thought it was a good idea for a conservation rate to be levied to pay for the restoration of Canterbury's old buildings. The Society also wanted the City Council to reveal its

1978 (cont.)

plans for St. George's Place. It had been two years since the public inquiy and the Society did not know what was the City Council's plan.

The City Council's newest Committee, called the Performance Review Committee, discussed a report on car parks in Canterbury. The Committee met in secret. The Committee had a 10 point plan for improving the parking situation in Canterbury. On the 11th October, its suggestions were agreed (without any discussion) by the City Council. The main point was that there were different parking needs on Saturday as opposed to the rest of the week. The Committee wanted to see more effort made to use commercial and Council car parks and said that better signposting for the car parks was needed. The Committee would like to have increased incentives for short-term car parkers to use central sites and long-term car parkers to use the outer lying car parks.

At the end of October, the Conservative Party selected its candidates for the May local election. The Selection Committee did reject an existing Conservative Councillor (who later stood as an Independent candidate in the May local election and won).

November

The Public Works Committee decided to proceed with its original plan for a 620 space multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. This came after a warning by the City Engineer that traffic in the City centre would grind to a standstill. The decision was made despite massive opposition from amenity societies and residents.

1978 (cont.)

The Public Works Committee decided that as and when traffic conditions warranted, a traffic management scheme to restrict the flow of traffic from Castle Street to the Wincheap roundabout would be introduced. The Committee also agreed to the temporary resurfacing of the Rosemary Lane car park for £40,000. The City Engineer said the car parking problem would worsen and become unacceptable by May 1979 unless "a speedy solution" was found to the City's car parking problems. The City Engineer discussed Canterbury's car parking problem with the County Surveyor. He assured the Councillors that Kent County Council would allow the building of the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane to begin before the results of the Transportation Study were known. He said if the Council resubmitted an application for two thirds of its original proposal for the Rosemary Lane site, the results of the traffic scheme at the Wincheap roundabout would permit Kent County Council to grant a Section 28A certificate. The City Engineer said if the City Council wanted the original scheme to be approved, Kent County Council would not raise an objection to the full scheme, providing a traffic management scheme could be designed to deal with the traffic problems of the late 1980's - ie the amount of vehicles leaving Castle Street on to the Wincheap roundabout. He recommended to the City Council to submit an application for the Rosemary Lane site.

Clarksons decided against letting the public use its private car park behind its offices. It would have made available on Saturdays 120 car parking spaces. Clarksons was worried about possible vandalism.

1978 (cont.)

By the end of November, the City Council said it would make another application to Kent County Council for a Section 28A certificate to build the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. Kent County Council's Powers Subcommittee (which had executive powers) thought the proposal should be deferred until the Transportation Study for Canterbury was finished and until a detailed study of the capacity and characteristics of the new Wincheap roundabout had been completed by Kent County Council, the City Council, and the Road Research Laboratory. Kent County Council's decision was deferred until the capacity of the Wincheap roundabout was known.

The DoE gave an increased grant for historic buildings to the City Council. The City Council had run out of grant money for listed buildings half way through the financial year. The DoE increased its donation by up to one half of this year's allocation. It said there would be an increase next year, providing the City Council could match it.

The Public Works Committee agreed to spend £1,200 on bollards to protect over-hanging historic buildings in Canterbury's narrow medieval streets from traffic.

The Council Leader criticised the people who complained about the City Council to the ombudsman. He called them "idiots" and said they were a "waste of the taxpayers' money".

The Canterbury Labour Party said the sacking of a Conservative Councillor as a candidate for the May local election would help the Party in its campaign.

1978 (cont.)

Ten of next year's 49 Labour candidates at the local election in May could be jointly sponsored by the Canterbury Co-operative Party. The selected candidates would be pressing for the adoption of Co-operative policies, especially housing.

The City Council's Estates Committee discussed the feasibility report of Cementation Projects Ltd.on underground car parking on the Marlowe site. The Committee said the report was based on a "number of incorrect assumptions". The Council Officers discussed the report with Cementation who had agreed there were massive problems to solve before an underground car park could be built. The incorporation of the necessary entry and access ramps for underground car parking would result in a major loss of retail floorspace. For that reason, the City Council had rejected the idea of underground car parking at an early stage in the design for the Marlowe site.

The Canterbury Society said the idea of underground car parking was "too good and too important to be dismissed by a few airy phrases". The Society maintained the shopping space lost would be compensated by the environmental and financial gains of on-the-spot car parking. The Society thought such questions had not even been considered by the City Council.

The amenity societies were upset that the City Council had rejected the idea of underground car parking on the Marlowe site. They objected to the way the matter of underground car parking on the Marlowe site and the Cementation Projects Ltd report had been handled by the City Council. They said the City Council had a "reputation for being stubborn, autocratic, and often, wrong". The amenity societies saw the Cementation report

1978 (cont.)

as a "constructive suggestion in the best interests of the City". They maintained the Councillors and the Officers were not receptive to viable suggestions. The amenity societies did not think that it was a coincidence that the City Council's decision against underground car parking on the Marlowe site was made in the same week as the decision of the City Council to proceed with the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park.

The amenity societies were also worried about the City Council's decision to proceed with the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park. Action for Rosemary Lane was surprised to hear the City Engineer's assurances that Kent County Council would permit the building of the multi-storey car park before the results of the Transportation Study were known. The County Surveyor had communicated to Action for Rosemary Lane that no decision would be made prior to the results of the study. Action for Rosemary Lane found it "incomprehensible" that Kent County Council would agree to such an arrangement, particularly when it had twice turned down traffic management schemes for the car park. The group said that no one questioned that there was a serious car parking problem in the City, but it said there were better sites outside the City walls - eg at the back of Clarksons, in Rhodaus Town, and underground car parking on the Marlowe site. The group thought the Councillors wanted to see the scheme started before their term of office expired. It appeared to Action for Rosemary Lane that the City Council wanted to have a "lasting monument to their disregard of the electors' opinions". The group hoped the people of Canterbury in the next local election would make it clear that their wishes "would not be trampled on".

1978 (cont.)

At its monthly meeting, the Conservation Advisory Committee agreed that another multi-storey car park in the City "would destroy the environment". The Committee urged Kent County Council not to grant the City Council a Section 28A certificate to build the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The Committee stressed the publication and public discussion of the Tranportation Study must precede any decision regarding the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park.

December

Several City Council Councillors were now saying that 620 spaces were too many for the Rosemary Lane site and one should consider the generation of traffic in that area. Other Councillors defended the Rosemary Lane proposal and said a maximum number of spaces were needed. They continued that Rosemary Lane was the only proposal that the City Council could quickly implement. These Councillors maintained that if something was not done quickly, to solve the traffic problem, then the "whole City of Canterbury would come to a halt".

The Council Leader told the Public Works Committee that the City Council might not be in a position to wait for the results of the Transportation Study if it wanted to proceed with the plan for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. He urged Kent County Council to grant the City Council a Section 28A certificate. He said if the City Council had to wait two to three years for Rosemary Lane, then "they will be in trouble".

The Canterbury Society urged Kent County Council to refuse to grant a Section 28A certificate for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane on the following grounds:

1978 (cont.)

1. the car park would lead to increased traffic flow along the narrow streets in the central area
2. the absence of the long promised Transportation Study
3. the absence of a traffic management scheme
4. the consequences of a car park that had not been properly debated.

Amenity societies and interested individuals wondered what was happening at the Rosemary Lane site. They noted that workmen had begun to demolish a brick wall on the site. They doubted if the City Council was permitted to do this without permission from the DoE because listed building consent was necessary. The amenity societies and interested indiviudals wanted to know the particulars of a new traffic management scheme for Castle Street. They were also curious to know how much the rates would be increased to repay the loan for the proposed multi-storey car park. They suspected the City Council wanted to get the proposal underway before the May 1979 local election.

The City Council already spent £50,000 in clearing away the heavily polluted matter - ie the gas containers and levelling the Rosemary Lane site.

A letter from a private individual was published in the Kentish Gazette that contained some financial details on the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park: The estimated capital cost was £1,329,500. The cost had soared by £375,000 in two years. The letter stated that if the City Council, two years ago, had hoped to secure a Public Works Loan (which would require government sanction) spread over thirty years at an annual interest rate of 14%, then the full estimated cost of the multi-storey car park would now be around £4¼ million. An equivalent loan on the present estimates

1978 (cont.)

would increase the figure to nearly £7½ million. The letter argued that the project was not financially viable in view of the cutbacks in local government expenditure and the general economic situation. The letter said it appeared the Council's answer to the increased cost was to take the entire amount out of the rates in the shortest time possible. The letter maintained that already £140,000 had been spent on the scheme although the City Council had not received the Section 28A certificate from the County Council. The letter said that next year, another £33,000 would be spent on Rosemary Lane plus another £102,000 for ancillary work on the site. The following year, one third of one million pounds would disappear from the general rate fund for the scheme. The City Treasurer and Officers said they were not allowed to comment on a letter from a private individual when they were asked to verify these figures.

At its monthly meeting, the Conservation Advisory Committee invited the Chief Executive to speak on the channels of communication between the Conservation Advisory Committee and the City Council. The Chief Executive said the City Council had failed in its obligations to the Committee, but he thought the Committee had expected too much from the City Council. The Chief Executive said the Committee's frame of reference entailed controlling advertisements, trees, and the appearance of streets. He termed these areas as "conservation matters". The Chief Executive stated the Committee's advice on these "conservation matters" would be carefully considered by the City Council. The Chief Executive said the Committee had discussed matters outside its frame of reference such as the Rosemary Lane car park "which was not an overwhelmingly

1978 (cont.)

conservation matter". The Chief Executive thought Rosemary Lane was primarily a traffic problem and it was in this respect that the Committee's views would only be considered as the conservation aspect of the scheme. The Committee thought that it should be concerned with matters of general policy and not just be concerned with a conservation input to a particular project. The Committee said it had asked the Council to keep it informed of any progress with the Rosemary Lane scheme and it had received nothing but an acknowledged postcard. The Chief Executive had admitted that nothing had happened to the request.

The consultative draft of the City Council's Conservation Study was completed. The Conservation Study was one input into the District Plan. The Study said that conservation must become the "prime consideration" and "war must be declared on traffic in Canterbury". Some of its major recommendations were: the building on most of the City's car parks, the pedestrianisation of many of its streets, and the location of major car parks outside the City walls to preserve what was left inside. The Study maintained that residents, shoppers, and tourists would have to accept that "they must use their feet and not their cars if Canterbury is to survive". The Study noted that the car had been accommodated to in the past, but this should not be so in the future.

This consultative draft went to the Town Planning Committee for discussion. The Town Planning Committee was responsible for making alterations and improvements and then the consultative study would go before the full Council for approval. Approval of the full Council was needed for the draft's publication and there would then be a two month period for public discussion. After that period, the Study would be returned to the Town Planning

1978 (cont.)

Committee for any changes to be made. After full Council approval had been obtained, the Study would be sent to the DoE which would accept it as extra guidelines in planning appeals. The recommendations of the Study would then become part of the District Plan. The consultative Conservation Study was greeted with enthusiasm by the members of the Town Planning Committee. The Committee recommended its acceptance by the full Council for public discussion.

The amenity societies were full of praise for the consultative Conservation Study. They said many of the the previous planning mistakes had been discussed in the Study. They agreed that conservation should be the prime consideration for Canterbury and hoped this advice would be taken seriously by the City Council.

The Council Leader was re-selected by the Conservative Selection Committee to be a candidate in the May 1979 local election. Political observers had previously noted there had been strong moves to oust him.

1979

January

At the Policy Committee meeting, the Council Leader was apprehensive and concerned about the official status of the Conservation Study. He said the Study was a fine piece of work, but some of its recommendations were outside the reference of the Town Planning Committee. He said the Study should be considered by the other Committees of the Council before it is officially published. The Council Leader maintained it was "very difficult to persuade people something is not offical policy once it had appeared in print". In other words, he did not want to commit the Council

1979 (cont.)

to any of the Study's recommendations. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee said his Committee had approved the document as being suitable for discussion, but it had not intended recommending it as the final draft. The Policy Committee agreed that each Committee with an interest in the old City of Canterbury would be asked to consider the Conservation Study and make its recommendations to the Policy Committee. The Policy Committee would then agree on the final draft of the Study before it was approved by the full Council for publication.

At its monthly meeting, the Conservation Advisory Committee discussed the following areas:

1. The proposed demolition by the City Council of the listed buildings at 10-16 Wincheap. The Committee was told that it would cost £50,000 to repair the houses. The Committee noted that similar houses in private hands had been done at similar cost.
2. The proposed Council demolition of a 17th century listed barn in Adelaide Place. The owner wanted the barn demolished in order to make way for an access road to an office block. The Conservation Advisory Committee was against this demolition.
3. Canterbury in Bloom campaign for spring/summer 1980.

A group called Canterbury Cares was formed. It was composed of amenity societies and interested individuals whose aim was to provide a platform for assessing how the local candidates in the coming local election felt about conservation in the old City of Canterbury.

1979 (cont.)

A questionnaire would be sent to all candidates in order to find out their views on Canterbury and conservation and the results would be publicised. Canterbury Cares would also hold a public meeting right before the local election so candidates could be quizzed by the electorate on issues. The group would not sponsor particular conservation candidates.

Kent County Council's rate was increased by 17.3p to 85.83p in the £. The reasons Kent County Council gave for the rise were: rising prices, inflation, the cost of extra staff, and improved services. Domestic ratepayers still received 18.5p in the £ subsidy (the domestic element of the Rate Support Grant).

February

The Town Planning Committee refused the demolition of a 17th century listed barn in Adelaide Place.

Four Independent candidates declared themselves as candidates for the May local election. They said they wanted a major indepependent voice on the Council. The last time this had happened was in 1945 when the Independents won in a landslide victory.

There was a lack of cash for urgent repairs on roads and some roads in the Canterbury area faced closure or collapse. Over £250,000 was needed to catch up with the backlog of work. The City Council told Kent County Council that it needed £468,000 for road maintenance in 1979/80, but Kent County Council had only allowed between £320,000 and £330,000. The frost damage added another £115,000 to the bill.

1979 (cont.)

At its monthly meeting, the Conservation Advisory Committee decided not to reconsider its frame of reference. The Chief Executive said the Committee should limit itself to the City's two conservation areas. He continued: "if the Committee stepped outside this term of reference to comment, then its views would not influence the Council."

The Environment Secretary proposed a tranference of certain powers such as education, libraries, planning, social services, and highways to district authorities. He termed this "organic change". The County Councils would lose a certain amount of power. The Environment Secretary said the main reason for the change was "the beneficial effects of increasing democratic control". He wanted decision making to become"closer" to the people who were most directly affected by it.

The experimental layout of the Wincheap roundabout was to be revised again at a cost of £3,000 because of the number of accidents that had occurred since it opened in June 1978. The change had been requested by Kent County Council. The City Engineer said the improvements carried out at the Wincheap roundabout were on an experimental basis. The new roundabout would be increased in diameter and its capacity for traffic would be reduced.

On the 19th February, a meeting was held with the Chief Executive, the Council Leader and leading members of the Canterbury Chamber of Trade. The Canterbury traders urged the City Council to pressurise Kent County Council for more car parking spaces in the City. The City Council told the traders that they should write to Kent County Council to support the need for more car

1979 (cont.)

parking spaces. The Chamber of Trade maintained car parking was a crucial issue for them: "it is the life-blood of trade in this City". The City Council confirmed that new signposts were being made to give a clearer indication of the location of short term and long term car parks. The meeting agreed that one councillor would attend the Chamber General Purposes Meetings to create better liaison.

On the 21st February, the Town Planning Committee decided to proceed with the building of the controversial car park at Rosemary Lane. The Committee recommended that the City Council give itself planning permission for a three level, 624 space car park with housing on three sides. Only two members abstained from voting. Fourteen other members gave their approval. This decision was condemned by the Canterbury amenity and conservation groups. They were particularly angry because the Town Planning Committee agenda merely said the Chief Executive was going to report on a car park scheme. The objectors were amazed to find that the plan had been given approval.

This approval of the Town Planning Committee was going to be considered by the full Council when it met on the 7th March. When the Town Planning Committee had last considered the plan, it agreed that a suitable traffic solution would be published for public comment and adopted before it approved the plan for the multi-storey car park. No traffic management scheme had been discussed by the Town Planning Committee. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee said the Committee had been in the position to grant itself planning permission since the Environment Secretary decided he would not call in the plan for a decision.

1979 (cont.)

One Councillor protested against the Rosemary Lane scheme for the following four reasons: its closeness to the Norman Castle; the lack of a solution to the traffic problem; its noncompatibility with Canterbury's old buildings; and the opposition from the people living in the City near to the car park. He believed that "Rosemary Lane is a complete travesty of town planning and is a mockery of democracy". Another Councillor asked for more information on the scheme because the City Council would soon be in a position of voting to spend £1 million on a multi-storey car park that it had no authority to use. The Chief Executive replied: "You have been through a very full public consultation procedure. It is quite clear that you have done more than the law requires and I don't think the Committee would wish to go through all that again".

The Council Leader said: "the car park must be built". He said some people had protested against it, but others had realised how desparately a car park was needed in the City. He maintained the City Council was not proposing to use the car park until it had overcome the traffic problems. He stressed that only the traffic problems had been in the Council's way. In his opinion, there had been no planning objections.

The traffic survey done 18 months ago stated that about 5,000 cars per day used Castle Street. It indicated that if the multi-storey car park was built at Rosemary Lane, then this number would be cut by half.

1979 (cont.)

The City Council was determined to build the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park without the Section 28A certificate. After the multi-storey car park had been built, the City Council would design a traffic management scheme and then pressurise Kent County Council into granting the Section 28A certificate.

The amenity societies were horrified that the City Council considered to spend over £1 million of the ratepayers' money on a building it would not legally be able to use. The amenity societies had not denied there was a car parking problem in the City. All their information pointed to Kent County Council refusing to grant a Section 28A certificate. The Canterbury Society said it was not opposed to the car park in principle, but it was opposed to the total number of spaces (620). It suggested that the total amount of car parking spaces should be 300. It wanted a traffic management system to avoid tailbacks onto the Wincheap roundabout. It could not see how the car park could be approved if there was no solution to the traffic problem.

On the 27th February, Kent County Council's Powers Subcommittee unanimously refused to grant a Section 28A certificate for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The decision came less than a week after the City Council's Town Planning Committee gave itself planning permission for the car park. The decision angered the Council Leader, but it delighted the amenity societies. The Council Leader said the City Council would definitely appeal. He stressed "that car park is going to be built and work must start this year".

1979 (cont.)

The Powers Subcommittee said it recognised the need for more car parking in Canterbury and suggested a meeting between the two Councils on how this need could be met. The Committee said the discussion could include the possibility of a smaller car park at Rosemary Lane, other feasible sites for multi-storey car parks, and the possibility of developers contributing to improving Canterbury's road system. There was a condition attached to the meeting: that "it would not occur until the relevant reports for a District Plan for Canterbury are available". The Subcommittee's main objections to the car park were: its size and the number of vehicles using the nearby roads, especially the Wincheap roundabout.

This was the second time the County Council refused to grant the City Council a Section 28A certificate. This time a formal refusal notice would be issued to the City Council so an appeal to the DoE could be made by the City Council. The Council Leader said the City Council would "go through with the motions of talks". He said there had already been discussions with Kent County Council. Kent County Council's report on the Wincheap roundabout stated that the roundabout's capacity had been improved slightly.

Action for Rosemary Lane hoped the City Council would now start looking for a more suitable site for a multi-storey car park. Some amenity societies suspected that the City Council would still continue with its plan.

The Council Leader confirmed that the City Council would proceed with the multi-storey car park scheme at Rosemary Lane. He said the car park would start in

1979 (cont.)

September 1979. The City Council maintained it could still build the car park, but it would not be able to use it until it had received a Section 28A certificate from Kent County Council.

March

The Chamber of Trade thought the problem of car parking was very serious and it formed a car parking subcommittee. It hoped the situation would improve in the next year because of the channels of communication between the Chamber and the City Council. After a recent meeting between the car parking subcommittee and the Council, it was agreed that representatives of the two groups should sit in on each other's meetings.

Amenity societies and interested individuals were worried that the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park would be built by the City Council without the Section 28A certificate. They were afraid that the City would be lumbered with "a concrete white elephant using the ratepayeers' money". They thought the City Council was trying to get approval for the multi-storey car park before the May local election.

A letter from a leading conservationist was sent to all the Councillors on the Town Planning Committee before its meeting in February. The following points were made in that letter:

1. The historic wall dividing the Rosemary Lane site from the small car park in Rosemary Lane itself (it used to be the old boundary wall) had been systematically demolished without any permission. The wall was in the conservation area and listed building demolition consent had not been obtained.

1979 (cont.)

2. There was no present planning permission for the surfacing of the site as a car park. The conservationist wanted to know when the permission was going to be sought and when would it be advertised for public comment.
3. From her reading of the relevant Acts, the conservationist understood that a car park could not be used until the Section 28A certificate was granted.
4. The cost of the multi-storey car park was huge.
5. There was the need for a full discussion of the scheme's details.
6. The recommendation of the Panel Hearing Report in 1977 stated that full planning permission should not be granted until a traffic management scheme had been properly adopted which had not yet happened.

At its meeting on the 7th March, the City Council sent a recommendation to the Town Planning Committee to proceed with the £1 million multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane despite objections from amenity societies and individuals.

At its monthly meeting, the Conservation Advisory Committee queried the disappearance of the boundary wall on the Rosemary Lane site. The amenity societies were amazed at the speed in which the wall had disappeared. The amenity societies had been told by the DoE that listed building demolition consent was necessary to demolish the wall. The Committee wanted to know whether consent had been granted. The Chairman of the Town Planning Committee said the whole site had temporary permission as a car park and it was necessary to clear away the polluted material. The Officers present did not want to comment on the question of the legal ruling on the matter of the demolition of the boundary wall.

1979 (cont.)

On the 21st March, the Town Planning Committee discussed the Rosemary Lane proposal. The Chairman said the Committee could do nothing at this stage. The Town Planning Committee also discussed in private a planning application for a three storey office block on Beer Cart Lane. The Town Planning Committee gave it informal approval. The permission for the office block already existed. It was one the City Council had inherited from the old City Council before local government re-organisation. The permission expired later this month. The new design had 12 car parking spaces (an increase of 6) although a total of 32 car parking spaces were required under the current standards. In April 1974, the developers paid the City Council an agreed sum for the car parking spaces that could not be provided. The ground and first floors were going to be used by estate agents. The new scheme would be considered formally by the Town Planning Committee on the 4th April 1979.

The Council Leader admitted there was no hope of the 620 space multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane being built for several years due to the traffic problems. He hoped to persuade Kent County Council to allow the £1 million development to be built in three stages. The piece-meal plan included a long term proposal for five-a-side football, badminton, and other sports to be played on the roof of the mulit-storey car park. He said the multi-storey car park would be acceptable if only one level would be in use for cars at first. He then hoped planning permission could be obtained "fairly quickly" for use of the second deck for cars. Parking on the roof for another 200 vehicles would be a longer term project.

1979 (cont.)

On the 5th April, this new suggestion would be discussed by several Officers and Councillors from the City and County Councils. The Council Leader denied that the car park would be a monstrosity. He said the delay imposed by Kent County Council had cost the ratepayers £100,000.

This latest plan was condemned by the amenity societies who termed it as "an ingenious plan by the Council Leader to save face". The amenity societies maintained the only realistic answer to Canterbury's car parking problem was "not to keep bashing its head against the Rosemary Lane wall, but to genuninely discuss alternative sites and come to some conclusions". They thoughtthe Rosemary Lane site was ideal for housing, shops, small offices, and workshops.

The Chairman of the Northgate Association, a leading conservation spokeswoman, declared herself as an Independent candidate for the May local election. The Canterbury Labour Party was contesting all seats in the old City of Canterbury in the May local election.

Despite statements of wanting to retire, the Council Leader was reappointed. Approaches had been made to the Chairmen of Council Committees about a successor, but a replacement could not be found.

The City Council's Amenities Committee considered seeking expert advice on a new theatre. The Committee had allocated £1,000 for the preliminary stage of the new theatre. The Chief Executive said there was difficulty in the timing of a new theatre because of the availabilty of resources. The Committee agreed to make informal inquiries about engaging a consultant.

1979 (cont.)

The group, Canterbury Cares, sent a questionnaire to all candidates standing for election in the five wards of the City of Canterbury. The questionnaire asked for their views on controversial issues and conservation such as the Riverside walk, multi-storey car parks, tourism, and restraint on commercial and industrial development. The group wanted to inform the local voters of the candidates' views on these matters. The group was determined to make conservation and the future of Canterbury a major issue at the local election.

The Labour Party said the City Council had misplaced its priorities as evidenced by its "lavish" expenditure of £2¼ million on the new civic offices and £100,000 on the Guildhall. The Labour Party termed them "prestige projects" that were a waste of money when housing was desparately needed. The Labour Party maintained the Rosemary Lane car park affair was typical of the City Council's indifference to the opinions of the local electorate. It said "the Council stubbornly pressed ahead with it in face of the opposition from amenity societies inspite of more suitable sites for development such as the Longport car park".

The new Chairman of the Canterbury Chamber of Trade attacked conservationists as being "narrow minded". He urged all City societies and organisations to unite and "end their squabbling". He thought Canterbury should be made more attractive to tourists because they would bring greater prosperity to the City. He saw the Kent Structure Plan as "very much a limitation on the development in the Canterbury area". He thought all groups should unite and work together for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane.

1979 (cont.)

Kent County Council said it was going to fight against the Environment Secretary's organic change that would result in "a costly re-arrangement of county services". The Environment Secretary said he was open to requests from any district council (although he was not obliged to grant them) with a population of more than 100,000 to take over the running of its own social services from the county council. The Environment Secretary claimed the present distribution of functions between counties and districts did not "allow sufficiently for real local accountability" and people were feeling "increasingly remote from the authority which decides what sort of services they are to receive". Kent County Council rejected these allegations. The Environment Secretary could transfer all development control functions to district councils and that would abolish the category of county matters.

April

Nominations for the local election in May closed on the 5th April. There were 114 candidates contesting 49 seats. In Canterbury, there were 39 candidates contesting 15 seats: 15 Conservative, 15 Labour, 6 Independents, 2 National Front, and 1 Liberal. One of the most striking features of this local election was the number of candidates contesting seats.

The Labour candidates boycotted a public meeting organised by Canterbury Cares because the National Front candidates were invited to attend. The public meeting was held on the 18th April. The meeting discussed conservation and other issues affecting the old City of Canterbury. The meeting tried to

1979 (cont.)

air "certain issues vital to the City", so voters would be able to make a better choice at the local election.

It was revealed at the City Council's Policy Committee on 8th April that a reduction in car parking spaces from 620 to 415 for the Rosemary Lane proposal might receive "favourable consideration" from Kent County Council. This was the result of talks between Kent County Council and the City Council on 5th April. The Policy Committee agreed without an objection, to recommend to the full Council on 25th April to make a new application to Kent County Council for a 415 space multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane.

Opponents to the Rosemary Lane scheme tried to turn this into a local election issue. They urged the people to vote against the Conservatives to register their protest. When Kent County Council refused to grant a Section 28A certificate, the scheme's opponents thought that the plan was finished. The opponents maintained "it was a nonsense to spend over £1 million to park 200 more cars there". They said the interests of the Council were those of property and commerce and "not in providing a better City for local people to live, work, and shop in".

The Labour candidates said Rosemary Lane was the wrong place for a car park, whether it be 400 or 600 spaces. They said Castle Street would not be able to cope with the extra traffic. They maintained traffic should be removed from the City centre.

1979 (cont.)

The opponents to the Rosemary Lane scheme saw this proposal as a test of the City Council's commitment to conservation. The City Council said it was in favour of conservation. The opponents maintained that if a multi-storey car park was built, then "that claim is a sham". They stressed the people of Canterbury did not want a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane and it would be the ratepayers who would be "footing" its bill.

A City Council spokesman said since a new application was submitted to Kent County Council for a 415 space car park, the City Council would not proceed with its appeal against Kent County Council's refusal for a 620 space car park.

At its meeting on the 25th April, the City Council approved the proposal for a reduced number of spaces for Rosemary Lane despite allegations that the "plans were an act of vandalism". The Councillors voted overwhelmingly for planning permission to be sought for a 415 space car park at Rosemary Lane.

The City Council's Town Planning Committee recommended the approval of the application for a Sainsbury's supermarket and car park at Kingsmead Road. The application was referred to Kent County Council on traffic grounds.

On 24th April, Kent County Council's Powers Subcommittee gave outline planning permission for 35,000 sq. ft. Sainsbury's superstore on land between the Stour River and Northgate. As part of the application, Sainsburys promised £100,000 towards road improvements in the area. The plan

1979 (cont.)

included a car park for 178 vehicles. The subcommittee gave temporary permission for ten years for another car park of 121 cars. The County Surveyor said there had been a highway objection to the plan because of the extra traffic that would use the traffic lights at Kingsmead/Sturry Road junction. Kent County Council's Works and Projects Subcommittee had approved a scheme for replacing the lights with a roundabout and Sainsburys would pay £100,000 towards the cost of the work. Sainsburys also agreed to give land to widen Kingsmead Road at the entry to the site. The Riverside Walk had also been safeguarded.

At its annual meeting at the end of April, the Canterbury Society had grown and it felt it played a significant role in the City's life. The Society said the steady flow of new members (about 500 in total) demonstrated agreement with the Society's views. The Society praised the Conservation Study and said it was an invaluable document for amenity societies. The Society felt that through the Conservation Advisory Committee's discussions, many planning issues had been discussed openly that otherwise would have been discussed only by the City Council. The Society said the traffic problem would increase proportionately to the growth in Canterbury's floorspace. The Society stressed there was a limit to Canterbury's commercial growth before its character was sacrificed.

May

The results of the local election on 3rd May were: Conservatives 37, Labour 6, Independents 4, Ratepayers 2, Liberals 0, and National Front 0.

1979 (cont.)

The results in the five wards of the City of Canterbury were the following (there were three seats in each ward):

Barton Court	- all Conservative
Northgate	- all Labour
St. Stephen's	- all Conservative
Westgate	- 2 Conservatives, 1 Labour
Wincheap	- 2 Independents, 1 Labour

The Conservative MP for Canterbury was re-elected by an increased of a 8,000 majority. The polling was heavy for the general election with about a 75% turnout.

The Council Leader recommended changes in the local government administration. He believed the red tape in planning and highways/traffic management matters could be lessened through more direct power to the district council. He wanted to see a revision of the respective responsibilities in the roles of the district and county councils.

The consultative draft of the Conservation Study would soon be officially ready for public discussion. It had been to all the Council Committees and no alterations had been made. The unoffical draft had been widely circulated amongst the amenity societies and conservationists.

June

The Council Leader tried to sack the Vice-Chairman of the Housing Committee from the Conservative ruling group. This led to a row within the Conservative Party. Angry backbenchers said they "are tired of the Council Leader's dictatorial

1979 (cont.)

attitude". The Council Leader's actions followed the election of the Vice-Chairman of the Housing Committee over the Council Leader's personal preference. Later in the month at a Conservative group meeting, the Council Leader expelled the Conservative Vice-Chairman of the Housing Committee. The move was carried by a majority of five votes. Several Conservative Councillors walked out on the Council Leader.

The Environment Secretary refused planning permission for an office development on Rheims Way because of the need for conservation and planning restraint in Canterbury. The public inquiry was held in March 1979 because the City Council failed to determine the planning application for a four storey office block, a car park, improvements to the access road, and the construction of a footpath. The appeal was lodged by Home Securities. The Inspector said the "traffic and environmental conditions are such that planning permission should not be given for this substantial office development".

The City Council's Town Planning Committee gave initial approval to a scheme that would convert the City Council's Dane John offices into flats, maisonettes, and houses after the City Council staff moved into its new offices at Chaucer Barracks. The Council Leader said this move was part of the Council's policy to move offices from the City centre and the reintroduction of housing to the City centre. The Council Leader said "by insisting upon a high quality residential development, we shall make enough of a financial gain to help pay for our new offices and thus greatly reducing the cost to the ratepayers". The Council Leader continued:

1979 (cont.)

"obviously, this site is one of the Council's most valuable assets in Canterbury and I hope we can realise its full financial potential in order to offset the cost of our new offices . The area forms an important key to the future development of Canterbury".

Support was growing for a Canterbury Arts Council's plan to build a 1,200 seater theatre in Canterbury. Local groups backed the plan. The Chairman of the Amenities Committee doubted whether a large building could be filled and was worried about its financial cost. Amenity and drama oriented groups wanted a new threatre built before the present 652 seater Marlowe Theatre was demolished. The Chief Executive and the Chairman of the Amenities Committee recommended the City Council to engage a theatre consultant "so that Councillors could arrive at an educated solution as to the right type of building". They said that one of the theatre consultant's first jobs should be to seek the views of different groups like the Arts Council. Then Councillors would take his advice in light of the financial situation. Later in the month, the City Council's Finance Subcommittee said a theatre expert would advise the City Council on the design for a new theatre.

On 12th June, a High Court decision upheld Slatters Hotel claim that the City Council was obliged to provide car parking spaces for the Hotel in the Marlowe car park redevelopment scheme based on the terms of an agreement made by the Hotel with the previous City Council in 1961. The judge declared that the City Council was obliged to provide car

1979 (cont.)

parking for the Hotel and any development that did not provide the facility would not be permitted. The City Council was ordered to pay Slatters Hotel's legal costs and its own costs. The High Court decision meant the City Council would have to re-examine its design for the Marlowe redevelopment. The High Court decision also reopened for discussion underground car parking for the Marlowe site.

The City Council said it might appeal the decision given by the High Court. If it did not, it would then have to re-examine the plan for the Marlowe redevelopment and provide the necessary access for Slatters Hotel. Planning permission had already been given for the Marlowe redevelopment and the design had passed the scrutiny of the Royal Fine Arts Commission. Its construction had been delayed by the court case.

July

The Canterbury in Bloom Committee was formed. The Committee's aim was to bring flowers and colour to as many parts of the City as possible.

The City Council's Labour group at the City Council's full meeting on 10th July said "Longport was the right place to put Canterbury's multi-storey car park". The Labour group wanted priority to be given to the Longport site over the unpopular Rosemary Lane site.

The Estates Committee agreed to sell the Council buildings in Dane John that would be left empty when the City Council moved to its new offices at Chaucer Barracks.

1979 (cont.)

The Canterbury trade unionists might be asked to black the building of the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park if the City Council continued with the project. The Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park was discussed at a meeting of the Canterbury and District Trades Council. The delegates were concerned that the preparations appeared to be going ahead on the site. The Trades Council wished to add its voice and weight to the growing opposition to the building of a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The delegates also agreed "that if, despite all the representations made over the years, the City Council ignores the objections, trade unionists may well be asked to consider taking no action which will progress the proposed scheme".

The Canterbury Theatre Trust told the Amenities Committee if the City Council could not decide soon whether to build a new theatre, then it should begin with improvements to the existing one. The Theatre Trust said there was an urgent need for a new theatre to be built within the next five years.

August

At the full Council meeting, an argument started over the Policy Committee's recommendation for it to have the power to change Committee membership. It led to a revolt by the Conservative backbenchers. They were worried the power would be misused. The Policy Committee recommendation was termed "political dictatorship" because it would remove from the Councillors any freedom of choice they still might have. The move to send the recommendation back to the Policy Committee was defeated by 24 votes to 16. Later in the month, the Conservative backbenchers

1979 (cont.)

were ready to rebel again against the Council Leader in his latest attempt to sack the Vice-Chairman of the Housing Committee. The Vice-Chairman was chosen by the Committee over-ruling the Conservative Selection Committee and the Council Leader's personal favourite. The move to sack the Vice-Chairman of the Housing Committee came a week after the Council delegated power of Committee membership change to the Policy Committee. A Conservative Councillor said: "it is a direct threat to the control of the Council by all Councillors. It puts even more power into the hands of a select few."

Rosemary Lane was still the City Council's number one priority. On 21st August, Kent County Council's Powers Subcommittee approved the plan for Rosemary Lane by 13 votes to 7. There were conditions attached to this approval: Although the City Council could build a multi-storey car park on three floors for over 600 car parking spaces, only 415 car parking spaces on the ground and first floors could be used and 204 vehicle spaces could not be vacated between 4 and 6 pm(which was the time when shoppers and City workers would want to leave for home). (These conditions were identical to the ones which the City Council's Policy Committee agreed to at its last meeting.) A County Council spokesman said the reason for the conditions was "in order to restrict the amount of traffic going on the Wincheap roundabout which is, and always will be, overcrowded". The Council Leader said in a letter to Kent County Council that Canterbury would accept any reasonable conditions to get the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park built and in use.

1979 (cont.)

The Kent County Council spokesperson continued: "Consideration could be given at a later date to using the third floor, but any major improvements to the roundabout such as an underpass, could not be included in any budget until at least 1990." The opponents to the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park plan (including Action for Rosemary Lane and the Labour Councillors) termed the decision as "the most depressing thing to have happened in Canterbury for years". They maintained that the conditions which covered the use of the multi-storey car park would make it unusable and therefore it would be the biggest white elephant the City had ever seen. They were staggered that the City Council wanted to proceed with it despite the uncertainty. They stated that permission for the multi-storey car park had been given without any regard to the Transportation Study (which had not yet been published). A great deal of opposition was expressed. A delegation from Action for Rosemary Lane had visited County Hall before the Subcommittee met and talked to Councillors and Officers. At the time, the group felt that the County Councillors and Officers supported its opposition to the plan.

There was a cautious welcome for the car park from the Chamber of Trade. The Chamber said it was a pity that the car parking spaces had to be limited.

At the full Council meeting, the Council decided against a facelift for the Marlowe Theatre while the feasibility study was still in progress. The Labour Councillors wanted the facelift for the Theatre.

1979 (cont.)

September

On the 5th September, the Town Planning Committee granted planning permission for the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park after a short debate. The only opposition came from the Labour Councillors. The matter was termed as a "matter of urgency" and this meant that it could not be fully discussed again by the full Council. The Council Leader said a lot of "exaggerated nonsense" had been made about the scheme. The news of the planning permission was greeted with disgust and fear by the opposition. They hoped that the ombudsman or the Minister appointed to stop unnecessary local government spending would pursue the matter. They stressed that the fight against the multi-storey car park was not finished. They said no financial information still had not been released and they maintained there were viable alternatives to the Rosemary Lane site.

The opponents of the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park met at the Seven Stars Hotel, Canterbury on 26th September to plan a campaign to stop the multi-storey car park from being built. Action for Rosemary Lane agreed to launch a leaflet campaign to inform local people exactly what would happen if the plan went ahead. The leaflet would be distributed to everyone in the old City and would urge residents to lobby their Councillor and MP if they did not want the multi-storey car park. Otherwise, it was stressed that their silence would be taken as acquiesence. The working party planned a short campaign for the next two weeks before the next full City Council meeting of 10th October. At that meeting, the Labour Councillors would try to refute the minutes of the Town Planning Committee that had given the City Council

1979 (cont.)

permission to build the multi-storey car park. Other ideas included taking the City Council to the ombudsman on the charge of maladministration. They also considered taking legal advice from a planning expert and would appeal to the Transport Minister over Kent County Council's decision to grant a Section 28A certificate for the multi-storey car park. The main hope of the objectors was to mobilise the weight of public opinion against the scheme. The objectors wanted to devise an alternative traffic strategy for Canterbury to protect the City's heritage from traffic.

October

At its meeting on the 1st October, the Policy Committee rejected the amendment that would have permitted the Committee to sack the Chairmen or Vice-Chairmen of Committees. Several Councillors wondered why the Council Leader had backed down in this matter. It was thought the move had primarily been an excuse to sack the Vice-Chairman of the Housing Committee. However, it appeared that the Council Leader realised that the weight of public opinion was against him.

The plan for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane was the centre of dispute at the full City Council meeting on 10th October. The scheme was approved by 29 votes to 12. The Labour Councillors won support from the Independents, Ratepayers, and one Conservative Councillor. The debate lasted for over an hour and there were interruptions from the packed public galleries.

1979 (cont.)

The Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee said it was against the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park but there was nothing further it could do to stop the scheme. The latest figures by the City Treasurer's Department on its cost were: £205,000 p.a. for national loan charges. This sum would be paid from the general rate fund. This figure did not include the cost of the 43 homes around the car park. The 620 space car park would cost £1,600,000. Opposition to the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park continued.

The Labour Councillors accused the City Council of manipulating the figures for Rosemary Lane in order to give an acceptable estimate of its cost. The Labour Councillors said the cost would be an enormous strain on the ratepayers. They also attacked the Council for not honouring its own recommendation in the Panel Hearing Report (1976) that a suitable traffic managment scheme was needed before the car park was built.

The Conservative Councillors said the building of the car park would enhance the area. They said the motorist from rural areas could not find a place to park in the City. They maintained the income from the Marlowe site would generate good income and this site could not be developed without the construction of the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. As for the traffic problem, the Conservative Councillors said Kent County Council decided no traffic management scheme was needed. The City Council received a letter from the Castle Street Traders Association urging full and immediate support for Rosemary Lane.

1979 (cont.)

In his amendments to the Kent Structure Plan, the Environment Secretary ignored the City Council's pleas for a substantial increase of the City's growth in the 1980's. He wanted tighter development controls. He made 89 modifications to the Kent Structure Plan and the public had six weeks to comment on the changes. Then he will consider all views before making a final decision. The Environment Secretary approved the restraint policies on development for Canterbury in the Kent Structure Plan. He tried to clarify them. He rejected the policy that would have banned further residential development and replaced it with one of growth - to 4,300 homes from mid 1977 to mid 1982. He changed the policy that would have banned further industrial land allocation. He said "In urban areas of Canterbury, the provision of land for industrial development for mid 1977 shall not exceed 15 hectares. Permission will not normally be granted other than to firms existing locally of providing a local service". He supported the policy against speculative office and shopping development. He was against massive or high buildings that were out of scale with the central area.

The City Architect said the City Council had wanted the degree of restraint quantifitied and the Environment Secretary had done this in some areas. He said "In general the Secretary of State's modficiations have brought the plan more into the mode of a strategic vehicle for setting policies. Most of the arguments between us and the County Council were over details of how the restrictions would have been imposed and now that has been cleared up. By tightening restriction, the Secretary of State has helped us. The restrictions have been made much more workable".

1979 (cont.)

The City Council said its legal experts would appeal against the High Court decision giving Slatters Hotel access rights on the Marlowe site. This could affect the redevelopment scheme for the Marlowe site. The Estates Committee said that the City Council maintained there was " a fairly and properly arguable appeal against the decision given".

At its meeting on 29th October, the Public Works Committee approved a City centre traffic ban. The plan would ban taffic from Canterbury's historic centre for a six month experimental period. The main accesses to the central area would be blocked off from 10 am to 4 pm Monday to Saturdays. The scheme would start in April 1980. Barriers would be put across the affected roads but they would be designed to allow the access of invalid carriages. The main streets affected were: Palace Street, Guildhall Street, Burgate, High Street, Parade, St. Margaret's Street, St. Alphege Lane, St. Peter's Street, Orange Street, Best Lane, Butchery Lane, Mercery Lane, The Friars, St. Peter's Lane and Stour Street.

November

The Chamber of Trade sponsored a meeting on 12th November to discuss the City Council's proposed traffic ban for the City centre. The Chamber feared that shoppers would have difficulty in taking away heavy goods and the traders would have difficulties with deliveries and collections. The Chamber wanted these difficulties to be solved. At this meeting, the traders voiced their opposition to the City centre traffic ban saying it "could sterilise the City centre and cause shops to close". The Chamber of Trade condemned

1979 (cont.)

the City Council's proposal as "ill conceived" and it "would do more harm than good". The aspect that most angered the traders was the restriction on deliveries to and from the shops before 10 am and after 4 pm. They felt the City Council should have done more research. The Council Leader and the Chairman of the Public Works Committee agreed to meet five traders on 16th November.

The amenity societies supported the traffic ban for the City centre. However, they were distressed to hear the traders were against the traffic ban. They thought it was strange for the ban to be proposed so soon after the City Council's decision to proceed with Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park. The amenity societies said the reasons put forward by the Council for closing the City to traffic were the same ones put forward by the objectors to the multi-storey car park - ie traffic was damaging to the medieval character of Canterbury and any increase in its volume should be restrained by all available means.

Pressure from the traders forced the City Council to rethink its pedestrianisation scheme for the City centre. At the full City Council meeting on 21st November, the Council shelved the six month experiment after the Chairman of the Public Works Committee admitted "we need more time to consider the problem". The Labour Councillors were against the deferment of the scheme. They said the plan would "rescue" the historic core of the City.

The amenity societies accused the City Council of losing its nerve over the implementation of the City centre traffic ban. They said the traders were "inward looking and insular". On the whole, they thought

1979 (cont.)

the City centre traffic ban had been the most sensible plan coming from the City Council in years.

At its monthly meeting, the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee discussed the "disturbing trends" in shopping. The meeting was told that Canterbury shoppers were in danger of being pushed to the edge of town shopping areas while the City centre catered for tourists. The Committee heard the trend started with the Wincheap Industrial Estate. The Estate had not been originally intended as a retail shopping area. The trend continued with a major supermarket on Sturry Road and formed the beginnings of an out-of-town shopping centre. Concern was expressed about the number of money shops such as building societies in the City area that interrupted attractive window displays with their boring shop fronts.

The Chairman for the Canterbury Constituency Conservative Association quit after he vainly bid to expell the Council Leader from the Party. The two individuals clashed over the admittance of an outsider to the meetings of Conservative Councillors. The Council Leader claimed the selection of the candidates for the May 1979 local election had led to the loss of three seats for the Conservatives. The Chairman tried to expell the Council Leader from the Association. He failed when the 80 strong executive Committee refused to discuss the matter.

The Town Planning Committee approved outline planning application for a design for the Station Road East site. The design had ground floor shops around a landscaped courtyard. The first and second floors were offices and the basement had two decks for

1979 (cont.)

car parking. The Town Planning Committee approved the design despite warnings that Kent County Council would probably oppose it because of the extra traffic that would be generated onto the Wincheap roundabout. The Labour Councillors asked how Kent County Council could possibly refuse the application on these grounds when it had agreed to the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park.

Central government decided to maintain the Rate Support Grant at last year's level.

On 21st November, the City Council approved a plan for a luxury hotel complex at Dane John. The Council thought the plan would give the Watling Street area a facelift. The luxury hotel would be housed in the current Council offices that would empty when the City Council moved into its new offices at Chaucer Barracks. The Council felt the scheme would provide income to the Council's funds.

December

The Canterbury Society had reservations about the traffic ban in the City centre but thought that it should go ahead. The Society felt that a number of difficult problems had to be solved but it was a chance that should not be missed.

The City Council failed to grant the Conservation Study official status.

The City Council published its survey of Canterbury's future with respect to shopping, housing, and other aspects. It was one input to the District Plan.

1979 (cont.)

The report said that the growth in shopping on the trading estates had been the most marked change in shopping trends since the early 1970's. The report described the City as a subregional shopping centre that provided a full range of goods. The report continued by stating Canterbury surpassed all other East Kent town in floorspace and in the range of goods. There was more than one million feet of retail floorspace in Canterbury. On 1971 figures, the shops produced a £24.7 million turnover. The report estimated another 83,000 sq. ft. of floorspace for nonfood shopping could be accommodated. The report said any more demand for food shops would be absorbed by those permissions already granted. The potential for nonfood shops would largely be absorbed by the proposed shopping development on the Marlowe site. The report acknowledged that the City supermarkets would find themselves in direct competition with the new out-of-town Key Markets supermarket, although the report thought small food shops would not suffer unduly. The report said the City received about one million tourists in 1975. Tourism contributed £8,500,000 to the local economy and gave jobs to 2,500 people.

The City Council considered the consultative draft of the Transportation Study. The Study would not be made public until after it had been considered by Kent County Council's Planning and Transport Committee in February 1980. The City Council's comments would go the Policy Committee which would formulate a City Council view of the Study. There were 10 options coded A to K. Several of the options were based on the 1970 Buchanan proposals. It already emerged that option K (costing about £5 million) was considered by

1979 (cont.)

the Council Officers to be the best one. Option K included the construction of a Wincheap underpass and a new Northgate-St. Stephens link road. The objectives of the Transportation Study were to determine the existing travel demands in the City, to investigate and evaluate alternative transport systems, and to recommend a comprehensive policy for transport including highways, public transport and car parking. It examined the present transportation system in Canterbury and the way it had evolved. The common assumptions of options A to K were: the construction of the Canterbury by-pass, the implementation of the City centre traffic management scheme (including the ban on through traffic) and the maintenance of the present road system. Many amenity societies and conservationists were worried that City Councillors would form preconceived ideas about the plan. They feared the plan would not alter once the Study was formally published for public consultation.

Kent County Council's Powers Subcommittee refused outline planning permission for an application by Grove Hill Securities Ltd. for the demolition of existing buildings and the building of offices and retail units at 2-13 Station Road East. It would be a four storey pitched roof development that would have 30,000 sq. ft. of offices and 9,000 sq. ft. of shops and associated servicing and parking for 139 cars. The City Council had welcomed the application and had granted planning permission. The application had to be referred to Kent County Council on traffic management grounds. Kent County Council refused permission because the development was premature in advance of the publication of the Transportation Study and the implementation of any relevant

1979 (cont.)

highway improvement proposal. Kent County Council said the additional traffic that would be generated by the development would have an adverse effect on traffic flows and safety on approaches to the Wincheap and Riding Gate roundabouts.

Conservationists and amenity socities attacked the City Council for its lack of public consultation over the revised designs for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The application to approve the design was left off the list of planning applications produced by the City Council. The list was circulated to amenity societies. The amenity societies and conservationists said they did not have a chance to comment. A leading campaigner against the scheme claimed the lack of public consultation was "another chapter in this disreputable saga . . . For the most major thing going on in Canterbury for many years, this is an extra-ordinary state of affairs". Another leading conservationist commented: "I think this project has been mishandled as far as public participation is concerned from its inception. Public opinion and expert opinion have been ignored at every stage and this latest example seems to be part of a long record of the lack of public participation".

These attacks followed the decision of the Town Planning Committee at its meeting on 19th December to approve the details of the revised Castle Street elevations for the multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. The changes included moving the car park entrance along Castle Street to provide better access, interior alterations to the proposed Rosemary Lane and Gas Street housing and the provision of a passage between

1979 (cont.)

the main housing on Castle Street and the car park. The City Council thought it had fulfilled its statutory obligation in only advertising the design scheme once. The amenity societies and conservationists did not think this was public participation, especially on a controversial issue. All members of the Town Planning Committee were lobbied on 18th December with two letters. They were confiscated on orders of the Council Leader before many Councillors had a chance to see them (or read them). The letters were not considered at the Town Planning Committee's meeting. The Council Leader ordered that the only views to be considered by the Committee were those that had been seen by the Council Officers and edited into a report. This time, the Officers' report was not finished in time because many views had arrived late. The report was not before the City Councillors when they made the decision to approve the changes in the design for the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park. A Council spokesperson said it was "normal practice" to precis views of the public for Councillors. It was not normal policy to allow Councillors to see the public's letters on town planning matters. The Council Leader confirmed it was Council policy not to distribute letters from the public to members of the Town Planning Committee.

APPENDIX D - RESEARCH METHODS

This Appendix details my research methods. It is divided into five main sections: Documents and Reports, Formal Interviews, Informants and Observation and Participant Observation. The Documents and Reports section lists publications from the Department of the Environment, Kent County Council, and Canterbury City Council. The Formal Interviews section lists all the interviews that I conducted during the course of my research. The Informants section lists the contacts I had made mainly through my position as secretary to the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee and Canterbury Cares. The Observation and Participant Observation section details my duties as secretary to the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee and to Canterbury Cares as well as the other functions I have attended.

DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Department of the Environment

1973. Canterbury Southern By-Pass (A2) Alternative Routes A Consultative Document.

1973. Public Inquiries Into Road Proppsals. (leaflet)

1974. Road Planning and the Public - Procedures Outline. (leaflet)

1976. Development of the Strategic Plan for the South East.

2.12.1976. Letter from the DoE concerning the scheduling of Canterbury's Norman Castle.

20.12.1976. Letter from the DoE to Norton, Rose Botterall & Roche regarding the erection of an office building on land at St. George's Place, Canterbury.

1976. Inspector's Report. Application by the Anglo-American Property Company Limited.

1977. Inspector's Report. Canterbury A2 By-Pass.

1977. Inspector's Report. Kent County Council and Canterbury City Council Appeal. Public Inquiry - Key Markets, Sturry Road, Canterbury.

15.9.1977. Letter from the Doe to Canterbury City Council regarding the granting of demolition of the Marlowe Theatre.

3.5.1977. Letter from the DoE to Canterbury City Council regarding the proposal for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane. It was not necessary to call a public inquiry for the site.

3.5.1977. Letter from the DoE to the objectors of the Rosemary Lane multi-storey car park informing them that it was not necessary to call a public inquiry for the site.

1977. Secretary of State's Report on the Public Inquiry of the Canterbury A2 By-Pass.

1978. Kent Structure Plan Examination in Public - Notes for Participants.

1978. Structure Plans: The Examination in Public.

DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS (Cont.)

Kent County Council

7.10.1974. Letter from Kent County Council to Canterbury Planning Action Group regarding office and shop development in Canterbury.

1975. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: A Progress Report to the Public.

1975. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Issues for Discussion - Population Growth and Change.

1975. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Issues for Discussion - North East Kent.

1975. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Issues for Discussion - The Countryside.

1975. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Issues for Discussion - Shopping.

1975. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Issues for Discussion - Employment.

1975. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Issues for Discussion - Area Issues.

1975. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Issues for Discussion - Conclusions and Postscript.

1975. Kent County Structure Plan: Report on Transport Issues.

1975. Kent County Structure Plan: Shopping.

1975. Kent County Structure Plan: Conservation and the Character of the Built Environment.

1975. Kent County Council At Your Service.(booklet)

1975. Transport Supplementary Grant 1975/6.

1976. Abstract of Accounts. 1974/5.

1976. Budget 1976/7.

1976. Kent County Council At Your Service. (booklet)

1976. Kent Heritage Bulletin.

1976. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Choices - A Report for Discussion Purposes.

Kent County Council (Cont.)

1976. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Choices - A Report for Discussion Purposes Supplement on Transport Choices.

1976. Towards a Structure Plan for Kent: The Main Choices - A Report for Discussion Purposes Transport.

1976. Transport Policies and Programme 1976/7.

1976. Transport Supplementary Grant 1976/7.

1977. Budget 1977/8.

22.3.1977. Report by the County Secretary to the Powers Subcommittee regarding the Rosemary Lane car park.

24.3.1977. Letter from Kent County Council to Canterbury City Council regarding the Rosemary Lane car park.

1977. Offices in Kent 1976-77. A Register of Office Development.

1977. Kent Heritage Bulletin.

1977. Proof of Evidence Re: Key Markets, Sturry Road, Canterbury.

1977. Kent Structure Plan Written Statement Consultative Draft.

1977. Kent County Council At Your Service. (booklet)

1977. Transport Policies and Programmes 1977/8.

1977. Transport Supplementary Grant 1977/8.

1978. Budget 1978/9.

1978. Issue No 7: Statement No 7 Submitted on behalf of Kent County Council.

1978. Kent Strcuture Plan Examination in Public. Statement No 7 Submitted on behalf of Kent County Council.

1978. Issue No 7: Statement on behalf of Kent County Council in response to a question by the Chairman of the Panel.

1978. Kent Structure Plan. First Annual Monitoring Report.

1978. Transport Policies and Programmes 1978/9.

1978. Kent County Council At Your Service (booklet)

1979. East Kent Tourism Study.

DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS (Cont.)

Canterbury City Council

1973. Riverside Area Footpaths and Recreation.

1974. Canterbury City Car Parking Study.

1974. Financial Statistics for Canterbury City Council 1973/4.

29.4.1974. Estates Subcommittee. Land in St. Radigun's Area.

1974. Rate Levy 1974/5.

1975. Abstract of Accounts and Financial Statistics for the Year 1974/5.

1975. Draft Report on the Building of New Civic Offices.

1975. Capital Estimates 1975/6.

1975. Car Parking in Canterbury.

1975. Castle Street/Rosemary Lane Environmental Improvement and Car Parking Study. (revised)

1975. City of Canterbury Central Area Interim Office Policy.

1975. City of Canterbury Central Area Study.

14.10.1975. Forward Planning of Expenditure 1976/7.

1975. Draft Report of the City Engineer on the Proposed Redevelopment of Existing Car Park Sites Adjacent to the Marlowe Theatre and the Former Municipal Car Park at Watling Street.

5.3.1975. Rate Budget 1975/6. Statement by Chairman of Finance Committee.

5.3.1975. Rate Budget 1975/6. Staement by the Leader of the Council.

1975. Rate Levy 1975/6.

10.12.1975. Redevelopment of the Municipal (Watling Street) and Marlowe Car Parks. Report of the City Architect and Planner.

10.12.1975. Redevelopment of the Marlowe and Watling Street Car Parks. Report by the City Chief Executive.

1975. Redevelopment Sites - Marlowe and Minicipal Car Parks Discussion Points.

Canterbury City Council (Cont.)

1975. Tourist Study.

1976. Abstract of Accounts and Financial Statistics for the Year 1975/6.

1976. Canterbury Transportation Study. (in conjunction with Kent County Council)

1976. Detailed Revenue Estimates 1976/7.

1976. Report of a Panel of Members of the Town Planning Committee of Canterbury City Council on the Hearing Held on the 16th and 17th November 1976 on Representations Concerning the Seeking of Town Planning Permission for the Development of the Rosemary Lane Car Park.

12.7.1976. Public Questionnaire regarding St. Peter's Street General Improvement Area.

1976. Rate Levy 1976/7.

10.2.1976. Rate Levy 1976/7. Report of the City Treasurer.

23.2.1976. Rosemary Lane Car Park Proposals. Planning Subcommittee Minutes.

12.11.1976. Background Information on the Problem of Shopping in the City.

1977. Abstract of Accounts and Financial Statistics for the Year 1976/7.

1977. Conservation Area Advisory Committee for Canterbury. Working Party Discussion Paper.

1977. Detailed Revenue Estimates 1977/8.

28.9.1977. Marlowe Car Park Shopping Development.

1977. The Marlowe Development.

1977. Statement of Objections and Other Representations to the Secretary of State for the Environment on the Submitted Kent Structure Plan.

1977. Project Report Canterbury City District Plan.

1977. Rate Levy 1977/8.

1978. Abstract of Accounts and FInancial Statistics for the Year 1977/8.

1978. Canterbury Conservation Study.

Canterbury City Council (Cont.)

1978. Further Statement No 1 Arising from Objection 313 to the Panel Examining the Kent Structure Plan. Issue No 8 - The Appropriateness of the Policies to Restrain Growth in Small Rural Towns, Villages, Rural Areas.

1978. Further Statement no 2 in part Arising from Objection 313 made jointly on behalf of the District Councils of Dover, Shepway & Swale and Canterbury City Council to the Panel Examining the Kent Structure Plan. Issue No 2(a) (ii & iii): Priorities for Employment Growth.

1978. Further Statement No 3 Arising from Objection 313 to the Panel Examining the Kent Structure Plan. Issue No 2(a): Priorities for Employment Growth and the Feasibility of the Policies.

1978. Canterbury City Council's Further Statement No 3.

1978. Further Statement No 4 Arising from Objection 313 to the Panel Examining the Kent Structure Plan. Issue No 1(b): Longer Term Clarification of the Provision of Housing in Relation to Population Growth.

1978. Further Statement No 5 Arising from Objection 313 to the Panel Examining the Kent Structure Plan. Issue No 7: The Degree of Restraint Justified at Canterbury Having Particular Regard to the Conservation of the Built Environment, Rural Land Resources and the Transport System.

1978. Further Statement No 5 Arising from Objection 313 to the Panel Examining the Kent Structure Plan. Issue No 7.

1978. Further Statement No 6 Arising from Objection 313 to the Panel Examining the Kent Structure Plan. Issue No 7: The Degree of Restraint Justified at Canterbury Having Particular Regard to the Conservation of the Built Environment, Rural Land Resources and the Transport System.

1978. Further Statement No 7 Arising from Objection 313 to the Panel Examining the Kent Structure Plan. Reservations of Exceptions Within HEC Policies for Determination by the County Council.

1978. Rate Levy 1978/9.

1978. Representations to the Secretary of State for the Environment on the submitted Kent Structure Plan.

1979. Abstract of Accounts and Financial Statistics for the Year 1978/9.

1979. Canterbury City District Plan - Summary Report of Survey.

1981. Preliminary Development Brief. Marlowe Development.

FORMAL INTERVIEWS

Formal interviews were carried out with people closely involved in Canterbury planning issues and specifically in the Rosemary Lane and Marlowe site proposals. The interviews were explicitly stated to be part of my research on these matters. Standardized questionnaires were not used. Instead I established beforehand a list of topics for discussion and let the interview flow freely. Notes were taken at the time of the interview. I found that most interviewees did not wish to be taped.

The majority of the interviewees were very forthcoming in answering my questions. I felt that being an American was an advantage because individuals did not take for granted that I was particularly conversant with English local government and therefore were more explicit. Also, I thought that some felt flattered to be interviewed about a topic which to some might have appeared dull. However, a small minority of interviewees, especially Conservative councillors, were adept at 'managing' the interview. They talked so fast that I had trouble taking down notes, and did not answer some of my questions directly even when pressed to do so, etc.

I felt that these interviews were very helpful because they gave me a feeling of the types of personalities involved as well as information which in some cases was not readily available. They promoted my understanding of the subtleness of the cases I was studying.

FORMAL INTERVIEWS (Cont.)

Mr. Abrams, Canterbury City Council, City Engineer's Department. 5.12.1976.

Hilary Aplin, Former Secretary of the Canterbury Society from 1960 to 1974. 26.3.1977.

Mr. Barford, Canterbury City Council, Treasurer's Department. 12.1.1977.

Mr. J. Berbier, Former City Architect, Canterbury City Council to 1973. 2.5.1977.

Mr. J. Boyle, Former Town Clerk, Canterbury City Council from 1942 to 1972. 30.3.1977.

Joan Brown, Planning Representative of the Oaten Hill and District Society from 1976 to 1977. 26.3.1977.

Mr. Dick Burton, Kent County Council, Treasurer's Department. 30.11.1976.

Mr. T. Castle, Canterbury City Council Conservative Councillor from 1974, Chairman of the Town Planning Committee 1976 to 1977, Chairman of the Estates Committee 1979 to 1980. 30.3.1977.

Mr. Keith Catall, Canterbury City Council, Project Architect for the Marlowe site. 15.4.1977.

Mr. John Chater, Canterbury City Council, Conservation Officer from 1974. 15.4.1977.

Mr. T. Collier, Director of Canterbury Urban Studies Centre from 1975 to 1977. 31.3.1977.

Alannah Coleman, Secretary of the St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society from 1974 to 1977. 8.4.1977.

Barbara Corlette, Secretary of the Canterbury Society from 1976 to 1978. 31.5.1977.

Mr. George Dak, Canterbury City Council, Treasurer's Department. 15.1.1977.

Mr. Eggledon, Canterbury City Council, City Engineer's Department, Senior Assistant Engineer. 6.4.1977.

Mr. Gordon Fowler, Chairman of the Canterbury Planning Action Group from 1974 to 1978. 1.5.1977.

Mr. M. Fuller, ex-Labour Councillor on Canterbury City Council, Leader of the Opposition from 1971 to 1974. 24.11.1976.

FORMAL INTERVIEWS (Cont.)

Mr. L. Gage, member of the Canterbury Planning Action Group from 1974 to 1978, Lecturer at the School of Architecture, Canterbury. 31.3.1977.

Mr. R. Gates, Chairman of the Black Griffin Lane Residents Association from 1974 to 1978. 28.4.1977.

Mr. C. Graves, Canterbury City Council, City Architect's Department, Principal Planner from 1974. 22.4.1977.

Mr. P. Insley, Canterbury City Council, City Architect's Department, Architect. 6.4.1977.

Mr. P. Jackson, Canterbury City Council, City Architect from 1974. 26.4.1977.

Mr. Landon, Canterbury City Council, City Treasurer from 1974. 29.11.1976.

Mr. P. Osborne, Secretary of the North Lane Area Group from 1974. 29.4.1977.

Mr. J. Paine, Kent County Council, Surveyor's Department. 1.12.1976.

Mr. Parkinson, Canterbury City Council, City Secretary's Department. 6.4.1977.

Mr. Parratt, Department of the Environment. 3.4.1977.

Mr. K. Pinnock, Vice Chairman of the Canterbury Society, Vice Chairman of the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977. 24.3.1977.

Mr. A. Porter, Canterbury City Council Conservative Councillor, Leader of the City Council from 1974. 29.3.1977.

Margaret Scott-Knight, Canterbury City Council Conservative Councillor from 1974, Vice Chairman of the Town Planning Committee from 1976 to 1977. 14.4.1977.

Caroline Simpson, Chairman of the Northgate Association from 1976 to 1980, stood as Independent candidate for Canterbury City Council in 1979 but was unsuccessful, Director of Canterbury Urban Studies Centre from 1980. 28.4.1977.

FORMAL INTERVIEWS (Cont.)

Mr. M. Steptoe, Canterbury City Council Conservative Councillor from 1974, Chairman of the Amenities Committee from 1974. 29.3.1977.

Mr. T. Tatton-Brown, Director of Canterbury Archaeological Trust from 1976. 9.4.1977.

Canon Tufton, Head of the Church Council for City Council Parishes. 22.9.1977.

Mr. K. Waller, Secretary of the Local Chamber of Trade, Canterbury Branch from 1974. 5.5.1977.

Barbara Weare, Canterbury City Council, City Architect's Department. 13.5.1977.

Mr. A. White, Canterbury City Council, City Engineer's Department. 2.4.1977.

Mr. J. Wilkins, Canterbury City Council Conservative Councillor from 1974 to 1979, Chairman of the Estates Committee from 1975 to 1976. 28.4.1977.

INFORMANTS

The following individauls acted as informants. The initial contact in most cases was made through my acting as Secretary to the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee and Canterbury Cares.

Mr. A. Austin, Canterbury City Council Conservative Councillor from 1976, City Council representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

Audrey Bateman, Chairman of the St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society from 1977, Chairman of Action for Rosemary Lane, St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977. member of Canterbury Cares 1979.

Anne Bindoff, Kentish Gazette, reporter.

Mr. T. Castle, Canterbury City Council Conservative Councillor from 1974, Chairman of the Town Planning Committee from 1976 to 1977, Chairman of the Estates Committee from 1979 to 1980, City Council representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

Mr. J. Chater, Canterbury City Council Conservation Officer from 1974, attendance at several meetings of the Canterbury Conservation Adviosry Committee from 1977.

Mr. A. Clague, Royal Institute of British Architects representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1979.

Mr. A. Cooper, Canterbury City Council Conservative Councillor from 1976, City Council representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1978.

Barbara Corlette, Secretary of the Canterbury Society from 1976 to 1978.

Mr. P. Evans, Chairman of the South Canterbury Preservation Society, member of Canterbury Cares 1979.

INFORMANTS (Cont.)

Mr. Farrar, member of the Oaten Hill and District Society, member of Canterbury Cares 1979.

Amy Fowler, member of the Canterbury Planning Action Group from 1974 to 1978.

Mr. G. Fowler, Chairman of the Canterbury Planning Action Group from 1974 to 1978.

Mr. L. Gage, member of the Canterbury Planning Action Group from 1974 to 1978, Lecturer at the School of Architecture, Canterbury, Canterbury Urban Studies Centre representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1979.

Mr. C. Gay, Chief Executive, Canterbury City Council from 1974, attendance at several Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee meetings from 1977.

Eileen Goodrich, Canterbury Chamber of Trade representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1978.

Sarah Goulden, member of Canterbury Cares 1979.

Mr. A. Haigh, Kent County Council Conservative Councillor, Kent County Council representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977, member of the Canterbury Society.

Mr. J. Hayes, member of the Canterbury Society, Canterbury Society representative on the Canterbury Conservation Asvisory Committee from 1977 to 1978.

Mr. P. Jackson, Canterbury City Council City Architect and Planner from 1974, attendance at several Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee meetings from 1977.

Professor Keith-Lucas, member of the Blackfriars Association, Chairman of the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1978, member of the Canterbury Society, member of Canterbury Cares 1979.

Mr. F. Lee-Evans, member of the Canterbury Society, Royal Town Planning Institute representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

INFORMANTS (Cont.)

Dr. H. Lefever, member of the Oaten Hill and District Society, Oaten Hill and District Society representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1978.

Megan Lowe, Federation of University Women representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1978.

Mr. P. Marsh, Dean and Chapter representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

Mr. A. Martin, Rotary Club of Canterbury representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1979, Treasurer of the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1979.

Mr. A. Mauduit, Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

Mr. P. Osborne, Secretary of the North Lane Area Group from 1974, North Lane Area Grpup representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1979, member of Canterbury Cares 1979.

Mr. R. Paine, Chairman of the Stour Valley Society, Stour Valley Society representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

Mr. K. Pinnock, Vice Chairman of the Canterbury Society, Vice Chairman of the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

Mr. C. Robinson, member of the Stour Valley Society, Stour Valley Society representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1979, member of Canterbury Cares 1979.

Mr. David Rose, Kentish Gazette, Editor.

Caroline Simpson, Chairman of the Northgate Association from 1976 to 1980, Director of the Canterbury Urban Studies Centre from 1980, Northgate Association representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1979, member of Canterbury Cares, 1979.

INFORMANTS (Cont.)

Mr. J. Stamper, Canterbury City Council Assistant City Architect and Planner from 1974, attendance at several Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee meetings from 1977.

Mr. J. Sullivan, member of the Rotary Club of Canterbury, Rotary Club of Canterbury representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

Mr. A. Swaine, member of the Victorian Society and Ancient Monuments Society, Victorian Society and Ancient Monuments Society representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977.

Canon Tufton, Treasurer of Canterbury Cares 1979.

Mr. K. Waller, Secretary of Canterbury Chamber of Trade, Canterbury Chamber of Trade representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977 to 1978.

Mr. G. Walton, Secretary of the Canterbury Society from 1978, Canterbury Society representative on the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1977, Canterbury Cares 1979.

Mr. P. Williams, Chairman of the Oaten Hill and District Society, Chairman of the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee from 1978 to 1979, Chairman of Canterbury Cares 1979.

OBSERVATION

Attended several meetings of the Canterbury Society from 1976 to 1977.

Attended the Examination in Public of the Kent Structure Plan Issue Number 7 on 8.6.1978 and 13.6.1978.

Attended several meetings with the Neighbourhood Design Unit, 4th year studio, Canterbury School of Architecture from 1976 to 1978.

Attended Panel Hearing on the proposal for a multi-storey car park at Rosemary Lane on 16.11.1976 and 17.11.1976.

Attended the Public Inquiry on the Canterbury A2 by-pass on 18.1.1977, 20.1.1977, 21.1.1977 and 25.1.1977.

Attended a Seminar on East Kent Tourism on 3.3.1979.

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

In the course of my research I occupied a number of positions from which I was able to engage in participant observation. The main positions where this was possible were:-

- Secretary to the Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee - a post I held from September 1977 to September 1979. Duties involved attending meetings, taking minutes, typing up minutes and agendas, correspondence, reports, filing, distribution of all relevant materials to members, administrative dutes, the following up of enquiries, obtaining information on certain issues and liaising with the press, Canterbury Conservation Advisory members, City Councillors, City Council Officers, amenity societies, businessmen and residents.

- Secretary of Canterbury Cares from January 1979 to May 1979. Duties included taking minutes, correspondence, liaising with members, public and press, organising meetings, agendas, questionnaire, public meeting and press releases.

The majority of individuals in each organisation knew I was doing research on the Marlowe and Rosemary Lane sites. However, only a handful really understood what this research entailed. If anyone asked me any questions about my research I would answer them truthfully, but I did not 'advertise' my research interests. At first, the majority of individuals were rather conscious of my presence. Whether or not this could be attributed to my research position or to English reticence is hard to tell. However as time progressed, I felt that I had become 'a fly on the wall' and that the majority of individuals had become sufficiently relaxed about me and my research role.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ashford Borough Council.1977. Ashford District Plan Topic Report No 5 Shopping.

Ashford Borough Council. 1978.Issue No 7 - The Degree of Restraint Justified at Canterbury.

Association of County Councils. 1978. A Financial Revolution? The Future of Local Government Finance. London.

Canterbury Society. 1977. Kent Structure Plan.

Canterbury Archaeological Trust. 1976. Canterbury Archaeology 1975/6.

Colin Buchanan and Partners. 1970. Catnerbury Traffic Study. London.

The Guardian Newspaper 1978.

Healey and Baker. 1975. Feasibility Report on the Commercial Development of the Marlowe Site.

Healey and Baker. 1977. Canterbury - Sturry Road Planning Appeal 26.7.1977.

The Kent Financial Officers Association. 1975. The District Councils of Kent Statistics 1975/6.

The Kent Financial Officers Association. 1976. The District Councils of Kent Statistics 1976/7.

The Kent Financial Officers Association. 1977. The District Councils of Kent Statistics 1977/8.

The Kent Financial Officers Association. 1978. The District Councils of Kent Statistics 1978/9.

Moss, Ronald A. 1976. Proposed Food Store, Sturry Road, City of Canterbury, Kent. Planning Statement.

Rolmead Limited. 1977. Land at Sturry Road, Canterbury. Appeal Against Refusal of Planning Permission for Development.

St. Mildred's and St. Margaret's Area Conservation Society. 1978. Kent Structure Plan.

The Times. Commercial Property Section 1976 to 1979.