Before we take up the ways in which coherent grouping of houses may be planned, it is necessary to consider further the advantages and disadvantages of terrace houses and detached houses built in close proximity to one another. Some people are under the impression that detached houses are in some way more healthful than terrace buildings, even where there are the same number to each acre of land, but I do not think this needs serious refutation. The detached houses are certainly colder; they call for less skill in planning and have not the especial advantage possessed by the terrace house, that of compelling the architect to provide for every window an open outlook either across the street or close, or over the garden, thus securing the adequate lighting of each room which almost all English by-laws demand.

In planning terrace houses it should be made possible to get "a clean blow through" the house, to remove all stagnant air and secure really satisfactory ventilation. In almost every room in the detached house it is possible to have windows on more than one side, while in the terrace house few rooms can have this advantage, so that satisfactory ventilation is more easily attained in the former than it is in the latter. This is another reason for claiming that a through living room is almost essential for the ideal terrace house.

Elsewhere I have pointed out the advantage of having all chimney stacks within the house and none on the exterior walls. This, of course, is more easily contrived for houses in terraces than for any other type of building.

But perhaps it is in the garden that the terrace house has the greatest advantage over the detached house. In the plans for terrace houses given in my last article, I showed small gardens between the houses and the roads. Whether these are desirable or not depends very largely upon the character of the street on which the houses front. In many streets modern motor traffic has made it desirable to set the houses back from the street, but where there is little through traffic it is perhaps wisest to build the houses right up to the street line and have the garden on the side away from the street, especially if this is the sunnier side. Small front gardens are generally of little use and involve effort to keep them tidy. Still, if they are planned like little forecourts, they may be very charming and of some real service. If the ground between a road and the house fronting on it, instead of being divided up into separate small gardens, is laid out in a continuous strip, as in Diagrams Two and Three, the effect
may be most desirable from all points of view, and may help to link a whole road into a complete composition. The question really is, "Is this space more useful and desirable in front of the house than it would be if added to the gardens in back?" and this is a question each householder must answer for himself.

In the last issue I gave two plans (one for terrace and one for detached houses in a row) and allowed the same frontage to each house in both plans. In order to make clear the advantage the garden of the terrace house possesses, I am here giving plans contrasting terrace and detached houses, as before, but instead of allowing the same width of frontage and size of plot to each (and therefore the same depth of plot), I am showing the terrace houses with narrower frontage than those occupied by the detached houses and the yawning chasms between them, and have given to each the same area of garden (see Diagrams Five and Six). How much more desirable is the form of garden that is possible to the terrace house! The garden for the detached house is necessarily a public and draughty strip around the house, but the garden for the terrace house can be in the convenient and pleasant form of an oblong, secluded from the street and protected from its dust and noises. At the same time, the garden for the terrace houses will be much more sunny and airy and less shaded by buildings, and with less draught than that of the detached house. The narrower frontage means less cost of land, less expensive road, sewer, gas and water mains, and cheaper maintenance of all these. It also means shorter distances from one house to another, to the doctor, to the shops and places of amusement, and for the tradesmen's daily rounds.

The greater depth in the plots means that the garden side of the terrace in one street is further away from the garden side of the terrace in the street running parallel with it, and is, therefore, less overlooked and more open. Around all our towns we now have a belt of characterless residential suburbs, garish for the well-to-do and drab and monotonous for the poor. Much of the charm of the Medieval cities arose from the abrupt termination of their closely built streets into open country and the absence of dismal straggling suburban areas. If we should change our ideal of little detached houses each in the center of its own little plot for something less individualistic, we might come nearer recovering the lost charm of real street pictures on the one hand and open unspoiled country on the other. The detailed plotting of an area on which houses are to be built should be the result of the most careful consideration of plans for the houses themselves.

In the past, however, instead of first planning the houses for the
These diagrams show how a row of houses may be planned between a road and an open space, so that the houses on the side of the road toward the open space obstruct little of the view of those on the other side of the road.
SCHEME FOR PROPOSED COPARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AT STOKE-UPON-TRENT, STAFFORDSHIRE, ENGLAND, SHOWING HOW THE GROUND BETWEEN THE ROAD AND THE HOUSE, INSTEAD OF BEING DIVIDED INTO SEPARATE SMALL GARDENS, MAY BE LAID OUT IN A CONTINUOUS STRIP, THUS LINKING THE WHOLE ROAD INTO A COMPLETE COMPOSITION: BARRY PARKER AND RAYMOND UNWIN, ARCHITECTS.
COPARTNERSHIP BUILDING OF HOUSES

different sites and laying out the land in plots to facilitate the best realization of all the advantages the proposed house plans could offer, land has usually been cut up into plots which were supposed to be suitable for any house. As a rule, the plots have been so arranged that the best could not be made of any type of house plan which was decided upon. There are many notable exceptions to this, of course, among them "New Town," Edinburgh, and the eighteenth-century London squares, which were laid out to accommodate houses whose plans were known beforehand. The difficulty, of course, has been that in many instances the type of house the prospective builder would wish to erect could not be foretold. In such cases, the site planner should start with the best plans obtainable for the types of houses it is most likely the future owners would wish to build in the locality he is dealing with, under the conditions laid down by the sites; and plan out his area so as to make the most of houses built to these plans. It is probable that whoever takes a plot will modify his own ideas to secure for his own house most of the advantages which the site planner has visualized for him. The result as a whole would then be better than could possibly be attained by arbitrarily laying out the land without considering house plans which would make the most of each plot. If the site planner, in plotting out in detail the smaller areas into which the estate is divided, should show on each plot in some detail the house plan most likely to obtain all the advantages that particular plot possesses, the time spent on this would never be wholly thrown away. Often forms and arrangements of plots would be modified in order to gain advantages for the houses, and these plans would suggest ideas to the man who took any particular plot, and he would be likely to make better use of the plot than he otherwise would.

Take the suggestions made in Diagrams One and Four as an instance: These plans were made to meet the objection against providing open spaces, which is so frequently raised. This objection is that while it would be practicable in many specific instances to furnish the necessary land for an open space, the cost of a road around that open space would be prohibitive, because it could only have houses fronting on one side of it; the other side would have to be left open, as the prevailing idea seems to be that the front of a house must necessarily face the road. Diagrams One and Four suggest that not only may the road be set back and a row of plots for houses planned between the road and the open space, but if the plots on either side of the road be planned to carry out a scheme designed for the houses, without reducing their number, those on the side of the road toward the open space may be designed to ob-
struct little of the view of the open space from those on the other side of the road. Those on the side of the road away from the open space may be arranged so that a greater number can be built, and thus increase the number of those which will have a view out over the open space.

The most difficult conditions under which a coördinate scheme can be produced are those which arise when land is intended to be sold in plots to unrelated individuals. Under other conditions, there are greater opportunities for coördinating and correlating all the buildings on a given area of land into a general scheme. The most common of these arises when a building scheme is started as an investment, or when a land-owner undertakes to develop an area of land.

It is fashionable to decry the speculative builder and his ways, but he is often a maligned individual. Some architects have discovered that the commissions that afford them the most satisfaction are those undertaken for the speculative builder. The more intelligent speculative builder now knows that by availing himself of the architect’s skill in planning he can work more economically and with greater financial success. Even if he intends to build only one or two houses at a time, and to build others only when he has disposed of the first lot, he very often wants a related scheme for the whole undertaking. He realizes that it will be to his ultimate advantage to have this reasonably well worked
out at the beginning, so that when completed it may be satisfactory as a whole, and each house maybe planned and placed so as to detract as little as possible from the beauty and convenience of the others. The architect is thus given an opportunity to conceive the undertaking as a whole, even though the builder may intend to carry it out in sections.

Again, when the owner of a piece of ground has had the foresight to secure unity of effect by commissioning an architect to prepare a complete scheme for the development of his land and by laying down conditions when letting or selling each plot, he is reasonably sure that the broad lines of his scheme will be adhered to.

But the best opportunities for a coördinated whole in building are those made possible when the development of land is undertaken by a copartnership tenants society. In these societies the tenant does not own his own house; he owns shares in the society which is the landlord of all the houses comprised in the undertaking. The tenant is not tied to the house he lives in; if it is to his advantage to move to another place, he is free to go, and the responsibility of finding a tenant for his house does not rest with him alone, but with the society as a whole. So long as he chooses to remain in his house, he has all the security that belongs to the man who owns the house he lives in; if he wishes to leave it, he may do so without risk of financial loss. Another advantage is that his money is invested. His home is situated on an estate which can be planned to the best ad-
vantage of each house individually and of all the houses upon it collectively. Such societies have a future far greater than has yet been realized. Their building operations can be undertaken on a big scale, each member sharing the benefits which this makes possible,—the standardization of all the component parts of the buildings and the economies effected by buying in very large quantities. Each individual can procure for himself a better house and probably a larger garden by joining one of these societies than he could by working alone.

Copartnership opens up a new range of possibilities, for through this medium all may enjoy a share of many advantages. The wealthy man may have his own tennis court and bowling green and play places for his children, and may secure a wide and pleasant outlook from all his windows, but the man of more moderate means may only have them if he joins a copartnership society. An intelligent land-owner or company may lay out an estate so as to provide for the common enjoyment of some of its advantages, but an estate owned by a copartnership society will naturally be laid out to attain this end. It will be thought of as a whole; it will be planned for a community; institutes, schools, clubs and common meeting places will be considered; spots of natural beauty will be preserved; distant views will not be shut out; play places and shelters for the children and spaces for outdoor games will be arranged, not only for the enjoyment of these games, but to provide pleasanter outlooks from the windows of the houses, and attractive terminations for streets. The buildings will be designed in groups, not as individual units; these groups taken together will be conceived as larger units, and the whole designed on a big scale. The principle of sharing, therefore, will make each individual house more attractive, the whole scheme being conceived as a coherent and harmonious whole. An organized civic life such as distinguished our old-time villages will spring up and take the place of the ugliness and lack of organization which characterizes buildings produced by the extreme individualism of recent times. It will be the outward expression of the life of a community, taking the place of a mere aggregation of individuals, the hopelessness of which the estate development of recent times has made us far too familiar with. Diagrams Two and Three embody such a copartnership scheme, designed for a piece of land which falls to the southwest and commands a very fine view in that direction.