

Chukyo University Institute of Economics

Discussion Paper Series

March 2024

No. 2305

**Some aspects of the housing debate in England during the 1930s:
government policy changes and the case for flats**

Tatsuya Tsubaki

Some aspects of the housing debate in England during the 1930s: government policy changes and the case for flats

Tatsuya Tsubaki*

School of Economics, Chukyo University, Nagoya, Japan

Abstract

Public housing policy introduced in Britain after the First World War, in the form of state-subsidised housing provision, underwent a significant change in the 1930s. This article uses contemporary sources to trace the ways in which public authorities and various bodies and individuals concerned with the questions of popular housing provision contributed to this process of policy reorientation. It will suggest that there was a growing interest in flats in the field of public housing. Enthusiasm was fired in the first instance by a shift in government's housing policy which appeared to emphasise the necessity for 'building upwards' in its policy for the central redevelopment of towns. Continental housing, because of its long association with flats, offered a potential model for some local authorities contemplating large slum clearance schemes. Some took to research to find out the economic and technical possibilities of flats. At the same time, the results of several social surveys were pointing to the shortcomings of the conventional form of housing development. All this was in striking contrast to the situation in the 1920s, when the building of low-density suburban cottage estates had been taken for granted.

Keywords: housing policy; public housing; flats; housing estates; slum clearance; England

*E-mail: tsubaki@mecl.chukyo-u.ac.jp

Introduction

The comparative rarity of flats or apartment houses in the history of English housing is well known. In contrast with many other European countries on the continent, where flats have come to be accepted as part and parcel of living in cities, this has never been the case in England. The English distaste for this form of dwelling type seems to be rooted in her historical tradition. Hence an old adage, ‘An Englishman’s house is his castle’, with its connotations of privacy and independence, believed to be seriously compromised if you lived in a flat.

Historically, owing to her unique geographical position and relative political stability, English towns were allowed to expand outwards. The need did not arise to crowd dwellings within the confines of ancient/medieval walls. In due course, the leasehold tenure system discouraged intensive development, as it gave the ground landlord a continuing interest in the site. In the freehold towns, it was the inertia of centuries which acted against the building of multi-storey residential structures. And the industrial urban growth, when it came, produced its own high-density accommodation in the form of back-to-back terrace houses and court dwellings.¹

In the second half of the nineteenth century, the sheer pressure on urban land and the first efforts to alleviate the housing problem of the working population did lead to some flat building. So-called mansion flats were built in place like London and made comfortable homes or *pieds-à-terre* for the upper and middle classes. For the working class, flats in those days meant either those model tenements and philanthropic housing, which were drab, austere and barrack-like in appearance with only basic facilities and inadequate space, or a form of shared occupation of once fashionable, large terrace houses for the well-off, in which overcrowding was rife and sanitation minimal. The grim tenement image associated with these living conditions certainly persisted in people’s minds and was carried into the twentieth century.² Lacking indigenous equivalent to the continental tradition of multi-storey living, modern flats in England were initially taken up in the 1930s by architects of modernist inclinations and housing reformers as a conscious, innovative form of dwelling designed to offer ordinary people decent accommodation with modern amenities within their means.³ Significantly, the decade coincided with an important shift in national housing policy.

This article uses contemporary sources to look at the views expressed by various public authorities and interested bodies in the debates surrounding the questions of popular housing provision in England during the 1930s, and to explore the ways in which they might have contributed to the process of policy reorientation in housing. It suggests that there was a growing interest in flats in the field of public housing. Enthusiasm was fired in the first instance by a shift in government’s housing

policy, especially that of the Conservative National Government, which appeared to emphasise the necessity for 'building upwards' in its policy for the central redevelopment of towns. Continental housing, because of its long association with flats, offered a potential model for a number of local authorities contemplating large slum clearance schemes. Some took to research to find out the economic and technical possibilities of modern types of flats. At the same time, the results of various social surveys pointed to the shortcomings of the conventional form of housing development. All this was in striking contrast to the situation in the 1920s, as the first section of this article will show, when suburban cottage estates, built twelve houses to the acre, had been taken for granted.

Housing policy in the aftermath of the First World War

In the aftermath of the First World War, there was an acute shortage of housing across the board for the working class. Accordingly, the main purpose of housing policy in the 1920s was to supply a sufficient number of new accommodation units in the form of small houses to let. It was decided for the first time that the state should intervene to take responsibility for providing working-class housing. Under the 1919 Housing and Town Planning Act, the local authorities were made the principal agency responsible for building houses, and subsidies were provided by the Treasury and from local rates. The acceptance of a new standard in public housing followed the recommendations of the Tudor Walters Committee, set up during the war to 'consider questions of building construction' of dwellings for the working class. The Committee's report was largely the work of the architect Raymond Unwin, who, together with Barry Parker, had designed Rowntree's industrial village, New Earswick near York and the first garden city at Letchworth before the First World War. He had also created the Hampstead Garden Suburb. Unwin was an influential exponent of the garden city movement and the leading force behind the government's adoption of the garden city model in its housing programme.⁴

The Tudor Walters Report thus recommended a maximum of twelve houses to the acre in urban areas and suggested that 'two-storey cottage is the type which should generally be adopted', which would be built mainly in blocks of four or in pairs (as in semi-detached houses). The deep, narrow-fronted terrace house or the bye-law type with back extensions were to be avoided in favour of one having 'a simple rectangular form' with wider frontage, which was more economical and allowed greater amount of air and light into the house. Recommended space standards for a three-bedroom house ranged from 767 square feet (Type I with a bath in the scullery) through 872 square feet (Type II with a separate downstairs bathroom) to 1,145 square feet (Type IIIA with 'a parlour', i.e. a room for sitting in and entertaining visitors, and an upstairs bathroom representing 'undoubtedly the type desired by the majority

of the artisan class'). As far as the arrangement of rooms inside was concerned, the Report identified a strongly-marked tendency of working-class families 'to eliminate from the living-room the dirty work and particularly the cooking of meals' and sought to cater for this by providing a scullery with copper, sink and gas cooker or cooking range. The Report also warned of the danger of having a large scullery 'as many tenants would live mainly in the scullery and keep the large living-room as a parlour'. There was indeed a widespread desire among the working class for the best room in the house in the form of a parlour. In view of the likely demand for higher standards of accommodation, the Report suggested that a large proportion of houses should have parlours in all future schemes. At the same time, it was realised that, though desirable, the parlour was beyond the means of many of the tenants. Hence the report argued that it should not be secured 'by cutting down on the desirable minimum sizes of the living-room, scullery, or other essential parts of the houses'.⁵

In contrast, the Tudor Walters Report gave short shrift to flats, saying that no advocate appeared for 'large blocks of tenements four or five storeys high' although 'modified types of such buildings might be necessary in the centre of areas already developed with this class of dwelling or to meet special conditions'.⁶ In the 1920s, the customary development by the self-contained cottages was commended in all cases and this was set against the experience of 'those countries and cities which have had the misfortune to adopt the tenement system to any great extent'.⁷

Between 1919 and the early 1930s, over 1.5 million houses were built in England and Wales. Of these, two thirds were subsidised houses provided under the successive housing acts and directed towards relief of general housing shortage.⁸ The majority of them were located on 'newly developed building estates'⁹ on the outskirts of towns, built to the density of twelve to the acre. Towards the end of the 1920s, however, there was a growing realisation among housing reformers and government officials that the existing policy was failing to cater for the poorer members of the working class.¹⁰ The process of 'filtering up',¹¹ on which some hope had been placed, was not working, and the slums in the centre of towns had been left almost untouched.¹² Grim accounts of slum conditions were being published.¹³ In the national campaign for slum clearance and rehousing which followed flats became relevant for those searching for a solution to the housing problem.

New directions in housing policy

The first step in this direction was the Housing Act of 1930, the so-called Slum Clearance Act, introduced by the second Labour government. This measure was specifically geared to the clearance of slums and subsidies were to be given according to the number of those displaced by clearance

schemes. One of the distinctive features was a higher subsidy provision made for rehousing in urban areas where this had to be done on expensive sites in flats of more than three storeys.¹⁴ But in keeping with Labour's commitment to the public provision of working-class housing, this legislation was initially intended to be worked in combination with the 1924 Wheatley Act, which provided for general-need housing.¹⁵ The way in which Arthur Greenwood, Minister of Health, explained this new form of subsidy showed that he was still thinking in traditional terms, putting forward the old arguments which had led to the building of tenements in the nineteenth century:

Much as I would prefer to see the population spreading out rather than rising heavenward in the dwellings, one has to face the fact that for a limited number of our people, who must live, or who passionately desire to live in the centre of very cities, tenement provision must be made.¹⁶

The need for some sections of the working class, such as street traders and casual workers, to live within walking distance of their jobs had to be catered for. Housing provision on expensive, central sites required high density in block dwellings, which were known to be costly. Hence a higher subsidy was justified. In Greenwood's view, this special provision only applied to a few places, such as London and Liverpool.¹⁷

If anything, Labour's affinity lay with the conventional type of housing development. The party had adopted a resolution back in 1918, supporting 'the establishment of new towns...on garden city principles', and pending the full operation of this scheme, it called for 'the provision of good self-contained houses with gardens'.¹⁸ Some Labour figures continued to express their opposition to flats. Greenwood himself later attacked the Conservative National Government for driving people into flats.¹⁹ When pressed in Parliament, on the second reading of the 1935 Housing Bill, to clarify Labour's position on flats, George Hicks, a former builder, responded by saying that he was sure none in his party liked them. He then listed the objections to flats: hardships suffered by many flights of stairs; the lack of privacy; and the problem of noise.²⁰ In an important statement on housing policy in 1934, however, the Labour Party equally disapproved of building 'huge dormitory estates in outlying districts'. Its preferred solution was 'small estates which fit in with existing building, and have the initial advantage of any social amenities already available'.²¹ Where there was a demand for flats, the statement noted, they should have a spacious layout, with gardens and playgrounds. But in densely-populated areas, such as London, it might be found desirable to develop self-contained units on garden city lines, with their own industries.²²

The National Conservative Government, which took over in 1931, appeared to push ahead with the idea of flats in its housing policy. The Conservatives saw municipal housebuilding as an adjunct

to the work of private enterprise and gave public housing only a residual role. They were clearly helped by the circumstances of the early 1930s. The sterling crisis, which led to Britain leaving the gold standard for good, had ushered in the economy campaign. The depression was bringing down the bank rate and with it the cost of borrowing. The Conservative Government first urged local authorities to take advantage of falling building costs and to economise in space standards. They were told that adequate accommodation for an ordinary family with children could be provided in a three-bedroom house of the non-parlour type with a superficial area of 760 square feet.²³ Then came the abolition of the general need subsidy in 1933 and local authorities were now instructed to start a five-year programme of slum clearance. The Government's new housing policy, as summarised in the *Report of the Departmental Committee on Housing* in 1933, was

to concentrate public effort and money on the clearance and improvement of slum conditions, and to rely in the main on competitive private enterprise to provide a supply of accommodation for the working classes – the provision by private enterprise to be supplemented, when necessary, by means of unsubsidised building by the Local Authorities.²⁴

The same report made two significant observations, which anticipated the directions of the Conservative policy on housing. It spoke of the excessive cost of tenement flats and 'the urgent need for further examination of the technical and other problems involved'.²⁵ Drawing on the 1931 Census figures, it also noted the prevalence of small families in many of the large towns and thought that 'a larger proportion of the smaller type of dwelling should be provided in future than hitherto'. The report was of the opinion that part of the overcrowding problem, the seriousness of which was recognised alongside the issue of slums, was caused by small families 'unable to obtain alternative accommodation suitable to their needs and their purse'.²⁶ In the same year, the Association of Municipal Corporations (AMC), the main body representing the interests of local authorities, passed a resolution calling for the slum clearance subsidy to be extended for the rehousing of persons 'living under overcrowded conditions', and the Government was coming round to the view that some measure had to be taken to remedy the situation. In particular, it was observed that in larger towns, the abatement of overcrowding turned on 'the provision of those houses in a particular locus, in which custom, industrial or commercial need require accommodation for the working classes'.²⁷ The solution was spelled out by Neville Chamberlain, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the Housing Policy Committee of the Cabinet:

it was not possible to deal with the problem of the central areas by providing ordinary houses: the sites were much too expensive. It was therefore necessary to build blocks of flats. The old

objections to accommodation of this kind were no longer valid because developments, particularly on the Continent had to a large extent overcome the drawbacks from which the older type of flats undoubtedly suffered. It was obvious that in future recourse would have to be had to a very large extent to the building of blocks of flats in the central areas.²⁸

The Housing Act of 1935 provided subsidies to help rehouse families living in overcrowded houses. The Act also introduced the so-called redevelopment areas. The local authorities were empowered to acquire and redevelop districts in the inner and older areas of towns, provided one third of dwellings there were deemed to be unfit or overcrowded. As the Conservative Minister of Health, Hilton Young, explained in Parliament:

you cannot remedy overcrowding unless you are prepared to find means for re-housing a large proportion of dwellers in these central areas near the scene of their original home...

It is impossible to make use of the central areas to which I have referred, where overcrowding is characteristically present, to their full extent without building to some degree upwards in the form of blocks of flats.²⁹

And what was contemplated, in his words, was 'nothing less than the reconstruction...of the bad old cores of the inner areas of our great towns'.³⁰ The Minister, mindful of the objections to flats, put forward a case for modern flats, echoing Neville Chamberlain's words in Cabinet:

I, myself, believed that prejudice to be based upon the fact that the original blocks of workers' dwellings and blocks of flats which were first constructed in the slums were thoroughly bad, badly designed, badly laid down and did not make proper provision for air and space and the amenities of life. I find, however, that wherever the good modern flat has been introduced, that prejudice breaks down. It is impossible for one who has not studied the subject to realise what enormous strides have been made in the technique of flat construction even in the course of the last 10 years. I venture to say that today the modern well-equipped flat to many families means more of a dwelling than does a small house.³¹

The Conservative National Government's plans, then, was to target the slums and highlight the overcrowding problem in the centre of large towns, for which redevelopment areas provided the sites for rehousing in flats.³²

Continental influences

The upsurge of interest in flats was also evident in government departments and among a number of local authorities. As some of the other European countries had greater experience of building flats,

those involved in public housing started to look to the continent for new ideas. Inside the Ministry of Health, the officials assiduously gathered information on standards of accommodation and housebuilding activities from as far afield as South Africa and the United States of America.³³ The Chairman of the London County Council (LCC) Housing Committee felt the ‘the time had come for British local authorities to study more closely what [was] ...being done on the Continent in the building of high tenements’.³⁴ Cities such as London and Birmingham, and the Department of Health for Scotland, were among those organisations which sent over delegations in the 1930s to get first-hand knowledge of housing conditions on the continent.³⁵

The delegations were invariably impressed by the wide range of communal facilities provided as part of estate development: public gardens; nursery and kindergarden schools; medical clinics; libraries; community rooms; and communal laundries. Although, in several cases, they found the actual accommodation provided, in terms of space standards and sanitary facilities, to be somewhat inferior, the communal amenities were thought to ‘form a very substantial addition to the real value of the accommodation provided within the walls of each individual house’.³⁶ Another point the delegations agreed about was the higher standard of design and finish seen on many of the estates. As the LCC delegation put it:

more expense appears to have been allowed in continental housing on the internal finish and appearance of dwellings, particularly as regards flooring and walls of halls and staircases, and the fitting-up of kitchens with labour-saving appliances. These improvements result in a saving in maintenance costs, add considerably to the comfort and homelike appearance of the dwellings, and undoubtedly encourage the tenants to take a pride in their homes.³⁷

The importance of having competent architects was pointed out by the Birmingham delegation:

In the design of buildings, many leading architects in addition to the architects of the Municipality have been entrusted with the preparation of the plans, with distinctive effect. By the adoption of this policy, an extraordinarily large amount of variety in design has been obtained, thus reducing to a minimum the risk of barrack-like monotony.³⁸

This point was echoed by the delegation from the Department of Health for Scotland, who stated that the lesson to be learned from the continental schemes was ‘how to combine artistic effects with real utility and real economy’, with the consequence that ‘all those engaged in housing our people must be convinced that housing design [was]...important creative work which should be entrusted to skilled hands’.³⁹ The delegations were also impressed by ‘the colourful charm and brightness of the continental schemes’ and commended ‘the value of a bright and colourful environment’.⁴⁰

On matters of actual design of flats, the delegations noted that the most common type on the continent was a four- or five-storey block, over which height they felt lifts should be provided.⁴¹ Staircase access was preferred to a common balcony because it gave greater privacy to the tenants. The reports also recommended the provision of private balconies which was a prominent feature of the continental schemes, enabling the tenants to obtain sunlight and fresh air.⁴² In layout, the latest practice of siting a series of parallel blocks on the north-south axis (the Zeilenbau plan) was mentioned, but as an alternative, a modified form of the courtyard plan – ‘a somewhat quadrangular arrangement, with the southern end of the quadrangular generally open’ – was commended for adoption.⁴³ The Birmingham delegation showed its appreciation of modern housing, presumably from Frankfurt, which were amply illustrated:

Architecture generally follows the lines of modern development. It is somewhat severe in style but relieved by the fine curves of balconies or verandahs; and the breaking of the monotony of the huge straight surface by the bringing forward of parts of the frontage of the buildings, with the use of boldly drawn horizontal lines along the whole frontage.⁴⁴

Similarly, the Scottish delegation, after commenting on the variety of architectural design seen on the continent, remarked:

The architecture generally reveals a much greater susceptibility to modern influences than does ours. The beauties of straight lines and plain surfaces are commonly used in domestic architecture instead of being confined to new shop fronts and cinemas, as they are here.⁴⁵

Yet, during the 1930s in England, among the most celebrated examples of continental housing were the municipal estates of Vienna. These estates were on the itinerary of all three delegations mentioned here, and many others involved in public housing of the period made their pilgrimage to Vienna. Most famous of all, the Karl Marx Hof, consisted of massive blocks forming a series of quadrangles and enclosing garden courtyards. They were of traditional brick construction with coloured stucco finish. The centre portion rose above the rest of the estate and was crowned by the six tower-like projections. The estate was accentuated by continuous lines of balconies and by four large archways. It had the appearance of a massive fortress giving an impression of monumentality. The individual flats were small in size, but like many other estates built by the Viennese Corporation, it was planned as a residential community with a comprehensive range of social facilities: kindergartens, communal laundries with bathing accommodation, a school, dental and maternity clinics, a post office and a host of shops.⁴⁶ These Viennese estates had an added attraction for those

on the left of the political spectrum because they were built and managed by the progressive, social democratic administration.⁴⁷

In Germany by contrast, the Nazis had assumed political power by the time the LCC and the Department of Health for Scotland sent their delegations in 1935. It led to changes in the direction of Germany's housing policy, particularly with regard to the type of house to be provided, and this was noted by the Scottish delegation:

At the time of our visit there was no provision in any part of Germany for State assistance for houses of more than three storeys. The new policy is directed mainly to the provision of "Siedlungen" – i.e. colonies of cottage houses, chiefly for unemployed men, which are being built on the outskirts of cities throughout Germany.

The general lay-out of these "Siedlungen" calls to mind the simplest of our pre-war garden village schemes. The houses are simple in construction and in the majority of cases without architectural merit.⁴⁸

Taken as a whole, the principal message of these delegations seemed to be that on the continent much more attention was being paid to the social and aesthetic aspects of housing estates. Birmingham, with little experience of building flats, was a prime example of those local authorities which realised the implications of rehousing people in the central areas and was one of the first public authorities to look to the continent for new ideas.⁴⁹ The Birmingham delegation, upon its return, recommended the City Council to proceed with the erection of model estate of flats up to 1,000 dwellings as part of the programme to rehouse people from the slums under the terms of the 1930 Housing Act. Its report to the City Council concluded:

our investigations have satisfied us that both adults and young children, can be housed quite satisfactorily, comfortably and happily in flat or tenement dwellings under perfectly healthy conditions, *provided the necessary amenities are included within the scope of the scheme*. For financial and constructional reasons, these amenities can only be justified when the colony of flats is sufficiently large. In our opinion this must be within the figure of from 500 to 1,000 dwellings.⁵⁰

As an addendum to the general recommendations for a large estate of flats, the Chairman of the Estates Committee presented a minority recommendation, calling for small blocks of flats 'dispersed in convenient areas', which he felt would better serve the needs of those people who must live in the central areas.⁵¹

Research on constructional methods

At the same time as the knowledge of continental housing was expanding in England, some organisations were carrying out research into the technical and economic problems of building flats. The Council for Research on Housing Construction was set up in 1933, as ‘a body of individuals, severally experienced in some part or other of the housing field, and united by a common desire to assist in fulfilling the nation’s housing needs’.⁵² Its first report of 1934 dealt extensively with the problem of providing alternative accommodation for people living in slums and overcrowded conditions. The report firmly stated that as the majority of people were tied to central areas by their occupation, a great deal of rehousing would have to be done in inner city areas, which could only be possible by the use of multi-storey flats. A major obstacle here was the cost. The Ministry of Health returns consistently showed flats to be 30 to 50 per cent more expensive than ordinary non-parlour houses. So, with the cost of building in 1934 at its lowest in years, houses cost £300 to build, whereas flats were between £400 and £450 (See table below).

The average cost of newly-built local authority dwellings, 1931-1939 (England and Wales)

Year ending 31 st March	Ordinary non-parlour houses (£)	Dwellings in buildings of 3 or more storeys (£)
1930-31	342	489
1931-32	327	562
1932-33	300	509
1933-34	290	453
1934-35	294	437
1935-36	304	465
1936-37	323	492
1937-38	364	574
1938-39	370	544

Source: Compiled from *Annual Reports of the Ministry of Health, 1930-1939* (London: HMSO, 1931-1940)

The main reason why flats had cost more to build than cottages of corresponding type, the report argued, was that their design and construction had not been adequately studied. And this inexperience stemmed from a persistent prejudice against flats, formed by the grim image of nineteenth-century tenements:

It should be added that the British idea of a tenement has and still is coloured by the existence of quantities of old-fashioned, unsatisfactory block dwellings. Most of these buildings have been converted from large single houses; others have been built as tenements, but of out-dated type; both kinds have proved a favourite breeding-ground for slum conditions. With such tenement slums as a warning example, a prejudice against further tenement building is not unnatural.⁵³

The fact was that, in the Council's view, flats of modern design and construction could make satisfactory homes. Accordingly, its investigation pointed to standardisation and the updating of building bye-laws as key components in any new housing programme:

15 The basis of progress and cost-reduction in tenement building is to be found in the application of modern and rationalized building technique, based on the principles of standardization, mass production, large-scale operation, organized assembly to strict time-schedules, a maximum working-face and a maximum speed of throughput. Of these principles standardization is the most fundamental, while the use of frame construction is the essential means whereby all may be applied.

18 All bye-laws should be periodically revised, in accord with all relevant British Standard Specifications. New and improved materials and methods which have passed suitable tests should be incorporated without delay.⁵⁴

The report produced model plans and estimates of five-storey blocks, and of ten-storey blocks equipped with lifts. By using these blocks of steel frame construction, it was demonstrated that flats, having satisfactory standards of light, air and space, could be built within the terms of the 1930 Act subsidies and be let at 10s per week.⁵⁵

Similarly, a departmental committee of the Ministry of Health took up the questions of the materials and methods of construction suitable for the building of flats for the working class.⁵⁶ The National Government was particularly anxious to find out how the building cost of flats could be brought down. The committee's task was mainly a technical one. In response to its plea, a number of firms and individuals submitted estimates for a unit block of five-storey flats, using various new types of construction. The committee, then, taking the estimate cost for a block of normal brick construction as a standard, examined in detail the comparative costs and advantages of different building systems. The final report of the committee was somewhat inconclusive and refrained from making a definite choice. Nonetheless, it noted that, apart from traditional brick construction which held 'an established place', some other building systems had 'distinct promise', and recommended

that 'several of the steel framed and reinforced framed systems' should be given 'an opportunity of tendering for actual blocks of flats'.⁵⁷ The report also called for a relaxation of fire regulations under certain conditions to allow the use of new structural elements.⁵⁸

Shortcomings of suburban housing estates

While increasing attention was being paid to the slums and the problem of overcrowding in the central parts of towns, there were also signs that all was not well in many of the new municipal housing estates, which had sprung up after the war. Social surveys and middle-class reforming opinion played a supporting role in favour of flats, by pointing out the hardship incurred by tenants rehoused on suburban estates.

The Becontree estate in east London, once described as the largest council estate in the world, was one of the out-county estates developed by the LCC. Terence Young, Secretary of the Becontree Social Survey Committee, in his study of its social conditions in the early 1930s recorded a high rate of turnover among the tenants, which was in striking contrast to the removal rates of other estates built within the area of the County of London. A large number of tenants moving into large council houses from poor neighbourhoods had to contend with higher costs of living which consisted of increased rents and rates, furniture payments and increased travel expenses.⁵⁹ In Stockton-on-Tees, an industrial town in the North East, research into the health of the local population found that, among the tenants who had been transferred from slum dwellings to a self-contained municipal estate, the death rate increased by 46 per cent. This was in stark contrast to the equivalent figure for a comparable population that continued to reside in slum houses which actually went down. The investigations of the Medical Officer of Health for the town threw light on the link between the increased mortality and serious dietary deficiencies found among the tenants on the new housing estate, who incurred higher rentals and had less money available for the purchase of food.⁶⁰ These survey results became widely known in reformists' circles and prompted the socialist thinkers G.D.H. and Margaret Cole to write:

the consequences of moving low-paid working-class families into better houses may be to reduce their food budgets well below what is indispensable for a healthy life, so that most of them will drift back to overcrowded slums if they get half a chance.⁶¹

Voluntary societies, like the Charity Organisation Society, were also apprehensive about the 'compulsory removal of families' to new housing estates, as it resulted in the uprooting of people who had long association with one place and destroyed their social and industrial ties.⁶² A Liverpool

survey carried out among the inhabitants in areas of poor housing appeared to confirm the view of the Charity Organisation Society. Of those families interviewed, 84 per cent said they were willing to leave their houses for better accommodation, but only 38 per cent were prepared to move out of their familiar surroundings altogether. Many expressed a strong attachment to the neighbourhood in which they had lived for years. The survey also found that, although the 'workman's cottage type of dwelling' was preferred by many, there was no general antipathy to flats.⁶³ Likewise, there were indications that religious institutions might be disinclined towards rehousing tenants from central areas to suburbs. Of Liverpool, it was said:

we have people of two different religions and those who require denominational religion in the schools must pay for their own school buildings (not for teaching). They have built their schools and churches and removal to the outskirts would involve building new ones.⁶⁴

The suburban housing estates themselves, too, came in for criticism, for their lack of social facilities and scope for communal life and for their depressing uniformity in layout and design, which in turn reflected their class composition.⁶⁵ In the case of the Becontree estate studied by Young, the LCC only provided houses at first, and the local authorities responsible for the area in which the estate was situated (Essex County Council and the three urban district councils – Ilford, Barking and Dagenham) all struggled to provide public services for the huge influx of population into what was formerly fields used for market gardening. Shopping facilities remained inadequate for many years. Local employment opportunities did not keep up with the growth of population, until the automobile industry began its operation, led by Ford's huge plant at Dagenham. Moreover, the one-class nature of the estate made it extremely difficult to raise money from the local people to start various social and religious institutions. In the end, Young questioned the virtue of concentrating a large uniform population in one area at a low density. He suggested on the one hand that an estate built at higher density, perhaps in the form of flats, might lead to a greater number and variety of shops, public services and social facilities because higher density of population would give the necessary financial support. On the other hand, he seemed to favour smaller estates, intermixed with private middle-class housing estates or in the form of an addition to neighbouring towns so that pre-existing public services and social amenities would be available for the new area in the first place.⁶⁶

Ruth Durant, a German émigré and one of the pioneers of urban sociology in Britain, studying another LCC out-county estate at Watling later in the decade,⁶⁷ came across a similar set of problems as that described by Young at Becontree. In particular, she highlighted the shortage of

small accommodation units. The great majority of houses on the Watling estate were built for working class families on good wages with a number of children living at home. Out of a total of 4,000 dwellings, only 110 were two-room flats. There was hardly any provision for young couples or old retired people. Watling, in Durant's view, catered only for certain phases of working life and did not allow its population to settle.⁶⁸ An obvious lesson she drew was that 'various types of dwellings should be built to accommodate families in the different stages of their existence'.⁶⁹

Arguments for the preservation of the countryside

Another important issue in the discussion of the role played by the reforming opinion was that of the preservation of the countryside, which may have influenced the way people thought about the desirable types of housing development. It was estimated in 1940 that 'an area equal in size to the counties of Buckingham and Bedford combined' had been covered with brick and mortar since 1900, with good agricultural land being lost in the process.⁷⁰ The Council for the Preservation of Rural England (CPRE), a propagandist body, had been formed in 1926, to act as a clearinghouse on countryside issues and to coordinate the efforts of various bodies and associations, mainly concerned with protecting the rural amenities from the danger of haphazard development.⁷¹

The destruction of the countryside increasingly became a serious issue during the 1930s. The decade saw a great housing boom in the private sector. A total of 2.5 million new houses were built between 1931 and 1939. Of these, 1.9 million were provided by private enterprise, which built well over 200,000 houses annually from 1934 onwards.⁷² Encouraged by the Conservative National Government and facilitated by the expansion of building societies providing cheap mortgages to prospective home owners, private enterprise was actively engaged in suburban housebuilding. The manner in which this housing boom appeared to be devouring rural land sometimes invited vitriolic criticism. For instance, a Labour M.P. in Parliament called it 'the nasty rash of what masquerades as new Tudor palaces in the beautiful countryside of Southern England'.⁷³ The Restriction of Ribbon Development Act of 1935 was an attempt to check the building of houses strung out along the trunk roads, which was a device often used by private builders to avoid road making charges and the provision of services.⁷⁴ In 1937, the architect, Clough Williams-Ellis edited a book entitled *Britian and the Beast*, with contributions from twenty-five individuals including J.M. Keynes (economist), E.M. Forster (novelist), Patrick Abercrombie (town planner) and G.M. Trevelyan (historian), writing on some particular part or aspect of the countryside. The book was admittedly a motley collection of essays, yet the contributors all agreed that the countryside, as a source of valuable agricultural land

and a place of rural beauty, was being destroyed by uncontrolled development. C.E.M. Joad, a philosopher and social commentator, set a characteristic tone:

To thousands, nature, newly discovered, has been a will-o'-the-wisp...building to live in a field and to look at a wood, a man discovers before a year has gone by that he is living in a row with an unhampered vision of next-door's garage. Thus the towns are throwing their ever lengthening tentacles of brick and mortar over the country; round every corner pops up a perky new villa, and the green face of England's landscape comes out in an inflamed rash of angry pink. In fifty years' time there will, in southern England, be neither town nor country, but only a single dispersed suburb, sprawling unendingly from Watford to the coast.⁷⁵

The keynote of the book, as to remedies, was to press for some form of central control of land use and greater coordination of the efforts on the lines pursued by the CPRE. Some preservationists appeared to be exclusively concerned with the plight of the countryside, but their case was echoed in the housing debate. Certainly, the modern architects and other advocates of flats made much of the damage done by suburban building and ribbon development of houses and posed the alternative of central development of towns with flats. For them, the solution lay in making the centre of towns more habitable and attractive.

Debates in Parliament

The housing debate and the move towards the adoption of flats in public housing provision brought out various responses in the House of Commons. Some politicians, particularly those from large urban constituencies, expressed their interest in flats. Often continental examples were cited as the kind of thing that they should be looking for. Thus, a Conservative M.P. for Newcastle-upon-Tyne found in Budapest, Berlin, Cologne and even Naples, marvellous flats with three or four rooms, bath and every convenience, and for a rent which, in their money, is equivalent to about 7s per week'.⁷⁶ A Labour M.P. from Liverpool urged his fellow member to go to the continent to and get a better vision of what to be done:

I have visited certain areas where there is light and beauty - beautiful landscapes and gardens, bathed in God's sunshine, and where you have the best housing in the world.⁷⁷

A Liberal M.P. from Bethnal Green, London, joined in the praise:

In Vienna, too, there are some of the finest examples of well-planned block dwellings. An immense amount has been done in connection with the design, planning and construction of

block dwellings. They are humanised, and are not the barrack squares that they used to be 20 or 30 years ago.⁷⁸

Another M.P., a Labour from Hammersmith, believed that blocks of flats were the only solution for the problem of overcrowding in central London, and of those flats he said:

Of course the whole point is that these modern flats must have modern amenities. That means modern lifts, central heating, and that in most cases the blocks of flats shall not occupy more than from a quarter to a third of the total land upon which they are erected.⁷⁹

Against this, there was frequent reference from all sides to the small house as the rightful place for their citizens. This was sometimes coupled with the wholesale denigration of flats, as in the case of a Conservative M.P. from rural Suffolk:

All flats are soulless and soul-devouring...It may be all well in Paris, Vienna or Berlin, where people are brought up in flats, but here people are accustomed to look upon a house as their home.⁸⁰

A Labour M.P. from Wednesbury, a market town in Staffordshire, felt that flats were something for London, not for 'provincial people' and emphasised the value of people living in houses to themselves:

The front door and the back door are their own, and when they are in the house it is indeed their castle. It would be a bad day if this new fashion for flats were to spread.⁸¹

Concluding comments

Whether 'this new fashion for flats' was desirable or not, it is clear that the question of flats became a major talking point in the 1930s for all those who took any interest in the problem of working-class housing. During the 1930s, the housing debate increasingly came to be focussed on the problem of slums and overcrowding in the centre of towns. Public authorities as well as interested bodies and individuals contributed to a shift in government's housing policy by exploring the potential of flats in slum clearance and redevelopment schemes, as well as highlighting the problems associated with suburban forms of development. The estates of flats at such places as Frankfurt and Vienna came to be widely known in England, at a time when the nineteenth century legacy of block dwellings was still alive in people's memory and the grim realities of sharing tenements were still very much present. In these circumstances, the recent achievements in continental housing acted as a means of dispelling the negative image of flats, signifying a new departure in public housing. As such, they

were readily taken up by their advocates, who saw in them the possibility of offering a new and improved way of life for the working-class people.

Notes and references

¹ Anthony Sutcliffe, 'Introduction', in Anthony Sutcliffe (ed.), *Multi-Storey Living: The British Working-Class Experience* (London: Croom Helm, 1974), 11-4.

² See, e.g. John Nelson Tarn, *Five Percent Philanthropy: An account of housing in urban areas between 1840 and 1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973); Anthony S. Wohl, *The Eternal Slum: Housing and Social Policy in Victorian London* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977); Richard Rodger, *Housing in Urban Britain 1780-1914: Class, Capitalism and Construction* (London: Macmillan, 1989), Richard Dennis, 'Residential Flats: Densification in Victorian and Early Twentieth Century London', in Peter Guillery and David Kroll (eds), *Mobilising Housing Histories: Learning from London's Past* (London: RIBA Publishing, 2017).

³ See, e.g. John R Gold, *The Experience of Modernism: Modern architects and the future city, 1928-53* (London: E & FN Spon, 1997); Elizabeth Darling, *Re-forming Britian: Narratives of modernity before reconstruction* (London: Routledge, 2007); Alexandra Harris, *Romantic Moderns: English Writers, Artists and the Imagination from Virginia Woolf to John Piper* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2010).

⁴ Mark Swenarton, *Homes Fit for Heroes: The Politics and Architecture of Early State Housing in Britain* (London: Heinemann, 1981), especially chaps.1, 5.

⁵ *Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board and the Secretary for Scotland to consider questions of building construction in connection with the provision of dwellings for the working classes in England and Wales, and Scotland*, Cd. 9191 (London: HMSO, 1918), paras 58, 85-89, 98-100, 144. The committee takes the name from its chairman, John Tudor Walters, an architect, surveyor and Liberal M.P., who was influenced by the garden city movement and had interest in housing reform.

⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 84.

⁷ Ministry of Health, *Manual on Unfit Houses and Unhealthy Areas. Volume 1 Policy and Practice* (London: HMSO, 1919), chap. IX – Rehousing, paras 1, 3.

⁸ Marian Bowley, *Housing and the State 1919-1944* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1945), 271.

⁹ Ministry of Health, *Eleventh Annual Report of the Ministry of Health 1929-30*, Cmd. 3667 (London: HMSO, 1930), 82.

¹⁰ See, e.g. E.D. Simon, *How to Abolish Slums* (London: Longmans, 1929), 52-61; Ministry of Health, *Eleventh Annual Report of the Ministry of Health 1929-30*, 76-7, 81-2.

¹¹ The concept of 'filtering up' or simply 'filtering' in housing referred to the functions of the housing market, by which it was assumed that a fresh supply of new and better housing would induce people to trade up and move house, thereby leading to the 'trickling down' of vacated dwellings to lower income groups in society. J.B. Cullingworth, *Essays on Housing Policy: The British Scene* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), 35. The argument was that the process would bring about an overall improvement

in national housing standards. Writing of the situation in the late nineteenth century, Alison Ravetz notes: ‘as the more fortunate gradually decanted themselves into new and better housing, those beneath them could move up the scale by taking over their vacated homes. The theory was to be crucial for the inauguration of council housing, and to the extent that it corresponded to some real patterns of mobility it could not easily be contradicted’. Alison Ravetz, *Council Housing and Culture: The History of a Social Experiment* (London: Routledge, 2001), 10. It was still the prevailing doctrine in the 1920s.

¹² Up to March 1930, only some 10,650 houses had been provided to rehouse persons displaced by slum clearance. See Ministry of Health, *Twelfth Annual Report of the Ministry of Health 1930-31*, Cmd. 3937 (London: HMSO, 1931), 107.

¹³ See, e.g. Howard Marshall and Avice Trevelyan, *Slum* (London: William Heinemann, 1933); E.D. Simon, *The Anti-Slum Campaign* (London: Longmans, 1933); Harry Barnes, *The Slum: Its Story and Solution* (Hempstead: Mill Press, 1934). In February, the *Daily Herald*, an organ of the Labour Party, carried a series of articles by the well-known journalist, H.V. Morton, on his ‘tour round the slums of our great industrial cities’, later published as a pamphlet by the Labour Party. H.V. Morton, *What I Saw in the Slums* (London: Labour Party, 1933).

¹⁴ Bowley, *Housing and the State 1919-1944*, 135-6.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 140.

¹⁶ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates* (Commons), 5th Series, 237, 7 April 1930, cols 1819-20.

¹⁷ ‘It was futile, for example, to expect London Dockers to live in Becontree. Broadly the tenement proposals would only apply in London and Liverpool’, was the reply Greenwood gave to the deputation of the building workers, who raised their objection to the extra subsidy, which they felt ‘would encourage local authorities in this unsatisfactory method of building’. The National Archives (hereafter TNA): HLG52/850, ‘Housing Bill – Deputation from NFBTO’ (National Federation of Building Trades Operatives), 3 April 1930.

¹⁸ Labour Party, *Report of the 1918 Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (London: Labour Party, 1918), 126-7.

¹⁹ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates* (Commons), 5th Series, 297, 30 January 1935, cols 391-2.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 31 January 1935, col. 644.

²¹ Labour Party, *Up with the Houses, Down with the Slums* (London: Labour Party, 1934), 6,7.

²² *Ibid.*, 5,6.

²³ Ministry of Health, *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Ministry of Health 1931-32*, Cmd. 4113 (London: HMSO, 1932), 97; Ministry of Health, *Housing Act 1930. Rehousing Operations. Typical Plans of Tenement and Other Dwellings* (London: HMSO, 1933).

²⁴ Ministry of Health, *Report of the Departmental Committee on Housing*, Cmd. 4397 (London: HMSO, 1933), para. 5.

²⁵ Ibid., para.61.

²⁶ Ibid., para. 97.

²⁷ TNA: HLG68/30, 'Notes for preliminary and informal discussion on the proposal of the Association of Municipal Corporations', n.d. but c. December 1933.

²⁸ TNA: CAB27/565, Conclusions of the Meeting of the Cabinet Housing Policy Committee, 13 February 1934, 2.

²⁹ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates* (Commons), 5th Series, 297, 30 January 1935, cols 362, 368.

³⁰ Ibid., col. 368.

³¹ Ibid., col. 366.

³² J.A. Yelling, 'The origins of British redevelopment areas', *Planning Perspectives* 3, no. 3 (September 1988), 282.

³³ TNA: HLG52/788, Ministry of Health memoranda on 'Standards of Accommodation in Foreign Countries' and 'Continental Housing Comparison', n.d. but c. 1935.

³⁴ *The Times*, 16 August 1933.

³⁵ Reports were published of their visits: City of Birmingham, *Report of the Estates and Public Works and Town Planning Committees respectively of the Deputation visiting Germany, Czecho-Slovakia and Austria in August, 1930* (hereafter *Birmingham Report*) (Birmingham: Council House, 1930); Department of Health for Scotland, *Working-Class Housing on the Continent. Report by Mr. John E. Highton, C.B., Secretary to the Department of Health for Scotland, on a Visit to examine Recent Developments in Working-Class Housing in the Cities of Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Hamburg, Berlin, Frankfurt, Prague, Vienna and Paris* (hereafter *Department of Health for Scotland Report*) (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1935); London County Council, *Working-Class Housing on the Continent and the Application of Continental Ideas to the Housing Problem in the County of London. Report by the Chairman, Mr. Lewis Silkin, M.P., as the result of a visit to Continental Housing Estates in September and October, 1935* (hereafter *LCC Report*) (London: LCC, 1936). The places visited by these delegations were as follows: Holland - Rotterdam and Amsterdam; Germany - Hamburg, Cologne, Frankfurt am Main, Munich, Berlin and Leipzig; Austria - Vienna; Czechoslovakia - Prague; France - Paris; and the Scandinavian countries - Copenhagen, Stockholm, Gothenburg and Oslo. Local authorities in Leeds and Liverpool also sent delegations to continental cities in the 1930s. Alison Ravetz, 'From Working Class Tenements to Modern Flat: local authorities and multi-storey housing between the wars', in Sutcliffe (ed.), *Multi-Storey Living*, 148, footnote 16.

³⁶ *Department of Health for Scotland Report*, 16.

³⁷ *LCC Report*, 29-30.

³⁸ *Birmingham Report*, 64.

³⁹ *Department of Health for Scotland Report*, 17.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 19-20.

⁴¹ *Birmingham Report*, 70; *LCC Report*, 27.

⁴² *LCC Report*, 28.

⁴³ Ibid., 6, 26.

⁴⁴ *Birmingham Report*, 66.

⁴⁵ *Department of Health for Scotland Report*, 19.

⁴⁶ Donald Brooke, 'The Karl Marx Hof, Vienna', *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, 3rd Series, 38, no.18, 8 August 1931, 670-7.

⁴⁷ A booklet called *The New Vienna* (4th Revised Edition, London: Labour Party, 1931), written by the President of the Vienna City Council, Robert Danneberg, was published by the Labour Party. It included an elaborate section on housing policy, with impressive illustrations of these estates. See also Eve Blau, *The Architecture of Red Vienna 1919-1934* (Cambridge Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1999).

⁴⁸ *Department of Health for Scotland Report*, 32. See also Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918-1945* (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1985), 205-12; Stephen V. Ward, 'What did the Germans ever do for us? A century of British learning about and imaging modern town planning', *Planning Perspectives* 25, no.2 (April 2010), 123-4.

⁴⁹ Howard Robertson, 'Birmingham Visits the Continent: The March, 1931, Report of the Housing Deputation', *Architect & Building News* 126, 19 June 1931, 398-401.

⁵⁰ *Birmingham Report*, 70.

⁵¹ Ibid., 73.

⁵² Council for Research on Housing Construction, *Slum Clearance and Rehousing. The First Report* (London: P.S. King & Sons, 1934), 9. The Council was chaired by the Third Earl of Dudley, a landed aristocrat with interests in the iron, steel and coal industries. He went on to chair an important government committee during the Second World War, whose report (Ministry of Health, *Design of Dwellings. Report of the Design of Dwellings Sub-Committee of the Central Housing Advisory Committee* (London: HMSO, 1944)) established the basis of official design guidance for post-war housing. The Council also included the following local authority architects as consultant members: W.G. Davies (City Architect, Sheffield); G. Topham Forrest (Superintending Architect, LCC); Leonard Heyward (Director of Housing, Manchester); and L.H. Keay (Director of Housing, Liverpool).

⁵³ Ibid., 75-6.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 137.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 137-8. The Council, after examining available published data, took a weekly rent of 10s. 0d. (inclusive of local rates) as the maximum an average family of four could afford and set out to provide for people in this category.

⁵⁶ Ministry of Health, *Construction of Flats for the Working Classes. Interim Report of the Departmental Committee* (London: HMSO, 1935) and *Construction of Flats for the Working Classes. Final Report of the Departmental Committee* (London: HMSO, 1937). This Committee also included prominent local authority architects and engineers on its membership, including G. Topham Forrest (LCC) and L.H. Keay (Liverpool).

⁵⁷ Ministry of Health, *Construction of Flats for the Working Classes. Final Report of the Departmental Committee*, 21.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 31.

⁵⁹ Terence Young, *Becontree and Dagenham: The Story of the Growth of a Housing Estate. A Report made for the Pilgrim Trust* (London: Becontree Social Survey Committee, 1934), chaps 22, 23 and Appendix 4. See also Andrzej Olechnowicz, *Working-Class Housing in England between the Wars: The Becontree Estate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

⁶⁰ The findings were first published in the medical journal *The Lancet*, 4 March 1933, under the title of ‘Removal of a Slum Population to Modern Dwellings’, and later incorporated in G.C.M. M’Gonigle and J. Kirby, *Poverty and Public Health* (London: Gollancz, 1936), chap. 7.

⁶¹ G.D.H. Cole and M.I. Cole, *The Condition of Britain* (London: Gollancz, 1937), 160. The Coles were fully aware that at its root the problem of poverty had to be tackled – ‘If we are to remedy overcrowding we must not merely build more houses but also ensure that families which are now living under overcrowded conditions shall be able to afford the improved accommodation without substituting one form of privation for another. That, however, cannot possibly be done except by raising the real incomes of the overcrowded families’ (*ibid.*, 160-1).

⁶² TNA: HLG68/30, ‘Notes of a deputation from the Charity Organisation Society to the Minister of Health’, 27 May 1935.

⁶³ Liverpool University Settlement, *Housing Problems in Liverpool: A Survey of Six Areas of Bad Housing, with special reference to the Housing Act, 1930* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Settlement, 1931), 29.

⁶⁴ Comment of Hugo Rutherford from Liverpool in, International Federation for Housing and Town Planning (IFHTP), *12th International Housing and Town Planning Congress, Roma 1929: Part III Report* (London: IFHTP, 1929), 67.

⁶⁵ See, e.g. New Estates Community Committee of the National Council of Social Service, *New Housing Estates and Their Social Problems* (London: National Council of Social Service, 1935); Norman Williams (University of Liverpool Social Science Department: Statistics Division), *Population Problems of New Estates, with special reference to Norris Green* (Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1939) .

⁶⁶ Young, *Becontree and Dagenham*, chap. 32 and *passim*.

⁶⁷ Ruth Durant, *Watling: A Survey of Social Life on a New Housing Estate* (London: P.S. King, 1939). As Ruth Glass, in the 1960s, she invented the term ‘gentrification’ in her study of social and residential transformation of inner London after the Second World War, which has since influenced generations of urban scholars. Ruth Glass, ‘Introduction: Aspects of Change’, in Centre for Urban Studies (ed.), *London: Aspects of Change* (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1964), xviii-xix.

⁶⁸ Durant, *Watling*, chap. 1. Young local couples from Watling were, in any case, ineligible to apply for houses on the estate, since the London County Council, as a rule, only accepted tenants from the London area under its jurisdiction. Another important point which stood in the way of the estate becoming ‘a real community, the traditional residence of successive families’ was the limited nature of local employment. Though Watling was well placed in relation to neighbouring industries, these newly installed factories almost exclusively employed semi-skilled labour. This meant that the estate’s younger generations were offered only ‘blind-alley employment’ and had to look further afield to learn a trade (ibid., 12-5).

⁶⁹ Ibid., xii.

⁷⁰ *Report of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population*, Cmd. 6153 (London: HMSO, 1940), para. 36.

⁷¹ Gordon E. Cherry, *The Politics of Town Planning* (London: Longman, 1982), 25, 35; David Matless, *Landscape and Englishness* (London: Reaktion Books, 1998), chap. 1.

⁷² Bowley, *Housing and the State 1919-1944*, 271.

⁷³ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates* (Commons), 5th Series, 297, 31 January 1935, col. 577. See also John Carey, *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880-1939* (London: Faber and Faber, 1992), chap. 3.

⁷⁴ Gordon E. Cherry, *Town Planning in Britain since 1900: The Rise and Fall of the Planning Ideal* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 71-2.

⁷⁵ C.E.M. Joad, ‘The People’s Claim’, in Clough Williams-Ellis (ed.), *Britain and the Beast* (London: J.M. Dent, 1938), 81.

⁷⁶ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates* (Commons), 5th Series, 297, 30 January 1935, col. 443.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 5th Series, 273, 15 December 1932, col. 629.

⁷⁸ Ibid., col. 584.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 5th Series, 297, 30 January 1935, col. 445.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 31 January 1935, cols 593-4.

⁸¹ Ibid., 30 January 1935, col. 435.