For many, an understanding and appreciation of post-war architecture would be a novelty. Many others, however, consider that the protection of significant examples should be a priority. The publication, *Scotland: Building for the Future* (2009) set the scene for a debate on the contribution of buildings from the period to Scotland’s distinctive character. The ensuing conference held at the Bonar Hall in Dundee on 24 November 2009 widened the debates. Key players ably set the context and clear issues emerged from the ensuing discussion, opening a continuing dialogue to inform the way forward.
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SCOTLAND: BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE

View to north from shopping area
The scale and nature of rebuilding of Scotland after 1945 was immense, inspired by a tremendous energy and vision. Every part of Scotland was affected by the improvements sought. New styles, new designs and new materials complemented the traditional texture of the nation. And these buildings have now come of age.

Historic Scotland, is charged by Scottish Ministers to identify buildings of special architectural or historic interest from all periods. They have begun the rigorous process of selecting the most outstanding examples from the post-war period to help protect their character through the management of future change.

We know that the protection of our post-war architecture is not always popular. We have therefore encouraged Historic Scotland to broaden the debate in Scotland. The publication in 2009 of Scotland: Building for the Future, has helped to start this debate, outlining the flavour of the post-war decades and introducing buildings worthy of celebration on a national and an international canvas. This book was followed by a conference at Dundee’s Bonar Hall on 24 November 2009 and the launch of the website www.celebratingscotlandsarchitecture.org.

The conference was well attended and stimulated a wide and interesting debate. It gives me great pleasure therefore to write the foreword for the publication resulting from this conference which includes not only the papers presented but also the wider discussion that took place later in the day.

Our post-war architecture is a highly important part of Scotland’s heritage. It is a subject of interest to us all and the overview which unfolds in the ensuing pages helps us all understand this legacy, why it is important, and helps guide us in our approach to its celebration.

Fiona Hyslop
Minister for Culture and External Affairs
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Thank you Pauline. I claim absolutely no architectural knowledge or experience whatsoever. Indeed I understand there’s a growing view that I’m trying to avoid speaking to architects, having missed the Saltire Awards last week because I had another commitment in sending a video message, and then, alas, missing the Doolan Awards on Friday because I was stuck in Galloway. So, my apologies. I think some people thought that it would be three in a row, but here I am, and very pleased to be here.

In August, I launched this publication, Scotland: Building for the Future, which contains a series of essays on our nation’s post-war architecture. It’s a wonderfully illustrated book. It’s also a very wise book and I’m grateful to all of those people who took part in producing it. And the purpose of the conference today, which follows on that publication, is to stimulate a wide debate across Scotland about our post-war architecture, its importance, and its significance for future generations. It’s an important conference to take part in. It’s a timely conference, and it’s a conference that must have an outcome in terms of what Historic Scotland decides to do, and how it takes this issue forward.
Opening Remarks

Thank you, Pauline, for agreeing to chair this. You’ve actually been in my house. You know it’s not a post-war house by any manner of means. It’s an 18th century house. But I do admit to a fondness for and fascination for much of our post-war architecture. But perhaps that fascination and fondness doesn’t get fully reflected by others in the Parliament. Those of you who read the account of the debate that we had two weeks ago, about the historic environment in the Parliament, would realise that whilst there was a recognition of the crucial role that the historic environment plays within the tourism sector, the education sector, the employment sector, and in the finances of the country, there was still something of a scepticism about modern building, that’s post-war building, and its place in the description “historic environment”.

Now the debate happily recognized that the historic environment contributes about 2.3 billion to Scotland’s national gross value added, mainly through tourism, construction and regeneration. It supports 41,000 full-time equivalent jobs, rising to about 60,000 once you take in indirect employment, and its contribution is about 2.6% of Scottish employment, and that’s very significant indeed. So, the historic environment is a player, and it’s a big player. And, it can play an even stronger role but we need to make sure that in our understanding of what the historic environment is, we don’t over emphasize the word “historic” and not talk enough about the word “environment”.

So, let’s ask ourselves some questions today about what we’re trying to define and what we’re trying to take forward. First of all, the buildings we’re talking about today: are they heritage at all? Are they worth protecting, because we know, from the figures that Pauline has given us, that the number of buildings that are recognised within the system of protection is actually very small. If they are worthy of protecting, are we protecting the right ones? Does the way they are built and the materials that were used in their construction create special difficulties in recognising them, and in preserving them, in that they may be more difficult to look after than some other buildings in the historic
environment? And, are the buildings that we’re talking about flexible and sustainable? I am using the word “sustainable” as an important, ongoing, and increasingly important definition of what we’re trying to preserve in Scotland.

Now I think today you are going to address all those issues either, within plenary session, or within smaller sessions. But there is probably a single proposition underlying the whole debate, and that is the proposition here. Are we building for the future, and if we have buildings that are important to us, how are we going to make sure that we recognise them and tell the people of Scotland about them?

I think that we can answer most of the questions I’ve posed strongly and affirmatively. Scotland has, of course, a very strong history of producing significant, indeed globally significant, architects. Robert Adam, Charles Rennie Mackintosh spring to mind. But actually go further. Just look into The Dictionary of Scottish Architects developed by David Walker and St Andrews University, and now maintained by Historic Scotland, and you see how rich our history of architecture is. And I think you can ask yourself a very simple question. If we have, through generations, produced such significant architects, did we just stop producing them in 1945 or is it possible that we have gone on producing significant architects, and significant buildings, and we simply have to keep updating our definitions in order to recognise the importance of what we’re doing?

In this room we have some of those people - I would hesitate to call you national treasures - who need to be recognised as the significant architects of this generation, and the generation before. There are, in this room, architects who deserve, and have, an international reputation, and there are architects who have designed and brought forward buildings which need to be listed, preserved and carried forward as part of our heritage.

The publications of others, including David Page and Miles Glendinning, both of whom are going to speak today, show the scale of our post-war legacy is vast, it is important, it demonstrates vision, energy, and it demonstrates confidence in society, and all those things are worth celebrating and carrying forward.

I would have said, had I presented
the Doolan Awards on Friday, that good architecture and good place making has the power to improve lives, to provide places which lift the spirit, and to make life easier and more enjoyable for everyone. And our best architecture needs to do precisely that. It has to underpin the development of a confident country with a strong cultural identity, a dynamic international image - a place worth living in, and that is what we are talking about and celebrating today. And if I were to pluck out of my own experience things that mean much to me within that category, then I would look at a place such as Our Lady of Sorrows at Garrynamonie in South Uist. Many of you know I have strong connections in the Western Isles. I was there during the summer, and that building, designed by Richard McCarron, was erected with the money from, and by the will of, the local community in 1964 and 1965. It is a remarkable intervention in a remarkable landscape, but it provides a building of substance and use for a community that focuses upon such buildings. That’s just one of many examples in modern Scotland of something that does change place, that does provide place, that does express a community’s confidence and does, in a great sense, carry that community and itself forward.

And, of course, it’s not alone, even in South Uist. You drive 20 miles to the north and you pass the great statue by Hugh Lorimer at Ben Reuval put up in 1956. This illustrates once more the desire of a community to express itself and to provide something that is of significance both to the landscape and to the people who use that landscape. And again and again, in every part of Scotland, we see that expression of post-war confidence, of post-war utility, and a desire to move forward with confidence.

This might be another example, the Bonar Hall. Robert Matthews’ university tower of 1958 sits in the grounds just to our west and that’s an exceptional Scottish modernist building incorporating the vernacular in what is a pioneering design. And this hall, designed by Gillespie, Kidd and Coia, completed in 1976, has not yet been considered for listing, but it makes a statement and says something about the confidence of this university, which
is now being fully expressed in the way that this university has not just a national, but an international reputation.

So, today is about thinking about what we have, understanding why it’s there, considering what it contributes, and then moving forward with confidence to make sure that it’s integrated into our view of what our job is in looking after the historic environment.

I want to finish in what I’m saying to make one reference to one individual here, to Ruth Parsons, who’s our new Chief Executive in Historic Scotland. All of you know that I am determined that Historic Scotland does its business in a transparent, partnering and front-footed way. That’s the approach that I encourage right across the public sector and it’s the approach I expect from Historic Scotland. I am delighted to say that all the staff of Historic Scotland, talented and able staff, are reacting to that very warmly, and I’m delighted that Ruth is leading that effort. I am quite certain that today’s conference, which considers how Scotland moves forward, is, to some extent, an expression too of how Historic Scotland wants to move forward, and I hope all of you will be part of that process.

I will be, unfortunately, having to leave you in about an hour; I have another event starting, and then I’ve got to go back to Edinburgh for Cabinet, but I have asked Ruth to tell me about the outcomes of today and the process of discussion of today. I have an enthusiasm for what you’re doing today. I hope you will do it in a way that will help Historic Scotland to take its mission forward, and I look forward to hearing about those outcomes.

Thank you.
In 1975 I was having dinner with the late William L Taylor, who was then my Chairman at the Housing Corporation in Scotland. He had been the Chairman of the Planning Committee of the Corporation of the City of Glasgow in the 1960s and had been a Councillor after the War. We had both enjoyed a dram or two, and I plucked up the courage to ask, “what made you build Easterhouse?” [Fig.1].

In the early seventies Easterhouse had a very poor reputation. It was one of four large perimeter estates built after the War – streets of Council houses with virtually no amenities - the statutory schools, churches but no pubs, and few shops. Billy Connell had dubbed them ‘deserts wi’ windaes’. It had gang problems, people wanted to move out, the houses were displaying dampness.

It looked like a planning disaster. Bill’s response was not what I expected. He leapt over the table, grabbed me by the collar and said, “If you’d been there in 1948 you’d have built Easterhouse!” I learnt a lesson – to try to understand the politics, the pressures and the issues within which the architecture of the period was created.

If we are beginning a reappraisal of the architecture of the post second world war period here in Scotland, we need to start by looking at the context. A number of people are uncomfortable about the architecture of this period – some regard its mixture of Brutalism, high rise and other building forms as a failed period of architecture. But is it? There are many good buildings, and to understand them, we need to look at the political, economic and social environment in which these developments took place.
In 1945 the war had been won, and the challenge was to win the peace. There was rationing, bread queues, poor housing, and crumbling transport infrastructure [Fig.2]. Change was about to take place. A typical British ‘revolution’ took place in 1945 when what might be described as ‘the people’s party’ won the election. It was committed to creating a better, fairer society, through the ‘Welfare State’. It immediately moved to create the National Health Service, provision of National Insurance, free secondary education, nationalisation of transportation and utilities. All of this brought together a centrally organised state - almost ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ (!) - and the architecture reflects this organisational approach.

The big clients were to be the public sector, and the public sector would drive change forward despite the problems that emerged. This was a confident public sector that knew what it wanted and knew what was best. There was no public participation as we might now understand it. It was, however, a period of huge public information campaigns, and a significant amount of consultation; a lot of which has survived in the form of film.

The Government had a very difficult inheritance; it was not simply about a post Second World War reconstruction. The inter-war period had left its mark - depression, unemployment, labour unrest, and the start of a programme to tackle poor working class housing meant there was no question of a return to pre-war ‘business as usual’.

In his 1976 study of Glasgow, The Upas Tree, Sydney Checkland[i], calls his chapter on 1945 -75 ‘The Faltering Economy’. In it he explains that the Upas tree of heavy engineering had killed or discouraged the growth of other industries of a more modern kind beneath its massive and intertwined branches. Checkland argues that Glasgow in fact, in economic terms, had died before the First World War. It had been kept alive by two World Wars and there was a recession in the middle which nobody realised that Glasgow was any different to anybody else. For example, at the end of the war we were still building steam engines long after anybody else and we were far too late to switch to diesel.
Housing conditions across Scotland were particularly poor. The Victorian inheritance – especially working class tenements – had lacked investment and many families had to share an outside toilet, and were badly overcrowded, both within individual houses and within neighbourhoods. [Fig.3] So a major priority was the provision of better housing – with higher space standards; bathrooms, and more external open space.

The intention was that various aspects of the welfare state were interlocked. The housing programme was also seen as part of improving the health of the nation. There was large scale tuberculosis, polio, and rickets, and the 1950s would see major campaigns to eradicate disease through mass screening and the improvements brought about by the NHS.

The fifties were also a period of dramatic transport change. The 1950s were an ‘Indian Summer’ for the railways as a provider of transport for the growing demand for holidays [Fig.4]. As people became wealthier, and cars became cheaper, the nation switched transport modes. And the pressure
on the road system led in turn to the development of a motorway network.

Many of these changes had been foreseen in the 1938 Empire Exhibition [Fig.5]. The exhibition created visions of a new Scotland, of new architecture and places and of a new society, and the ambition was even stronger after a seven year gap. “We have to improve the quality of life for ordinary people. We want to create places where people want to live. It is about social architecture”.

In some ways there had not been a gap. During the war there had been significant preparation work for the reconstruction of Scotland after the war. The approach to regional and national planning had been developed, with the clear aim of improve the conditions of the working class. In Glasgow in 1945 the waiting list for council houses was approximately 90,000 families, or a quarter of a million people. The debate was about how this scale of challenge was to be met. To achieve the objectives, density was to be reduced. There was a feeling that the poorer tenements housing private rented tenants were slums. Slums must be removed. The state must provide housing for the working class and therefore we must demolish the slum tenements and the professionals – planners and architects - would create the new Utopia, to match the new approach that would be taken to employment.

Economic diversification was to take place, so planners and architects got to work on industrial estates like Hillington, alongside new opportunities for old industries like the expansion by the National Coal Board in Ayrshire and in Fife. Other parts of the country were to benefit from the engineering (and design) achievements of the nationalised North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board.

There were some issues about building construction. While large sums of money were expended during the period, there was a shortage of materials. Traditional materials were
very expensive and so alternatives were tried, resulting, for example, in concrete and steel houses without an understanding of how these materials would perform in the longer term [Fig.6].

Glasgow is critical to the post-war story of Scotland because Glasgow dominated the urban developments that were to take place. It was the second city of the Empire. It dominated the economic life of Scotland. And it dominated all the statistics in terms of ill health, squalid housing, and high densities.

Immediately after the war, there was what has been dubbed the 'battle of Glasgow'. It was in reality a debate about how Glasgow should be developed, and it took place between the Government and the City Corporation. It had an effect on the kind of place and architecture that was to be developed during the 1950s and the consequences are still with us today.

During the war the Government commissioned Sir Patrick Abercrombie (with Robert Grieve and Robert Matthew as part of the team) to develop the Clyde Valley Regional Plan, which was published in 1946. The process involved much research, analysis and consultation. As a regional plan it covered almost half the population of Scotland, and followed some of the principles that had been set out in the
Royal Commission for the Distribution of the Industrial Population in 1940 (the Barlow Commission) which advocated that urban growth be restrained by the adoption of a positive policy of developing new and expanding towns. The key issue which in many ways was going to dominate thinking over the next twenty years was that Glasgow’s population should be reduced and dispersed. The Clyde Valley report suggested that approximately 250,000 – 300,000 people should be moved from Glasgow away from the city.

However Glasgow had its own idea. In 1944 the City’s Bruce Report was produced. This was the city’s answer effective to the Clyde Valley report and the city said “No. We will concentrate our population within the city and we’ll go further. We will in fact create a whole new central business district”. The plan was to flatten the city centre including the Art School, the City Chambers and various other buildings of historic and architectural value, and create a new civic centre, with a broad boulevard connecting North and South railway stations, to a single design with the aim of creating a coherently planned city. A ring road was to encircle the new city centre. The Bruce Plan was followed by a transport plan. Instead of the population being reduced, the city would create high density estates, much of which would be modelled on Le Corbusier’s Ville Radieuse. This was removing the past and creating a new architectural order which reflected the new kind of society.

Glasgow pressed on and created its four big peripheral estates. These estates had to be built according to local by laws which included that they should be dry areas - no pubs. But they were very much welcomed; people loved them when they first went there. They provided large houses – no overcrowding; bathrooms; external green space. Moss Heights was the first multi-storey development, designed in 1946 very close to the site of the Empire Exhibition and opened in 1953 [Fig.7]. From then on, ‘multis’ would be a key part of the solution.

Eventually the compromise came between Glasgow and Central Government. And as compromises often do, it was not necessarily the best of both worlds. So the ring road is built...
[or at least half of it]; there is significant overspill to new towns and expanding towns (to begin with overspill was related to employment opportunities, but later simply overspill); lower densities; plot ratios defined for central business districts which in the Glasgow context meant no higher than seven stories – and that defined the kind of architecture that is going to be built in the city centre [Fig.8].

Driving the ring road round the city centre involved large scale demolition of mainly poor tenements. At the same time a series of twenty-nine Comprehensive Development Areas (CDA) were developed, each planned to regenerate an area through demolishing all but a very few buildings and replacing them with new. This particularly applied to housing and schools – all of which were be publicly owned by the Corporation or by the Government’s own housing association – Scottish Special Housing Association. Because the houses were in tenements with ground floor shops, then they too were publicly owned.

For the CDA programme, Glasgow hired the best architects of the day.
Basil Spence, Robert Matthew and others were commissioned. This was Glasgow being a good client and demanding nothing but the best in architecture.

Queen Elizabeth Court, the now demolished blocks of flats designed by Basil Spence, in many ways represents the challenges, the issues, and the debate about the architecture of the period, particular for the public. Many see ‘modern architecture’ in that light, see it as de-humanising, and the perpetrators as egotistically forcing an alien architecture onto an unsuspecting public. But many of these are the same people who admired Tait’s Tower at the Empire Exhibition, who voted for the new brave world after the war and rejected their Victorian inheritance [Figs. 9 and 10].

It is therefore important to put Queen Elizabeth Court into the context of the huge achievements made over the twenty years between 1945 and 1965. In that period, more and more people had been better housed in terms of space standards. More and
10 View from west of Area 'C' of Hutchesontown-Gorbals Comprehensive Development Area (CDA), Glasgow [built 1962, photo 1987]
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more people had bathrooms. Fewer and fewer people were living in a one or two-roomed house. There was a reduction in the density and there was a redistribution of the population. The car had become a means of transport for the many, and not just the few. The nation’s health had improved dramatically – illnesses that were common at the end of the war had been virtually eliminated, and the hospitals in which they were cared for were beginning to be upgraded. In economic terms, jobs had been created and people had more disposable income. Large parts of the visions that people had in 1945 of a better society had been accomplished. Like many visions, the new architecture and the new society had created other, often unforeseen, problems. Utopia had not arrived.
One of the characteristics of the period was the rejection of the recent old architecture. Quality buildings of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries swept away in the name of progress – like Dundee’s Royal Arch or St Enoch’s Station [Fig. 11]. It was a time when we forgot to value the old. Are we about to do the same to the buildings from the last sixty years? The danger that faces us is that we ignore the post war period because of some of the mistakes made both in planning and architectural design, or because the period may not be currently fashionable.

It was late in the 1960s before the Victorian architecture of Glasgow was properly appreciated, and steps taken to conserve and rehabilitate that heritage. We are now more than 60 years after the great social experiment began with the end of the war.

Sidney Checkland’s conclusion, in 1976, in The Upas Tree, about thirty years of Glasgow’s reshaping was that “The rebuilding of Glasgow has not been the outcome of blind brutalism. Much consultation and discussion went into many aspects of so vast an undertaking. The research base was often elaborate and careful, but as there’s never enough partly because many of the questions asked do not become apparent until a commitment has been made. There was too the need in order that situations be made manageable to reduce them to overriding formulae. The three most important of these were the setting of plot ratios for the central business district, the establishment of densities for redevelopment areas and the setting of the overspill figure. Politicians and planners are certainly fair targets for public criticism but their job of urban renewal should be seen as totality and over time.”

His sentiments still apply. We need to recognise and value the buildings and places from the period.

Wood windows are ideal in every way for Houses, Flats, Schools, Hospitals, Offices, Factories. Wood is functional, lasting, economical to install and maintain, and provides maximum flexibility of expression. Furthermore, wood windows reduce heat losses, sound transmission, and condensation.
The focus of this review is the evolution of the architectural profession itself during the period in question. Perhaps some consideration of the cares, concerns and preoccupations of Scotland’s architects might illuminate the 1945 - 1980 era and help towards a better understanding of the re-birth of modernism after the hiatus of World War II [Fig.1].

Just how architecture comes to be a profession, how that profession and its regulation have evolved in the post-World War II era and the differences between Scotland and the rest of the United Kingdom all add up to a substantial and rich seam for study.
The emergence of architects as a distinct profession was largely a nineteenth century phenomenon. The formation of the United Kingdom architects’ professional body, the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1834 was a significant moment in the evolution away from “gentleman architects” towards a regulated profession, operating within legal structures.

Scotland spawned a number of local area institutions and had a few false starts in the mid-nineteenth century towards the creation of its own consolidated professional institution. Founded in 1916, the Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland did not emerge as a fully formed chartered entity until 1922, the year after its founder’s death.

The name is significant. The Incorporation was founded deliberately as an ‘incorporation’ in part as a reaction against the United Kingdom ‘Institute’. As an Incorporation of, ultimately, six locally based organisations, this was in part a critique of the perceived centralising tendency of the United Kingdom body.

However, it should be emphasised that the two organisations have somehow managed to maintain a usually constructive relationship from the outset. This, despite the fact that in 1922 the Incorporation had the effrontery to be granted its own separate Royal Charter. Permission to use the prefix ‘Royal’ was subsequently granted in 1929. The Charter confirmed and consolidated the Incorporation’s role as the autonomous organisation for Scottish architects, incidentally, a body which sets the “general advancement of architecture” as its primary Charter goal.

A review of membership numbers illustrates a pattern of growth, indicative perhaps of market demand, but also indicating that the consolidation of professional status and the educational route improved access.

At the time of its formation in the 1920s, the Incorporation had fewer than 500 members. By the late 1940s, that had increased to something over 1600. In recent years the figure has consolidated at around 3500, including around 500 retirees plus a fairly consistent 500 or so student members.
This is not the whole of the profession in Scotland, merely those who are either RIAS or RIAS/RIBA members. Around half as many again choose to eschew chartered status - presumably, in many cases, to save the cost of subscription.

Architectural education has reflected the changing status of the profession. In the 1920s, most architectural education had moved to the tertiary institutes, although a very significant number of students combined employment with part-time education. In the period since, part time provision has diminished to become almost negligible.

2 Bowery, Leslie, Fife, by H Anthony Wheeler, from RIAS Quarterly, Spring 1957. © RIAS
It should be emphasised, however, that within the now familiar orthodoxy of degree to diploma to Part III, as consolidated by the Oxford Conference in 1958, and regulated by the RIBA ever since, the Part III component is still office-based. This imposes an unusual reliance upon the goodwill and viability of the private sector for a key component of the training of a major professional grouping.

In previous downturns of course, it was possible for younger architects to look to the public sector for employment. What was a very substantial public sector for much of the twentieth century is now, sadly, hugely diminished. A point to ponder is what might have happened if architecture had been nationalised alongside medicine in 1948. The idea may seem ludicrous now but doubtless had a certain logic and might well have been discussed then.

Something which is of particular significance is the increased focus upon conservation among the architectural profession. Conservation campaigns are not, of course, new. The Glasgow Institute of Architects was a major voice in the fight to save Kelvingrove House when its demolition was proposed (and undertaken) for the 1901 Glasgow Exhibition.

Since then, architects in all of Scotland’s cities have campaigned against major infrastructure masterplans with varying degrees of success. In response to demands to demolish, among other examples of Victorian excess, Glasgow City Chambers, the New Glasgow Society was founded in 1965. Its early membership included David Leslie, subsequently President of the RIAS from 1987-89 and the sadly recently deceased, brilliant campaigner Geoff Jarvis (1928-2009).

The other aspect of the professional mix which cannot be overlooked is legislation. The most significant move in the regulation of architecture came with the Architects Registration Act of 1931, subsequently amended in 1934 and 1938. This led to the formation of the Architects’ Registration Council United Kingdom, known fondly as ARCUK.

ARCUK was dissolved after the Warne Report in 1993 determined that the title “architect” should no longer be protected. Much campaigning later and in 1998, the Architects Registration Board, which goes by the shorter and less alliterative acronym ARB, was founded. ARB flourished under the Chairmanship for its first few years of Dame Barbara Kelly, a very able Dumfriesshire Scot.

Something else which was regulated right up until the 1980s was the restriction upon architects acting as developers. Scotland’s architectural history demonstrates that architects do on occasion make very good developers. (Alexander Thomson did quite well in Glasgow!)

However, by the 1930s, the endeavours of W Beresford Inglis and Patterson and Broom, at the Beresford Hotel and the Maybury Roadhouse respectively, were considered ungentlemanly and unprofessional. Thereafter architects were barred from funding their own projects.

It would take another four decades before the anti-development rule was rescinded, enabling Kantel, Steinhuis and others to perform as architect-led development companies. In the book
marking the Burrell company’s quarter century, Andy Burrell credits the RIAS with making the first move in response to the then Conservative government’s legislative changes of 1981: ‘Magically, the rule went. They didn’t fudge it, they just scrapped it. So immediately we set ourselves up as architect/developers.’

On reflection it is strange that over the following quarter century relatively few architects took up this opportunity. However, the contribution of Kantel and the Burrell Company is hugely significant in both their patronage of young architects and in upping the ante on the architectural quality of both conservation and new-build urban housing over the last three decades.

Housing was among the key political priorities of the post-war years. In 1945, the Scottish population was 5.15 million, an increase of 350,000 from 1931 and the housing shortage was dire. By the end of 1946, around 30,000 prefabricated homes had been erected in Scotland. Some indication of the split between public and private provision can be seen from the fact that in 1954 nearly 49,000 new homes were built by public authorities in Scotland with only 2,600 supplied by the private sector [Fig.2].

From then the graph of public provision heads steadily downwards while private provision climbs rapidly for the next five decades. In the RIAS’ Quarterly in 1952, Archibald Jury, then City Architect and Chief Planner for Glasgow, commented on housing for what are referred to as “special groups”. He includes homes for old people, single persons’ hostels, housing for disabled people, housing for doctors and nurses within the National Health Service, provision for policemen and firemen’s houses and intriguingly, comments upon the particular provision within the public sector for higher income groups requiring three to four bedroomed homes (garages and 1,500ft²).

The same 1952 issue of the Quarterly features an essay on low cost housing and low cost planning by Robert Gardner-Medwin, then Chief Architect and Planning Officer for the Department
The Paton Cottage, Torthorwald, Dumfries

4 Cut-away of cruck-framed cottage, RIAS Quarterly, February 1952. © RIAS
of Health for Scotland. He talks about the thwarting of the aspiration to build prefabricated homes by material shortages and laments the continuing reliance on traditional, component built provision (i.e., bricks and mortar).

Gardner-Medwin notes that there are two ways to reduce costs in housing. The first is to reduce space standards; the second is to rely on the ingenuity of architects, a process demanding of them “imagination, ingenuity, a scientific attitude and much hard thinking.” Gardner-Medwin’s illustrations include the living room of the Department of Health’s experimental, space-saving, three-bedroomed home, furnished by the Council of Industrial Design [Fig. 3].

The same edition carries eight pages on school building, centre-fold photos of the Parthenon, and a measured study of a demolished Dumfries cruck-built cottage [Fig. 4]. A subsequent issue of the now re-named Prospect in 1957 carries an article on the proposed demolition of the Gorbals slums and their replacement by a Brave New World vision, a view of the proposals for East Kilbride town centre and an article on small burgh architecture [Figs 5 & 6]. There is a continuing preoccupation with both the grand planning of new towns and major urban renewal and more contextual and conservation based endeavour for smaller communities.

By 1959, Prospect’s editorial board consisted of Andrew Hannah, Archie Doak, Michael Laird, Sinclair Gauldie and Ian Woods. In the autumn 1959 issue, alongside a further major masterplanning article, this time on

5 Title page of Gorbals essay, RIAS Quarterly, Spring 1957. © RIAS
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Anderston Cross, Glasgow [Fig.7], are such diverse topics as the Cistercians in Spain, architecture and politics in Illyria and a piece on architectural teaching by Peter Smithson, which advocates that:

“Modern architecture has grown up on a didactic tradition, almost every building by Mies and Le Corbusier is an example and a method as well as a fact and this sort of architecture is still the best teacher.”

Another article is by Alan Reiach on his acquaintanceship with Frank Lloyd Wright [Fig.8].

A decade later the centenary of the Glasgow Institute of Architects in 1968 happily coincided with the RIAS Presidency of one Jack Antonio Coia. In his celebratory message he opines that:

“In the middle of another and painful rebirth of Glasgow, it is comforting but self-deceiving to assume that a process of historical inevitability assures architectural supply in response to architectural demand. Disillusionment results from deeper study. The great Victorians, in all their ventures, stand at the end of
a major historical period, exhausting the vein and themselves in the last fling of an era. The life of Mackintosh symptomises this exhaustion and dramatises a threatening discontinuity. He is the harbinger of a yawning gap, too wide for a man of even his genius to bridge.”

There is, however, according to Coia, some hope in joint professional action:

“During the decay of this consensus, a growing professionalism develops to defend the architect. But the second rebirth of your city demands a corporate response from the profession and the institute and involves them influencing and educating the public and private patron.”

Coia’s impassioned plea stands in stark contrast to the turgid message in the same centenary booklet by the then President of the RIBA, Sir Leslie Wilson OBE.

In the same publication, Archie Doak provides a considered and prophetic review of the Glasgow Institute’s history and the role of architects, both public and private. He particularly laments the diminution of the City Architects’ role from the combined office of Chief Architect/Planner to architect alone:

“Soon there may be fewer, but larger public offices; there may be fewer small practices capable of competing for work and these - and the larger firms too - face increasing competition from the package deals and project management firms.”
Extending the period just a little to look into the 1980s is helpful. For the RIAS, the highlight of that decade came in 1984 with Scotstyle, a major touring exhibition and publication by Fiona Sinclair. A selection panel, chaired by John Richards PRIAS and including David Walker, Andy MacMillan, Bob Steedman and Colin McWilliam chose one building from each of the past 150 years (in celebration of the RIBA’s 150th birthday).

Also in that decade, the Prospect special supplement of autumn 1985 implicitly celebrates the transformation in the Incorporation wrought by then Secretary, Charles McKean [Fig.9]. The supplement opens with Ron Cameron’s broad objectives for the Incorporation from 1978. These were: a construction industry study group, funds to enable the six RIAS Chapters to carry out their own PR and an improved headquarters at Rutland Square. The 1985 supplement proceeds to demonstrate that, on all these counts and on the creation of a brilliant administration, job done.

Three years later, in 1988, The Incorporation published its view forward.
to 1995. The working group convened by the Chief Architect of Fife Council, David Cowling, consisted of Tony Kneale, Gerard Bakker, Joyce Deans, David Mann, Stewart Henderson and Alan Forgan. Their conclusions reviewed where the profession had been and where, they thought, it was heading:

“By the 1960s, the pace of development was such that the government promoted the view that only through the industrialisation of the building process would the demand be met. Architects found themselves translating their architecture into a factory manufactured product. The demands of that process dictated major elements of design and forms of building. Schools, hospitals and factories were thus influenced.”

and:

“In the domestic field it became possible, even economically desirable to build high. For good or ill, architects became associated in the public mind with high rise buildings. Government and politicians wanted them, engineers made them possible, surveyors constructed cost regimes to encourage them and the architectural profession (perhaps unwisely) went along with them - sometimes even enthusiastically.”

They eventually stop beating themselves up in favour of a stirring conclusion:

“Up to end of the century, architecture must blossom; not for the sake of the profession but because the quality of our built environment is crucial to the success of everything for which our society strives.”

Perhaps however, the most apposite last words are back in Archie Doak’s 1968 essay. His plea for the culturally aware bespoke solution of the inspired Scottish architect is eloquent - and still absolutely pertinent:

“To some people a fir cone is a fir cone, but to some it may still be a doorkin, a yowie, a peerie or a cockabendie. Likewise children may be bairns or weans.”

and:

“Society will no longer need us if we cease to be highly qualified professionals of architecture. A professional is someone who delivers the goods - the real thing: that means more architecture, not less.”
SCOTLAND: BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE
I have often puzzled as to why ‘Modern Architecture’ got such a bad name [Fig.1]. First and foremost;
- it challenged traditional ‘architectural’ views of what was attractive and usable with formal and functional compositions which folk were not used to.

But in addition it widened its embrace to include planning;
- by going beyond its own particular building by building focus, widening its scope in creating completely novel ‘planning’ settings with which people were quite unfamiliar.

And finally it became pre-occupied with how these environments were produced - and for the most part it was ‘produced’ with materials that were novel, untried and untested. Inevitably the early generations of these failed and when this was done on an immense scale, moderate failures multiplied to distort much wider environments and therefore coloured the local population’s view [Fig.2].
The Liberating Aspects of Modernism

What this triumvirate of ‘environmental modernism’ - architectural style, embracing planning and production, sought to do was good in broad terms, to make access to our environment more egalitarian - the consequent environment, not the product of a capitalist élite but of a hoped for democratic representation.

It was an experiment. Now you know with medical experiments the amount of testing that is required over a number of years before a drug is announced as being safe for public use, well in the development of our widened notion of ‘Modern Architecture’ that did not happen.

And this is the crux of my talk, the experiment of ‘Modern Architecture’ as opposed to modern art writing or sculpture was in the usable public realm. At one level the history of the modern movement in architecture is littered with individual exemplar buildings that were an immense headache to their inhabitants, Corbusier’s Villa Savoye and Mies’s Farnsworth House just to identify two. But as tiny experiments they had little global impact on the lives of everyday people apart from through the magazines. However expanded onto the mass scale provision the experiment became more real, existing in real time not a laboratory or a studio, it was an immediate part of people’s lives. It was not a thing just to look at and agree or disagree with, put down as in the case of a book or just to walk away from.

Which is the focus of this talk. Before we get there though it is maybe worth defining the qualities of this new architecture for the twentieth century, first in a global sense and then more specifically to Britain.

In broad terms these qualities are not difficult to define. Taking an important Scottish example, if you look at the front of Fettes College in Edinburgh by David Bryce and compare it a hundred years later with its dining hall by the office of William Kininmonth, you can see the intention. On the one hand the monumental heavy focus of the main building by Bryce, incredible mass loaded onto a small door and flanked by arcading, and in contrast with the horizontal liberated plane above the sheer glass of Kininmonth’s building, light with a sense of openness.
Modernity, with its framed structures took advantage of the technology of the industrial revolution, liberating building form from the cloak of the antique. Technology freed the internal definition of space, till then largely dictated by load bearing walls and therefore the typologies of space associated with it, based on closed rooms. The result was the emergence of a new 'openness'.

In their book, *The International Style*, describing this new liberated architectural form, Henry Russell Hitchcock and Phillip Johnson distilled the changes and you will recognise them in the comparison between the work of the Bryce and Kininmonth offices. (I have taken the summary from Colin St John Wilson’s book *The Other Tradition of Modern Architecture*);

- volume as opposed to mass and solidity
- regularity rather than symmetry
- avoidance of applied decoration
- symbolic expression by allusion to the past has ceased to be necessary

Le Corbusier was more explicit that there was potential in the new technology, particularly of steel and concrete, for a new language of architecture defined by his five points;

- the house on piloti raised above the ground
- the free plan
- the garden on the roof
- the window from side to side
- the free façade
So coming back to the British experience, the wide scale adoption of the modern architecture experiment was somewhat belated. It was fuelled by a new generation of post-war architects determined not to be contained by either traditional vernacular experience or a return to the pre-war hierarchies and orders. The Second World War had been a collective effort, so too the future building and rebuilding of the country. What was aspired for was a release from the straitjacket of historical representation and replacement with a
new, open, democratic and accessible series of forms not loaded with all the associations of the past.

But the means with which to do that were the pre-war experimental forms that had only been road tested in largely individual one-off trials, as we have noted the best of which had been beset with problems. In general terms that all would have been ok, our cities would have been sprinkled with a rich assortment and mix of interesting contemporary forms, with one or two proving technically troublesome, but liveable with. In Scotland the Kininmonth’s office in Edinburgh in St Andrew’s Square, Robert Matthew in Dundee are great examples of one-off contributions, or Gillespie Kidd and Coia’s BOAC building in Buchanan Street Glasgow [Figs.3 & 4]. What characterises them all is their sense of good fit – modern forms and use relationships reconciled with the existing context they find themselves in.

Inevitably there were many less good and that happens when the language of a particular era becomes adopted. And remember, what is being spread as a way of doing things is still an experiment.

An example which we were involved in was Frank Fielden’s building for Glasgow University, which was a variation on this theme of a modern insertion in an urban situation. It was an elegant building although I think the Architecture Building at Strathclyde was much better. Its problem was its lack of fit to the setting. It felt disconnected and floating. [Incidentally to show that it would have been possible for Fielden to reconcile his modernity with the context, we re-embedded it by creating offset wings to the side streets, cladding the concrete panels and excavating the plinth to create a simple series of connected internal and external spaces. What we did was to retrofit a better connection to the existing fabric for the original piece in tune with the exemplars I showed earlier].

But on reflection it is hard to understand why this building should have been so dis-associated from its context. The other examples in Edinburgh, Dundee and Glasgow were self-conscious attempts to reconcile their modern architecture with the wider context [Fig.5]. Why was this not common practice? And this is where the true story of modern architecture gets confused and complicated.

As was mentioned earlier, parallel to the development of a modern architecture emerged a modern notion of planning and production. And it is very easy for the three to become intertwined and confused.

Fielden’s Building sat dis-associated from its urban context because it not only represented a form of modern architecture but also a view of modern planning and that view sought to present an alternative to the tradition of streets and closely defined building edges with a much more loose fit attitude. In this case Gilbert Scott’s original urban quadrangles block geometry was extruded to cross University Avenue irrespective of the existing geometry of the adjacent streets.

Embryonically this approach, had its origins in the radical assertions of the first CIAM, the International Congress of Modern Architecture, at La Sarrez in 1928 where the vision of some of the participants, Le Corbusier and others, was in the Manifesto arguing for
‘putting architecture back on its real plane—the economic and social plane’. The city was to be analytically broken down into ‘the organisation of the four elements of the collective life—dwelling, work, recreation, transportation’ for which ‘present technical means, which multiply ceaselessly, are the key.’ (Manifesto as quoted by Colin St John Wilson in *The Other Tradition of Modern Architecture*).

Modern Architecture was broadening its scope beyond the individual building to volunteer leadership and assume responsibility for first planning and then production.

As a first idea the city would no longer be that complex interweaving aggregated and changing intermix of uses and character but sub-divided and distinctive. The new architecture would then be autonomous within it. This notion would explain or attempt to justify Fielden’s thinking, a hankering for and autonomy from what had gone before.

But moving on there is importantly the birth of a new idea here, ‘present technical means which multiply ceaselessly’. 

Remember modern architecture was an experiment yet here it was being advocated to be multiplied like the output from a conveyer line. Any errors in the experiment would be spread on a virus like scale.

‘Modern Architecture’ became therefore associated with and in many ways made the huge political mistake of taking responsibility for a three-prong strategy all in synchronisation.

Architecture first.... an experiment in modern architecture.

Planning second by ‘putting architecture back on its real plane—the economic and social plane’ it advocated the transformation of the city as we knew it.

Then production third, in ceaseless multiplication and by that we mean endless repetition of an architectural experiment

What were the chances you would get all three right. The experimental architecture, the novel planning and the ceaseless production.

As we have seen if you got the architectural experiment to work you were doing well and I have shown examples where it did work and as with Fielden’s work where he possibly got it right with his architectural form but where his city vision was just not nice.

It is easy to stand back 80 years on and to be smart. The twentieth century had to serve huge population growth in our cities and the added challenge to extend the boundaries of the city using the car.

The problem for the public perception, is that the 3-dimensional architectural language of transformation then became synonymous in the public mind with a 2-dimensional planned accelerated expansion of urban form, a stretching of the city into extended settlements and new towns, and then in addition the production systems associated with it and all at once.

As a result, the original hope of a liberating language of architecture overturning the hierarchies of historical forms grew into one of equal open space and open-ended planning made all the worse by the multiple failures of the quality or lack of quality of this production. If ‘Modern Architecture’ had stuck to the historical density and containment as previously discussed, you could be both densely contained and yet modern.

Not all architects believed in the ability to tame the triumverate of ambitions. In fact it could be said that architects having to operate in that environment like Gillespie Kidd and Coia sought to create a surrogate historical urbanism in the open expanses of the new expansion areas, a form of resistance to this endless empty growth - little urban settings in a sea of open mediocrity [Fig.6].

The recessional dark days of the strikes and resource shortages of the seventies ultimately played a part in questioning the aggrandisement of ‘Modern Architecture’. It found itself swept up and found guilty along with the planning and ‘voracious production’ processes. It was now a good opportunity to rethink...primarily as the money to fuel the ‘voracious expansionist process’ had dried up.

Modernism was exiled with a return to a belief in historical forms and traditional means of construction. There were some great exceptions, both theatres, Nicoll Russell’s Dundee Theatre cleverly inserted into the
dense tenemental fabric of the city, and Eden Court by Law and Dunbar-Nasmith set into its river park setting [Fig.7]. (Curiously our contribution at Eden Court in growing the facility had to reconcile their relationship to the park with our renewed relationship to the surrounding streets) [Fig.8].

With the collapse in confidence, architecture and planning fell into disfavour and disillusionment, to production freed from its yoke and never lost for something to get its teeth into, and went on to the rape of the Scottish urban edge countryside in the vast proliferation of lowest common denominator housing in the suburban estates.

Curiously the best of modern Scottish architecture refound its touch and the essays in the publication, *Scotland: Building for the Future*, brings many to the fore. They found their touch in the revived historical urban settings that the early twentieth century sought to deny.

The best examples seek to show how modern architecture and historical context can be reconciled. The Poetry Library and Dance Base by Malcolm

---


Fraser; Fruitmarket Gallery by Richard Murphy; Partick Health Centre by Gareth Hoskins; St Aloysius School by Elder and Cannon; Reiach and Hall at Edinburgh College of Art.

And there was a breakthrough in Planning at Crown Street in Glasgow’s Gorbals. It showed how the traditional urban form could accommodate a variety of architectural forms and styles, with a variety of individual production techniques. Architecture here was conceived distinct from planning and distinct from production and not a unified Force Majeure.

So where are we now?

If we have learned anything from the history of the twentieth century, then we must resist the clumsy remarriage of architecture and planning and production. They are not one and the same. What is critical is that each discipline should continue for itself to develop the highest level of scholarship and practice, that the aim should be the development of the means of collaboration between the disciplines, not the ownership or overthrow of one by the other.

And we have new challenges, how do we produce environments conscious of the use of valuable resources, how do we create places that promote a sense of communal well-being and how do we make an architecture that enables and liberates the users?

It is in that spirit of collaboration that we will ensure the legacy passed onto the next generation is valued for its contribution to society.
THE ALIENATING GEORGE BROWN ESTATE, DEDDENBURY, IS A GRIM, BRUTALISING WORKER'S GHETTO, QUITE INAPPROPRIATE TO THE NEEDS OF FAMILIES FORCED TO LIVE IN IT BY STATE CAPITALISM... PURE DOGMATIC ARCHITECTURAL DETERMINISM... IT SHOULD BE BLOWN UP AND REPLACED!

THE CANONIC GEORGE BROWN ESTATE, DEDDENBURY, IS AN INSPIRED EXAMPLE OF THE HEROIC PERIOD OF '70S SYSTEM-BUILT SOCIAL HOUSING, ITS VIGOROUSLY ARTICULATED REFUSE CHUTES AND 'BETON BRUT' BACK-YARDS IN-THE-AIR ARE REMINISCENT OF AN ITALIAN HILL TOWN... IT SHOULD BE LISTED AND PRESERVED FOR POSTERITY!
If one factor links together today’s proceedings, probably it’s the relationship of our present day concerns with the post-war heritage. That’s a relationship that, it has to be said, is a very complex one, and getting ever more complex by the year. Firstly, there’s the paradox of something quintessentially ‘new’ and ‘modern’ and shiny becoming old and shabby. Then, on top of that, is the fact that in the last decade, a new phase of ‘modern’ architecture is being built today, evoking the original modernism in some ways but not all – I’ll come back to the question of the new and old modernisms in a minute [Fig.1].
Remaking the Future: the Multiple Faces of Post-War Scottish Architecture

But first, I want to make the more general point that it’s very well established already within the history and theory of conservation that heritage values are not inherent in old objects themselves, but are shaped above all by their reception by users or consumers today – a process which is characterised above all by constant change, as the wider values of society change. For example, the most comprehensive of the late nineteenth to early twentieth century attempts to define architectural heritage, Alois Riegl’s *Der Moderne Denkmalkultus* of 1903, put forward a wide range of monument values, all conditioned above all by ever-changing present day expectations – including the shifting concepts of artistic beauty and historical authenticity, and the requirement for practical usefulness. For Riegl, the only overarching value, the only thing that trumps today’s values, is what he calls ‘age value’ or *Alterswert* – the fact that everything is ultimately transient, something that all monuments testify to, whether they are preserved or allowed to decay away. So architectural heritage is as much about today and about change, as about the past and about permanence.

All very well - but how is that relevant to my task today – of giving an academic overview of post-war modern architecture in Scotland?

Because, although the overall trajectory of architectural conservation since the eighteenth century has been towards chronological extension to include ever more recent phases of architecture, that process has not been an even one, but has been conditioned by the violently fluctuating fashions of present-day architecture. And that has especially structured attitudes to post-war architecture. In fact, each phase of architecture *since* the post-war period...
has promoted such an extreme view of the period, as to virtually ‘remake’ its subject, and make the original or authentic ideals of the post-war built environment incomprehensible or even invisible.

In a minute, I want to briefly review the three most important of these shifts, or reorientations of heritage. But first I want to give the bare facts, the bare chronology of Scottish post-war architecture seen in its own terms. This is quite a simple story to relate. There’s two main phases: an early post-war austerity phase, in the 1940s and early/mid fifties, and a sixties boom phase. The forties and early fifties, in response to the post-war reconstruction urge and the push for state-led planning, were dominated not by fancy architecture of whatever sort but by rather bold housing and planning programmes, with state-employed public architect-planners steering the programmes of construction, often technologically advanced, but usually of modest architectural aspiration, very often involving buildings of limited scale and middle of the road styles. In some cases, what you had was
certainly modern architecture but in rather mild, so-called ‘empiricist’ styles: here for example are some projects by Basil Spence, who we’ll come back to later. In other cases, modernity was mixed up with persisting ‘traditional’ styles – whether Arts & Crafts, as in the redevelopments by Robert Hurd & Partners in the Canongate, or classical, as in the Pollock Halls – both in Edinburgh.

The late fifties and early sixties, with growing confidence in the booming mixed-economy welfare state, saw a growing diversification, individualisation and also a scaling up in size in the built environment. Many of the trends of the period were now so divergent as to be violently in conflict: whereas architectural theory since Vitruvius had insisted on a balance of aesthetic, practical and constructional...
considerations, some now emphasised one at the expense of the others. The effects of this were seen especially in Glasgow and the west coast, an area which with its reconstruction challenges, should have been a hotbed of architectural creativity, but was instead consumed by a virtual civil war between utilitarian and ‘arty’ factions [Fig. 2]. On the one hand, the production drives especially in housing, were ramped up in scale and daring, especially by David Gibson’s housing crusade in Glasgow, huge in scale and aspiration, as in the Sighthill and Red Road projects of 1962-9, but almost completely utilitarian in architectural terms, and involving massive, alienating surgery in the urban fabric. On the other hand, there were extreme architectural solutions largely disregarding practical and constructional factors, especially in the work of GKC, whose churches and seminaries – building types which in any case stemmed not from the twentieth century welfare state but from the sixteenth century Council of Trent – were designed in extreme sculptural forms that left their users with often grave problems of water penetration, and some of them have either been demolished or (in the case of their seminary complex at Cardross) left as ruins. As a result of this polarisation, architects in the west were largely unable to make a creative response to the challenges of reconstruction: it was telling that when Glasgow Corporation embarked on their prestigious Gorbals redevelopment in 1957/8, they went straight to Basil Spence and Robert Matthew in Edinburgh [Fig. 3]. The most creative ‘West Coast’ response to the demands of modernisation stemmed not from the architects but from the planners, in Cumbernauld New Town, where a radical new interpretation of the city and regional planning movement was developed from the late fifties onwards - a new concept of highly individualised new town, developed for an age of individual consumer affluence. It combined a radically structured traffic and pedestrian system with a strongly landscaped, place-specific residential zone and a ‘megastructural’ centre.

On the east coast, standards were far more evenly high in the sixties. There were no artistic fireworks, but nor was there any packing-case mass housing. In fact the east coast in this period saw the development of the finest and best-looked-after programme of Modernist social housing in any individual city in Britain, in the city of Aberdeen [Fig. 4]. More generally, it’s mainly to architects based in the east coast that we have to look for a creative and diverse late fifties and sixties modernism, sensibly linked to the welfare-state construction boom. This modernism was centred above all in the Scottish work of Basil Spence and Robert Matthew, but included a range of other firms such as Wheeler & Sproson, specialising in highly contextual interventions in decayed areas of old towns. Spence and Matthew had both risen to fame in the years around 1950 with designs in England, in Spence’s Coventry Cathedral win and Matthew’s concept for the Royal Festival Hall in London. In 1960s Scotland, their practices designed for the full range of Welfare-State building tasks, ranging from the most overtly ‘modern’, like power stations and new universities, to more traditional, like private houses or subtle interventions in small burghs – and they did this throughout Scotland, including Clydeside
too. From Matthew and his firm RMJM, for example, there was the modernity of Kincardine Power Station, Hutchesontown Gorbals area B multi-storey flats, or Stirling University, and here’s the more traditional scale and natural materials of his Gogarbank House for Boyd Anderson – internally, one of the world’s first eco houses – or his Burton Store in the High Street in Hawick, a superbly witty 1950s take on the idea of the vernacular, poking fun at its stolid nineteenth century neighbours with its pantiles and rubble [Figs. 5, 6].

At this point, it has to be said that, despite its consistency and integrity, relatively little of this 1960s output achieved international prominence at the time – including even the Scottish work of Spence and Matthew, whose international reputations were for other work, like architectural diplomacy or non-Scottish buildings like the Expo 67 Pavilion. The one thing in Scotland that really did grab the international architectural headlines, though, was Cumbernauld New Town, whose daring planning concept and avant garde town centre drew professionals from literally all over the world in droves for about 15 years, and it was awarded one of the world’s most prestigious prizes for urbanism in 1967, the RS Reynolds Memorial Award – and today, by some lucky fluke, the original prize trophy is now one of the many treasures in the collections of RCAHMS, whose recording and collecting initiatives, we should remember, largely pioneered the cause of ‘post-war heritage’ during the 1980s and 90s. Internationally, Cumbernauld was not just a big thing, it was the only big thing – although we might well ask how much that matters anyway, if we’re concerned chiefly with subsequent ‘reception’ of post-war architecture. But from the late sixties, and the seventies, that became irrelevant anyway, as architecture began another of its radical shifts, away from new building of any kind towards rehabilitation and towards new buildings in vernacular or, later, so called postmodern styles.

I don’t have time to go into that phase in its own right, but it gives us
a convenient excuse to pass on to my three radical remakings of the post-war architectural heritage. In each case, I’d like to ask what was the overall view of post-war architecture, and which bits were specially valued, or potentially valued, as heritage? The first of these remakings is the Postmodern revolution of the seventies and eighties. This was a time when architecture defined itself in relation to modernism, but in a totally negative way. In the case of anything that Modernism was thought to be – homogeneous, stark, regimented etc – Postmodernism would do the opposite: highly variegated and decorated, historically responsive, and ‘free’ in patronage (either through free-market capitalism or community user participation). All the old nuances and tensions within Modernism, between the production engineer people, the ‘arty’ types, and so on, became irrelevant. They all became
interchangeable - people would ask, why did the planners do this? - when in fact they’d tried to stop it, and so forth. Nobody cared less about these issues by the seventies [Figs. 7, 8]. No-one cared what anyone had actually thought in the fifties and sixties. The fact that the vast majority of the population in the fifties detested 19th century tenements and wanted them demolished simply became an un-fact. Of course people had wanted the tenements preserved, and ‘They’ had conspired to frustrate this, etc etc. So if we ask, which parts of post-war architecture were valued as heritage in this period? The answer is, none. Some of the antecedents of the Modern Movement were valued inordinately, above all the hallowed figure of Mackintosh. But post-war architecture and planning was simply ‘the’ bogeyman, belonging not to history or heritage at all and worthy only of demolition - a phase that culminated in the blowing up of Spence’s slab blocks at Hutchesontown-Gorbals Area C in 1993.

Now on to the second remaking, in the 1990s. Now, the attitude to the modern heritage changed from outright rejection to a kind of divide and rule. In the wider new-architectural world, Postmodernism was rejected as kitsch, and of its contextual references to the past as crass facadism. Instead, there arose a revived Modernism, a New Modernism, similar in its superficial styling, but driven by very different values from the original modernism, above all in its even more eager acceptance of capitalist competition as opposed to social-democratic sobriety, and its concern with iconic style and image as opposed to social context.

The New Modernism in relation to the old modernism was rather like New Labour in relation to the original socialism. Now the early 90s also saw the beginnings of heritage interest in post-war modernism, but after one or two brave but vain attempts as at Leith Fort, it rapidly became established that the heritage engagement with old modernism would be a rather unbalanced one, picking out the elements that anticipated the New Modernism and (with the notable exception of the recording work of the Royal Commission) sweeping the rest under the carpet. On the one hand, the thing that had really been most important at the time, Cumbernauld
New Town, slid into decay and neglect, and an attempt to get the Town Centre megastructure listed in 1992-3 was personally vetoed by the then minister, Tory laird Sir Hector Monro. On the other hand, something that had not been internationally prominent at the time, the churches and seminaries of Gillespie, Kidd & Coia (GKC), became the subject of an almost pop-cult-like revival, retrospectively hailed as iconic superstars and heirs of the sacred legacy of Mackintosh [Fig.9]. And finally, in the Scottish Parliament project, the baton of iconic inspiration was grandly passed on from Mackintosh and GKC to the ‘new iconic’ architecture of Enric Miralles.

Finally, to what hopefully will be a third ‘remaking’ of the heritage of post-war modernism. The wider architectural context for this is the sharp decline over the past few years in the fortunes of the New Modernism – partly out of purely architectural revulsion against the self indulgent excesses of the countless identikit iconic buildings by ‘starchitects’ like Frank Gehry, Zaha Hadid, Enric Miralles or Santiago Calatrava, but also influenced
by a broader revulsion against the excesses of the new capitalism with which the New Modernism was undoubtedly bound up. Does this present an opportunity for us to rethink our attitudes to the post-war heritage, and go for a more inclusive rather than divisive picture? Certainly, mainstream figures like Spence and Matthew have been ‘on the up’ recently – Matthew has had a new biography, putting him in the context of the changing international ideals of architecture, and Spence a major exhibition and various publications, while the work of both has been increasingly listed – for example in Edinburgh’s George Square. And other individual Matthew or Spence buildings could easily and uncontentiously follow - Gogarbank House and the Burtons Shop in Hawick are obvious candidates.

Here, in touching on the increasingly comprehensive post-war listing coverage by HS, we’re obviously moving towards the subject of the next paper, which is where I need to stop! Just one final thought, concerning the difficulty of adequately protecting not individual monuments but ensembles and areas, an area of special importance to DOCOMOMO’s International Committee on Urbanism, which I represent, but an area where, in Britain, the local authority-controlled conservation area system is the only real option just now. In some cases, where a building stock is properly cared for by its owners and users, special heritage protection is not needed – as, for example, in Aberdeen, whose meticulous civic pride and ethos of guardianship has left it, today, as
a virtual museum of post-war mass housing ensembles in a most beautiful state of preservation and mature landscaping – a heritage created not so much by original design as by good ‘reception’. Here, the north-east capital joins some very select company indeed at an international level, including Scandinavian countries or Hong Kong and Singapore [Fig. 10].

But what about when something of great importance is neglected and left to decay? Here, we have to return to the question of Cumbernauld New Town, a place that, because of its unique international standing, simply must be safeguarded from further decay, especially in its excellent housing areas. Yet despite the valiant efforts of some sympathetic local planners, the current local authority-led system, since the wind-up of the Development Corporation in 1996, has been ineffective, to say the least, in protecting this unique environment. To get round this impasse, could we not look at how a previous similar crisis in an internationally-renowned urban ensemble, that of the Edinburgh New Town in the sixties, was solved by a joint national/local initiative:

the uniquely successful Edinburgh New Town Conservation Committee? Maybe the time is ripe, forty years on, for a national/local joint initiative to set up a Cumbernauld New Town Conservation Committee?
SCOTLAND: BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE
The preceding papers have set the scene and given the context and place for the protection of the best of Scotland’s post-war legacy. This paper will run through the history of post-war listing, looking at when it emerged, how it evolved, the range and numbers of subjects, and the current focus.

There are 192 post-war listings currently in Scotland and that is a tiny percentage of the total number of 47,400 listed buildings. This illustrates the degree of selectivity that Historic Scotland has taken in choosing these buildings to date.
Looking at the History of Post-War Listing

The spread of the listings is: 22% at category A, 62% at B, and 16% at C(S). Category A represents special architectural or historic interest on a national canvas; B refers to its importance at a regional level; and C(S) denotes recognition for group and local interest. These figures show the cautious care taken in being notably different from the equivalent for all periods, where just 8% fall to category A, 51% to B and a greater 41% to C(S).

Statutory listing, that is the identification of buildings of special architectural or historic interest, only began in Scotland in the post-war period in 1947 with the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act. The term *special* is a critical factor in this definition, then as now. The first chief investigator at the time, Ian Lindsay, produced some astute Notes for Guidance (1948) to assist those investigating buildings for listing. His advice was very advanced. He set out the criteria which essentially stand today. He advised inspectors, for example, that they had to be ahead in their thinking, that buildings "need not to be old nor beautiful" to merit inclusion.

This was daring advice for 1948. While he had his own preferences he knew that these must have no place. Accordingly, he advised that, ‘just because we do not like Baronial’ it does not mean that it is not important! You have to have an open and impartial mind.

The National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh, by Reginald Fairlie, is one of a small group of transitional post-war listings conceived before the war but completed afterwards (in 1956). There are too many fine post-war *components* of buildings which were listed primarily for other reasons, such as Esmé...
Gordon’s shopfront addition to a corner of the First New Town in Edinburgh [Fig.1], but these are not included among the 192 quoted. Similarly, there are carefully-tailored modern additions made to existing listings which, while not the focus of the listing, contribute positively to this living heritage. As such there is a greater coverage of modern design than the list of pure examples alone can evidence alone.

The current legislation is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1997. This is supported by criteria, published in the Scottish Historic Environment policy paper for July 2009, Annex 2, which is available online at http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/shep-july-2009.pdf, and which sets out, under three broad headings, the principles of selection. The first of these headings, age and rarity, is perhaps the most resonant when considering the post-war period, but with this, equally, comes those of architectural and historic interest, and close historic association.

Historic Scotland’s listing team has been asked if we would consider setting separate criteria for the post-war period because the materials and styles were so innovative. While we

2 Cummins Engine Factory (now Centrelink 5), Shotts, by Ahrends Burton & Koralek, 1975-83.
have not found this necessary because the diversity of types in Scotland’s built heritage is wide for all periods, some may consider it has a place for other reasons and we welcome views. The proposal has, however, been considered and rejected in England. We have found to date that the ‘age’ factor provides the critical filter. The younger the subject, the less perspective is available with which to assess the property and the greater the need for selectivity. Beyond this the further principles of selection are equally relevant and are applied with equal rigour. There is an informal rule that a building should be a minimum of thirty years old before designation and there are few exceptions that will be made to this policy. Effectively, a building of lesser vintage needs to be under threat of change equivalent to demolition before we will consider its case for inclusion on the list.

The Listed Building Committee papers from 1971 give useful insight into the thinking that has informed this process from the earliest times. They show that the thirty-year policy has been in place almost from the inception of statutory listing. The Committee minutes of 1972 record, for example, agreement on a rolling terminal date of 1939. Sitting on the Listed Building Committee at this time were no other than Sir Robert Matthew, Dr Ronald Cant, and the ‘Chief Investigator’ of the day, now Professor David Walker. At the second meeting in 1972, the Committee reported that the terminal date could be rolled forward every few years, and that there should be no prohibition on the listing of more recent buildings, although such occurrences should be exceptional. We have held to the wisdom of this policy and forty years on work to a terminal date of 1979.

The Cummins Engine Factory, Shotts, by Ahrends Burton and Koralek, is the youngest building currently on the list, now known as Centrelink 5, built between 1975 and 1983 [Fig.2]. The Factory was an inspiring design, sophisticated, ergonomic in its conception, responding to consultation with the workforce, and as a result prioritised such things critical to comfort as the proximity of restrooms and tea points to the workspace.

Another consideration discussed by the Listed Building Committee in 1972, was whether or not to list the work of living architects. Ian Lindsay in his guidance for the fieldworks in 1948 had advised that they should not list such works but clearly the Listed Building Committee in 1972 was rather uneasy about this. They decided that exceptions might be made in special cases, for example, churches by Jack Coia might be included when the Glasgow list was revised, here showing an early distinction for work by Gillespie, Kidd and Coia (GKC). But interestingly, by late 1972, they decided to dispense with the restriction on living architects altogether. There are happily today a good number of living architects whose buildings feature on the list.
4 David Marshall Lodge, Aberfoyle, by Shearer & Annand, completed 1958-60. © RCAHMS [Shearer and Annand Collection]
The number of listings of post-war subject by decade of construction is instructive. At the moment there are twenty-four listings of buildings built after 1945. Representing just five years of activity, challenged by the dearth of key materials and associated restrictions, this is a significant number. The Wills Tobacco Factory, 1946, listed at category B, provides a good example of what is on the list from the years immediately after the war [Fig.3]. It has recently with listed building consent been given a vibrant new use. Most post-war listings are awarded to buildings erected in the 1950s (a core of 92), with the numbers declining proportionately thereafter with youth, and accordingly a slimmer 62 listings for buildings from the 1960s. It is expected that these figures will increase as our state of knowledge moves on, as the resurvey of the existing lists moves further around the country and we develop more thematic work. There are 14 buildings of 1970s vintage, which in being the latest decade within the eligible range, has consequently been subject to the greater selectivity described.

David Marshall Lodge, Aberfoyle, by James Shearer, is currently the youngest building to be listed. Completed in 1960 it was listed in 1971, with a gap of just eleven years. Ian Lindsay had recommended it for designation as one of the best pieces of work by the architect. In recognition of such esteem, it was listed soon after the deaths of its architect and its expert proponent [Fig.4].

The changing eligibility of post-war buildings for listing as the decades roll is shown clearly in the number of listings for each decade. The rolling thirty year constraint has its place. Only one post-war building was listed in the 1960s, 8 were listed in the 1970s, 22 in the 1980s, with a clear jump to 80 in the 1990s a pattern holding in the 'noughties', with 81 to 2009.

Listing is managed through three programmes. The first is the resurvey, the topographical survey of a parish, ward or burgh, at a time, which has been the source of about 40% of the post-war listings. The second type is list maintenance, or ad hoc listings (about which, more below). The third is thematic, that is specialist study
of a building type or the work of a particular practice. Historic Scotland is increasingly moving into a thematic approach to post-war buildings because it suits the particular challenges of the period very well. The first post-war thematic was kick-started by the demolition of Gillespie, Kidd and Coia’s St Benedict’s Church in Drumchapel, in 1991: this caused John Hume, the then Chief Inspector of Historic Buildings, to begin a survey of GKC churches, working with the Diocese, and by 1994 there were seventeen ‘Coia’ churches on the list. Among the churches by the practice which are on the Scottish Ministers list are St Laurence, Greenock, 1951-4, St Bride’s, East Kilbride, 1963, and St Paul’s, Glenrothes, 1956, recently promoted to Category A, as a seminal design [Figs.5, Figure 6 from David Page’s talk of St Bride’s East Kilbride, and Fig.6].

In the opening decade of the twenty-first century we have continued the practice-centred approach, focussing
for example on the domestic work of Morris and Steedman. The work has captured the inspirational range of the practice’s achievements in this field [Fig.7]. We have also looked at the work of Peter Womersley in the Borders. Indeed, the youngest listing for many years, was Womersley’s Bernat Klein Studio, Selkirk, completed in 1972. The recent thematic overview enabled us to list High Sunderland, the residence Womersley designed for the same clients to sit alongside the studio. One of the more exceptional post-war
listings emerged from this survey, Womersley’s boiler house for Dingleton Hospital, 1977 [Fig. 8]. Plans have since been lodged for the conversion of this building into flats, proving that with creative-thinking, even the most unusual redundant buildings can have a sustainable future. Historic Scotland is soon to produce online information leaflets on the work of these practices, freely available from our website.

The listing team has also been looking at the achievements of the post-war universities. The review of Edinburgh University was the first of these, at the request of the council to ensure that the University’s masterplan would develop from a
List maintenance is the third programme of listing and often the most difficult area for the team. It deals with high profile cases, those for which there has been a late awareness of some impending change or threat, and which tend to command media attention. The listing of Edinburgh’s British Home Stores by Kenneth Graham, and RMJM, 1964-68, occurred in such a context [Fig.10]. The building was designed as one of the ‘Panel’ buildings intended to provide a first floor walkway along Princes Street, a second retail street. This was an important concept. Interestingly, the new master plan for Edinburgh’s Princes Street is looking to achieve the same critical standards which the design of British Home Stores was required to satisfy when it was built, namely interpenetration, flexibility and high quality materials. The interior planning was innovative, with centralised lines of communication rather than peripheral, and with fine Scandinavian decorative schemes. It was designed in the round, with a neat roof-top patio for the staff, responsibly conceived in respect of views from the castle esplanade.
The post-war listings in place today give recognition to a diverse range of building types. Residential and ecclesiastical buildings are most numerous, both sharing 25% of the total. This is not surprising. New churches were populating the new housing schemes, necessarily satisfying the requirements of the Second Vatican Council and the liturgical changes posed across the denominations, and their number on the list were boosted significantly by the GK review.

Residential listings include halls of residence as well as private houses. Mass housing provided by the State has not yet been considered thematically but is recognised as an area requiring priority audit and evaluation. However, area designation may be a more appropriate designation to recognise the particular interest of the best examples than listing.

Further examples of the range of types of post-war buildings currently on the list, are such as Skinner, Bailey and Lubetkin’s Scottish Ambulance Building in Glasgow, 1966-70 (believed to be Lubetkin’s only work in Scotland), Madras College, St Andrews by RS Lawrie and Fife county architects, 1963-67 (exceptional in its use of colour, materials and creative design), and Lanark County Buildings by DG Bannerman, 1959-64 (a diminutive tribute to Le Corbusier’s United Nations building) [Fig.11].

At any one time, Historic Scotland’s listing team is handling on average half a dozen post-war subjects at various stages of consideration. The two most recent listings are the iconic boiler house at the former Guardbridge Paper Factory, Fife, 1949, and Our Lady of Sorrows in South Uist, by Richard McCarron, 1964-5, a very beautiful building realised as a community project [Figs 12, Mike Russell’s Figures 1 and 2 of Our Lady of Sorrows].

Thematic studies now in progress include the utility of hydroelectric power. This brings a welcome opportunity to work with various power companies in Scotland while celebrating a lesser-known engineering achievement which offers a sustainable agenda. James Shearer’s Fasnakyle, and James Williamson and Partners’ Monar Dam are, for example, part of this exercise [Fig.13]. The team is also looking at the work of the practice of Basil Spence, with the help of Clive Fenton, reviewing influential schemes such as the fisherman’s housing in Dunbar.
as well as existing listings such as Great Michael Rise and Mortonhall Crematorium, Edinburgh [Fig.14].

One of the most important initiatives for the promotion and celebration of the post-war period is the advancement of the Dictionary of Scottish Architects. This is the brainchild of Professor David Walker, a by-product of his life’s work, an invaluable and incomparable online resource. When launched in 2006 it initially covered the period 1840 to 1940 but Historic Scotland is funding both the maintenance of

this century and its extension into the period 1940 to 1980. The public’s assistance in this is critical and we welcome any information on figures from these decades. Comments or information can be submitted to Yvonne Hillyard, on the Dictionary website, www.scottisharchitects.org.uk. It is a rich resource, developing daily with help from Miles Glendinning and students from the Edinburgh College of Art and from Neil Baxter and the RIAS.

Listing informs the management of change, identifying significance so that the character may survive, and with care and imagination, all these buildings have a future. We have much to celebrate in our post-war achievement but we are only just beginning to recognise this. Today’s conference is intended to invite and promote an awareness that will help to inform our future direction.
What they say:

"The best five-shillings' worth... in Scotland."—Sunday Observer.

"...Witty and somewhat wicked."—Edwin Muir, broadcasting.

"Could scarcely be bettered."—Glasgow Herald.

A SALTIRE BOOK

PRICE 5/-
What I want to do in this paper is to talk about the statutory protection of post-war buildings in Scotland from the perspective of a statutory regulator. This seems particularly relevant at a time when the broader philosophy of regulation is under more scrutiny and discussion that it has been at any time in the past.

The passing of the first heritage legislation in Britain, the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, in 1882 was a clear signal that the State had a role to play in the protection of the historic environment. Since then though we have seen significant shifts in political philosophy of regulation - what level of State involvement is appropriate, how are regulators meant to work, and also what public expectations are of us as public servants?
Future? What Future?

The inspiration for today’s conference and for our listing work in this field was *Building Scotland*, the 1944 publication by Reiach and Hurd [Fig.1]. Many of you will know this book and I do not intend to describe it in detail here. The key points are that it was written specifically to act as an advocate for post-war architecture in Scotland, and it was seeking to share experience of post-war design and to place Scotland in a European context. If the book had an overarching message, it was about the confidence at that time in the role of new architecture to help recovery in the post-war period. The earlier presentations in this conference have investigated this in some detail.

At Historic Scotland, we saw our earlier book on post-war architecture in Scotland and today’s conference as following this optimistic spirit but they have also been about evaluating how well placed this confidence proved to be with the benefit of 65 years perspective. Following Bevis Hillier, we frequently speak about the *shock of the new*. One of themes that has come across this morning is the strong feeling about not just the bravery of the post-war architecture and its ambition but the shock it caused, how it stimulated broader social discussions and how it was used to support the social ambitions and necessities of the period. But this type of shock is not a recent phenomenon, nor is it restricted to the post-war period. Before I came to Edinburgh I worked with English Heritage in Manchester, a city that went through the ‘white heat’ of massive urban and social change from the 1780s onwards. In considering post-war architecture I have been struck by how similar some of the commentary was to that made in Manchester in the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries. Here, the arrival of the major canal networks and their warehouses, the steam-powered cotton mills in the planned suburb of Ancoats to the east of the town, the extraordinarily rapid and comprehensive replacement of the Georgian town buildings by the Victorian town, including the major textile warehouses, the improvements to the road systems and the arrival of the railways. This was associated both with the rhetoric of progress – the
industrial innovation that was to make the nation. But also with widespread condemnation of these changes and the associated social ills – the dark satanic mills - that ‘progress’ was seen to usher in. This of course was the city walked by political commentators such as Marx and Engels and by social commentators included Mrs Gaskell and Charles Dickens. Indeed some of the major impetus for the painting and drawing of our urban buildings and urban life in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was the increasing recognition of change and loss.

Although we only get legislative protection for historic buildings in Britain around the period of the Second World War and subsequently, it is important to remember that other mechanisms were being actively used to protect valued parts of our ‘heritage’ well before then. Land owners were using their own powers as owners to protect archaeology, buildings and to protect areas well before legislation arrived. In Manchester the Duke of Bridgewater used covenants to protect the last upstanding remains of the wall of the Roman fort at Castlefields [still preserved and invisible under one of the railway viaduct arches close to where the Bridgewater and the Rochdale Canals meet]. Protective legislation for
the historic environment is generally seen as a good thing but it is important to recognize that however good it is, without broader public understanding and support, it becomes very difficult to use successfully and ultimately it will be ineffective. To me this crucial linkage between public support and legislative protection is most evident when we look at the statutory protection of our post-war buildings. And I believe that post-war listing is the most difficult process that we do and is probably the process most open to challenge in the courts, in Parliament, and with the Ombudsman. Quite often the debate that accompanies the decision to list in the press and elsewhere is particularly vociferous when it involves post-war buildings and we are more likely to be accused of having got it wrong here than in any other area of our work.

It seems to me that the common criticisms are based around the view that somehow buildings constructed after 1945 are not in fact heritage at all. In past year in Scotland we have seen a heated debate about the value of the Category A listed Commonwealth Pool in Edinburgh, the Madras College in St Andrews, Fife, Category B [Figs.2 and 3]. And it does not take much for the debate to swing away from specific post-war buildings towards a broader question about whether heritage bodies have lost their sense. But as Michael Russell has already noted in his introduction, common sense would suggest that a country which had such a strong tradition of architectural innovation and achievement up until 1945 was fairly unlikely to have simply lost this art overnight. And if there is no reason why good architecture continued to be built after 1945 then common sense would also suggest that some of it is worthy of protection and will be seen in time as equally important to our earlier significant buildings.

Why then do we find it so hard to protect post-war buildings and why do we find it so hard to win public opinion? There is certainly an anti-modern bias as we saw for example in relation to George Square in Edinburgh and this is particularly the case when new buildings mean the loss of existing historic ones. When the post-war University buildings went up in George Square, as part of the wider masterplan by Basil Spence, understandably there was a massive rearguard against the demolition of what was one of Edinburgh’s earliest planned neo-classical squares [Fig.4]. In the case of Edinburgh that led really to the rebirth of the conversation movement across Scotland. There is a sense therefore that modern buildings are not judged in their own right but frequently are seen in comparison or indeed opposition to earlier buildings.

There is also a broader bias against modern materials such as concrete, steel and glass and again the value of earlier historic buildings often includes an appreciation of traditional – and local - building materials. And aesthetics is a curious thing. We often see earlier buildings and earlier structures as
aesthetically pleasing but there is a
time dimension herein that as many of
you know it was not that long ago that
Victorian and early twentieth century
buildings were not seen of value as
aesthetically but we appreciate them
very differently now. It is worth noting
though that there is often a time lag
between the ‘professional’ recognition
of value and the broader public’s
understanding and appreciation.

If we turn to the argument
frequently mobilized against the listing
of post-war buildings, a common
one relates to planned lifetime. The
argument runs that as the building
was only planned to last thirty years
then surely you should let it go and
allow something else. Well of course
the Eiffel Tower, and the more recent
Millennium Wheel in London, were only
planned to be there for a very short
period of time but that’s not to say
just because a building was originally
planned only to last a short period that
we should not be preserving it.

And we have already heard
this morning, the sheer scale and
dominance of some of the buildings that
were being built in the post-war period
was always likely to be challenging for
local communities and some of these
have clearly been adjudged to have
failed. In some cases, to have failed
in terms of their materials. But more
importantly, in other cases, failed in
terms of the social context and the
social ideals that they were planned to
meet. This debate sees most focus in
recent debates around the creation of
an x-list – that is lists of buildings which
the public wish to see demolished. But
the danger is that this debate begins
to leak into a broader condemnation of
post-war buildings as a whole.

So if we recognize both the potential
importance of some of our post-war
buildings but also the challenge in terms
of public perception and adverse media
coverage, how do we navigate through
these issues? Firstly, as noted above,
time is an important issue. As time
moves forward so we begin to rework
the importance of our architecture and
it becomes easier to carry the message
of importance and to get a more
sympathetic hearing.

Also as time passes so we begin
to see research, publication and
exhibitions on specific architectural
practices and on specific architectures.
This is crucial in terms of building a
better understanding of value in relation
to post-war architecture but also in
terms of a broader acceptability. In
Scotland we have seen recent and
highly successful exhibitions on Gillespie,
Kidd and Coia and also on Basil Spence.
This is part of a process that we see
very regularly - the ‘rehabilitation’ of
the work into acceptability and then
a movement towards recognition as
heritage.

In terms of the listing programmes
at Historic Scotland, the use of thematic
study of specific post-war subjects
helps in terms of building broader public
understanding and sympathy [Figs. 5
& 6]. Through such work you begin
to build narratives and to personalize
the stories in a way that has broader
currency that just historic environment
professionals or architects.

The loss of key buildings also
is highly important in terms of
building broader political and public
understanding and support. Such
events, such as the near loss of
fireplaces at Tattershall Castle in
Lincolnshire in the early twentieth
century, and the more recent loss of the Euston Arch or Firestone Factory in London were key moments in the development of support for conservation and the acceptability of the use of regulatory control.

There are still key challenges for us in terms of justifying the protection of post-war buildings. Whilst obsolescence is not always proven, there are indeed some buildings which their materials, their design, their form, their function has meant it is difficult to rehabilitate. The point here though is that these are unlikely to be selected for protection. But I would say that the rhetoric that all modern buildings have built in obsolesce has to be demonstrated rather than assumed.

The issue of sustainability is a bigger issue in this discussion. Modern buildings can have a very significant carbon footprint in terms of the material used and their transportation. The issue may be ensuring their adaptation towards better energy efficiency rather than their replacement. The irony is not lost on me that heritage professionals were doing sustainability before that word and that concept had ever been invented. And yet we are frequently now portrayed as being anti-sustainability in terms of seeking to preserve modern buildings (which are not always energy efficient) or stopping double-glazing. We have arguments we need to win here and to prepare more case-studies to help us move away from rhetoric to factually-based arguments.

Considerations for us are not just whether we use different designation criteria for post-war buildings but also, when it comes to the consents process, whether we should be using different criteria or placing different weight on the existing considerations. Our sense is that the same criteria apply – but that the bar needs to be very high. And also that the same principles should be applied within the consents process – but that again we need to recognize that the nature of the nature and merit of post-war buildings may mean that in certain cases we need to be flexible in terms of proposals for adaptive re-use. The key thing to remember here is that listing ensures (or at least should ensure) that a proper assessment of significance is undertaken when change is planned and that decisions are taken on the basis of an informed understanding of the implications of the proposals for the significance of the building. Listing though is often mis-portrayed in the media as intended to stop all change and can therefore be understood as such by the broader public. So we do have a tool that can be flexible and can be made to fit the needs of Scotland today. Listing does help us in informing the process of change and the management of change. Used well it can be the springboard on which intelligent decisions can be made;
informed decisions at a particular moment at time.

In planning change, it is worth bearing in mind that many authors writing about post-war architecture place great emphasis on the importance of the original design concept of an architect - the aesthetic, the social and the technical. One advantage in this process for post-war architecture is that there is vastly more information around. Indeed in many cases you can talk to the architect who designed the building and ask them what they were trying to achieve, what their client was trying to achieve and indeed look at the narrative of the building itself. We have hugely more information if we are dealing with a post-war building than we do if we dealing with a building of the 1650s or the 1700s where you would be maybe far more limited in the information. Of course this is not always without its challenges. What do you do if you are looking at a building of 1968 and the architecture says to you “I don’t think it’s a very good building I don’t think it should be preserved”. And that has actually happened.
Another challenge for us which is particularly relevant for post-war buildings is to consider whether we are preserving for its aesthetic technical design in its originality or do we allow in and value evolution. How do we place a value on the evolution of a post-war building from its original concept to the way it is in front of us today?

In drawing this paper to a close I must emphasise that I believe that the most difficult task we do in Historic Scotland relates to the statutory designation of post-war buildings and the subsequent casework relating to change management of these buildings. It is the area that we are most likely to be misunderstood and most likely to be challenged. If we all believe that we have a duty to understand, select and protect parts of Scotland’s post-war heritage – and that we should be doing this now rather than waiting for say another fifty years - then I believe that we have very big task ahead of us in terms of public and political opinion. And if we do not undertake this broader task then we will find that our ability to use the existing legislation for this purpose will be significantly reduced. And it may not just be public and political opinion. Even within organizations like Historic Scotland there is a range of opinion about the value of such buildings and, in particular, how to approach the comparative valuing of post-war buildings against earlier buildings.

So to conclude. Should we protect post-war buildings now? I believe strongly that the answer has to be yes. Do we use the same criteria as earlier buildings? Well as Dr Deborah Mays has said, the answer is yes but we set the bar very high. Do we need to be more transparent? Again I think the argument has to be yes. We need to do far more work to increase public understanding and sympathy. We also need to do more work on the technical side of working with and repairing modern materials in a conservation-minded way. And we need to do much work on the best approaches for adaptive reuse and energy efficiency. Without all of these the danger is the battle will be fought and lost for the wrong reasons. Some of Scotland’s post-war buildings stand on an international stage and deserve protection and celebration [Fig.7]. Today’s conference is part of this process.
SCOTLAND: BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE
This will necessarily be a very brief canter through the collection that is held in the Scottish Screen Archive at the National Library, Scotland. We will look particularly on films that reflect on the built environment in the post-war period. These films were, primarily, made for municipal and national agencies, for education and classroom teaching purposes, and for theatrical and community release. This selection is predominantly drawn from non-broadcast material, works not made for television transmission but for public screening in cinemas, public halls, to be shown at festivals and community events, trade fairs and international ‘expos’ and cultural events.
In terms of the themes that crop up most frequently there is a heavy weighting towards housing, urban renewal and planning, the New Towns in particular, engineering and industrial projects, and transport infrastructure. We have few films about individual grand buildings, or indeed, about the architects themselves. Most films made in the post-war period about architects and designers, tended to have been retrospective and historical, ‘biopics’ if I can call them that, on individuals such as Mackintosh, Greek Thomson, Robert Adam, but nothing substantial on contemporary architects in the second half of the twentieth century. These kinds of historical biographical films emanated partly through the Scottish Arts Council who, in the 1960s and seventies, were sponsoring films about art and culture, but principally they come out of the Films of Scotland collection. Films of Scotland was a committee formed in 1954 with a government remit to produce theatrical short interest films that would present and promote Scotland on the cinema screen, both at home and abroad. Films of Scotland operated for some thirty years and produced over one hundred and fifty films in that period. Most of their films about architecture, building and engineering, were narrative, factual accounts of technical processes, social engineering, and served as a sort of public information film. They could arguably be described as civic and national propaganda. An exception to this, and unique within this body of work, would be Murray Grigor’s *Space and Light*, his elegiac film about Coia’s Catholic Seminary at Cardross on the Firth of Clyde.

The story of post-war building in Scotland, as captured in film, starts in March 1943 with *Homes That England Built* [Fig.1]. Over the course of this fifty-five minute film, we follow a deputation from the Scottish Housing Advisory Committee as they travel to some nine cities in England and visit a wide range of different kinds of styles of housing, including Welwyn Garden City, Bournville, London and the big industrial cities of the north. Their mission – to see for themselves ‘the achievements of local authorities, public utilities and private enterprise’ with a view to informing plans for building Scotland’s post-war homes.
Municipal film making in Scotland was dominated by the Glasgow Corporation. They commissioned over sixty films in the post-war period, to inform the citizenry on matters of public health and welfare, for classroom teaching of civic and local studies, for propaganda, basically, about the Corporation’s work. Quite a number of these films relate to actions being taken on housing improvements, remodelling the city and improving transport and amenities. The Bruce Plan was the first big city improvement scheme to be propagandised in film in *Glasgow Today and Tomorrow*, made for the Corporation Planning Committee, in 1949 [Fig.2]. The extract, from which the soundtrack is reproduced below, shows a huge scale model of the city fathers’ ambitions for sweeping away the Victorian city centre and the surrounding environs and replacing it with a ‘Corbusier style’ cityscape of towers and ring roads.

‘The Glasgow of tomorrow is taking shape. The overcrowded and overdeveloped city will give place to a new and free flowing city, laid out in open manner, and providing ready

2 A vast urban model for a new Glasgow featured, frame enlargement from the 16mm, black and white film *Glasgow Today And Tomorrow*, 1949, sponsored by the Planning Committee Glasgow Corporation. Courtesy of Scottish Screen Archive at National Library of Scotland, ref 3158.
accessibility, a fundamental requisite, particularly of a city centre. This is not just a plan on paper, it is one on which work has already started. The beginning of a new Glasgow, in which it’s people can live and work in comfort, with amenity a primary consideration. There is much more to be done yet, but the new plan is underway. These scenes, of part of the exhibition model, indicate the vast plans which have been prepared to make Glasgow of today a new and better Glasgow of tomorrow.

The New Town corporations also used film in a major way, all five of the Scottish New Towns commissioning, through the Films of Scotland committee, promotional films for community and cinema distribution. The New Towns’ development was also recorded in educational film, for the teaching of modern studies and geography. Here follows a sound extract from one of those educational films called, simply, New Towns, made by Educational Films of Scotland in 1969 [Fig.3].

‘The New Towns were set up as the result of an Act of Parliament following a Royal Commission. Once designed, what should the New Town look like? In the parliamentary debates on the New Town Bill in 1946, Ministers had this to say. Perhaps they’d already seen drawings of the proposed New Town of East Kilbride. “I want to see New Towns gay and bright, with plenty of theatres, concert halls and meeting places. The New Town should provide valuable experience and the best use of leisure. Our New Towns must be beautiful. Here is a grand chance for the revival, or creation, of a new architecture. We must develop, in those who live in the towns, an appreciation of beauty.'
The New Towns can be experiments in design, as well as in living. We want the New Towns to grow into adult and independent towns. We want prosperous communities, with a good average standard of life, and immunity from recurrent bouts of large scale unemployment. In 1956, Welwyn Garden City was already thirty years old, yet it still provided the basis of planning of the New Town of the forties and fifties. Thus, East Kilbride reflected the influence of the Garden City movement, and the writings of a famous Scotsman, Patrick Geddes, often considered the father of modern town planning. East Kilbride occupies over ten thousand acres, and will eventually have a population of seventy to one hundred thousand. It has a traditional town centre, and four residential neighbourhoods, each with its local shopping centre. More than twenty years after its designation, East Kilbride is now a well established town with a good balance of age groups. This is important for, like every other town, the New Town must have both its young families and its elderly townsfolk. A cottage type house for every family was the ideal of the Garden City planner. Widespread motorcar ownership, however, meant easy access to the countryside, and called for new ideas in town planning. With the countryside for his garden, the New Town dweller could be housed in a town with a high density population. Cumbernauld was built to house the same population as East Kilbride, but in half the area. Today, the outcome is normally a balance between high and low density population.

We also have a small but fascinating collection of films made by architects and builders, mostly as amateur cine enthusiasts and, again, mostly about housing. Firstly, We Build Houses made in 1953 [Fig.4]. This film was made by J L Paterson, who served his architectural apprenticeship with Stewart Kay and Partners, during which time he made this film, shot on silent 16mm reversal stock. In the year it completed, it was submitted, and indeed won, the premiere award in the UK wide
competition, the Amateur Cine World’s ‘Ten Best Films of 1954’. The film Paterson made in 1953 portrays a group of unskilled workers, members of the newly formed Dunedin Self Build Association, as they go through each stage of building the houses, designed for them by Stewart Kay, from laying the foundations on the virgin site, to actually moving in on the day they complete the house, still in their working clothes. The complete film lasts for about eleven minutes, and shows every stage and process of building a home.

The Dunedin Self Build Association seems to have thrived. By 1961 they had more than fifty-five houses under construction.

Paterson later joined Robert Matthew Johnson Marshall and Partners, and in the mid 1960s, moved into teaching architecture at Edinburgh College of Art, becoming principal there in 1984. The film was found amongst his papers, now preserved in RCAHMS.

One of the directors of Bett Homes was also a keen amateur cine enthusiast. He filmed on 8mm film creating a unique record of his company’s construction of multi-storey blocks in the 1960s. The complete film lasts twenty-one minutes and is silent. Here is an extract from a 1990’s Grampian Television programme, The Way it Was, where Jim Clark, who was then manager of Bett Homes, talks over the film made by his predecessor, of the system building of multi-storey flats at Trottick, in Dundee [Fig.5].

Presenter to camera: ‘The era for building high rise multi-storey blocks of flats for people to live in, has long passed. In fact, nowadays it’s more fashionable to blow them up or knock them down, but not everywhere. Here in Dundee, for instance, the three high rise blocks at Trottick, remain a prominent feature on the skyline, as they have done for the past thirty years. As you would imagine, their arrival here in the 1960s caused considerable interest. Enough, in fact, to merit a permanent record to be made of them being built’.

Interview with Jim Clark: ‘Now there we are, Jim, there’s the scene before your company put them up. What was the thinking behind the building of these three multi-storeys at Trottick?’

Jim: ‘Very much a system building, to try and push forward housing which was badly needed in the area at the time. They were built faster than
standard multis, and much faster than traditional housing. This is the foundations, the steel work for the foundations, being assembled, which will go in amongst that foundation work there.

‘I must say, they look like very flimsy foundations for a multi-storey’.

‘The brick work was only shuttering to contain the concrete. Rather than using timber, it was found to be easier than that. These are the basement panels, which carry the first ground floor, floor slab, going in now. That’s second floor level with the cranes up now. There are fifteen floors in them. That’s wall panels, which come from a factory. The exterior wall panels you see there came pre-glazed with the windows in them, painted ready. The biggest problem with the wall panels inside is you can’t put a nail in to hold a picture up. Because they were made of concrete. All the kitchens and finishings went in as each floor was assembled, so the joiners could continue inside while the rest of the frame was going up, which saves time, obviously.’

‘How much more quickly could this kind of multi-storey go up, compared with what they were doing before that?’

‘Much faster. The traditional method is casting the concrete as you go.’

‘Staircases, instead of having a cast, it’s lifted in from the factory, and you’re probably talking half the time of a traditional build. Green field to finished building around about twenty-six weeks, or something like that’.

‘Which is very quick. And at that time, in the 1960s, the demand was such that you had to put them up more quickly.’

‘Correct. That’s Dunlop Hill in the background there and the previous multis, which were built traditional, at the back. That’s the new ones nearly completed now, and the flags are flying. That flag was for Bison, who provided the units. They had a Queen’s Award for industry.’

‘And there’s the finished scene’.

We have good coverage of industry, of engineering and transport, again, mostly through the Films of Scotland Committee, portraying Scotland in the modern world. But we also have sponsored films from the big construction companies themselves, and from consortia and trade bodies who were promoting their technical and physical infrastructural developments. So we have footage of building of the Ravenscraig, and Gartcosh steel works, the Linwood car factory for Rootes, of North Sea oil installations, both land and at sea, various hydro schemes, Dounreay, all the big bridges built over the Firths, and the new A9 roadway in the 1980s.

We will see now a very brief extract from one of the bridge films. This is about the Cromarty Bridge [Fig.6]. Interestingly, and unusually the commentary quite often refers to the fact that the bridge design took account of the natural habitat, and the needs of the local bird population, thereby establishing the project’s environmental credibility.

Presenter: ‘The Cromarty Bridge is underway. After four years of planning and design work, four years of tidal flows to be measured and test piles to be driven into the silt, we know the kind of bridge we’ll get and how it will look.’
Engineer: ‘It’s fairly long, but it could be analysed and looked at as sixty-eight simple structures joined together across one wide waterway. Lots of similar bridges might only have two piers or three piers, this one has sixty-seven piers. That makes it special.’

‘To cross a stretch of water measuring over a mile in length, each little bridge will be linked together.’

‘The tide comes in and out, and at one stage we’ve got fourteen to sixteen feet of water, and at another stage we’ve just got a large mudflat. It becomes difficult because there’s water, and that is the thing that makes this separate from most types of structure.’

A number of Scotland’s most highly regarded film makers and documentary camera men of today, several picking up their BAFTA Lifetime Achievement Awards in recent times, worked on these films as young men, developing their skills as photographers and directors. Murray Grigor, now a critically acclaimed film maker specialising in arts and architecture, contributed two very different films to this canon of work, and we will see extracts from both. Firstly, his Space and Light, a homage to Coia’s St Peter’s Seminary at Cardross, first filmed by Murray in colour in 1972, when the building was functioning in its role as a college for the Catholic Church, and more recently, last winter, when he returned to the site and filmed what is now a derelict ruin, in black and white [Fig.7]. We’ll have a look at an extract from his original colour film from 1972. And then to follow that – something completely different. The New Town corporations saw film as an ideal vehicle to promote the New Town ideal, and to attract inward investment, and they commissioned a number of sponsored documentaries that were shown in cinemas and community halls.
St Peter’s Seminary, Cardross, a still from the 16mm colour film Space And Light, 1972, directed by Murray Grigor. Courtesy of Scottish Screen Archive at National Library of Scotland, ref 3071
Fenella Fielding and a map of Cumbernauld, a still from the 35mm colour film Cumbernauld Hit, 1977, directed by Murray Grigor for Cumbernauld Development Corporation. Courtesy of Scottish Screen Archive at National Library of Scotland, ref 4294.
across the UK, but also abroad. From their titles you get a sense of the scope of the films Livingston: A Plan for Living, Cumberland: A Town for Tomorrow, and East Kilbride: A Town on the Move. In 1977, Cumbernauld Development Corporation commissioned Murray Grigor to make a new promotional film. Instead of a dry factual documentary, Murray convinced them to try something more imaginative, a different approach to sell the delights and services that Cumbernauld offers its citizens, to entertain as well as to inform audiences. The result is Cumbernauld Hit, Fenella Fielding at her most gushing, seventies’ fashion excess and kitsch abounds [Fig.8].

‘I am Lianna. My fine furtive friends who have all fed me information; reports, statistics, hard facts, but educated guesses. Now your labour is about to bear fruit. I’ve come far across the world to take charge of this project. Cumbernauld, a New Town, tomorrow already here. A town festooned with awards for community architecture, a veritable jewel in the navel of Scotland. Ladies and Gentlemen, we’re going to hijack Cumbernauld!’

Members of the hijack gang deliver pineapple yoghurt pots full of germ warfare, to every single building in Cumbernauld, so you get to see the new swimming pool, the library, the shopping centre and everything else. And then the gang hold the town to ransom for one hundred million dollars! And a very novel way of selling a New Town.

There are in the Scottish Screen Archive a number of films that reflect on all aspects of the built heritage and architecture in Scotland in the post-war period and earlier. Information about these can be found on our online catalogue, see www.nls.uk/ssa

For Glasgow Corporation films, on the Bruce Plan and seventies’ urban renewal: Best Laid Schemes: www.bestlaidschemas.com
Scotland’s Post-War Architectural Heritage: The National Collection at RCAHMS

The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) creates a unique national collection through its own survey and research, and by identifying and collecting material relevant to the built environment of Scotland. As a non-regulatory body, RCAHMS can record the post-war built-environment dispassionately within the long-term research perspective of what future generations will find representative of contemporary architecture.

The following paper is an addition to the Transactions, detailing an important resource for the identification and recording of buildings from the period.
Scotland’s Post–War Architectural Heritage: The National Collection at RCAHMS

RESEARCH AND SURVEY

RCAHMS’s principle aim is to undertake strategic and thematic studies and bring together collections from working architectural practices and other key sources well in advance of any threat of demolition or consideration for preservation in order to create a representative record that is as comprehensive as can reasonably be achieved [Fig.1]. This applies equally to post-war architecture as to all other periods of human history in Scotland. No cut-off date is applied, the criteria for recording relating to representative examples of type or architectural practice, significance, character, urban setting, and value to future research. Additionally, under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, RCAHMS has a statutory right to record buildings that are under threat of demolition or change. This is also harnessed to ensure that, prior to significant change, adequate records are made of buildings of any period for the future.
use of scholars, heritage professionals and the general user. RCAHMS is working with local authorities and other built environment professionals to develop a more strategic approach to threat-based recording, particularly where development threatens post-war architecture.

A broad-based approach to surveying and collecting is particularly well suited to the large post-war planning of entire new areas or redevelopment of nineteenth century city slums. While the traditional nineteenth century emphasis on individual bespoke architect-designed buildings can be given due attention by recording public architecture such as churches, schools, administrative buildings, and hospitals, equally important is the ordinary architecture of the houses, streets and industrial zones of these new environments. A topographical site-based approach counteracts any tendency to give dominance to art-historical notions of architectural merit, any particular architect or individual building, and it positions architectural work within the broader urban environment.
Private practice architects’ papers from this era also cover a full range of building types, from a firm’s important public works, to its ‘bread and butter’ domestic work and alterations.

The recently adopted Urban Survey Programme will extend the survey work to enable map-based recording of complex urban areas including industrial sites, which will provide research not only on the historical geography of towns but also their essential and distinctive characters. This work complements the comprehensive aerial photographic cover of Scotland, dating from 1940s to the present day that provides snapshots of our towns and cities as they developed through the decades.

The recording of threatened buildings, pioneered by the Scottish National Buildings Record (SNBR) had, in the 1980s and 1990s, far-reaching implications for the development of RCAHMS collecting and recording activities relating to the post-war built environment. The SNBR, later incorporated into RCAHMS, was one of a new cluster of interwar and early post-war cultural and preservation initiatives to focus on old historic burgh houses which were imminent targets of slum clearance. A broad mixture of threat-based and systematic recording of diverse building types characterised SNBR work in the 1950s and 1960s, but one of the enduring legacies is the strong representation of architectural collections from private practices that specialised during the 1940s and 1950s in site-sensitive modern vernacular redevelopments, and were also heavily involved in pioneering post-war preservation. Academic and heritage interest has inevitably expanded to include new buildings and sites of the 1980s and 1990s Post-Modern era with an increasing interest in the history of the Conservation Movement itself.

The incorporation in 1985 of the Scottish Industrial Archaeology Survey into RCAHMS also paved the way for a systematic coverage of the vanishing traditional heavy industry of Scotland. Examples from this strategic programme include the products of 1950s coal-mining expansion, such as Monktonhall Colliery (recorded 1989 prior to demolition) and Rothes Colliery (surveyed 1993) [Fig.2]. The vanishing steel industry (Ravenscraig Steel Works, built from 1957, and recorded prior to demolition in 1990), and de-commissioned nuclear and coal-powered stations (Hunterston ‘A’ Nuclear Generator, recorded prior to demolition, surveyed 1989, and Kincardine Power Station, surveyed 1999) were also included.

This long term threat-based approach has also included a wide range of non-industrial types under threat, ranging from Victorian lunatic asylums to Cold War defence sites, and coming forward to the mass post-war buildings now suddenly in many cases functionally obsolete. The scale of the threat to Scotland’s post-war heritage over the last three decades is reflected in the RCAHMS collection, covering all significant post-war building types: hospitals and asylums (Carstairs State Hospital, 1950s extension area, surveyed 1994, and Lennox Castle Hospital complex, surveyed prior to closure 1996, and subsequent demolition); decommissioned post-Cold War defence facilities (MHQ Pitreavie Underground Headquarters, surveyed
prior to closure 1996); factory closures
[Cummins Diesel Factory, surveyed
1996 prior to closure]; and young
churches burdened with technical
problems (St Benedict’s, Drumchapel,
recorded prior to demolition in 1990).
The records of post-war housing
schemes threatened with demolition
and regeneration in the 1990s, ranging
from tower blocks to small prefabs, are
numerous. Significant among them are
Basil Spence’s Hutchesontown-Gorbals
CDA, Area C [surveyed 1993 prior to
and during demolition]; Royston CDA,
Area B [recorded 1992]; and Dundee’s
massive Ardler Estate [surveyed 1997].
Broader threat-based recording in the
late 1990s focussed on the vanishing
1950s and 1960s site-sensitive neo-
vernacular housing developments in the
east of Scotland (Dysart & Buckhaven
Central Redevelopments recorded in
1997 and 2001 respectively), and post-
war schools earmarked for demolition
as a result of the 1990s Private Public
Partnership project (Craigmouth High
School, Edinburgh, and Smithycroft High
School, Glasgow, both surveyed prior to
demolition in 2002) [Fig.3].

As part of the strategic approach
a series of thematic and topographical surveys have enhanced the collections, and in particular the Area Photographic Survey greatly expanded post-war built environment coverage. Beginning with the Glasgow and the Clyde-side area, this has focused mainly on urban areas, chiefly comprising images of post-war housing schemes, schools, hospitals, and new administrative and commercial town centres. All significant urban areas have now been covered. In particular, the survey has included post-war New Towns (East Kilbride, built from 1947; Glenrothes, from 1948; Cumbernauld, from 1957; Irvine, 1962; and Livingston, 1966) [Fig.4]. Despite being a multi-award winning New Town, receiving the acclaimed American Institute of Architects R S Reynolds Award for Community Architecture in 1967, by the early 1990s Cumbernauld had acquired a notorious reputation, amidst a general anti-Modern Movement climate, as one of Britain’s most reviled product of post-war architecture and planning. Six post-war buildings have been listed in the new town area: four religious and educational buildings by the avant-garde Scottish practice Gillespie Kidd & Coia, and two churches by Alan Reiach. Independently of any preservation agendas, RCAHMS was able to carry out a full ground and aerial photographic survey of the town between 1990 and 1991, and began archive gathering in anticipation of the winding-up of the Cumbernauld Development Corporation in 1993.

4 Cumbernauld Town Centre, during part demolition in 2000.
© Crown Copyright: RCAHMS. Licensor www.rcahms.gov.uk
This included the most significant architectural and planning elements of the new town design – its layout, housing patterns, landscape, its massive megastructural Town Centre (G Copcutt, Phase I, 1963-7), its churches, and educational buildings. The renowned Town Centre was part demolished and refurbished from 1999-2007, and RCAHMS recorded this painfully slow demise in 1991, 1999 and 2000. Interestingly, during a public poll for the most popular archive image of Scotland’s Treasured Places, run as part of RCAHMS centenary celebrations in 2008, the architectural drawing of Geoffrey Copcutt’s design, prepared by Michael Evans circa 1963 of Cumbernauld city centre came in the top ten.

**POST-WAR ARCHITECTS’ PAPERS**

Post-war records held by RCAHMS have primarily been acquired within the last twenty years. They lie within collections of office papers, many salvaged in collaboration with the Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland (RIAS) whose collections are cared for by RCAHMS. Aside from the papers of individual practices, there are several other sources that contribute towards an understanding of the period. Public works are well represented in the wide-ranging work of the Property Services Agency throughout Scotland including a very large collection of photographic negatives, along with those of their predecessors the Ministry of Public Building and Works and the Department of the Environment, while the Saltire Society Collection of competition boards illustrate public projects from across the country. The private house building industry is represented most specifically by the Mactaggart & Mickel Collection.

Unlike the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), RCAHMS has not systematically courted contemporary architects to encourage the deposit of post-war design drawings but it has developed relationships with certain practices in order to secure agreement for the preservation of their records. The most notable example of this approach is the agreement reached with Ian G Lindsay & Partners, successor to Ian G Lindsay’s practice, which ensured the gradual transferral of virtually all drawings and photographs to RCAHMS [Fig.5]. This archive represented a watershed in RCAHMS collecting policy because when the practice finally closed in 1992, it was decided, for the first time, to also take in office files. This was in recognition of the needs of those researching architecture of this period but also of wider trends within institutions acquiring architectural material that sought a more comprehensive view, not only of the work of specific designers but of their building projects and working practices.

Ian G Lindsay & Partners was one of many Scottish architectural
5 Proposed 1960 design for housing at Lochgilphead. A perspective from the Ian G Lindsay Collection.
© RCAHMS [Ian G Lindsay Collection]. Licensor www.rcahms.gov.uk
practices to close or downsize in the challenging financial climate of the early 1990s that led to a great many architectural records becoming vulnerable to destruction or dispersal. A market in architectural archives was starting to develop to fill the stores of the new architecture centres that were appearing in Europe, North America and Canada at this time but this new attitude to the financial value of entire archives had yet to impact on what was happening with post-war Scottish architectural archives. However, in later years it was to result in the acquisition of James Stirling’s archive by the Canadian Centre for Architecture.

RCAHMS approach to this situation was strategic. The critical issue was to assess the scale of the problem and so the Scottish Survey of Architectural Practices (SSAP) was set up in 1992 to establish what existed in Scotland and what might be at risk. One hundred practice archives were surveyed over a four-year period and several archives were deposited with RCAHMS as a result. Connections with RIAS were strengthened so that a combined approach could be taken as and when the need to salvage material arose – an early example of this co-operation being the rescue of the Spence Glover & Ferguson archive in 1992 [Fig.6].

It soon became clear that the volume of material brought in was beyond RCAHMS resources to deal with. Fortunately, it was successful in its first application to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) in 1999 for a project to catalogue and conserve 195,800 architectural papers; a large proportion of these date from the post-war period and are searchable on Canmore. SSAP also surveyed the planning records amassed by most of Scotland’s 214 Dean of Guild Courts to establish what survived within local authority building control departments.

The immediate effect of this focus on entire office archives was that the stores of RCAHMS began
to fill rapidly due to the exponential increase in material being acquired. There were, however, losses too. By the time RCAHMS was aware of the disposal of Spence Glover & Ferguson’s records, the office files had been destroyed and while the drawings and photographs survived, these had to be moved immediately. Whilst significant logistical challenges were presented by salvaging large archives in this way, collecting continued because the validity of preserving the breadth of projects contained in these collections was recognised. Collectively these large archives tell us more than the history of individual firms. Through them we can trace social and economic trends, explore building technology and trace design influences.

Although many of these office archives were acquired reactively, they
can be categorised in broad terms. There are several that describe the work of award-winning, published and influential designers such as Alan Reiach, Morris and Steedman, Peter Wormersley and Basil Spence [Fig.7]. Holdings are strong for architects who contributed to the growing conservation movement in Scotland, and in addition to Lindsay include Leslie Grahame Thomson Macdougall and Walter Schomberg Scott. Many relate to the work of generalist practices that undertook a variety of more every-day work, both domestic and commercial, but in doing so contributed much to the changing post-war landscape of Scotland. In terms of sheer volume, the archives of Hurd Rolland and Robert Matthew Johnson-Marshall & Partners, acquired in 2005, are the largest collections of office papers relating to the post-war period held by RCAHMS. These important archives are noteworthy because they were acquired through agreement with practices still in operation.

The dominance of public sector architecture during the post-war period is not overtly expressed in the RCAHMS holdings given that the relevant bodies, such as the New Town Corporations, have, in the main, made arrangements for the retaining their own records. However, since most architects in private practice were reliant on commissions from the public sector, many collections within RCAHMS contain material that is pertinent to an understanding of the period. Alexander Buchanan Campbell, for example, worked for the Development Corporations of East Kilbride and Glasgow; Carr & Matthew, provided housing schemes for war-damaged Clydebank and Meadowbank; and the Fife-based firm of Haxton & Watson designed schemes for the Scottish National Housing Company Ltd [Fig.8]. Other areas of public sector investment that are illustrated through the Collections include the development of the Hydro-Electric Power industry, which is a key part of the Shearer & Annand Collection.

There were many opportunities for design in the commercial sector once the economy began to recover after the War and the papers of large firms such as J & F Johnston and Dick Peddie & McKay demonstrate how they began to specialise in shop frontages and interiors. The Henry Wylie Archive, though small by contrast, is of particular interest in representing the work of a sole architect with a specific interest in contemporary industrial design as shown in the work of the company DISC (Design and Industrial Styling Consultants) which Wylie set up in the late 1950s.

Individual archives relating to significant post-war projects are rare within RCAHMS, a notable exception being Barry Gasson’s entire design archive for the Burrell Collection in Glasgow. The Scottish Parliament Project for example is currently only represented by a small collection of Enric Miralles’ design models, although RCAHMS has made a photographic survey of the competition entries. The competition entries for the new Museum of Scotland building were acquired, although unfortunately Benson and Forsyth’s winning scheme was not deposited with the set.
8 The Dollan Baths, East Kilbride circa 1968. Buchanan Campbell Collection.
© Courtesy of RCAHMS (Alexander Buchanan Campbell Collection). Licensor www.rcahms.gov.uk
PROMOTING UNDERSTANDING

A number of recent RCAHMS initiatives have focused on promoting a greater understanding of the complexities of the post-war era and in fostering greater public awareness and understanding of architecture and the built environment. Stronger academic links have been fostered through the recognition of RCAHMS as an Independent Research Organisation by the Arts & Humanities Research Council in 2006: an ‘inventory’ of Cumbernauld New Town, for example, was completed in 2008 under a joint AHRC PhD project. The Basil Spence archive and research project of 2005-08 (in partnership with National Galleries of Scotland, the University of Warwick, Edinburgh College of Art, and the Lighthouse, and supported by the HLF), produced an array of project outcomes including exhibitions, publications, and educational and creative workshops. These programmes of public engagement not only reinstated the public reputation of this highly significant twentieth century architect, but helped people to recognise the purpose and value of his design and the influence of architecture on our daily lives.

Our centenary work on Treasured Places demonstrated the importance of places to people as part of individual stories and national identities and included a significant proportion of twentieth century architecture in the programme of work. RCAHMS is committed to encouraging community groups and individuals to celebrate their national culture and to enjoy the towns and cities where they live. To do this, often working in partnership with other organisations, we are using our research, recording and collections to stimulate public interest in the historic and built environment around them, much of which is, inevitably, of post-war origin.
SCOTLAND: BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE

TRANSACTIONS

To north from shopping area
The panel discussion gave an important platform for delegates, along with key representatives from the built environment, to consider the particular issues affecting the post-war heritage and to make suggestions on the way forward.
Precis of Key Issues Emerging from the Panel Discussion

The session was moderated adeptly by Pauline McLean. The panel members were Neil Baxter, Malcolm Cooper, Malcolm Fraser, Miles Glendinning, David Page and Raymond Young. Discussion began with questions tabled in advance by conference delegates followed by questions taken from the floor, over 90 minutes.

The key issues considered by the panel were:
• the suitability of post-war buildings to satisfy modern standards for energy performance
• the nature of public regard for post-war architecture
• the importance of narrative, social and contextual considerations in evaluating a building’s significance
• growing sympathies with old (state-driven) modernism from an aversion to the new (privately led)
• the perceived anonymity of modern design and its response or otherwise to the local vernacular
• the lack of recognition and definition for what constitutes modern vernacular
• the appropriateness or otherwise of
internationally inspired designs on Scottish soil

- the place of creating a virtual record of a building instead of seeking its physical retention
- the value of understanding the requirements of the place (notably climatic) in providing good design, learning from long-established tradition and vernacular forms
- the place of corrective surgery and when and why a building may be deemed to be beyond this
- the idea of leaving outstanding post-war examples as stabilised ruins until funding allows for appropriate restoration
- the need to identify the skills necessary for new design in historic settings
- the need to deliver these skills effectively to local authorities, developers, architects and clients and embed them within the planning process
- the degree to which factors such as management, maintenance and economic issues have coloured regard for the mass housing of the period and how they remain critical in finding a way forward
- the quality (positive or negative) of post-war construction
- the absence from the architect’s education since 1945 of detailed training in the specialist crafts
- the stability of a building’s architecture and its design philosophy versus the short-term swings of social customs and changing opinions
- the ability of post-war building materials and construction to support a sustainable future
- the need for craftsmanship, appropriate usage, careful construction and repair to ensure longevity, regardless of the material
- the prevailing use of mass-produced components sourced from abroad and their impact on new design
- the apparent disincentive in the current VAT system with regard to retaining existing buildings and their repair
- the desirability of financial incentives to encourage reuse of the existing building stock, particularly with the benefit of reducing emissions.

What follows is a report of the views of a range of individuals and does not necessarily reflect those of Historic Scotland. It is distilled from the discussions around these issues. The comments were made in a free and frank exchange of views, expertise and opinions and as such have not been attributed.

**Question 1**

Steven Tolson, Ogilvie Construction UK:

A popular Modern Movement principle was ‘form follows function’. While some modern buildings are beautifully formed, does the panel believe that such buildings can be adapted to achieve a sustainable function and a low-carbon future?

The panel agreed that, in respect of climate change, there is a need to work with existing buildings rather than unquestioningly replacing old stock to
achieve buildings with better standards of insulation. They considered that the first question asked in determining the future of a property should be: ‘How can we retain this building?’ This should replace the assumption, which is particularly acute for 1960s stock, that we should knock it down. Post-war buildings can outperform buildings being constructed today in terms of their extreme sturdiness, and should not be relegated thoughtlessly to landfill sites.

To achieve this, an important starting point is an understanding of the construction and the materials with which post-war buildings were made. The work of Historic Scotland’s Technical Conservation Group in this area was cited. While sustainability is not a factor at present in determining if a building is of special architectural or historic interest, the question can be considered.

Rather than adopting new build as the only avenue to satisfying energy performance, the industry should recognise that interventions into historic buildings can make them more sustainable and more energy efficient, and can reduce carbon emissions. Our understanding of the challenge and the available technology has advanced considerably in the past decade and a range of new techniques are being found to suit particular circumstances. The case is well illustrated by the example of double glazing and double-glazed units: the technology of these ten years ago was so poor it was not acceptable, but some high-quality double-glazed units are now becoming available. The overhaul and retention of the original windows remains preferable and more sustainable, but in certain circumstances, when beyond this, technology is beginning to provide acceptable alternatives. We should be confident that in five or ten years’ time we will have a wider range of solutions than are available today.

Historically, we accept that buildings are a mix of many periods of construction – Siena Cathedral, for example – and we should consider the need to adopt a new historic aesthetic. We need to allow our contemporary modern buildings to be different, to embody the energies that are there, to accentuate the most characterful elements, while allowing a more complex architectural form to emerge which is in tune with our historic cities.

Understanding of maintenance and management is critical. The buildings from the 1960s are seen as being low-cost constructions which are now requiring high maintenance. But we have failed to maintain them to the standard that was originally intended. We need to consider their upkeep and adaptation to reduce carbon emissions and reject the question of demolition.

There is a need to address the problems facing the system-built designs of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s in terms of their energy efficiency and their inherent sustainability.

In setting targets to reduce carbon emissions, Scottish Ministers need first to assess and analyse the energy performance of our existing building stock to provide baseline information. This is a huge exercise but it is critical to determining the necessary remediation and providing the expertise. The regular Scottish House Condition Surveys give some information on the performance of our building stock, but this data needs to be developed.

Spending money on good maintenance remains a sound
investment. The thriving post-war estate in Aberdeen, described in Miles Glendinning’s paper, illustrates the success of this. Initiatives to maintain buildings to as a high a standard as possible will impact positively on environmental issues.

**QUESTION 2**

**Robert Forbes, Planner, Aberdeen City Council:**

*Is the public disenchanted with modernism simply as a result of the tendency to increasingly regard buildings as a product within a global marketplace, a reflection of the deliberate failure of architecture and planning to reflect local vernacular and adequately embrace the ‘genius loci’ of places, or is it merely symptomatic of a lack of design awareness?*

A report that the majority of the public are disenchanted with post-war buildings is simply not accurate. The evidence of discussion among a random cross section of the general public on a football website, for example, has revealed support for modern architecture (if within limits – as it does not extend to the St James Centre, Edinburgh). There is a far more nuanced response. Recent condemnation of the buildings of the 1960s can be compared to the equally unjustified dismissal of Victorian buildings in the decades immediately following that period.

We need to open up the way we talk about the built environment, to go beyond economics, considering important elements such as the relationship to nature, the light, the gathering space, the democratic space. Consideration should be given to extending the principles of listing to include social impact.

There is a knee-jerk reaction against modern architecture which may relate to an inadequate narrative. Many buildings, spaces and places have social significance in the sense of being associated with the narratives of people or communities; but these things in their own right are not enough to justify listing because, even if legislation allowed us to protect on that basis, there would be contradictory arguments about their value. Debates in Northern Ireland about whether or not to protect the H-blocks at the Maze Prison illustrate this. Whose narrative is to be listened to in terms of their importance? Consideration of the Dounreay Fast Reactor sphere presents similar issues: some would argue it should be protected for all time as an iconic structure, while others would like to see it removed as representative of a very controversial scientific experiment.

A useful example can be found in East Manchester, where preparations for the Commonwealth Games included a regeneration of the building stock which was carefully targeted towards the creation of social cohesion. The simple solution was the retention of some of the older buildings, the pubs on street corners, which – if not that important architecturally – were critical in terms of narrative and allowing people to understand their environment. There are good reasons to accompany listing proposals for the post-war period with more of a narrative, to help people understand and encourage their involvement. This approach is already in place and successful for
consideration of Victorian, Georgian or 1930s architecture. Of course, if there is no sympathy and no meaning for our architecture in the communities in which that architecture sits, the likelihood of being able to maintain an argument for a building’s protection is reduced very significantly.

In carrying out overviews of building types that are dear to communities – such as sports buildings, cinemas and pubs – we are better able to explain the narrative which informs the listing process and the value of the designation across all building types and periods. Such choice examples help to bring the principles to the people in an intelligible form and improve the understanding of the system of protecting our heritage. Considerable advances have been made here in the last ten years.

Buildings are one component of what makes a successful place, but they are by no means the only one. Their context, how people relate to them, the setting and things like engineering and road standards are crucial, and all these things have a part to play in people’s everyday existence.

The regard for post-war buildings may be changing just as the reaction to the drivers of modernism is changing. Old modernism was state-driven, basically social democratic and collectivist, but the public became disenchanted with its ethos in the late 1960s and 1970s, and a more individualistic society emerged, bringing a new modernism founded on private initiative and linked to the global marketplace. This modernism has in turn disillusioned its audience, and many feel now that the iconic buildings of the new era could arguably be sited anywhere – in Edinburgh, or Barcelona, or Dubai. As a result, the identikit individualism of new modernism is meeting increasing scorn when compared with the high ideals of its immediate predecessor.

Discussion must also recognise the volume of non-architecture in the suburban sprawl, in the retail parks, in the fringes of every town and city in this country, much of which has not involved an architect. There is a need to concentrate attention on persuading people to involve architects in creating and developing our cities.

There would be value in distinguishing between what makes good architecture and what makes bad, just as we distinguish between what makes good and bad art. Historic Scotland has identified 192 examples of good post-war architecture which could be displayed for the public. These are good buildings – power stations, churches, fine houses. There would be an acceptance that we have around two hundred great artists in Scotland, and along with this an acceptance that there are forty thousand not-great artists whose works are barely seen. The difficulty for architecture is that it displays its wares.

There is a lack of clarity as to what constitutes ‘vernacular’. When Alexander Thomson was providing his Greek-inspired designs a hundred and fifty years ago, no one raised concerns about his disregard of the local vernacular. Yet there is today a dismissal of modern housing estates seen as inspired by Spanish haciendas, despite an acceptance of design inspired from abroad two hundred years ago. Should we seek to return to a vernacular of the but-and-ben, with crowstepped gables and thatch as the
only acceptable form? The best Scottish architecture has always been of an international quality, drawing influences from all over the world, and this is to be celebrated. There is a need to recognise the local vernacular that emerged in the past fifty years and to explain how it came about. We need to publicise, to capture the imagination and to help people to understand their story. This will serve to nurture an understanding of what vernacular is about.

**QUESTION 3**

**Dr Iain Bruce**

*Basil Spence’s Queen Elizabeth Square* (built 1958, demolished 1993) was built on his interpretation of pilotis which in the Mediterranean climate provided the welcoming amenity of a cooling breeze – but in the West of Scotland, a rain-sodden wind tunnel. What would have been the issues had it been considered for listing?

Historic Scotland is currently carrying out a thematic survey of the work of Basil Spence. If this Square had still existed, it would have been part of this overview. It would have been considered under the standard criteria applied for designation – age and rarity, architectural and historic significance, and close historical association. Considered amongst these would be the reasons for its success or failure socially, its technical performance and the quality of its design.

While Basil Spence was a brilliant formalist, there are those who point out that he made two mistakes with the design of Queen Elizabeth Square. He put two blocks close together and orientated them wrongly so that one side was perpetually dark and damp, casting incredible shadows. The idea was beautiful, with two-storey interiors, but the positioning and orientation created an uninhabitable environment.

There may be occasions when the building itself need not be saved to recognise its historic significance. In the case of Spence, the collection of his drawings survives and is preserved. Recording may on occasion be a justifiable option. There is a far greater range of information surviving for the 20th century. Historic Scotland and the Dictionary of Scottish Architects are currently working with the Edinburgh College of Art and the RIAS to capture the period through the main practitioners and a programme of oral recordings. There is, however, an issue of authenticity. A previous suggestion that a virtual record of our heritage may on occasion be adequate now that the technology allows for this was made in England some years ago. However we would not accept this for fine art, for a favourite painting by Matisse. The idea must therefore be treated with considerable caution. It is critical to get the thinking the right way around.

If a building is beyond restoration for whatever reason and has to be demolished, then there is a duty on those managing the heritage to seek its preservation through other media, and the process for this already exists in the legislation.

There are good reasons to consider the success of our historic vernacular. The Victorians wanted to knock down Stromness High Street and put ‘a nice straight proper street’; however, this proposal failed to recognise the local climate. Their plans would have
created a wind tunnel. Stromness’s higgledy-piggledy streets, and the perpendicular houses with outshots which frame them, snag and dissipate the wind. There are lessons for us in the form and longevity of the local vernacular. Understanding of local climatic conditions must be central to any consideration for modern design. Reiach & Hall’s Pier Arts Centre in Stromness shows the success of this. It may not be a matter of importing inspiration from international sources, but rather one of understanding what is important about the locality. Modern and contemporary design can bring new ideas and fresh thinking.

Corrective surgery should be considered when determining the future of the post-war building stock. The prospect of demolition would not, for example, even have been entertained for more historic buildings such as those by Robert Adam or Christopher Wren, where elements of their schemes had failed for design reasons. We now have more technology and techniques available. We should consider if the problem may be put right, or if it is beyond solution or the only solution is one which would destroy the philosophy behind the building.

The consents process in Scotland (for managing change to listed buildings), and that for south of the border, takes into account whether there are arguments that a building really has reached the end of its useful life. This is going to be an issue for St Peter’s Seminary, Cardross, which has deteriorated significantly but which is an important building. The issue for all of us to consider is: have we reached the point where its future is irrecoverable? Or is there some sort of viable use now, or a potential use for some stage in the future, which means we should be holding onto it?

There may be an option for buildings such as Spence’s Hutchesontown or Gillespie Kidd & Coia’s St Peter’s becoming ruins in the manner of many former cathedrals or castles. Some people would rather see the more outstanding post-war buildings stabilised as ruins rather than converted inappropriately. Stabilisation would allow the option of restoration should future economics allow.

We are living through an interesting period with a growing acceptance of the buildings of fifty years ago. Scotland is now creating buildings of international excellence, which stand in comparison with the best in Europe, as shown annually through the Doolan Awards. This should help to facilitate recognition of our past successes.

**Question 4**

**Chris Winter,**

**Historic Towns Forum:**

> Are there plans to support and train local authority officers and elected members with regard to ensuring high-quality design for contemporary buildings in historic contexts?

Historic Scotland’s Inspectorate has been working with the Scottish Government and with Architecture and Design Scotland to provide guiding principles for new design in historic settings, for publication in spring 2010. However, as highlighted in the recent summit on the built environment, while we have some tremendous success stories in Scotland, we could be better at sharing those successes, drawing
out the principles and making them easier for others to draw upon.

Critical in this is how actively the public adopt the guidance that is produced. We have a natural habit, in this country, of not following up drafted guidance with targeted training, development, discussion groups and monitoring so that the practice is embedded in the thinking and actions of our country. We need to instate a programme of outreach for these principles, with the local authorities and all relevant stakeholders including architects and their clients. Today’s conference is a good example of how we should engage with a much wider group of people in this exercise.

Certainly, the existence of the appropriate expertise among councillors and their planning officials is open to question. They are bombarded with demands, and have little time to reflect. Good urban design requires considerable training and experience. There are opportunities and challenges in how we create the right kind of places and recognising this Jim Mackinnon, as Chief Planner, is keen to improve the system.

Proper analysis of the built environment and understanding of context are crucial as a first step in urban design. We must reach beyond the current position where it is possible to tick the necessary boxes and yet produce a mediocrity. The process of design is a creative one and should not be mechanistic. Is it possible to reach a point where local authority officers involved in new design understand what is good architecture through a system of checks, ‘painting by numbers’, which is alien to the creative process?

To ensure high-quality medical treatment, you would enlist good doctors and obtain good facilities. The same applies to high-quality urban design and planning. Put the necessary quality of staff and training in place and it should be possible to differentiate between mediocrity and what is good.

At the front of the process, there must be intelligent procurement. Some say that we adhere to European legislation in this, and argue that this is counterproductive for Scotland. We must use architects who can create the future of the cities rather than putting this future in the hands of accountants within local authorities who do not have an understanding of what they are purchasing. You cannot purchase architecture in the same way you purchase paper clips.

The answer is of course not simply a matter of hiring a good architect. The best places are often the product of a partnership between a good designer and a good client – the partnership develops the creativity. We need to ensure that the community at large is more involved. The 1940s and 1950s were dominated by an architecture of democracy – the people’s architecture – rather than the dominant approach today of private individual and private patron. There are positive arguments for a partnership of community and architect. There are superb examples of such creativity in Scotland, where there is a community client.

On the medical model, Malcolm Cooper mentioned spotting a book recently, in the medical section of a bookshop, entitled A Quick Reference Guide to Surgery. This was a worrying concept and certainly not the way forward for our built environment.
Comments and questions from the floor

Riccardo Marini, City Design Leader, City of Edinburgh Council:

There were indeed some microclimate issues at Queen Elizabeth Square which we could possibly have dealt with. The flats in themselves were stunning, a brilliant section, brilliant plan, a nice place to be with elevated views. There were however problems of social ordering, which is a UK-wide problem for modernist housing. The buildings of Moss Side were a picture when put up, but we would not wish to live there now. The social conditions of these places are severe, and it is difficult as such for the buildings to be loved or cherished. While we, as architects, can look at them and comment on their design quality, the environment we have created as council officials and managers are condemning them forever. We need to ensure, before pulling these buildings down, that their replacements are significantly better. It is relatively easy to consider listing fine churches or private houses, but large sections of mass housing provide a different challenge. It is rather the social management of these areas which makes or breaks their future. The success of the Aberdeen examples cited is encouraging. The way we develop the infrastructure for the future has to do with the people that we force to live in it.

The model of Edinburgh’s New Town and the local initiative which saved it is perhaps one to be considered for equivalent post-war mass-housing schemes such as Cumbernauld. However, such focus requires agreement at a national level on the outstanding nature of the commodity which, while possible for the 18th-century New Town, might not be possible for Cumbernauld. The Aberdeen example is outstanding because of its condition and maintenance. There is probably not an equivalent for the estates of the late 1960s and early 1970s which, like buses, came in quick succession across the country and did not have the unique claim of Edinburgh’s New Town.

Craigmillar and Wester Hailes illustrate the impact of social problems following mass unemployment, and it was convenient for society to blame the architecture – the building of these places – for these problems. Wester Hailes has escaped the scale of demolition that Craigmillar has encountered, but the latter has as a result provided a good example of an economically driven business model, of new urbanism, which relegates everything to a landfill site, and then faces financial stalemate. Inadequate consideration was given to the buildings’ reuse.

Besides maintenance, the other key issue is management. Students, when asked what should or should not be built in the future, often reply that deck access and underground car parks should be avoided; however, estates such as Cowcaddens, where both of these components exist, are hugely successful with waiting lists. While its location has helped Cowcaddens, so has the quality of its management and maintenance.

The impact of unemployment on the real and perceived quality of a place
can be detrimental. The Drumchapel estate, Glasgow, shows this well. The houses were designed with coal fires but as the price of coal shot up, and unemployment figures grew, the residents could not afford to heat their house as designed and the environment started to malfunction. The houses got damp, and the knock-on effect was considerable. We must consider always the impact of the economic and political reality on the architecture.

**David Stark, Director, Keppie Design:**

You have covered a good range of issues. But to me, there are probably two reasons why architecture of the 1960s and 1970s was so unloved by the public. One was, as you said, its disregard and disrespect for heritage and the past, the other was the lack of craftsmanship in architecture at the time, education probably having a lot to do with this. We were taught modernism, but we were not taught how to build it. I think a lot of people would have been quite happy with modern architecture if the buildings did not leak, were not draughty, did not start falling to bits, and did not require such high maintenance. This is still something we need to learn from. I am nervous when people talk of good or bad architecture or architects, at an intellectual level, because what really matters is how people respond to buildings and how they live in them. There are certainly procurement issues that get in the way of good design. The lack of esteem that people have for architects, because of the poor quality of buildings from the 1960s and 1970s, has resulted in project managers, cost consultants, design-and-build contractors, bureaucrats and so on being trusted more when policies have been drawn up. It has taken us a long time to try and claw our way back to influence how good design can arise.

There are obvious disagreements as to the changing craft of architecture, as some consider it has in fact declined since the 1960s. There is no general craft of making buildings now. Buildings tend to be assemblages of components. We do not understand how they will perform, yet some of the buildings of the 1960s had clarity and integrity in their construction that puts these to shame. It would be interesting to think that in twenty years, buildings designed by the panel members should be considered for listing. We should consider a return to that care, craft and integrity.

Architecture in the 1960s and 1970s played for high stakes, it played to take over the world, it had a vision, but it lost the bet. It might take a whole century to redress the architect’s position in society.

Raymond Young explained how, having gained his Part 3 qualification as an architect, and setting about tenement rehabilitations, he produced a set of drawings for the various tradesmen. The plumber took one look at them and invited Raymond to spend some time with him to see how things actually go together. It made him realise that an architect could go through seven years of training and work in an architect’s office for a year but still have little idea how the building was constructed physically. In Japan, it seems that they do not allow students to qualify until they have produced a building themselves, with their own
hands. The separation between what we think we want, and what the skilled tradesmen on the ground can produce, needs to be addressed. The problem has been sown in the last sixty years and needs to be reversed.

It is critical to work with the buildings. The case of the High Point flats in North London illustrates the logic. These were seen as marvellous when first built but, following decline, were later seen as dreadful and requiring demolition, yet now they are perceived as desirable once more and fetch premium rates. The architecture is still essentially the same architecture and the philosophy is essentially the same philosophy. What has changed is rather the social context. We need to learn from this and be cautious. Heritage professionals and architects who take the long view are very good at this, because it is often social customs that are changing. We have to be very aware of short-term-ism, as the decision that a building is no good can change overnight, and the arguments actually do not bear long-term scrutiny.

In considering cases for change, Historic Scotland necessarily asks hard questions, because it is often confronted with alarming arguments as to why a particular building should be demolished or components should be removed. There is a percentage where this case is invalid, for which the work is not necessary when subjected to scrutiny. The agency’s job, in such situations, is to ensure that the necessary overview has taken place. Informed change is a good and transparent thing.

Delegate:
As a keen amateur observer of architecture, one thing that I cannot help noticing is the rapid deterioration of many modern building materials. So my question is: can the panel justify how modern buildings, and that includes those from as recently as 2009, constructed from cheap, poorly weathering materials, like timber-cladding and hard concrete blocks, can ever provide the sort of sense of place, long-term sustainability and desirability, that we appear to have achieved in mainly stone-built areas using traditional materials?

Traditional buildings tended to be made of similarly cheap, readily available materials, like hard block or stone and timber. The problem is not with the materials that are used, but rather the integrity with which they are used, and the fact that they are not used to cover up something else, or have something else tucked in behind. Timber, if you let it breathe, works well in Scotland, if detailed properly. We should recover the craft of putting materials together well. In considering sustainability we should consider what is now easily available to us, just as those working in the straitened circumstances of rationing after 1945 had to design according to the few materials available to them.

There is a problem with modern work and the assemblage of components. The Germans do it beautifully because they have the right equipment. Much of our architecture is off-the-peg, from an equivalent of a supermarket for architectural products and with a considerable percentage of the materials coming from abroad. This was not the case in Victorian times when the majority of catalogue supplies came from Scotland. Historic Scotland
is looking at the matter of reopening slate quarries in Scotland, and we are looking at local timbers from Bute to see if we can fabricate buildings using softwood. The demand for responsible carbon footprints and lifecycles requires us to rethink our selection of materials by considering sourcing them closer to where they are to be used.

Ironically, the most highly rated eco buildings being built in Scotland at the moment, such as those by Gaia, are made from timber imported from Germany. Investment in the machinery which handles heavy timber construction would improve the quality of the building industry in Scotland. Such houses should be the new Scottish vernacular – we have timber, we have that ability, but we’re importing it from abroad.

The Scottish government supported the building of the eco-friendly headquarters of the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority at Balloch, where the timber frame comes from Scottish timber, from Aberdeenshire. Unfortunately, the cost of transporting, crafting and tailoring timber and bringing it back to the site can be prohibitive, more than bringing the finished article from Russia. We need to take or seek initiative and incentives, and we need entrepreneurs to assist with the problem.

Neil Sutherland, an architect working from Inverness, has taken just such an initiative. Frustrated that while he could make designs there was no manufacturing base to realise them, he set up his own factory. He is now producing a limited number of small buildings, with indigenous materials and design. Here is an architect creating contemporary buildings, employing a local team, and providing us with a sustainable model.

In view of the policy which requires buildings to be at least 30 years old to be eligible for listing, it is clear that more buildings will be listed as the 30-year period rolls forward. Therefore the 192 post-war buildings currently listed are not yet fully representative. It is good to approach the work systematically. A listed building is important because of the ideas that made that building, and they are as relevant today, whatever century it is from. We have got to identify what buildings and ideas from the post-war period are useful and are important to us.

Listing is very positive and we should be doing more of it. We need to remind ourselves that it tells a story of Scotland and a story of our people, in concrete, stone, timber – whatever the material, it is about our built environment. Owning a listed building should be regarded as a cachet. In return it would be good to see listing bring further benefits. For example, insurance companies could consider that, as a listed building will usually be better maintained, the insurance premium should be less. We should also think about the use of conservation areas to protect the interest of this period. We should develop the concept that places such as Seafar (Cumbernauld) or parts of Aberdeen City could be conservation areas and have the same status as the New Town of Edinburgh.

The total proportion of listed buildings in Scotland within the overall building stock is under 2% – a tiny percentage which does not stand in the way of advancing our cities, but rather highlights the tiny minority which are deemed to be outstanding. We will all have seen buildings that may now be
gone which we would have considered list-able, whether built last week, last month or a thousand years ago. The 30-year rule perhaps creates a holding pen for buildings that we all know should be the listed heritage of the future, but maybe we should consider listing 2% of all contemporary buildings now.

We must remember that listing is not the way to protect the totality of the built environment, as it represents only the pinnacle, the very best buildings. We should be valuing the rest of the building stock: any good, solid, well-built, crafted Victorian building or any decent modernist building deserves our care and consideration. It would be good to look for conservation areas amongst our more modern stock – the Inch Estate in Edinburgh, for example. We should use the listing system to help us think more about the qualities of light and space etc in modern buildings as well as craft and solidity in all buildings.

Charles Strang, Royal Town Planning Institute:

I thought I heard the panel, as a generality, point out that in their opinion you should require some form of consent to demolish a building on the grounds that you are removing embodied energy and the whole thrust of the climate change agenda will be to retain existing building stock and work with it, rather than clear things away willy-nilly?

To a degree, this is already happening. Some clients will first look at the existing building thoroughly to see whether it is capable of reuse in terms of embodied energy. For them it is becoming part and parcel of executive thinking.

It should certainly be something of which local authorities are made more aware. Looking very closely at the sustainability of the existing stock before giving out alternative consents would show a responsible approach, particularly where those consents are about a short-term economic gain.

The current tax regime contains, some say, an incentive to demolish. There is, for example, no VAT charged for the demolition of a building or the erection of a new structure, while it stands at 17.5% for the repair of buildings. There may be exclusions, but they add to red tape and difficulty in their administration. As it stands, some consider that the current VAT system is a punishment for retaining buildings. It creates, they suggest, a potentially negative environment for listing which can as a result be used to fight for issues that should be won on economic grounds.

There are good reasons for providing incentives for the retention of buildings rather than encouraging their demolition. We need to have a society which values its heritage – whether that heritage is two hundred years old or just fifty, there is a need to make people aware of the value. The searching target set by the government in response to climate change and recent work done on the importance of embodied energy should assist. The established advisers need to understand that while installing double glazing may improve a house’s thermal performance, the work required to bring about the new glazing will invariably expend greater carbon than it could ever reclaim. We need to consider embodied energy if we are going to approach sustainability seriously, and this would reduce the number of demolitions.
However good the legislation, unless there is a public will to sustain post-war buildings, the work will be an uphill struggle. This conference, and the preceding publication also entitled *Scotland: Building for the Future*, have sent out an invitation to the public to explore the case for listing post-war buildings. The issues identified in the day’s proceedings were far-reaching. They have provided useful insight into different reasons for appreciating the architecture of the period, how to determine, convey and celebrate its importance. They have highlighted options for its protection and the wider environmental context supporting its retention. The issues have underlined the key actions required to inform and provide incentives for the repair, maintenance and management of this resource. The delegates voiced a clear need for guidance on the technical solutions to common problems and how to rehabilitate buildings through corrective surgery.

On behalf of Historic Scotland, I warmly thank the moderator, the speakers and the panellists who contributed to this conference for their expertise, their thought-provoking papers and the lively and informed discussion. I thank with equal weight the delegates who participated in the event, who showed considerable interest, inquiry and enthusiasm throughout the day.

We invited those attending to tell us which were their favourite post-war buildings. These are detailed in the following list and the accompanying selective montage and show both the breadth of interest in our built environment and the range of its achievement.

Historic Scotland’s website www.celebratingscotlandsarchitecture.org has provided a brief overview of the conference and will host further material relevant to this debate. It will also feature free introductory leaflets on the post-war practices whose work the listing team has surveyed. We welcome suggestions for future seminars and workshops, and comments on the papers and issues reported above.
Your Favourite Post-War Buildings

The conference delegates were asked to nominate their favourite post-war building and the results are as follows in order of their relative vintage:

**Forth Road Bridge**, Edinburgh and Fife
Consulting Engineers, Mott, Hay and Anderson in association with Freeman Fox & Partners, 1958-64 [Listed] [fig 1]

**Lanark County Council Buildings**, Hamilton
Now Lanarkshire Council Offices
D G Bannerman, Lanark County Architects’ Department, 1959-64 [Listed] [fig 2]

**The Lillie Gallery**, Station Road, Milngavie
Michael Bowley, 1959-62

**Castle Terrace Car Park**, Edinburgh
John L Paterson, 1959-60

**Sillitto House**, 32 Charterhall Road, Edinburgh
Morris & Steedman, 1962 [Listed] [fig 3]

**Livingstone Tower**, University of Strathclyde, 26 Richmond Street, Glasgow
Glasgow Corporation, 1965-68 [fig 4]

**Glasgow University Library**, Glasgow
Sir William Whitfield, 1965 [fig 5]

**Commonwealth Pool**, Edinburgh
John Richards and RMJM, 1967-70 [Listed] [see p77]

**Andrew Melville Hall**, University of St Andrews, St Andrews
James Stirling, 1968

**West View**, Linlithgow Bridge, Linlithgow
Lawrence Alexander, 1968
**New Viewforth**, Stirling Council Offices, Viewforth, Stirling
A J Smith, 1968-71

**Hutcheon Court**, Hutcheon Street, Gallowgate, Aberdeen
1973

**Cummins Factory**, Shotts
Now Centrelink 5
Ahrendts Burton & Koralek, 1975-83
[Listed] [fig 6]

**Burrell Collection**, Pollok Park, Glasgow
Barry Gasson and Brit Anderson, 1978-83

**Kyelsku Bridge**, A894, Cape Wrath to Ullapool
Ove Arup & Partners, 1985

**Saltire Court**, Castle Terrace, Edinburgh
Campbell & Arnott, 1991

**Scottish Parliament**, Edinburgh
Enric Miralles and RMJM, completed 2004 [fig 7]

**Maggie’s Centre**, Inverness
Page & Park, Architects, with Charles Jencks, Landscape Designer, 2005 [fig 8]

**Pier Arts Centre**, Stromness, Orkney
Reiach & Hall, 2007. © Gavin Fraser/FOTOMA [back cover]
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For many, an understanding and appreciation of post-war architecture would be a novelty. Many others, however, consider that the protection of significant examples should be a priority. The publication, Scotland: Building for the Future (2009) set the scene for a debate on the contribution of buildings from the period to Scotland’s distinctive character. The ensuing conference held at the Bonar Hall in Dundee on 24 November 2009 widened the debates. Key players ably set the context and clear issues emerged from the ensuing discussion, opening a continuing dialogue to inform the way forward.