German town planning has long been hailed for its contribution to the health and prosperity of the German cities. While much has been written about the products of the planning process—the physical structures, site plans and the housing assistance programmes—relatively little has been written about the town planning theories and ideologies which provided the influences, paradigms and foci for these efforts. In particular, there has been a lack of research comparing the town planning theories developed during the years of the Weimar Republic (1918–1932) with those of the pre-war National Socialist period (1933–1939). This paper is intended as a contribution to this hitherto poorly studied area.

Town planning in the German context has traditionally taken a different form from that of the United States or Britain. American town planning can be defined as a process through which society's resources are distributed as equitably and efficiently as possible. The key words are efficiency, equity and process. Often, efficiency and equity appear as opposites, a situation which contributes significantly to the social tension which often surrounds the town planning process and which is related to the frustratingly poor record of plan implementation. The third key word is process and North American and British planners have oriented themselves strongly towards ensuring that 'due process' (i.e. correct procedure) is maintained. In fact, due process, rather than the actual building of structures or delivery of programmes, often appears to be the purpose of the planning effort. In the German context, by contrast, equity and process have not traditionally been as important as efficiency. Process, throughout most of this century, has been played down. If the typical American definition of city planning was translated into German, it would be called Stadtplanung. This is not, however, the generic term which is used to describe the traditional German planning of cities, which is Städtebau. Translated into English, this term means 'city building.' German planners have had a much stronger orientation towards the physical placement of buildings within the urban environment, process, in essence, is emphasised less than output.

Town planning theory at once reflects existing societal values, culture, technology, economic and demographic trends, ideas for future changes and planning practice. These elements often form a cauldron which contributes to societal tension. This tension, in turn, helps to illuminate the dynamism of the city. Given the spirit of the inter-war years, an analysis of city planning theory can
provide important insights into how the German city was perceived in this period by its residents and its leadership. Furthermore, it helps answer a basic question concerning civic expectations: were they different under the Weimar Republic than under the Third Reich?

This article is divided into three major sections. Section One, presented in this issue of the *Town Planning Review*, describes and analyses key town planning theories developed and utilised during the Weimar years. It begins with a brief review of the pre-World War I antecedents and then examines the Weimar years in terms of the chaos of the first years (1918–1924), the years of prosperity (1925–1929) and the years of collapse (1929–1932). Section Two, to be published in the next issue of the *Town Planning Review*, focuses on the key town planning theories developed and utilised during the pre-war National Socialist period. It is divided into two sub-sections; one which assesses the Years of National Recovery (1932–1936) and a second which analyses the First Four Year Plan (1936–1939). Finally, and also to be published in the next issue of the Review, Section Three compares and contrasts the two experiences.

SECTION I: THE WEIMAR EXPERIENCE

*The Antecedents*

German town planning became increasingly important to urban officials and citizens during the twenty-five years prior to World War One. The rapid rate of urbanisation and massive industrialisation of this period changed the German city from the human-scaled city of the middle ages to the larger, impersonal metropolis. With this growth rose an increased need for order, control and municipal improvements in such areas as public health, water and sewer systems, new transportation systems and improved housing. Theoretical discussions centred upon the right of the nation-state to intervene in local matters, the role of citified communities in German culture and how cities could be best controlled.

The role of the nation-state as the supreme controlling force was a major source of tension between national and city government officials. The national government, which emphasised conservative political stances and the maintenance of a societal status quo, commonly perceived the city as being radical, anti-patriotic, a centre of proletarian agitation and potentially socialist. From the cities' perspective, the involvement of the national government in local affairs represented an erosion of the strong, independent, home rule powers which had existed from the beginning of the nineteenth century. The resulting conflict rested squarely upon the question of self-determination. Were the cities responsible for themselves or were they extensions of the state?

From the earlier times of the city states, as well as from the later Stein reforms (1808) and Prussian Free Cities Act (1817), many German cities had exhibited a strong degree of local control and self-sufficiency. Despite inter-governmental tensions, this tradition was maintained during the last half of the nineteenth century as city after city took independent action to counter the problems of urbanisation. The national government only intervened in city matters when the
perceived national interest was threatened or when the interests of the ruling elite were in jeopardy.

The proper role of the city as a culture-building agent was also argued on a theoretical plane. The city as a place where 'communitarian morality' could be attained—a concept espoused by Fichte and Hegel, among other late Enlightenment figures—gave way to the German equivalent of the Dickensian City that was considered to be non-Germanic, international and the 'home of the Bolshevik and the Jew.' Anti-urban ideologies influenced perceptions of how the city should be treated. Some theorists, like Riehl, Langbehn, LaGarde and Moeller Van den Bruck, considered the city to be culturally evil and called for a return to the Burg or Mittelalterliche Stadt. Others such as Wilhelmi and Damaschke espoused utopian settlements that would reduce the high density of the city to a more human scale. Still others, like Theodor Fritsch, advocated an accommodation of industry and agriculture—a meeting of field and factory in a Gartenstadt setting (Fig. 1). While it would be difficult to call the utopians and accommodators anti-urban, they both were 'escapist.' The evils of industrialisation (Manchestertum), the highly dense housing (the Mietskaserne) and the attitudes of urban dwellers (Seelische Verstäuberung) were attacked in particular. Rather than advocating programmes to counteract these perceived evils, the escapist theorists recommended the creation of new forms of community. Leading this movement was the German Garden City Association. Founded in 1902, the organisation first emphasised the need to preserve rural values, to return to nature and to recreate a craft/guild society. Over time these concerns were replaced by a desire to reform urban housing conditions and to develop satellite cities.

There were also those who desired to change the city from within. These people,
labelled as ‘regularists’ by Françoise Choay, advocated the improvement of cities along guidelines developed by Baron Haussmann. In Germany, the work of Stübben and Baumeister supplied examples of this approach. The supporting theory maintained that health needs could be met by lowering densities, increasing air flow, providing park land and laying sewer and water lines. The net effect of the work of the regularists was substantially to change the organically-derived romantic character of the mediaeval city to the rational, orthogonal layout typical of modern cities. This approach fell prey to heavy criticism from the Austrian Camillo Sitte, who perceived the grid-iron pattern as leading to monotony and sterility. Throughout his major text, entitled City Planning According to Artistic Principles (1889), he argued for a renewed emphasis on aesthetics in urban design. His plea was well received and had a forceful impact on planners across the nation. These included such respected planners as Karl Henrici, Cornelius Gurlitt, Theodor Goecke and Theodor Fischer. Thus, even within the city itself, extensive theoretical argument resounded.

Above all else at this time, town planning seemed to be a wealthy man’s toy. Social improvements were implemented begrudgingly and usually only when they would not threaten the national interest, the political status quo or the powerful elite. This was most clearly portrayed by health improvements and housing development programmes. For example, one of the key stimuli to national government involvement in urban public health improvements came as a result of the fact that military recruits from urban areas were less healthy than were their rural counterparts. This condition reduced the nation-state’s ability to maintain its defence objectives and, therefore, had to be addressed. Concurrently, the national government offered little assistance for housing improvements. Housing supply was largely controlled by the elite and any changes in supply or quality could have caused a shift in local power. The evils of the industrial slum therefore continued to fester and housing remained almost totally within the domain of private enterprise.

Placing these phenomena and ideas in perspective, town planning theorists in the twenty five years prior to World War One focused on the proper conceptualisation of the nation-state/city interface, the role of government in meeting critical local needs and the city as a culture-building agent. All of these ideas ‘simmered’ during the War years (1914–1918) and ‘boiled’ in the first years of the Weimar Republic.

Order Out of Chaos

The violent creation of the Weimar Republic marked a dramatic change in the nation-state/city interface. No longer was the nation-state totally supreme and no longer was it able to back its domestic policy positions with the Army. In fact, beset with problems of revolt and occupation from within and the reparations crisis from without, the national government during the first five years of its life barely governed beyond crisis management.

The rise of the Arbeiter und Soldatenräte at War’s end provided the first major indication of a new order. With the collapse of the Wilhelmian government, city
government became the key organisation for providing basic essentials. The *Arbeiter und Soldatenräte* advocated a shifting of civic priorities from the pre-war government’s laissez-faire approach to housing towards one that would meet the housing needs of the masses. Above all, on a theoretical plane, the *Arbeiter und Soldatenräte* accomplished three goals. They expanded the process of democratisation to include all citizens, developed a strong working class focus in terms of the approach of government, and helped to re-establish the primacy of the city in meeting local needs. However, beyond these points, the new local governments could initially do little but maintain local order. Runaway inflation, a weak national government, the lack of taxation revenue, the lack of enabling legislation and the massive influx of veterans and colonists all contributed to this state. This sense of chaos lasted until approximately 1925.

Little innovative planning of any type was attempted throughout this 1918–1925 period. Although planners and architects experienced extensive practical inactivity, at the same time, it was a period of extensive theoretical thinking, congresses, manifestos and utopian writing. While this ferment had its roots well before the formation of the Weimar Republic, the inhumanity of the War and the lack of employment during its aftermath provided the stimulus for revolutionary change.

During this period of inactivity, the theorists reflected on four key concepts: the role of the street in urban planning; the role of urban design as a culture enhancing agent; the need to lower densities; and the need to unite man and nature. In essence, the leading thinkers of the turn of the century (Stübben, Baumeister, Sitte, and the German Garden City advocates) provided the ‘take off’ point for discussions. These influences can be clearly noted in several of the planning handbooks and guides written at War’s end by such leading planners/designers as Fischer (1922), Gurlitt (1920), Heiligenthal (1921) and Wolf (1919). And yet, while the influences of the past were still strong, they were interpreted in a new context. For example, there was no longer a major push to demolish old buildings for new streets. Instead, there was a move to build streets that would connect the *Altstädte* to smaller communities on the fringe. Similarly, the Sittesque principles of artistic city planning were no longer treated as totally aesthetic elements but, rather, were perceived as contributing to the spatial definition of sub-areas in the city and facilitating the creation of *Heimat*.

This period is also marked by a shift in planning theory away from a localised design focus and project orientation toward a concern with large scale, multi-community and multi-faceted problems. The roots of this shift, in a theoretical context, can be noted in the proposal developed by Eberstadt, Mohring, and Petersen for Greater Berlin prepared in 1910. They saw that planning, to be effective, had to become policy oriented. Goecke, commenting on the Greater Berlin study, wrote that this approach shows ‘...a new way out of such unhealthy conditions that no building society can abolish ... We need a new urban planning policy ...’ The Eberstadt, Mohring and Petersen approach (coupled with similar concepts developed by Wolfe [1917] and Machler [1920], the experience of the regional government for Greater Berlin [1911–1920] and the new *Siedlungsverband Ruhrkohlenbezirk* [1920]) were highly influential in the
Fig. 2 (above) The radical city form by Eberstadt, Mohring and Petersen (source: Heiligenthal, Roman, Stadtebau, Heidelberg, C. Winter Verlag, 1921)

Fig. 3 (right) P. Wolf's schematic plan for a major city (Source: Wolf, Paul, Städtebau: Das Form Problem der Stadt in Vergangenheit und Zukunft, Leipzig, Verlag Kunkhardt und Biermann, 1919, p. 85)

Fig. 4 M. Machler's planning concept for Greater Berlin (based on a sketch found in Der Städtebau. Vol. 1 (1920), p. 10)
creation of urban regions that followed later in the Weimar and National Socialist periods (Figs. 2–4).\textsuperscript{52}

The impetus for theoretical change also came from groups which were concerned with the role of art, architecture, urban design and technology in society. Among the most important groups were the \textit{Deutscher Werkbund}, the \textit{Arbeitsrat für Kunst}, the \textit{Novembergruppe} and \textit{Der Ring}.\textsuperscript{23} The leading participants in these groups included Walter Gropius, Adolf Behne, Hermann Hasler, Bruno and Max Taut, Otto Bartning, Ludwig Hilberseimer, Hans and Willi Luckhardt and Ceasar Klein. While their emphasis was not intentionally toward town planning, they perceived that any design improvements would have to relate to the physical and social character of society as a whole. In fact, a commonly shared belief among many of the members of these organisations was that their objectives could only be met by becoming involved in town planning matters. They stressed the need to apply their skills to the problems of ‘every day life’ and to create a new cultural milieu that reflected the changes in post war society. In particular, they were arguing for dramatic change in two ways. First, they urged that designers and planners should orient themselves towards the masses: no longer should they look solely to the elite for their assignments. And secondly, they argued that if architects, urban designers and town planners were to serve the masses, they would have to emphasise the specific needs of the masses (i.e. housing, work, food, and recreation) and meet the masses’ ability to pay. In sum, utility, standardisation and functionalism were being strongly encouraged in the context of the societal needs as a whole. It was a call for a new order embracing new cultural and social standards.

How radical were the pronouncements of this period? In comparison with North American or British planning theory of the same period, the German theories appear quite radical. And yet, when placed in the context of a revolutionised Germany, their ideas reflect a mainstream course. Despite the rhetoric, these theories were remarkably centrist. While they did argue for new cultural standards with new ideals and a new emphasis upon the needs of the working classes, they were not arguing for a communist or even for a socialist approach. What they were seeking was simply the expansion of housing production, the creation of jobs and the development of strong cultural standards. These ideals may have struck utopian chords, but they nevertheless were pursued within the context of the existing post-war order. Furthermore, realising that the application of these ideals could only occur within a political framework, planners and designers alike developed strong political relationships with government leaders at all levels.\textsuperscript{24} In this manner, they gained entry into government programmes and were able to influence policies.

The initial application of these theoretical concepts occurred at two locations. One, the \textit{Siedlung Georgsgarten} at Celle, designed by Otto Haesler (1923) represented new concepts in the development of communitarian housing.\textsuperscript{25} No longer would the working man have to exist in the dank, six-storey, hollow-blocked, unsanitary \textit{Mietskaserne} (Fig. 5).\textsuperscript{26} No longer would man have to be separated from nature. And no longer would he have to suffer from air pollution, high density or slum living. A promise of the new era found in Haesler’s
design carried the hope that each local government could meet the housing needs of the local workers and that the stigma of municipal housing would cease to exist. The Siedlung was placed away from the built up portion of the city in a setting that allowed for extensive greenery, air flow and sunlight. Terms such as radical, unique and foreign were used to describe the settlement. Perhaps more importantly, the Siedlung represented the use of modern ‘technique’ to meet the key municipal problem of the day: the shortage of housing. Technique (i.e. modern design measures), in essence, overcame taste (i.e. the eclecticism of the nineteenth century) and style (i.e. the Heimatstil). This amounted to a significant achievement.

The other noteworthy theoretical application of this period lies in the work of Bruno Taut at Magdeburg. Taut, one of the more extreme designer activists of the period, was strongly oriented toward the need for new cultural and artistic standards. Hired as the Magdeburg city planner in 1923, Taut faced the task of revitalising the city’s central area during a period of low taxation revenue and runaway inflation. Given these conditions, he realised that large scale change was impossible. Therefore, he decided that the best he could do was cosmetically to change the dreary character of the central area by painting its buildings in bright colours. His intent was, at least in part, to ‘wake up’ the city to the new era. It was quite successful and, over time, Magdeburg became a ‘must visit’ place for German planners and architects (Fig. 6). As with Haesler’s Siedlung, Taut’s work announced the coming of new design and planning concepts.

In summary, town planning theorists of the ‘years of chaos’ concerned themselves with the nation-state/city interface, the needs of the working classes and the need for new cultural ideals and standards. These ideas, while conceptualised in utopian rhetoric, were far from radical. In fact, the theorists fit
well into the spirit of the time in their desire to see the new government succeed and economic production regain its earlier levels. The extent of the influence of their theories can be found in the period of prosperity (1925–1929).

The Years of Prosperity (1925–1929)

The ideas expounded by the theorists in the first half of the decade were modified and applied during the latter half. Several factors contributed to this: the stabilisation of the currency through the Rentenmark, the modification of the reparations programme under the Dawes Plan and the passage of the Hauszinssteuer—a revaluation of pre-war house mortgages. The Hauszinssteuer was by far the most direct influence for it enabled the cities to gain funds specifically for town planning purposes.

In terms of the town planning process, planning was undertaken for the people rather than with the people. This was a continuation of the Prussian bureaucratic tradition. The city administration was knowledgeable, professional and perceived that it knew what was best for the people. At the same time in many cities, including Berlin and Frankfurt, the planners viewed themselves as propagandists for the new order and used their offices to direct cultural change. In Frankfurt, for example, the city planner took responsibility for a new city logo, the design of allotment gardens and for the editing of a slick, four-colour, monthly magazine that propagated the city’s efforts.²⁹ He was also involved in the city art programme.³⁰ As long as these planners had the support of the newspapers and the politicians, their efforts could continue without interference. It should also be noted that the success of these planners was a key factor in the retention of a municipal power base by the centrist parties. In many cases, the governments retained their positions only as long as they continued to provide inexpensive housing and new jobs. As soon as the housing programmes stopped and lay-offs began, support for these parties often greatly diminished.
Figs. 7a (above) and 7b (below) Sketch and photograph of Frankfurt's Siedlung Westhausen show the rigidity of the rationalism of the 1920s. The contrast with Germany's mediaeval cities was indeed remarkable (source: Frankfurt Stadtarchiv)
In ideological terms, can these town planners be considered pro-urban? Like the escapers of the pre-war period, these planners seemed to desire an alternative to the city. Yet, also wished to maintain a tie to the central city while not being an integral part of it. They saw their Siedlungen as capturing the best of nature and the best of technique and, for this reason, felt that their ideas were unique. These Siedlungen were conceptualised as 'daughter towns' attached to the 'mother' city by mass transit umbilical cords. In each settlement there were to be such facilities as schools, laundries, local shops and even local work places. Housing was often designed in standardised and prefabricated forms for the minimum existence and at the price level of the common worker. The structures lacked ornamentation, but were painted with vivid colours. From their designs, it seems that the members of the avant garde were endeavouring to develop a sense of separation from the old cities without losing the economic symbiosis necessary for survival. They felt that the new locations were critical for the creation of a new Wohnkultur. They also perceived that the sense of a new cultural standard could not be developed in the old city because the cultural social system, with its traditional values, precluded the opportunity to attempt change in a comprehensive framework. In the new settlements, the Wohnkultur could be attempted because the separateness enabled the designers to create a new, manufactured sense of communitarian morality without the intervention of the older, more traditional values.

In a sense the Weimar era theorists were anti-urban. Most members of the avant garde maintained a fundamental view of the city as inherently negative. The large city, they felt, displayed all the attributes of Toennies' Gesellschaft while the new Siedlungen—designed to overcome the negative aspects of the metropolis—seemed a part of the Gemeinschaft (Figs. 7 and 8). The ideas expressed in Kropotkin's Fields, Factories and Workshops appear to represent a precursor to the non-urban ideas of these theorists. In essence, man, to be fulfilled, must come to grips with both nature and technology. Neither the rootless urbanite nor the 'tied to the soil' peasant fit. Modern man with a sense of the land and the skill of the factory would emerge as the product of the new culture.
The ideas of many of these theorists found a wide audience. The Bauhaus, the leading avant garde design institution in Germany, found itself being recognised throughout the world. Thousands visited the Deutscher Werkbund sponsored Weisenhof Siedlung Exhibit of 1927. The Frankfurt experience of Ernst May was so widely praised that special classes were formed to teach the Frankfurt approach. Thousands of modern dwelling units were built in Frankfurt, Berlin, Hamburg, Celle, Karlsruhe, Cologne and Magdeburg. Their success brought such recognition that the Reichsforschungsgesellschaft (RFG), a national government research institute, regularly contributed funds to the modernists.

And yet there remains debate as to the success of the theorists in gaining the support of the man in the street. The idea of the Wohnkultur never was accepted. The man in the street was too enmeshed in the old civic structure; when he moved to the new settlements he took his old values with him. Also, while these settlements were generally not located in the built-up sections of the city, they reflected modern 'citified' values. Moreover, they were built under city government auspices, by city workers for city residents. As the decade came to a close, these values became less and less popular. The historian Harold Lloyd Poor noted that this was a period of sentimental yearning for the countryside which quickly changed to an 'active virulent hatred of the city.' He perceived that reaction as an almost complete yet unconscious rejection of things urban. This inherent anti-urbanism was ultimately utilised by the National Socialist Party to further its own Party goals. As it gained strength in the second part of the decade, the Nazi Party began to attack these settlements as being foreign, Bolshevist and as places fit only for animals. In sum, a yearning for the simplicity of the country, the inherent rejection of things urban and the anti-modernist diatribes of the Nazis resulted in a stigmatisation of the settlements. Demand for these units dropped dramatically as the decade came to a close. By 1930, the theories which influenced the creation of the settlements were essentially discarded. No longer was there a desire to create communities supportive of a new culture. Rather, the intent was to create communities that would contribute to basic survival and economic revival.

**The Depression and Collapse (1929–1932)**

By late 1929, the economic depression had made an extensive impact. Millions remained unemployed as welfare funds became depleted and the Hauszinssteuer, once hailed as the saviour of the city, was now causing destitute people to abandon their homes. These problems resulted in national government action. In particular, self help planning programmes for the unemployed and the hungry were emphasised. A feeling lingered that times would not improve and that autarchic perseverance afforded the only course of action.

The Depression brought an effective end to German town planning experimentation of the 1920s and key theoretical leaders started to leave. In fact, as National Socialist pressures became increasingly unbearable, the exodus took on the character of a modern day diaspora as the leaders moved to Russia, Africa, England and the United States.

**Summary**

Town planning during the Weimar Era marked a continuation of the ideologies,
theories, and practices inherited from the Wilhelminian Era and, at the same time, represented new approaches toward solving the problems of German cities. The inheritance included a commitment to improve the health of the masses, the desire to relate man and nature and the pursuit of the development of smaller communities. The major differences lie in the fact that, during the Weimar Era, there was a stronger orientation towards the needs of the working class and that planning and design were perceived as part of a new cultural milieu.

Was planning effective? The Weimar Era was marked by the creation of new models, innovations, schemes and unique plans to attack the problems of the time. For these efforts, the planners deserve great praise. At the same time, the 'practical' performance of town planning agencies was not successful enough to solve the key problems facing the German city. Several explanations can be offered for this failure. First, with the exception of 1927 and 1928, there were no periods in which prosperity and tranquility existed simultaneously throughout the fourteen years in which the Weimar Republic existed. Whenever there is social or economic unrest, planners are forced to focus on short-term issues. The Weimar Era was no different. Planners were regularly required to help in job generation and the finding of shelter and food for the destitute. In the light of these conditions, and given the lack of funds, the failure of the national government to provide policy directions and periodic social and economic chaos, the fact that so much was accomplished is astounding.

Some social critics view the Weimar Era as being 'urban' oriented. The modern designers of the Bauhaus, the art of Klee, Gross and Kandinsky, the music of Hindemith, the plays of Brecht and the acting of Dietrich have all been labelled as citified. Can it be said that the planners of the Weimar Era were pro-urban? There is little evidence to support such a position. It is clear that none of the Weimar town planning theorists focussed upon the city as an ideal form. Rather, they emphasised escapist, small scale, limited size, balanced communities placed within green belts. In essence, these theorists saw the city as too complex, disorderly, traditional and unchangeable. For these reasons they advocated a new form of community. This new form, in theory, would simplify the complexity of the community experience, bring order to community form and reflect a new Gesamtkultur or Wohnkultur.

The conceptualisation of new community forms by the Weimar theorists did not reflect an overt dislike or hatred of cities. Neither did it ascribe mediaeval characteristics to the people who were to reside in the new communities. However, the theorists did see the need to decentralise, regionalise and create new non-urban communities. To this end, the greatest emphasis of the Weimar era theorists lay in alternatives to the overcrowded, Mietskaserne dominated centre city.

The community design principles of the Weimar period modernists were both a response to the time—a rejection of past values and the development of new techniques—and a support for the spirit of the Weimar Republic. These modern design concepts could be interpreted as having both a political and a creative basis. The political basis helped the creative basis to be realised. The modernists captured world-wide attention through the Bauhaus, the Weisenhof Exhibition, the planning experiences of Berlin, Hamburg, and Frankfurt and the new
settlement design applied in Cologne, Karlsruhe and Celle. Their unique design features commanded much attention: flat roofs, lack of ornamentation, vivid colours, pre-fabricated and standardised construction elements, built-in kitchens and uniquely designed furniture. The designs were considered to be of an 'international style' and the concepts behind them quickly spread throughout Europe and beyond.

The role of ideologies, principles and theories as guides to planning actions seemed to diminish as the Weimar Era came to a close. In the beginning, with very little planning occurring, it was a time of extensive theoretical thought. The ideas developed during this period served as guides to planning actions during the second half of the decade. Finally, with the coming of the Depression and the increasing inability of the national government to rule, planning ceased to be an effective activity at the local level and new theories and ideas began to emerge. Many of these new concepts were applied by the National Socialist Government which took power on 30 January 1933, and will be discussed in the next issue of the Town Planning Review.
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