



Figure 15.8  
1952 – flats (6 storeys) and  
houses (3 storeys) at an average  
density of 25 dwellings per  
hectare. (Source: MoHLG, 1952.)

there could be variations within a development (Department of the Environment, 1976). The impact of higher densities on community and social factors was also considered in government research (MoHLG, 1970; Department of the Environment, 1973; 1975).

Effectively, most of the arguments now in vogue had been made decades ago, namely for urban containment, compact forms, efficient use of land, a mix of building types, and proximity to facilities, transport and work. Yet, despite the familiarity, there is something new. The arguments for compact forms and higher density in the 1990s and present decade are promoted in terms of sustainability (see Table 15.3). If the earlier arguments had an anti-suburban bias, the arguments of the 1990s were more likely to have an anti-car slant. The link between higher densities and forms that encouraged a modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport was made (e.g. Jenks *et al.*, 1996; Williams *et al.*, 2000; Schoon, 2001), and was reflected in government publications and policy. The Urban Task Force (2000, p. 64) noted that ‘higher densities allow a greater number of public amenities and transport facilities to be located within walking distance, thus reducing the need for the car and contributing to urban sustainability’. Government guidance implemented the ideas to locate development near to transport (DETR, 2001) and for denser development, again related to

Figure 15.9  
1962 – 100 dwellings per  
hectare, Alton Estate,  
Wandsworth, London.  
(Source: MoHLG, 1962.)



Figure 15.10  
1962 – 60 dwellings per  
hectare, Gleadless Valley Estate,  
Sheffield. (Source: MoHLG,  
1962.)

