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EXTRACT FROM SUPREME COURT VOLUME
THE PLACE: PARLIAMENT SQUARE

CHRIS MIELE

The lack of any obvious designed relationships around the square is evidence of disputes that have not so much been resolved as allowed to happen. Notwithstanding the absence of a masterplan, the whole makes perfect sense.
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Entering the phrase ‘London, United Kingdom’ into Google Earth takes you straight to Parliament Square (fig. 1), to a point very near the bronze of Winston Churchill (1874–1965) that dates from 1953, the work of Ivor Roberts-Jones (1913–1996). On foot this spot is harder to reach: fast-moving traffic makes for slow progress. This is not ideal, but neither is it inappropriate. Victorian engineers and architects formed the square as the linking space between new roads, making one large space out of several ancient ones. Concerns about traffic congestion and safety led to the installation of the world’s first set of traffic lights there in 1868. In 1926 the square became London’s first traffic gyratory.

Difficult though he may be to reach, the view from Churchill is worth the effort (figs. 2 (a) and (b)). To the south is Westminster Abbey, founded during the reign of the Saxon King Edgar (959–975). The north transept facing you was the main front in Henry III’s time (1216–1272), a perfect example of thirteenth-century style thanks to the Victorian architects who improved it. To the left, or east, are the Houses of Parliament, a masterpiece of revived Gothic including a few real medieval elements that survived a massive fire in 1834 (fig. 3). Most notable is Westminster Hall, constructed in the eleventh century and enlarged between 1397 and 1401. The architect of the Victorian palace, Sir Charles Barry (1795–1860), had wanted to build office ranges right up to the corner finishing the square, but the cost was too great.

If the visitor looks to the left of the palace from the foot of Churchill, there is a winding view up Parliament Street, another Victorian improvement, towards the older line of Whitehall and Sir Edwin Lutyens’s (1869–1944) Cenotaph (1920), where each year, on Remembrance Sunday in November, the United Kingdom and Commonwealth nations gather to honour the war dead. What visitors on a typical day may not realize is the important role the square plays in official ceremonies, from the opening of Parliament to royal weddings and state funerals (fig. 4).

Forming the north side of the square are the former Government Buildings, now HM Treasury, designed by J.M. Brydon (1840–1901) as civil service offices (1899–1915). It was restored and refurbished in 2002–2004 by Foster + Partners working with Felden + Mawson, the architects for the Supreme Court. Its symmetrical stone façade does not align with any feature in the square. In fact, no building has any axial relationship with any other (fig. 5). The square itself is a self-contained design.

The lack of any obvious designed relationships around the square is evidence of disputes that have not so much been resolved as allowed to happen. Notwithstanding the absence of a masterplan, the whole makes perfect sense. Here are monumental expressions of the law and the will of the people. Between them is the established Church, which, because of its association with the monarchy, enjoys a special position in the English constitutional settlement. These three important buildings – Abbey, Parliament and Supreme Court – are all recognizably Gothic. Government and the civil service are represented by HM Treasury, grandiose Edwardian Baroque, setting a classical theme that continues north along Whitehall.

It is too easy to dismiss the square as a failure of urban planning. Its story should, instead, be read as a lesson in Victorian notions of the role of the state – notions that are with us still. At no point in this history has any government had the political will to impose a coherent vision on a space that more than a century and a half ago came to be regarded as the centre of the largest empire the world had yet seen. Neither has any Parliament, which does have the potential power, sought to impose a single solution. Centralized authority worried the Victorian political classes. In 1847 Benjamin Disraeli (1804–1881) observed that centralization...
'If left unchecked will prove fatal to the national character.' Victorian Tories and Liberals alike (even many Radicals besides) did not see the state as a single entity requiring a singular physical expression. As one earlier critic of the operation of the new Poor Law put it in 1841, this approach was the ‘Saxon system’ of governance, and desirable precisely because it called the ‘energies of all ... into play’.

For many political thinkers in the nineteenth century, central government was the enemy of personal liberty, which, so the argument went, could be traced back to Anglo-Saxon institutions—and this is where the style of some of the buildings that line the square becomes significant. In the eighteenth century, Gothic came to be seen as the expression of a free people whose liberty was preserved by a common law seen then as an inheritance of Saxon institutions (the common law is now understood to be an Angevin creation). Gothic had no strict canon of style. Flexible and organic, it embodied the same evolutionary principles that had shaped the law and the British constitution. And so, looked at in one way, the square is an unintended monument; and as for the whole, so for the part. The new UK Supreme Court (UKSC), the highest court in the land, has— as Lord Bingham explains in the previous chapter—emerged out of an adjudicative function that happened to be performed by the House of Lords and that had reached the point where it made sense for this function to take on an independent character. In so doing, the court has found a home in a suitable location, making use of a historic building that happened to be available on the day.

**Beginnings**

The longer story of the place begins, though, with the geology of London and the Thames Valley. The land in and around the square was the product of the alluvial landscape created by the river and its tributaries tens of thousands of years ago. This historic core of the City of Westminster (one of thirty-three public authorities comprising Greater London) is formed on a gravel eyot, known as Thorney Island, deposited over millennia. The River Tyburn near by—now culverted—helped to define this feature, one of many that emerged in the early Holocene period (c. 11,000 BC) to become the focus for settlement during the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze ages (c. 4500–3500 BC).
Thanks to excavations undertaken in association with the Jubilee line extension to the London Underground, archaeologists have had the opportunity to document the historical geography of the area produced by the constant movement of the boundary between land and water. By the middle of the eleventh century AD, shortly before the Norman Conquest, Edward the Confessor (1042–1066) made Thorney Island a principal royal residence. He rebuilt the older abbey to a design resembling the abbey at Jumièges, as a private church equivalent to Saint-Denis in Paris. In the last decade of the century William Rufus (later King William II of England, 1087–1100) built a great hall of gigantic proportions in this residence. The lower parts of the walls of Westminster Hall are survivals of it. By about 1100 two routes ran out from Edward’s new abbey. King Street started at the north transept; it was stopped up in the 1860s with the construction of the new Foreign and Commonwealth Office, or Government Offices as they were formerly known. Tothill Street ran from the west front, on an axis with the nave of the Abbey. A street of the same name survives beside Methodist Central Hall, but its alignment was affected by the cutting of Victoria Street from 1845 to 1851.

By the early sixteenth century the component parts of the Abbey precinct and palace were fully developed, and understanding these elements helps to explain the street names that today mystify even native Londoners. St Margaret’s Street, Old Palace Yard and Aldington Street are one road over no more than 100 metres (328 feet); their names reflect a now lost sequence of distinct spaces.

A plan prepared by the Museum of London Archaeological Service shows two large complexes (fig. 6). One is the Royal Palace. It was organized around the reconstructed hall, its cloisters and courtyards. On the ‘land side’ are three walled yards: Green Yard (a statue of Cromwell by Hamo Thornycroft, 1830–1925, was positioned here in 1899); Old Palace Yard, which survives in name only; and New Palace Yard, which is an open area enclosed by R.M. Barry’s (1830–1880) heavy iron railings in the 1860s. What is today Parliament Square fell mostly within the Abbey’s precincts, and was entered by a gate near the junction of Great Smith and Victoria streets. There was then no bridge across the Thames at this point.
The first map evidence (fig. 7) dates from the time of Elizabeth I (1558–1603). Then comes a plan by John Norden and finally one by Stow (fig. 8), the most reliable of this early sequence. Here New Palace Yard, Old Palace Yard and Broad Sanctuary stand out as separate areas. The most formal of the three was New Palace Yard, recorded in an engraving by Wenceslaus Hollar (1607–1677; fig. 9).

The building of Westminster Bridge in the 1740s increased traffic through the area, and specially appointed Bridge Commissioners widened streets to deal with the congestion. In the 1760s the first major public building — new law courts designed by John Vardy (1718–1755) and built up against the side of Westminster Hall — was added to the palace (fig. 10).8

By the 1750s Lonconers had started to take in the views from the new Westminster Bridge (a modern engineering wonder; see fig. 11). This was demolished in the 1800s to make way for the current iron one. Canaletto (1697–1768), who came to England in 1746 on the heels of potential patrons, made a painting of the west front of the Abbey and Broad Sanctuary, with St. Margaret's Church and tower closing the view to the rear (fig. 12). Just above St Margaret's is the long roof of Westminster Hall. This Canaletto is the best historic view we have that records how the area corresponding to Parliament Square looked before its Victorian improvement. The whole outer Abbey precinct was bounded by railings, and outside were buildings on a domestic scale. It is hard to think of a similar sort of space in England today. It is not a cathedral close, similar to Salisbury. Instead, the proximity of city to great church would have had a more Continental feel to it.

The New Sessions House and 'Garden Square'

Only in the early nineteenth century was there any interest in designing the space or the buildings around the Abbey and Parliament. The opportunity came from a local initiative, the rebuilding of the Middlesex Sessions House. In 1804 a new site within the old precinct was found, one occupied by the remains of the old Sanctuary Tower (and the future site of the Supreme Court). Completed in 1815, the new courthouse was the work of architect Samuel Pepys Cockerell (1733–1827), whose Neoclassical building was arranged on a Greek-cross plan (see fig. 14, p. 54, and fig. 6, p. 77). The proposals for a new public building persuaded Parliament to set up another commission with powers to purchase land. Private Acts of 1805, 1808 and 1814 enabled the acquisition of sites for clearances to improve the movement of traffic. All this was on the understanding that the freetholds acquired would be vested in the Crown, which
Vacation improvement. The whole outer Abbey precinct was bounded by railings, and outside were buildings on a domestic scale. It is hard to think of a similar sort of space in England today. It is not a cathedral close, similar to Salisbury. Instead, the proximity of city to great church would have had a more Continental feel to it.

The New Sessions House and 'Garden Square'

Only in the early nineteenth century was there any interest in designing the space or the buildings around the Abbey and Parliament. The opportunity came from a local initiative, the rebuilding of the Middlesex Sessions House. In 1804 a new site within the old precinct was found, one occupied by the remains of the old Sanctuary Tower (and the future site of the Supreme Court). Completed in 1805, the new courthouse was the work of architect Samuel Pepys Cockerell (1753-1827), whose Neoclassical building was arranged on a Greek-cross plan (see fig. 14. p. 54, and fig. 6, p. 77).

The proposals for a new public building persuaded Parliament to set up another commission with powers to purchase land. Private Acts of 1806, 1808 and 1814 enabled the acquisition of sites for clearances to improve the movement of traffic. All this was on the understanding that the freeholds acquired would be vested in the Crown, which
as a result this day owns Parliament Square. (The Greater London Authority manages it on the Crown's behalf.)

The commissioners did have powers to provide footways and ornamental gardens associated with them, although the Treasury was there to keep costs down. First, land to the north and east of St Margaret's—Westminster's parish church (fig. 13)—was cleared to give an uninterrupted view of the courthouse. Cockerell, the Sessions House architect, repaired and tidied up the outside of St Margaret's (he had previously, in 1801, restored the church).

In 1866 the commissioners invited proposals to create a new terrace of buildings on the line of the medieval enclosure, flanking Cockerell's Sessions House. This included the creation of a new 'Garden Square'. A plan (fig. 14) shows the position of the new court, the block of houses to be demolished to link the Abbey precinct to New Palace Yard, and the new plans that the commissioners envisaged to complete the square. A handful of proposals for this scheme survive in The National Archives at Kew. One is for matching terraces in the Palladian style (fig. 15). James Wyatt (1746–1813) also proposed building terraces in a medieval style and re-cladding the then newly completed court to match (fig. 16).

No terraces were built, but the commissioners did form a park to the north of St Margaret's. This Wyatt design had curving paths and ponds, and probably also ornamental beds,

...
in a layout typical of the period. Another garden enclosure was later created to the north of the Sessions House. This space eventually came to be known as ‘Canning Green’ after Richard Westmacott's (1775–1856) bronze of the Tory prime minister (completed in 1832) was positioned here (figs. 17 and 18).

Within the palace, the architect Sir John Soane (1753–1837) was in 1824 asked to rehandle Vardy's earlier court buildings beside Westminster Hall in a modern version of English Gothic, an exercise not to his liking. These ranges were most visible from within the new Garden Square (fig. 19). Thus before the great fire of 1834 destroyed the ancient Palace of Westminster, the Gothic style was understood to be appropriate here, at the symbolic centre of the United Kingdom. As for the Soane–Vardy courts, they survived the fire only to be demolished in 1882, when the High Court decamped to another new Gothic building, the Royal Courts of Justice in the Strand.

Barry's Parliament Square

When, in 1855, the new parliament was nearing completion, its architect, Sir Charles Barry (fig. 20—he turned more than once to A.W.N. Pugin, 1812–1852, for help with the medieval detail) proposed enclosing New Palace Yard with a range of buildings entered on the corner by an elaborate Gothic-style lantern. This would have entailed moving the law courts and St Margaret's (the latter stone by stone) to a site between
Princes and Tothill streets. Barry planned another green square for Old Palace Yard, which would have provided a fine setting for the chapel of Henry VII. These plans—which would have properly enclosed the square on one side (fig. 21)—were costed at a staggering £51,285, and failed for that reason.

This scheme was soon eclipsed by Barry's more ambitious set of proposals for the complete replanning of the area (fig. 22). At the centre was a new Palace of Administration on the north side of Whitehall, facing the Thames across a public park, answering the 'Palace of Legislature' or Parliament. Just as the new palace for civil servants was to be given an appropriate setting, so too did Barry envisage Parliament and Westminster Abbey with a generous new public open space, a 3.6-hectare (9-acre) park composed of three lawns occupying the area that today corresponds to Parliament Square. This was to have been bounded by wide roads on regular alignments continuing along Victoria Street. A more private ornamental garden, New Abbey Gardens, would be on land just west of Old Palace Yard. From this garden the Chapter House (later to be restored by Sir George Gilbert Scott, 1811–1878) and Henry VII's Chapel could be contemplated alongside a new range of buildings for the Abbey School. This plan envisaged a new river crossing next to Waterloo Bridge. On the opposite side of the Thames, Barry showed new monumental buildings along a new road (beside an embanked river), with public squares at the bridge heads. This was grand planning in a European context, equivalent in its ambition to contemporary proposals for a new Ringstrasse in Vienna.

This plan may seem fantastic now, but at the time, there was reason to hope that something very significant might happen to give London an administrative centre commensurate with the country's expanding empire. A new Office of Works had been created in 1855, and its First Commissioner, Sir Benjamin Hall, hoped to use his powers to improve London. A select committee was appointed to look into consolidating all government activities around Parliament. The first project to emerge from this was a massive, single structure, housing the Foreign, Colonial and India Offices, which was built to the designs of Scott (and known generally as Government Offices—no to be confused with J.M. Brydon's later Government Buildings, now HM Treasury). And in that same year, 1855, Parliament legislated a new Palace-wide authority, the Metropolitan Board of Works, to deal with roads and public health matters. Its first great plan was to construct huge intercepting sewers to deposit the capital's filth far downstream, and then to embank the Thames in the central area. There followed a series of new roads, which some hoped might be developed with terraces in a grand, Parisian manner. In the end, though, there was no body with the powers to control the appearance of new buildings realized through these clearances. The new streets—Southwark Street, Charlie's Cross Road, Shafterbury Avenue—were architecturally disappointing and remain so.

When Barry died, his son Edward took over the job of completing the palace. With it fell to him the problem of what to do with the surrounding area, which had been a construction site for nearly thirty years and was still being dug up to create the London underground railway. Whatever he might have thought of his father's aspirations, E.M. Barry's plan of May 1861 for the new 'Parliament Square'—the earliest use of that term—was more pragmatic. He was also charged with finding 'suitable positions for statues of public men, and securing as much uniformity in the treatment of their pedestals, and accessories, as may be consonant with the dictates of architectural propriety and good taste'. This gathering of statesmen was seen as an extension of the commemorative burials that had colonized the Abbey. It also reflected the creation of a new National Portrait Gallery. Established in 1857, this collection was housed from 1859 to 1869 on the very edge of the square, overlooking the Houses of Parliament, in a terraced house that stood at 29 Great George Street.

Barry's design was for a carriage-way winding a railed enclosure to a simple greenward. It was bisected by a viewing axis that framed Canning's memorial at the far or
gathering of statesmen was seen as an extension of the commemorative burials that had colonized the Abbey. It also reflected the creation of a new National Portrait Gallery. Established in 1857, this collection was housed from 1859 to 1869 on the very edge of the square, overlooking the Houses of Parliament, in a terraced house that stood at 29 Great George Street.

Barry's design was for a carriageway ringing a railed enclosure to a simple greensward. It was bisected by a viewing axis that framed Canning's memorial at the far

north end (fig. 23). The railings incorporated gas standards on granite piers, all in the Gothic manner similar to heavy cast-iron railings Barry designed for New Palace Yard. Instead of linking the park back to the Abbey precinct, as the existing Garden Square did, Barry proposed for convenience a road or 'short street between [Victoria Street] and St Margaret's Church.' 55 feet wide and 150 feet long, it would', he wrote, 'cut the distance [for] carriages travelling from St Stephen's Tower to Victoria Street by 200 yards'. Therein lies the source of the pedestrian troubles today. Until then, the
green area around St Margaret's had at least kept the traffic away from the Abbey and provided a picturesque and green setting for the ancient and modern Gothic buildings (fig. 24).

E.M. Barry's piece of greenery had no footpaths, planted beds or benches from which to admire the monuments all around. It was a traffic island laid out to display sculpture. In 1851 a statue of the Tory Sir Robert Peel (1788-1850) had been placed in Wyatt's Garden Square (Matthew Noble, 1818-1876, was the sculptor). It was the first to take up a place near Canning in the new Barry layout. Later came Edward Stanley, the 14th Earl of Derby (1799-1868), a Whig turned Tory, the statue again by Matthew Noble and completed in 1874. After Stanley was Henry Temple, 3rd Viscount Palmerston (1784-1865), whose politics defied easy classification; the sculpture once more by Noble, in 1876.

The great Conservative politician Benjamin Disraeli had to wait more than a decade to take up his place (in 1892; his likeness executed, appropriately, by a sculptor who was, like the Earl of Beaconsfield, of Italian extraction -- Mario Raggi, 1821-1907). Students of Victorian politics may be surprised to find Gladstone nowhere in sight, but there was no iconographic programme being methodically worked out here.

After the square was redesigned in 1951, and the Victorian statesmen assigned their present positions, the new commemorative sculpture was of the South African politician Jan Christian Smuts (1870-1950), depicted in what is perhaps the finest work of art in the square -- by Jacob Epstein, 1880-1959, and dating from 1956. Smuts actually fought against the British in the Boer War, but he was later a loyal ally through two world wars, and played an important role in forming the United Nations, which met for the first time near by, in Methodist Central Hall. The bronze of Nelson Mandela by Ian Walters (1930-2006) was unveiled in August 2007 after a lengthy planning process. It will probably be the last statue to be erected in the square.

A notable feature of the Barry plan was the alignment of a north-south roadway between the square proper and Canning Green on axis with the north door of the Abbey, providing a fine view to people in carriages (and later motor cars) of that medieval monument, Scott's restoration of which was by this time (the 1860s) well under way. There is no suggestion that Barry was trying to reflect the line of King Street that had emanated from the precinct along the lines of the north transept. The position of this road was instead set by the distance needed at either end for the 'weaving' of vehicles across lanes as they wheeled around the junctions.

The roundabout as built was bisected by an east-west path extending the line of the carriageway entrance to New Palace Yard. The statue of Canning was repositioned on this axis and in this position provoked a (brief) debate in the

Commons at the end of the session of 1867. Then the Tory MP Alexander Beresford-Hope took the opportunity to canvas support for Barry's scheme as an improvement over existing conditions, commenting that it provided a suitable position as well for the anticipated commemorative statue of Palmerston. It is not surprising that Barry's scheme pleased Beresford-Hope and the MPs on hand that day and led them to support his motion, since it was laid out for their appreciation, orientated on axis with the carriageway approach they used to enter and leave New Palace Yard. The layout did not direct itself to the wider public at all; it was an extension of Parliament into the square.

The Next Instalment: Public Outcry and Traffic Again

Even on its own terms, as an ornament to Parliament, the Barry layout was far from perfect. The greenward to the west, Canning Green, was bounded on one side by an imposing Victorian block, Westminster House, a commercial building in multiple tenancies. In 1933 Middlessex County Council learned that the Westminster Real Property Company had acquired the leases on this site from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and was intending a much larger speculative office block. The proposed building, which would have towered over the Guildhall, caused a minor public outcry (fig. 23). In response the company instructed Giles Gilbert Scott (1880-1960; the grandson of Sir George, the Abbey surveyor, and himself the designer of the familiar red phone box) to improve and 'Gothicize' the first proposals.

Indeed, the project came quite close to being a reality. The developer tendered for the work, which prompted Middlessex -- not the Office of Works, not Parliament, not the London County Council (LCC) -- to campaign against the proposals, which it claimed would be out of keeping with the historical surroundings of the square. The council's Clerk tried to purchase a lease from the property company. Talks stalled, and Middlesex sought a private member's bill for the compulsory purchase of the land. Negotiations ceased and the developer agreed to sell for £375,000 the 999-year lease that it had acquired from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

There is a very interesting pair of drawings from this time that illustrates the existing layout of the square, one showing Westminster House and the other with it removed (figs. 26 and 27). Middlessex wished to gift the plot it had
The public outcry caused by this proposed speculative office block led Middlesex County Council to purchase the land thus forestalled the basis of the modern square.

The public perspective prepared by London County Council shows the Barry layout and Westminster House, the office block on Canning Green.

The same viewpoint as in fig. 26, altered to show the benefit of removing Westminster House, and a proposed new layout for the square.
acquired in perpetuity as public open space to preserve the setting of the square. The London County Council agreed to contribute some funds to purchase the site from Middlesex, but only if the Treasury bore most of the costs. Despite public petitions, the First Commissioner of Works – the government's agent in such land transactions – was not supportive. 'Normally', one of his civil servants wrote, 'the responsibility for civic improvements falls upon the local authorities concerned. The proposed improvement of the amenities of Parliament Square is not, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, of sufficient importance from a national point of view to justify a departure from the general rule.' If not here, one might ask where.

The desire to commemorate George V (1910–1936) offered a way out, perhaps. The parties promoting the expansion of the square suggested a national memorial to the king on Canning Green in order to force the government's hand. The prime minister, Stanley Baldwin, embraced the idea of a monument, but – and here was the fatal snub – he favoured a site in Abingdon Street, which the government conveniently owned already. William Reid Dick's (1879–1961) stone monument, with a base by Giles Gilbert Scott, was erected there near Old Palace Yard in 1947. At this point entered an improbable hero, the Ministry of Transport (MoT), which had long wanted to acquire the square for traffic improvements. In 1935 it came to the table with a plan for the rehandling of the square (fig. 28). This entailed doubling the area of Barry's roundabout and forming a new road obliterating half of Canning Green; all the memorials would have to be relocated.

This plan would speed the flow of traffic and reduce pedestrian accidents, and it is essentially the one that came to be realized in 1950–51. The MoT's engineers understood that this was no simple piece of traffic engineering, and their plan indicates how the space in the roundabout might be designed: there is a paved walk on axis of the north transept, an open greenward, and what appears to be a hemicycle (perhaps for a sculptural group).

So, finally, with necessary traffic improvements leading the way, the MoT was able to persuade a previously unwilling Office of Works to commit funds to the project, but still the Treasury drove a hard bargain. The estimate for the works was £400,000, in addition to the cost of the land. The transport minister agreed to meet some of this, and looked to other sources for the rest. Eventually Middlesex County Council offered £60,000, the LCC £100,000 and Westminster City Council £50,000. On that basis, in 1939, the Treasury agreed to buy the land provided that the LCC, Westminster and poor old Middlesex itself would also bear some more of the cost. They all agreed, with the help of the Pilgrim Trust (£50,000) and the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS, £10,000). Years of deal-making came to nothing, however, when war was declared later that year. And so the site remained as it had been, with a run-down office block bounding one side.

The case of beautifying Parliament Square was, however, taken up in the ambitious County of London Plan of 1943. This proposed diverting traffic from the area by turning Great George Street into a dual carriageway on the basis that this 'noble group of buildings around the nation's ancient shrine [the Abbey] calls for a more tranquil setting ... It demands too, for ceremonial occasions, a dignified and reasonably spacious environment.' An aerial perspective showed how this proposal would solve, as the authors put it, 'the whole traffic problem in Westminster' (fig. 29).

The editors of the Architectural Review took up the cause in their issue of November 1947, which published Gordon Cullens's proposals for a new, pedestrianized precinct (figs. 30–32). Although he did not turn Great George Street into a dual carriageway, Cullens closed the whole area south of it, including Broad Sanctuary. He assumed vehicular access to the palace would be by means of an underpass and roundabout excavated in New Palace Yard (possibly not the most preservation-friendly solution; a massive underground car park for MPs was, however, eventually constructed there). Parliament Square was to be hard-paved, and the statues of Victorian statesmen moved to the north edge lining Great George Street and facing Whitehall. Old Palace Yard would be turfed in the manner of an English cathedral close. It might seem now pie in the sky, but in 1947 many things seemed possible. The LCC was still confident it could transform Parliament Square, but 'as a long-term project, say 40–50 years'.

Meanwhile, the LCC was busy reworking the MoT plan of 1935 specifically to allow 'a more adequate weaving length on the north side of the roundabout'. This new
transport minister agreed to meet some of this, and looked to other sources for the rest. Eventually Middlesex County Council offered £50,000, the LCC £100,000 and Westminster City Council £50,000. On that basis, in 1939, the Treasury agreed to buy the land provided that the LCC, Westminster and poor old Middlesex itself would also bear some more of the cost. They all agreed, with the help of the Pilgrim Trust (£30,000) and the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (£10,000). Years of deal-making came to nothing, however, when war was declared later that year. And so the site remained as it had been, with a run-down office block bounding one side.

The cause of beautifying Parliament Square was, however, taken up in the ambitious London Plan of 1943. This proposed diverting traffic from the area by turning Great George Street into a dual carriageway on the basis that this 'noble group of buildings around the nation's ancient shrine [the Abbey] calls for a more tranquil setting ... it demands too, for ceremonial occasions, a dignified and reasonably spacious environment.' An aerial perspective showed how this proposal would solve, as the authors put it, 'the whole traffic problem in Westminster' (fig. 29).

The editors of the Architectural Review took up the cause in their issue of November 1947, which published Gordon Cullen's proposals for a new, pedestrianized precinct (figs. 30-32). Although he did not turn Great George Street into a dual carriageway, Cullen closed the whole area south of it, including Broad Sanctuary. He assumed vehicular access to the palace would be by means of an underpass and roundabout excavated in New Palace Yard (possibly not the most preservation-friendly solution; a massive underground car park for MPs was, however, eventually constructed there). Parliament Square was to be hard-paved, and the statues of Victorian statesmen moved to the north edge lining Great George Street and facing Whitehall. Old Palace Yard would be turfed in the manner of an English cathedral close. It might seem now pic in the sky, but in 1947 many things seemed possible. The LCC was still confident it could transform Parliament Square, but 'a long-term project, say 40-50 years'.

Meanwhile, the LCC was busy reworking the MoT plan of 1935 specifically to allow 'a more adequate weaving length on the north side of the roundabout'. This new version allowed the retention of mature London plane trees planted in the nineteenth century. There remained, though, a few points at issue between the newly created Ministry of Works and the LCC. One was whether the 'roundabout' – the word used at the time – should be enclosed as Barry's had been, to keep pedestrians out; or, if not, whether people should be allowed, even encouraged, to cross to the square and so interrupt traffic. Once there, assuming this was the outcome, how were pedestrians to be protected from the traffic raging on all sides?

The Metropolitan Police did not want any access on road-safety grounds. The Ministry of Works took a different view. Its deputy secretary, Sir Eric de Normann, set out his concerns in an internal memorandum: 'I get the impression that this plan has been prepared by the LCC ... entirely from the point of view of improving traffic facilities in Parliament Square. This may be very right and proper but from our point of view we must consider the matter from a wider aspect and amenities must certainly come into the picture.' He worried, too, about how the Victorian statues could be given a meaningful setting. Recalling the County of London Plan of 1943, he continued: 'Moreover, I am doubtful whether this increase in traffic facilities is in line with planning policy. Surely ... Abercrombie [the author of the County of London Plan] ... intended to divert traffic away from the Abbey? Though this plan may not be realizable for a good many years, I see no reason why in the interval we should go so completely against the spirit of it.'

De Normann encouraged an open debate, and that is just what he got over the following three years. At the heart of it were questions concerning what sort of place the square should be. Was it to be a small park, an ornamental roundabout or both? That was not the only problem. Other colleagues in the ministry disliked the winnowing away of Canning Green 'to a small pointed strip on which it will be difficult, if not impossible, to site either the Canning or Lincoln statues'. The latter had been a gift from the US government in 1920 (the work of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, 1848-1907, it is a copy of an earlier casting in Chicago). Finally, the chief architect at the Works tried to wrest control of the design from the MoT by proposing to buy the site from Middlesex County Council, which, it will be remembered, had been looking for someone to take it off its
Right: 30. Gordon Cullen proposed the pedestrianization of the wider area in the November 1947 issue of the Architectural Review (vol. 102, pp. 159-170). This image shows a view west along Great George Street, with the Victorian stations looking up Waterloo.


Opposite: 32. Cullen envisaged reinstating the old Abbey boundary railing shown in the painting by Cordyburn of 1744, illustrated earlier in this chapter (p. 533). This would have required diverting the traffic in Vauxhall Street west.
books for some time. One compromise idea offered was to form a subway to the centre of the square, surround it with a high wall to screen out traffic noise, and arrange the statues in a circle round a garden. A Ministry of Works civil servant remarked that "this would look pretty queer".

By summer of 1947 the ministry had persuaded the LCC to adopt a compromise design that allowed for a pedestrian crossing to a walkway on the line of the north transept of the Abbey, a feature of particular importance to civil servants. The view of the north transept that Barry's arrangements afforded was just about the only thing admired in the Victorian layout. "The Works also hoped that this walkway would be part of the normal route for people making their way on foot from Whitehall to Parliament (although that seems strange, since this alignment is far from the fine of Whitehall, and negotiating it involved crossing twice over large roads)."

The MoT officials now lost their patience. If the LCC wanted something architectural, it should pay for it or accept an expedient, short-term solution for dealing with the traffic. Otherwise, congestion across the wider area would become unacceptable. MoT staff also pointed out that a solid block of vehicles harmed the setting of the Abbey and Parliament far more than the steady movement of traffic - a fair point. Congestion had been bad before 1939, had eased during the war, but by early 1948 was getting serious again despite petrol rationing. No agreement seemed possible. In February 1948 de Normann complained, 'Every time I go through Parliament Square I reflect on its bedraggled appearance.' Maybe, he conjectured, the Victorian arrangement could be smartened up by fresh planting. He asked the Royal Parks, which suggested rhododendrons, but pointed out that these would have to be rotated seasonally to recover from the effects of air pollution. It is a mark of the austerity of the time that the modest sum of £5000 a year would not be found even for this window dressing.

The Ministry of Works decided finally to intervene and force a compromise with an aesthetic edge. Instead of leaving the design of the roundabout to an engineer, de Normann approached the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) to suggest architects capable of working with the LCC's engineers to make the roundabout attractive. George Grey Wornum (1888-1957) won the subsequent limited competition. He had previously gained an RIBA medal for 'Street Architecture'. It helped that he advised Westminster City Council on municipal projects, including social housing. His best-known work is the headquarters building of the RIBA itself in Portland Place. He also designed a housing standard, examples of which can still be seen around the square.

From Wornum's appointment in November 1949 the project took on a particular urgency, since everyone wanted the works finished by the opening of the Festival of Britain in 1951 - its day an event of as much significance as the 2012 Olympics. Parliament Square was not, however, one of those linked Festival projects, such as Churchill Gardens in Pimlico or the Lansbury Estate in Poplar, where the design was deliberately Modern to echo the spirit of the event. If that had been the intention, then Wornum was the wrong choice. His sensibility was that of a previous generation, and he was a safe pair of hands. Today his design certainly appears attractive, but it looks similar to something Lutyens could have done for a country house in the 1920s. Wornum definitely wanted pavements on each side of the roundabout so that his new space could become part of the pattern of pedestrian circulation in the area. The Metropolitan Police disagreed. Westminster City Council, along with the MoT, weighed in against Wornum's best intentions. Now that the proposals were achieving architectural form, the Royal Fine Arts Commission became involved. It particularly approved the handling of the west side of the square by means of a low terrace that retained the trees and provided a platform for the statues, which Wornum repositioned there. Middlesex County Council was disgruntled because the MoT plan brought traffic too close to its front door at the Guildhall (as it still does). The irony of this would not have been lost on the county, without the far-sighted intervention of which there would have been no new plan to debate in the first place.

But the talk could go on only for so long. The Ministry of Works put a bill before Parliament seeking authorization for the plans. Middlesex, Westminster and the Metropolitan Police all threatened formal objections because Wornum's paved area round the edge continued to look as though it might accommodate pedestrians. The Works got all parties together to broker a compromise at a meeting with the architect, who suggested that if the path on the north side were extended farther east to meet the corner, the space would become more inviting for pedestrians. And so the favoured Google Earth 'hit spot' with which this essay began arose out of a last-minute compromise. Wornum agreed to remove the wide pavements on the south and east edges of the square for which he had previously been fighting. These became instead the rough paved strips we have today, which were retained to provide areas for the public to view official processions (grass on its own presented practical difficulties).

At last the matter was settled, and the work completed in time for the opening of the Festival of Britain. Wornum was rewarded with the RIBA's highest accolade, its Gold Medal, although it is tempting to think that this may well have been in recognition of his sheer dogged determination (figs. 33-35).

Although Wornum, the Ministry of Works and the Royal Fine Arts Commission had all wanted the square to be what we today would call 'accessible', the documents give no indication of just what this meant. Wornum must have realized that only a few people would get into the square. He decided to pave it with Portland stone, which is a beautiful, quintessentially London stone, but not hard-wearing and therefore never specified for well-used footways or public spaces.

Today certain features of Wornum's vision are admirable. The large green space provides visual relief from the traffic and, with that light Portland stone, creates a calm foreground setting to the Abbey and Parliament. The scheme turns its back to the rest, but to dwell on this would
The architect, who suggested that if the path on the north side were extended farther east, to meet the corner, the space would become more inviting for pedestrians. And so the favoured Google Earth 'hit spot' with which this essay began arose out of a last-minute compromise. Wornum agreed to remove the wide pavements on the south and east edges of the square for which he had previously been fighting. These became instead the rough paved strips we have today, which were retained to provide areas for the public to view official processions (grass on its own presented practical difficulties).

At last the matter was settled, and the work completed in time for the opening of the Festival of Britain. Wornum was rewarded with the RIBA's highest accolade, its Gold Medal, although it is tempting to think that this may well have been in recognition of his sheer dogged determination (figs. 33–35).

Although Wornum, the Ministry of Works and the Royal Fine Arts Commission had all wanted the square to be what we today would call 'accessible', the documents give no indication of just what this meant. Wornum must have realized that only a few people would get into the square. He decided to pave it with Portland stone, which is a beautiful, quintessentially London stone, but not hard-wearing and therefore never specified for well-used footways or public spaces.

Today certain features of Wornum's vision are admirable. The large greensward provides visual relief from the traffic and, with that light Portland stone, creates a calm foreground setting to the Abbey and Parliament. The scheme turns its back to the rest, but to dwell on this would
be to criticize it for failing to do something that was never in Winson’s brief. The subtle level change across the site is well handled, too. All this can be appreciated, however, only by the braves, the fleet of foot, the patient, or the determined protester. There are roughly 40 million pedestrian movements along the pavements lining the square each year. Of these, only 500,000 actually get into the centre, and about half of them do so on events days, when the roads are closed to traffic (these figures come from Transport for London Surveys of c. 2005).

A Greater Parliament Square!

Proposals to redevelop the site to the west of the Guildhall, occupied by the Stationery Office and Westminster Hospital, were revived in 1947, when the government purchased the site for $42,000 and commissioned designs for a new Foreign and Colonial Office (fig. 36). This was seen as an opportunity to set back the old building line and create a larger space in front of Methodist Central Hall on one side of Broad Sanctuary. Churchill himself, however, seriously questioned whether there should be any building at all there. On 22 October 1954 he wrote to Nigel Birch, Minister of Works: ‘Pray give your early consideration to the question of building the Colonial Office on the site opposite Westminster Abbey. It seems a great pity to fill this unique space. What alternatives could be proposed?’ The prime minister had in mind clearing the space between Central Hall and Parliament, involving the demolition of the RICS headquarters and the Guildhall. Birch’s response betrayed some irritation at carefully worked-out plans being thrown aside. He observed that the proposed building ‘would not be unworthy of its surroundings and the Colonial Office would get the Headquarters which they need’. This was hardly a glowing tribute to the new design.

Churchill sensed he was being outnumbered, but did not let go. In November he prepared a letter (which was never sent) to answer Birch. In it he outlined his vision of a greater Parliament Square:

It might one day be possible for the whole of the site, from the [Methodist] Central Hall to the Houses of Parliament, to be cleared of buildings and laid out as a great square. The cost no doubt would be heavy, but it would spread over many years, perhaps even generations. I am not convinced that we should prejudice this magnificent prospect now by erecting an obstacle to it [a new Colonial Office] which might last for centuries.

I remember there was a lot of public criticism of the proposal when the Labour Government announced it, and that there was opposition from all Parties in the House. One alternative which has been suggested to me … is Somerset House. There are five buildings which would be more impressive to Colonials, and I should not think it is beyond human ingenuity to move the Inland Revenue and Wills to less grand premises.

I am not proposing that the final decision should be taken now, but I do consider that building [the Colonial Office] should be postponed for a few years. Meanwhile, the pavements [around the cleared site] should be pulled down so that the public could see for the first time what possibilities the site presents.'

In the final version to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Churchill wrote, ‘I believe we should take a long-term view and go for what Birch describes as a “truly noble conception”, i.e., aim at eventually (possibly not in our lifetime) getting the whole site … cleared and laid out as a great square … Once they [the public] have seen it there would, I think, be a spontaneous demand that it should not be built over.’ The chancellor replied: ‘I do not see how I could defend in Parliament the big unproductive expenditure, to say nothing of the destruction, involved in such a scheme.’

The public criticism to which Churchill referred was that of the Royal Fine Arts Commission, which was unhappy with the bulk and height of the proposed Colonial Office in relation to the Abbey. Winson suggested a compromise in a massing diagram of that year (and the eventual redevelopment of the site with the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre follows his sketch almost exactly; see figs. 37 and 38). The Hospital and Stationery sites were then cleared, and, regrettably, there was no ‘spontaneous demand it should not be built over’.

In April 1955 Churchill’s son-in-law Duncan Sandys, Minister of Housing and Local Government, held off redevelopment and arranged for the site to be used temporarily as a surface car park. In 1958 the Colonial Office proposals were abandoned; the whole notion of a Colonial Office was coming into question, and the UK was then beginning to reformulate its relationship with its overseas dominions. The question of what to do with the vacant site was seen aside to avoid prejudicing Leslie Martin’s (1968–2000) proposals for replanning Whitehall. He proposed a ‘traffic-free precinct’ around Parliament Square, and on the hospital site a building of ‘international significance’, but not for governmental use. The proposals involved considerable demolition, were contentious and so led to a public inquiry. They were dismissed, but out of them came the decision that the cleared site to the rear of the Guildhall should be a government conference centre. Although a brief for this was issued in 1969, architects were not selected until ten years later, and construction on Powell and Moya’s Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre began in 1982.

By this point Westminster City Council, as the local planning authority, was promoting its own proposals to pedestrianize Parliament Square, and published formal guidance on this in 1984. Political intent did not focus on the knotty problem of whether it was right for traffic to take a back seat to people on foot, however, until the more recent major reorientation in thinking about our towns and cities that has occurred as planning policy has moved towards concepts of sustainable development. So it was that in 1996 agencies and public authorities with an interest in central London came together to form the ‘World Squares for All’ Steering Group to improve pedestrian provision and reduce the impact of traffic in London’s two most important public spaces, Trafalgar Square and Parliament Square. From 2001 this group was
The public criticism to which Churchill referred was that of the Royal Fine Arts Commission, which was unhappy with the bulk and height of the proposed Colonial Office in relation to the Abbey. Wornum suggested a compromise in a massing diagram of that year and the eventual redevelopment of the site with the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre follows his sketch almost exactly: see figs. 37 and 38. 'The Hospital and Stationery sites were then cleared, and, regrettably, there was no 'spontaneous demand it should not be built over'.

In April 1955 Churchill's son-in-law Duncan Sandys, Minister of Housing and Local Government, held off redevelopment and arranged for the site to be used temporarily as a surface car park. In 1958 the Colonial Office proposals were abandoned; the whole notion of a Colonial Office was coming into question, and the UK was then beginning to reorient its relationship with its overseas dominions. The question of what to do with the vacant site was set aside to avoid prejudicing Leslie Martin’s (1908–2000) proposals for replanning Whitehall. He proposed a traffic-free precinct around Parliament Square, and on the hospital site a building of 'international significance', but not for governmental use. The proposals involved considerable demolition, were contentious and so led to a public inquiry. They were dismissed, but out of them came the decision that the cleared site to the rear of the Guildhall should be a government conference centre. Although a brief for this was issued in 1969, architects were not selected until ten years later, and construction on Powell and Moya's Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre began in 1982.

By this point Westminster City Council, as the local planning authority, was promoting its own proposals to pedestrianize Parliament Square, and published formal guidance on this in 1984. Political interest did not focus on the knotty problem of whether it was right for traffic to take a back seat to people on foot, however, until the more recent major reorientation in thinking about our towns and cities that has occurred as planning policy has moved towards concepts of sustainable development. So it was that in 1996 agencies and public authorities with an interest in central London came together to form the ‘World Squares for All’ Steering Group to improve pedestrian provision and reduce the impact of traffic in London’s two most important public spaces, Trafalgar Square and Parliament Square. From 2001 this group was
chaired by the newly created Greater London Authority (GLA), working closely with its strategic traffic and highway authority, Transport for London (TfL). 'Partnership working' was by this point de rigeur, and the steering group was packed with agencies, government departments and public authorities with an interest in these two spaces: English Heritage, the government's adviser on the historic environment; the Department for Culture, Media and Sport; the Parliamentary Works Directorate, Westminster Abbey; Westminster City Council; the Metropolitan Police; and the Royal Parks Agency. A masterplan by Foster+Partners was completed in 1998, and the first phase, the closure of one arm of the Trafalgar Square gyratory, was realized in 2003.

The second part of World Squares for All was Parliament Square, the implementation of which was also integral to the delivery of the Westminster World Heritage Site Management Plan (figs. 39, 40 and 41). This not
surprisingly identified high traffic levels as the single largest threat to the "outstanding universal significance" reflected in the UNESCO-approved designation. Detailed work on the redesign began in 2006, and by early 2007 a team of landscape designers, conservation experts and traffic engineers was appointed under the direction of masterplan architect Hawkins Brown, which was charged with implementing the closure of the road separating the Abbey from the roundabout that Barry had created to ease traffic congestion, and with downgrading St Margaret's Street to the east so that it would take much lower volumes of traffic.

A Zurich-based landscape practice, Vogt Landschaftsarchitekten, proposed to replace Worren's work with a new paved scheme and associated planting around St Margaret's, the latter deliberately echoing Wyatt's first Garden Square (figs. 42 and 43). The architects proposed using natural building stones from across the UK and laying these in a rhythmic mesh pattern that was seen as organic and also redolent of Gothic rib vaulting. A low wall was to be created at the north-west corner to give views of the World Heritage Site. Vogt also retained the raised platform on the western edge to preserve the trees, and maintained the sculptures in their current positions.

In some quarters the proposed removal of Worren's landscape of 1951 was contentious. In 2001 English Heritage had added Parliament Square to its non-statutory Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, a list reserved for landscapes of national significance. Nevertheless, the design team believed it was necessary to undo Worren's scheme. The proposed road closures undermined the logic of his design. Portland stone and turf are not durable enough to cope with the tens of millions of people who were anticipated to use the new space. The scheme of 1951 also relied on steps to deal with level changes, and required extensive adaptation to meet inclusive design standards. While English Heritage supported the closure of the south side and the remodelling of the square to improve accessibility, it wished to retain elements of the Worren scheme that it considered provided a simple, elegant setting for the World Heritage Site. The GLA, led by the then mayor, Ken Livingstone, was strongly supportive of a contemporary, fully inclusive scheme, emblematic of the twenty-first century, and so instructed TFL to prepare the necessary planning application.

Then Livingstone lost the mayoral election of May 2008 to the Conservative candidate, Boris Johnson. Johnson reviewed all capital projects under TFL's control and on
In some quarters the proposed removal of Wornum’s landscape of 1931 was contentious. In 2003 English Heritage had added Parliament Square to its non-statutory Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, a list reserved for landscapes of national significance. Nevertheless, the design team believed it was necessary to undo Wornum’s scheme. The proposed road closures undermined the logic of his design. Portland stone and turf are not durable enough to cope with the tens of millions of people who were anticipated to use the new space. The scheme of 1931 also relied on steps to deal with level changes, and so required extensive adaptation to meet inclusive design standards. While English Heritage supported the closure of the south side and the remodelling of the square to improve accessibility, it wished to retain elements of the Wornum scheme: that it considered provided a simple, elegant setting for the World Heritage Site. The GLA, led by the then mayor, Ken Livingstone, was strongly supportive of a contemporary, fully inclusive scheme, emblematic of the twenty-first century, and so instructed TfL to prepare the necessary planning application.

Then Livingstone lost the mayoral election of May 2008 to the Conservative candidate, Boris Johnson. Johnson reviewed all capital projects under TfL’s control and on 6 August 2008 announced that Parliament Square would not proceed. He was concerned that the potential cumulative effects on traffic in central London, arising from significant developments at Victoria and Elephant and Castle, would be simply too great. In reaching this view the new mayor took into account the congestion that would arise from traffic diverted by the construction of Crossrail (the most important public transport project in the capital and now under way). All in all, the TfL project would, the official press release went on, make congestion in London even worse, since traffic, as TfL itself had just revealed, was returning to pre-Congestion Charging levels. Additionally, Johnson’s administration was opposed to losing the turfed area in the square. And so the last word on this latest installment in the history of this small, politically charged piece of land must belong to the current mayor (as recorded on the GLA website): “There is absolutely no sense in Londoners paying £18 million from their stretched transport budget in order to reduce capacity on London’s roads. This scheme would have turned a green glade of heroes into a vast, blasted, chewing-gummed pizza.”
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COMMENTS ON DR GERHOLD’S SUBMISSION

1. In this Appendix to my main Proof, I present information about the existing memorials in VTG and their political character.

2. I offer these observations in the context of Dr Gerhold’s criticisms of the NHM, the content of which he considers is not consistent with the meaning of memorials nearby.

3. I make these observations without prejudice to my main evidence, which is simply that the content of the proposals has no bearing on Westminster’s Reasons for Refusal. Neither does the policy context require complementarity of content. The policy context only goes to establishing whether there is harm to the ability to appreciate what is special about the several assets under consideration.

4. I consider Dr Gerhold’s objections in terms at the close of this note.

THE BUXTON MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN (1866, 1957)

5. I consider the architectural and historic interest of this memorial in my main proof, at section XX.

6. The following comments deal with its associations relative to its context.

7. This Gothic Revival Structure, designed by S.S. Teulon with amateur architect Charles Buxton, son of Sir Thomas Buxton, was raised in honour of the latter. He was a campaigning MP closely involved in the anti-slavery movement which led to the abolition of the trade in 1807. It originally stood in Parliament Square, and was removed during Grey Womum’s make-over of the square in 1949.

8. The memorial was re-erected here in 1957. The Anti-Slavery Society insisted on its remaining close to Westminster, to honour the parliamentarian battles waged to end slavery in debates.

9. Now associated very much with Buxton, it was originally erected in honour of all MPs who supported Wilberforce’s anti-slavery campaign.

10. Its theme, clearly, is to commemorate the overcoming of inhumane treatment of a class of individual, based on their race. In that sense, the subject matter of the memorial complements that of the NHM.

11. As noted in my main evidence, there is no particular association between this meaning and the present setting, which is not original in any case, beyond its association with Parliament by reason of proximity and visibility.

RODIN’S THE BURGHERS OF CALAIS (1915)

12. I do not treat this work of art in detail in my main proof, where I conclude its setting is not harmed.

13. The original sculpture was commissioned by the City of Calais to mark the demolition of the city’s medieval walls, in 1884.

14. Three casts were made – this one was bought by the National Art Collections Fund in 1911, and installed here in 1915. Other sites were initially considered (outside the Tate and outside the Wallace Collection) but this one prevailed.
15. Rodin expressed his delight at this statue being located so close to the seat of British government, and described the work in 1913 as ‘an artistic trophy to the honour of England and France’. At first he wanted the group positioned even closer to the Palace of Westminster.

16. The group depicts the six prominent citizens of Calais who offered themselves to Edward III as hostages on the surrender of the city after a siege: Edward had promised to spare the city if its leading citizens surrendered themselves as sacrificial victims, and walked out with the keys to Calais, and wearing nooses.

17. According to Froissart’s Chronicles, Edward’s queen Philippa of Hainault pleaded for their lives and they were duly spared.

18. The group depicts a scene of bravery and mercy, and a rare incident of Franco-British reconciliation during the Hundred Years’ War. Conceived long before the Entente Cordiale of 1904, it was particularly appropriate as a subject in the years before the outbreak of war in 1914.

19. Whether this statue carried a political message at the time of its unveiling is uncertain. It certainly carried messages of courage and virtue, and the place of clemency in the operation of state power.

20. Rodin’s reputation was extremely high in our country at this time, and the notion of having one of his principal works on display in a public setting would have been extremely attractive. It is a measure of the respect he was held in that Rodin was invited over to London in 1913 to advise on the setting.

21. The sculpture, therefore, has an international character by reasons of its artist and the Anglo-French conflict which provides its historical context. Its location close to Parliament was particularly valued, and having a work of one of the greatest sculptors of the C19 and early C20 clearly adds to the cultural associations of the WHS.

22. The monument’s latent associations it attracts by reason of the history of relations between our two countries was not intrinsic to the piece.

23. Unlike earlier statues located close to Parliament, and depicting monarchs and statesmen (in Parliament Square), the Rodin depicts common people in a situation of peril, undertaking an act of bravery with dignity which in turn led to clemency. The sculpture therefore celebrates courage and virtue, and latterly, unintentionally, diplomacy.

**MEMORIAL TO EMMELINE AND CHRISTABEL PANKHURST (1930)**

24. Emmeline Pankhurst’s memorial comprises a bronze standing figure by Arthur G. Walker on a plinth by Sir Herbert Baker. It was augmented with a low screen wall with two bronze medallions in 1959.

25. The Westminster location was very important for this tribute to a prominent campaigner for women’s rights.

26. Attempts by the Office of Works to shunt the statue off to Manchester (Mrs Pankhurst’s birth-place) were resisted by the memorial committee, which began by requesting a site right beside Cromwell outside Westminster Hall, or at the end of Downing Street. The involvement of Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin in the cause, who had agreed to perform the unveiling, trumped any further objections concerning the location.

27. The location close to the Palace of Westminster embodies the success of the campaign for universal suffrage, and that proximity embodies the seriousness of the cause. There was, as it happened, a lack of statues commemorating women at this time or embodying recent causes (see Florence Nightingale in Waterloo Place, by the same sculpture and of 1915). The other significant association is the role of no. 10 in securing this prominent location.
PARLIAMENT SQUARE – GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

28. I append the article I wrote in the UK Supreme Court book on the evolution of the Square for information.

29. This area has become politicized in recent years. It has always, since its formation in the mid-19th century, been political in that statues of prominent statesmen have been raised which connect the landscape with the Palace of Westminster directly. In recent times, this character has been widened to become international and diverse.

30. Statues to Palmerston, Derby and Peel were raised in the 1870s. Abraham Lincoln’s arrival in 1920 widened the spectrum, and introduced a foreign figure widely respected for his leading the US in its war between the states and against slavery. It is also a mark of the strength of Anglo-American relations, a strong bilateral relationship.

31. Nelson Mandela’s arrival in 2007 was extraordinary in that Mandela (1918-2013) was still alive and unveiled the statue himself. Gandhi followed in 2015, and Millicent Fawcett in 2018. They varied from the original sculptural intention, great statesmen associated with Parliament.

32. Parliament Square had become a place of protest between 2001 and 2012. This, together with the new character of statues being raised to persons other than British statesmen, has affected the perception of this open space. It is less a zone of tribute and respect, more a monumental place which celebrates reformers and campaigners, and places militants on a pedestal (or in Mandela’s case, off one). As a consequence the Westminster memorial landscape has acquired a moral or expressly ethical dimension over time, and over the course of this and the last century.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

33. A political reading of Westminster’s memorials might properly start with the installation in c1676 of Le Sueur’s equestrian statue of Charles I at Charing Cross. He rides down towards his place of execution, the image of regal authority, embodying the confidence of the later Stuart monarchy after the Restoration.

34. The idea of Westminster’s memorial landscape bearing a moral meaning dates back to the arrival of the Burghers of Calais in 1915.

35. Parliament Square has always had a political population of bronze figures. In the C21, beginning with Mandela, there has been an active programme of widening the range of persons commemorated to include persons of colour, and of progressive reputations.

36. There has been quite a lot of movement of statues. They have not been a static, immobile group.

37. The Bali Club Bombing Memorial (2006) honouring the 202 people killed in terrorist attacks on Bali in 2002 was deliberately sited close to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office at the insistence of the Victims’ Group, which accused HMG of not having given enough warning to travelers.

38. This is an admonitory monument addressed to government, and a recent response to atrocity killings.

CONTEXTUAL REFERENCES

39. Monuments erected with Holocaust associations include the
a) **Raoul Wallenberg** statue by Philip Jackson (1997) at Gt Cumberland Place. The inscription goes into great detail about his role in Budapest in 1944-5, saving Jewish people from death but disappearing in Soviet captivity.

b) Fred Kormis (1887-1986), a German sculptor who was a prisoner of war in Siberia during WW1, created ‘the Marchers’ in 1975: it depicts a group of naked figures, anxiously clinging to each other, and has unmistakable Holocaust overtones. Versions are at King’s College London and University College, Swansea. He also produced the **Prisoners of War Memorial** in Gladstone Park, Dollis Hill (1970).

c) A **UK Holocaust Memorial Garden** was unveiled in Hyde Park (just east of the Serpentine) in 1983. It consists of a boulder upon gravel, surrounded by silver birches.

40. These are very modest in scale and character.

The **Imperial War Museum’s Holocaust Gallery** was opened in 2000 and is scheduled to be replaced with a new display shortly. It needs to be viewed as one of the national memorials, as its didactic approach is very clear to the visitor. This is against the main British tradition of museum displays, but akin to the original nature of the Imperial War Museum in its earliest incarnations, which included memorial zones along with the exhibits.

**OBJECTIONS FROM DR GERHOLD**

41. Here follow observations on the points raised in his objection dated 8 February 2020.

42. Para 4: Harm and degree of it. I treat this allegation directly in my main proof.

43. Here I note that the objection does not entertain any potential public benefits consequent on the proposals (see HE’s response).

44. Para 6: significance of project is not irrelevant.

45. Para 7: Parliament’s alleged record of intolerance. I simply note that this objection does not go onto recognize that the UK did go to war against Nazi Germany and did admit Jewish refugees. Claims of memorial being ‘banal… meaningless… utterly incoherent’ are extreme and emotive assertions.

46. Para 8: ‘no direct link between the Holocaust and the UK Parliament’. There does not need to be: the unparalleled scale of the Holocaust affects every government in every country as a warning. Having a memorial near Parliament does not deny the relevance and meaning of the event to others, but does show its seriousness.

47. Para 10: VTG is a prestigious space. I agree it is by reason of location – my main evidence explains its significance. That being agreed, that is, the prestige of the space, it is no surprise that promoters of the memorial wish to have such a location. The prestige of the location appears to me to be a good reason in terms and not a weak reason as stated.

48. Para 11: existing monuments have a political and moral character. There are very specific accusations here which I think split hairs. The big point holds: these monuments explore issues of morality, politics, and legislation. That this legislation took time to get passed does not deny that the steps were eventually taken – and were influential internationally.

49. Para 14: allegation no system was used to identify the site. This falls to the evidence presented elsewhere by the promoters. Mine deals exclusively with the impacts. I say no more on related topics. In simple
terms, and whatever the Minister’s finding on the alternatives, it is clear that there is no more prestigious location in central London. In straightforward terms, that prestige lends importance to the memorial.

Annex 1

50. Criticism of ‘tone of national self-congratulation’. A sour note, which does not recognize the sacrifice of 450,000 UK citizens in WW2, killed in the fight against Axis powers. Irrelevance of democracy/genocide distinction.

51. Nazi Germany was a dictatorship, not a democracy. The Holocaust was made possible through political power, applied in an evil way. Westminster is an old democracy (however defined) and the seat of government is a good place to consider what a state can do, and what a wicked state can do. There is, I think, a too literal approach to the reasoning here.

52. Getting people to think about political power and the devastating consequences of when it goes wrong is surely a worthy aspiration for a structure beside the Palace of Westminster. The closing remark about visitors leaving with their backs to Westminster is of no real merit.

53. Dr Gerhold accepts rationale for a holocaust memorial. Non-sequitur re visitors having to exercise their vigilance in local communities: places can inspire and inculcate messages which are taken away elsewhere.

54. No real objection identified to the claim that a monument here might hold Parliament to account. Last sentence alleges a contradiction to para (3): I don’t see this.

55. Various historical details: the point is, the Nazi legislation was passed in a state with a (young) parliamentary tradition. How sovereignty of parliaments can be eroded is a historical process worth considering.

56. Making visitors think about Parliament’s role in the 1930s/40s has to be a good thing, and makes it possible to examine the UK’s flawed attitude to Nazi persecution of the Jews (see Martin Gilbert, *Auschwitz and the Allies*, 1981). Point re decisions being made in Whitehall, not Palace of Westminster, is trivial.

Annex 2: VTG as a garden of Britain’s conscience

57. Dr Gerhold seeks to deny that there is a theme linking the monuments in VTG. There may not be a deliberate, orchestrated plan to create such an ensemble – but the end result is just such a thing (see above). The emergence of themes in response to changing perceptions is the way that the seat of our democracy (executive, legal and legislative) has evolved.

58. Parliament Square now contains the Supreme Court, as an independent institution in its own building, having its own identify. That was never planned at all (see my article) but that does not make it less resonant.

59. Burghers of Calais ‘has no long-term significance whatever in the story of human rights and liberties or of Parliament’. Perhaps not – but this comment ignores its message of political responsibility (the burghers who offer themselves up), political power (Edward III’s life or death authority) and mercy (the burghers’ salvation).

60. Dr Gerhold accepts that the Pankhurst memorial does relate to human rights and liberties.
61. Re the Buxton memorial: Dr Gerhold claims this commemorates the fight against slavery overseas, though not the slaves. It actually honours the parliamentary struggle to get Wilberforce’s legislation through. It has a lot to do with the active safeguarding of human lives and rights.

62. Crude denial of there being a link between the Holocaust and other memorials. The higher point is – this would join other memorials which invite the viewer to ponder on reform, mercy, power and the role of governments in these important things.

63. To bring in Amritsar Massacre, Irish Famine, slavery is to open a whole new set of questions. Magna Carta is celebrated at Runnymede; other political events mentioned by DG could indeed be memorialized, but however terrible they are overwhelmed by the crushingly huge event of the Holocaust.