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Résumé de l'article
Depuis la fin du XIXe siècle, un groupe informel mais dévoué de Canadiens anglais provenant de la bourgeoisie et de la classe moyenne se sont initiés aux principes émergents de l'urbanisme. Dans cet élan, ils ont établi des liens avec une cohorte internationale de spécialistes d'urbanisme et ont diffusé les connaissances qu'ils ont acquises à travers le Canada. Cet article traite de l'impact de ces discussions transnationales en examinant en détail la tournée pancanadienne d'Henry Vivian, expert du mouvement britannique des cités-jardins, en 1910. À la demande d'Earl Grey, le neuvième gouverneur général du Canada et promoteur des bienfaits de l'urbanisme, Vivian a parcouru le Canada pendant une durée de trois mois. Il a visité les centres urbains du pays, où il a donné des conférences publiques sur le concept de la cité-jardin tout en offrant des conseils sur les problèmes urbains locaux aux intéressés. Cet article considère le mouvement d'urbanisme canadien et transnational comme toile de fond à la tournée de Vivian et analyse en profondeur les origines, le progrès, et l'influence de son séjour au Canada.
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Introducing Canada to Urban Planning? Henry Vivian’s Canadian Planning Tour, 1910

Catherine Mary Ulmer

From the late nineteenth century onwards, an informal but dedicated group of middle- and upper-class Canadians came to embrace urban planning, building networks across the growing international movement that they used to import and circulate foreign innovations within Canada. This article studies the impact of such transnational planning exchanges through exploring British Garden City planning expert Henry Vivian’s 1910 tour of Canada. Arriving at the request of Earl Grey, Canada’s ninth governor general and an influential planning advocate, Vivian spent three months touring municipalities, lecturing on the Garden City approach, and advising on local urban issues. The article studies the wider Canadian and transnational planning movements from which Vivian’s tour emerged before considering the tour itself and Vivian’s ultimate influence on Canada’s planning movement.

On 13 October 1910, Henry Harvey Vivian, the British politician and noted housing and urban planning expert, found himself far from his London home addressing the Toronto branch of the Canadian Club on the subject of town planning. Speaking to the members assembled at a special luncheon, Vivian expanded on his topic and provided his opinion on Canada’s urban progress. As he told his audience, though urban development was less advanced in Canada than it was in Great Britain and Europe, “big mistakes” had already been made. “I have in my mind a [Canadian] city of 26,000,” he explained. “[It] will surely have a hundred thousand within twenty years … [but] the town is so poorly planned that it will become a death trap … automobiles are coming on to the streets … travelling at twenty miles an hour. What does that mean to the pedestrian? If there is not provision made … in twenty years the modern city will be intolerable.”

Vivian’s remarks came towards the end of his lengthy journey across English Canada. Arriving at the invitation of Earl Grey, Canada’s governor general and a patron of urban planning efforts, Vivian spent from September to late October 1910 travelling from Halifax to Vancouver Island and back, speaking on British housing and planning developments, touring local municipalities, and giving advice based on what he encountered. In venturing on his tour, Vivian joined the ranks of early twentieth-century “cosmopolitan planners”: a group of planning experts whose international practice and lecturing both reflected and helped to sustain the transnational nature of the urban planning movement that emerged from the 1890s onwards.

As scholars have emphasized, twentieth-century urban planning was an international movement. It emerged out of a growing recognition that, in attempting to perfect the modern city and attend to the issues posed by rapid urbanisation, reformers and planning advocates in industrialized nations shared a similar set of concerns and a common language of approaches and solutions. Knowledge of advances in planning was gathered and transnationally disseminated: through conferences, study tours, the circulation of planning-focused media, the exchange of correspondence, and, as Vivian’s tour illustrates, travelling
planning experts who lectured and worked internationally. All such activities were intensified by mounting improvements in travel and communication.

From the outset of urban planning’s development as an emerging international movement in the 1890s, a heterogeneous group of middle- and upper-class English Canadians contributed to its growth. Like their foreign counterparts, they too attended international conferences, kept in contact with far-flung colleagues, imported planning ideas, and disseminated the knowledge they gained across English Canada. Furthermore, between the late 1800s and 1914, they welcomed several foreign planning experts who practised and lectured across the country, including Americans Frederick Law Olmsted Sr and Jr, Frederick Todd, and Edward Bennett, and British planners like Thomas Mawson, Thomas Adams—and Henry Vivian. Such men provided an immediate link to international developments, physically transferring and applying new planning practices and theories across the country. Accordingly, the Canadian careers of experts such as the Olmsteds, Todd, Bennett, Mawson, and Adams have each merited wider academic study.7 Vivian, however, remains one of the least examined of the individuals amongst this group. While scholars have mentioned his tour within analyses of early twentieth-century Canadian planning history, Vivian’s time in the country, and the impact of his visit, have yet to be fully considered.8

This article redresses these historiographic absences, examining Vivian’s 1910 tour, and considering its effects on Canadian planning. I first situate Vivian’s tour within the broader context of the transnational planning movement from which it emerged. Drawing upon new archival research undertaken across Canada and Great Britain, the article next moves to Vivian’s case. While supporters credited him with introducing the idea of cooperative housing and town planning to Canada, Vivian’s actual influence was limited and can be most clearly observed through a critical assessment of the impact of Vivian’s time in Canada. As I emphasize, though both Grey and Vivian hoped the tour would spur on the construction of British Garden City–style communities and suburbs across the country, this was not the case. While supporters credited him with introducing the idea of cooperative housing and town planning to Canada, Vivian’s actual influence was limited and can be most clearly observed through his role in promoting the Garden City approach across Canada, and his impact on planning discourse in the period following his visit.9

Setting the Scene: Canada and the Transnational Planning Movement

Towards the end of Henry Vivian’s tour across Canada, Albert Henry George, the fourth Earl Grey and ninth governor general of Canada, wrote to a friend of Vivian’s visit, explaining, “I have brought [Vivian] to Canada in the hope that he may be able to open the eyes of Canadians to the serious character of the danger that threatens [their cities] … if they refuse to look ahead and take those steps that will safeguard them.”10 As Grey confessed to another associate, Canadian Pacific Railway chairman Sir William Van Horne, “[Your] cities are drifting steadily into the slums… . There is absolutely no forethought or design shown… . [B]elts of shacks surround existing limits and throttle the expansion of growing cities.”11 In Grey’s opinion, the British Garden City model Vivian espoused offered the best solution to unregulated civic expansion, inadequate working-class housing, and a lack of planning that he felt many Canadian cities were suffering from.

While Grey correctly identified that many municipalities struggled to tackle the issues posed by rapid industrialization and urbanization, he was wrong to state that Canadians needed their eyes opened to these problems, or that they lacked awareness of the international planning models that offered solutions. Vivian neither awakened his English Canadian audiences to the difficulties their municipalities faced nor introduced them to the idea of modern urban planning. Indeed, by his 1910 arrival, Canada possessed an active urban planning movement, comprising a heterogeneous group of middle- and upper-class actors who embraced planning to address their wider professional, political, and reform aims.12 The members of Canada’s early planning cohort had diverse reasons for supporting planning efforts: some urban and municipal reformers, public health experts, and philanthropists included planning advocacy within their campaigns for improved moral and physical health and civic administration. Those businessmen, real estate investors, and city boosters who chose to advocate for planning often did so to protect land value and increase business productivity. Finally, moved by a combination of professional expertise and self-interest, individuals within the fields of landscape architecture and architecture, surveying, and engineering frequently supported planning to assert their professional right over local and national planning contracts.13 Together, such actors pushed first civic improvement, and increasingly planning issues, to the forefront of urban debates throughout the early 1900s.

As in Europe and the United States, such individuals’ interest in planning emerged in response to the rapid changes to the urban environment engendered by late nineteenth-century industrialization. Between 1880 and the 1920s, a shift in focus from agricultural towards urban-industrial economic growth saw Canada transform from a largely rural, to predominantly urban nation. Whereas in 1881 roughly 1.1 million individuals resided in urban areas, by 1921 4.3 million people, almost 50 per cent of the nation’s population at the time, were urban dwellers.14 Particularly in more developed cities such as Toronto and Montreal, rapid urbanization and industrial expansion intensified overcrowding, insufficient civic services, and public health, triggering new debates amongst middle- and upper-class Anglo-Canadians over how modern industrialized cities might best be organized.

While the act of shaping the urban space to reflect social, political, economic, and cultural needs long predated the late 1800s, what distinguished the “modern” approaches to planning from those that came before was their general insistence that the component aspects of a city be considered as
an interconnected whole. As planning historian Stephen V. Ward emphasizes, modern planning represented a shift from prior methods that focused more on the laying out of streets and discrete improvement projects. It instead “expressed the newer functional priorities of land use, infrastructure, efficient circulation, and ... social welfare.”

Tracing modern planning’s evolution, Ward points to German town-extension planning in the 1870s, the American City Beautiful movement of the 1890s, and British Garden City–building in the early 1900s as key developments influencing the emergence of “a growing international body of thought and practice.” He also underscores the extent to which modern planning was also defined by a “strong internationalist spirit,” and had, in part, emerged from within what urban historian Pierre Yves Saunier defines as the urban internationale: “the international milieu ... dedicated to the study of issues relating to cities” that formed during the early twentieth century.

Scholars such as Daniel Rodgers and Thomas Adam have well demonstrated that the “cultural and social infrastructure of nineteenth-century cities ... did not emerge in isolation but was a result of intensive contacts and transfers across geographic, linguistic, and later ‘imagined’ national borders.” Furthermore, a growing literature has interrogated these contacts and transfers, identifying the different means through which urban reform and planning advocates interacted, and circulated knowledge in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. For instance, Finnish urban historian Marjetta Hietala has identified four central pathways through which civic administrators transferred innovations: hiring foreign experts; studying abroad; circulating journals; and attending international conferences and exhibitions. Other authors have isolated and examined a single category of exchanges, with John Griffiths highlighting the importance of journals for the circulation of municipal reform ideas, and Robert Freestone and Marco Amati emphasizing the importance of planning exhibitions as central “portals” for the acquisition of planning knowledge. Finally, authors have considered the “international efforts of ... planning practitioners,” studying those individuals who practised and lectured outside their home nations.

As current literature and primary records illustrate, between 1890 and 1914, English Canadian actors relied on all these channels to import and circulate planning and urban reform knowledge. They wrote to colleagues living outside of Canada, read and contributed to foreign journals, and travelled internationally to tour exemplar cities and attend events like the World’s Columbian Exhibition in Chicago (1893), the American National Conference on City Planning (1910), and the Royal Institute of British Architects town planning conference in London (1910). From the late 1800s onwards, English Canadians also welcomed several foreign planning experts to lecture and take up contracts in Canada.

The practice of inviting planning experts to Canada began in 1873, when Montreal became one of the first Canadian cities to embrace the American park-based approach to planning, hiring famed American landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted to design Mount Royal Park. In the early 1900s two of the Olmsted firm’s protégés, Frederick Todd and Canadian-born Rickson Outhet, opened Montreal offices, and in 1910 Montreal’s City Improvement League contracted Frederick Law Olmsted Jr., then the leader of America’s planning movement, to advise on planning matters. Outside of Quebec, in Ottawa, City Beautiful planners were hired in both 1903 (Frederick Todd) and 1913 (Edward Bennett) to devise park and city plans, respectively. Additionally, between 1912 and 1914, Vancouver, Regina, and Calgary all contracted City Beautiful expert Thomas Mawson to create plans. At the national level, in 1910 Henry Vivian undertook his cross-Canadian planning tour and, in 1914 Canada’s Commission on Conservation hired British town-planning expert Thomas Adams as its national planning advisor—a position he held until 1922.

Despite the breadth of Vivian’s visit, and the value contemporary English Canadian planning supporters attached to it, in contrast to fellow experts such as Todd, the Olmsteds, Bennett, and Adams, there has been no focused examination of Vivian’s time in Canada. The following sections of this article provide this analysis, exploring the origins of his tour, retracing his journey, and assessing his effect on English-Canadian planning efforts following his departure.

**Henry Vivian**

Henry Harvey Vivian arrived in Canada not as a little-known British urban reformer and politician, but as an internationally recognized expert with nearly twenty years’ experience in cooperative housing and Garden City planning. Born in Devon in 1868, he followed in the footsteps of his father, apprenticing as a carpenter. Upon moving to London in the 1880s, Vivian became active as a trade unionist before embracing co-partnership, a movement that called for workers to become owners in the companies they worked for, sharing profits and participating in decisions surrounding work conditions and management. In 1890 he took up the position of secretary of the Labour Association where, through delivering addresses and consulting on co-partnership endeavours, he honed his skills as a lecturer and advisor. In the following year he established General Builders Ltd., a co-partnership building firm that sought to provide its members with employment and housing.

By 1905, General Builders Ltd. had achieved moderate success, building fifty homes in London and establishing a planned suburb in Brentham. However, what pushed co-partnership housing efforts forwards past these early gains was its association with Ebenezer Howard and the Garden City movement. Howard, originally a court stenographer, published the foundational text of the Garden City approach, *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, in 1898. In *To-Morrow* he advocated for an end to overcrowded, unhealthy, capitalist urban life through the creation of a series of satellite garden cities of limited size. He envisioned the cities as self-sufficient, enclosed by a greenbelt with spaces for business, leisure, and residency. Following *To-Morrow’s* publication, support for Howard’s work grew.
leading to the 1899 creation of the Garden City Association and its ensuing plans to create Letchworth, the first Garden City.

Howard’s vision was readily compatible with the aims of co-partnership housing. His book emphasized a need for housing and land tenure reform and called for the working class to “invest [its] own money in co-operative enterprise” rather than relying on private builders to construct homes.\(^\text{31}\) In 1901 the connection between the two movements solidified when Ralph Neville, a London barrister and co-partnership advocate, became president of the Garden City Association (GCA) and promoted cooperation between the two groups.\(^\text{32}\) Vivian likewise supported this relationship, working to turn Brentham into the “pioneer society” of the Garden Suburb movement.\(^\text{33}\) In 1907 he continued his involvement by taking on the role of chairman of the newly created Co-Partnerships Tenants Ltd., which supported the development of housing in Letchworth and Hampstead Garden Suburb.\(^\text{34}\)

In addition to his work within the co-partnership housing movement, Vivian also spent the early 1900s advancing his political career, standing as the Liberal-Labour candidate for Birkenhead, Cheshire, in 1906. Winning the seat, he sat as a member of Parliament until defeated in December 1910.\(^\text{35}\) As a politician, Vivian extended his interest in planning and housing, helping to construct the landmark 1909 Housing and Town Planning Act.\(^\text{36}\)

**Earl Grey and Henry Vivian**

Thanks to his work at Brentham, Letchworth, and Hampstead, by the early 1900s Vivian was recognized as a “pioneer” of the Garden City movement.\(^\text{37}\) This opinion was clearly shared by one of the Garden City’s most prominent supporters: Earl Grey. Writing of Vivian’s career and involvement with housing and planning in Britain in 1910, Grey stressed, “It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the services contributed by Mr. Vivian.”\(^\text{38}\) In Grey’s estimation, Vivian was “an individualist” who was “not afraid to stand up … and fight any proposals … [that] undermine the spirit of self-reliance and manhood of the average citizen.”\(^\text{39}\)

Such commendation rested on Grey’s familiarity with Vivian’s career. The earl was a supporter of social reform and, through this wider interest, co-partnership.\(^\text{40}\) The men first came into contact with one another in the 1890s, thanks to Vivian’s work within the Labour Association. Grey stood as one of the association’s vice presidents, and, by the late 1890s, received personal updates from Vivian describing the organization’s progress and finances.\(^\text{41}\) The pair maintained their correspondence as Vivian established himself with General Builders Ltd. and Co-Partnership Tenants Ltd., and the relationship deepened thanks to their shared participation in the Garden City movement throughout the early 1900s.

Like Vivian, Grey took great interest in Ebenezer Howard’s work: the two wrote to one another regularly during Letchworth’s construction, and Grey presided over its opening ceremonies in 1904.\(^\text{42}\) When Grey left Britain for Canada, Thomas Adams, then secretary of the First Garden City, Ltd., wrote to him, expressing hope that “you will have in your new sphere opportunities of disseminating knowledge of the Garden City.”\(^\text{43}\) As Adams anticipated, Grey did transport his social reform concerns with him, expressing “a personal interest in … [the] social and national welfare” of his new country of residence that extended to town planning.\(^\text{44}\) During his tenure in Canada, Grey involved himself in local planning while also maintaining his ties to British housing and planning developments.\(^\text{45}\) The earl both “closely followed” planning developments within Ottawa, advocating for the Ottawa Improvement Commission to improve roads and parkways, and stayed in touch with the Garden City movement in Britain.\(^\text{46}\) While in Canada, Grey remained on the board of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust, relying on his correspondence with fellow members, such as noted housing reformer Henrietta Barnett, to keep him informed of new developments.\(^\text{47}\) He also continued to write to Vivian, praising him on his contributions to Garden City efforts, and confessing in 1905 that...
*the interest I take in the Co-Partnership Movement has not … less[ened] owing to my crossing the Atlantic."48

Although it is unclear if any one particular event spurred Grey to conceive of Vivian’s 1910 tour, Grey’s motivations for doing so likely came from a combination of his belief in the benefits of Garden Cities and his mounting concern for the state of planning and housing in Canada. While Canadians were certainly aware of foreign planning developments, up to the early 1910s, it was grandiose City Beautiful style, developed and popularized in the United States, that gained widespread support. Yet, despite the proliferation of City Beautiful plans within Canada from 1906 to 1914, by 1910, interest in the style was waning. At this time, nationwide scarcity of homes, particularly for working-class families, combined with rising rents and overcrowding, turned housing into one of Canada’s most urgent social issues.49 Throughout the 1900s, Canada’s urban population expanded at a rate greater than private enterprise could house. Nationwide, the lack of working-class housing caused a widespread housing shortage, with thousands of families inhabiting homes of only one to two rooms.51 Though, with their larger populations, cities like Winnipeg, Toronto, and Montreal experienced some of the severest overcrowding, smaller cities likewise faced a housing crisis.52 For example, in Saskatoon it was noted that the early 1910s saw the erection of “poorly built houses” alongside “crowding and improper conversion.”53

While the grand boulevards, lush parks, and columned civic buildings envisioned in City Beautiful plans were visually compelling, their price, and their failure to account for residential housing, proved increasingly unpopular as housing concerns intensified.54 As early as 1907, Grey began calling on the Canadian government to turn its attention to housing issues, directing members of Parliament to Vivian’s work, praising the co-operative housing model as a “great success,” and asking for “someone … [to] invite Mr. Vivian over to Canada … with the object of enabling him to explain his methods.”55 By 1910 Grey’s concern for the future of Canada’s urban centres had only intensified. As he noted in a letter to Montreal philanthropist Elsie Reford (née Meighen), if Canadians did not improve their cities, they risked being “engulph[ed]” by “slums and all their innumerable attendant evils.”56 Moved to act, Grey decided to take up his own earlier suggestion that Vivian visit Canada and “[preach] the gospel” of improved housing and planning.57 Although Grey remained in contact with other Garden City authorities such as Thomas Adams and Ebenezer Howard, his admiration for Vivian’s emphasis on co-partnership housing as an integral element of Garden City planning singled out the latter as Grey’s preferred choice. At some point in early 1910, Grey met with Vivian at Hampstead Garden Suburb and persuaded him to undertake a cross-national lecture tour of Canada.58

**Henry Vivian’s 1910 Tour of Canada**

As neither Grey nor Vivian preserved detailed records of the tour’s organization, it has proven difficult to trace how the arrangements for Vivian’s visit were made, and determine with certainty all the stops on his cross-Canadian trek. Grey seemingly relied on a cross-Canadian network of personal and professional connections to help determine the areas Vivian would visit, coordinate his lectures and meetings, and attend to his accommodation and other needs. For example, in a letter Grey sent to Montreal businessman Jeffrey Hale Burland, Grey mentioned that Vivian was granted a free rail pass for the duration of the tour, and reminded Burland that he, along with Liberal Senator William Cameron Edwards, and Torontoonian Sir Joseph Flavelle, had agreed to cover all of Vivian’s other Canadian expenses.59 Grey himself volunteered to host Vivian and his party during their stops in Ottawa, where Grey arranged for influential friends like Senator Edwards to “have a talk with [Vivian] under my roof.”60

Despite the apparent absence of precise documentation, or a master list of the stops and dates of Vivian’s tour, the narrative of his time in Canada can be revealed by bringing together the Canadian and British newspaper and journal articles written about his journey, Vivian’s tour lasted from August to October 1910. He likely arrived at his first Canadian stop, Halifax, Nova Scotia, in late August and made his way to Toronto, Ontario, by early September, where he spoke on town planning to an audience of two hundred assembled at the Toronto Industrial Exhibition.61 By 5 September Vivian was in Winnipeg addressing its Canadian Club before moving to Saskatchewan.62 Vivian arrived in Calgary, Alberta, by 9 September, when he lectured there before travelling to Edmonton.63 Upon leaving Edmonton, he journeyed on to British Columbia, where he addressed Vancouver’s Canadian Club and Liberal Association and moved on to stop in Victoria and the Okanagan Valley.64 He passed back through the Prairie Provinces towards the end September and returned Ontario in early October, spending time in both Toronto and Ottawa.65 By 19 October Vivian was in Montreal, where he passed a few days meeting with groups such as the Province of Quebec Association of Architects and the Montreal
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City Improvement League before returning to Ottawa on 21 October. His last stop before returning to England was Halifax, where he delivered an address to the Canadian Club on 28 October.66

As Vivian's English Canadian supporters acknowledged in an ornate commemorative book, his tour was far from a leisurely exploration of Canadian cities. Instead, the visit found Vivian throwing himself “ardently into a campaign of lectures … and discussions among unfamiliar scenes and people in this wide Dominion, travelling without rest from … the Atlantic to the Pacific border, making light of physical fatigue and mental strain.”67 For his part, Vivian recalled the tour’s scale more simply, noting in an interview with the Grain Grower’s Guide, “I visited all parts of the Dominion … from Halifax to Victoria” and “addressed the clubs, which are a feature in all Canadian towns.”68 Indeed, in addition to meeting with civic officials and conducting city tours, in each location he stopped in, Vivian delivered lectures to local branches of the Canadian Club, as well as reform and professional organizations. He also delivered public addresses to audiences at local halls, universities, and even the federal Parliament Buildings.69 From printed transcripts of his lectures and contemporary newspaper articles summarizing his comments, it appears that Vivian’s addresses often followed a pattern.70 He outlined the recent history of urban growth in Britain, particularly linking public health to worsening urban conditions, before describing the successes of model villages such as Bourneville, Port Sunlight, and Letchworth and lauding the recent passage of Britain’s landmark Town Planning Act in 1909.71 He then moved on to compare Britain and Canada, highlighting Canada’s relative youth and abundance of undeveloped space as key advantages.72 As he stated in Toronto, “You [Canadians] have an opportunity that is not ours … look well to your future.”73

Though Vivian generally praised Canadian cities for their space and clean air, he warned his audiences against complacency, describing poor housing and worsening civic issues in older and more heavily urbanized municipalities like Toronto and Montreal.74 Although he compared these centres favourably with Liverpool, Edinburgh, and London, he warned audiences of the need to address planning and overcrowding immediately. Speaking of Montreal, Vivian warned, “[The city] needs to take action without delay. The population … grows by about 30,000 to 40,000 persons a year, who dump themselves down practi- cally as they like…. I do not think we have anything quite so bad in England as the worst districts of Montreal.”75 In a public address Vivian gave at the University of Toronto on 13 October, he dramatically revealed the extent to which he felt Canadian municipalities were ignoring public health and housing by producing photos taken during his tour showing “people crowded into cramped quarters … [small houses with five families living in them, and] one room with eight persons.”76 Asked by a Toronto reporter for his opinion on working-class row housing in the city, Vivian replied, “I would not care to give an answer. It would not be printable.”77 In contrast, Vivian emphasized that smaller, newer, western Canadian municipalities enjoyed an advantage over older cities in eastern Canada. Despite identifying “the germs of future slums” in some western towns, and disagreeing with the way in which real estate interests, rather than trained civic administrators, often directed suburban development, he was hopeful for the region’s future.78 He praised the region’s civic boosters for their ambition, avowing, “I have not yet found in the west a town or a little city that is not ultimately destined to become the centre of the British Empire.”79 As he stated in Edmonton, “The older cities show a startling lack of order in the way they are laid out…. [For example] Toronto’s main street is altogether too narrow to handle the city’s immense amount of traffic and no amount of money can widen it…. Edmonton is only a village…. [Now is the time to lay out your city].”80

While Vivian did not criticize the City Beautiful style that dominated English-Canadian planning during this time, by directing his audience’s attention to the urban and social issues affecting their cities (traffic congestion, unregulated subdivisions, lack of attention to the laying out of streets, poor public health, and insufficient working-class housing), he did help draw attention away from civic beautification projects and towards the benefits of planned cities and suburbs like Britain’s Letchworth and Hampstead Garden Suburb. As he emphasized, while these developments provided “every facility for healthy development,” their biggest advantage came from being designed as a whole, “as towns instead of … as streets and housing.” In this way, Vivian stated, buildings, streets, and parks were not just “dumped down anywhere.” Instead, “the city has been planned for the next twenty years, providing for gardens, residences, parks, and public buildings.”81

In addition to his larger lectures, Vivian met privately with individuals interested in planning and urban reform. In Montreal, he spoke at length with members of the Province of Quebec Association of Architects.82 In Toronto, millionaire meat manufacturer and philanthropist Joseph Fiavelle hosted a private meet-and-greet for Vivian and a select group of reformers and philanthropists at his mansion, Holwood. As a reporter invited to the event recounted, “A small number of people, keenly interested in the subject [of co-partnership housing and planning] were asked to meet [Vivian],” and they “sat and chatted” with him throughout the evening.83 Vivian also attended the Union of Canadian Municipalities’ annual meeting in Toronto, Ontario. Addressing an audience of municipal, provincial, and federal representatives, Vivian “pointed out the necessity” of implementing planning efforts and greatly impressed those gathered.84 In 1930 Saskatchewan’s town planning director, Stewart Young, noted that the speech Vivian’s gave at this meeting was what first inspired those in his province’s Department of Municipal Affairs to considering planning efforts.85

Assessing Vivian’s Influence

Vivian delivered one of his last Canadian addresses to the Halifax Canadian Club on 28 October, arriving back in Britain.
by early November. In an interview granted upon his return, Vivian stated that he considered his visit a success: “I found the people most anxious to hear my views on housing and town planning and I believe the meetings will bear fruit.” As he wrote to Grey in early 1911, “I am frequently getting letters from all parts of Canada. . . . It is splendid to see the growing interest.” For his part, Grey shared these sentiments, writing to Vivian on 26 October 1910, “I cannot allow you to leave. . . . without giving expression to my most grateful thanks. . . . You have given [Canadians] a real wake-up, and it will now be their own fault if they do not avert the evil you have shown them is creeping in.” Some Canadian planning advocates publicly joined Grey in his praise. In 1912 G. Wray Lemon, secretary of Calgary’s City Planning Commission, credited Vivian’s speeches in Calgary with “with planting “a seed . . . in good ground,” while, in the same year, Harry Bragg, editor of the Canadian Municipal Journal, went so far as to thank Vivian for “introducing the Garden City idea into Canada.”

Although Vivian should not be credited with introducing English Canadians to British planning innovations, the impact of his 1910 visit to Canada does merit further consideration. Vivian’s tour served as a nationwide publicity campaign for the Garden City style he represented. Thanks to Vivian’s own efforts to travel around the country, and to the circulation of the papers and journals that reported on his work, British planning ideas were more thoroughly disseminated across Canada than ever before. For one, while many English-Canadian planning supporters had acquainted themselves Garden City ideas, the sheer breadth of the tour meant Vivian directly transported news of British developments to areas beyond the eastern centres of Montreal, Toronto, and Ottawa. By stopping at far-flung western Canadian cities like Edmonton or Calgary, Vivian provided many residents with a rare chance to interact with an internationally recognized expert. He also developed an interest in the region that outlasted his original trip, returning to western Canada in 1912, and stopping in the municipalities he visited previously to inspect their progress.

Vivian’s tour also helped bolster the discussion of British housing and planning advances within English Canadian planning discourse. His status as a prominent Garden City expert, coupled with the Grey’s sponsorship, lent prestige and credibility to the tour, and, as a result, generated increased interest in his topic within Canadian newspapers and journals. As previously discussed, articles published in local, regional, and national newspapers recorded nearly every step of the tour. From Vivian’s arrival in late August to his departure at the end of October, a piece appeared discussing his tour almost every other day, with most emphasizing the importance of his work by underscoring Vivian’s reputation and Grey’s support of his tour.

Reference to Vivian’s journey and speeches likewise appeared in several of Canada’s planning-related journals. The Canadian Courier, a weekly magazine that often included articles on urban reform, published an interview with Vivian during his visit in which he explained the “Garden City idea” and stated, as he had in his addresses, that he felt Canadians were “reproducing too many of the faults of England . . . shutting out air . . . [and] overcrowding.” Between 1911 and 1912, Construction, a journal focusing on architecture, engineering, and contracting, included articles describing Vivian’s 1910 meeting with architects in Montreal, and his dire warnings about the “degenerating effect” of congestion and overcrowding in eastern Canadian cities. In 1913, Construction also printed in full an address Vivian delivered during his second visit to Calgary.

Although the pieces in the Courier and Construction tended to report rather than analyze Vivian’s work, others used his comments to underscore a need for improved urban planning and pointed to his tour’s influence on their own reform goals. A 1911 article in the Public Health Journal, “Child Welfare and the City,” drew on Vivian’s warnings that the “slums of London are being rivaled and even surpassed” in Canada, to underscore a need for “efficient house-and-town planning” in Montreal. In 1912 Harry Bragg, editor of the Canadian Municipal Journal, proposed that Canadians adopt “Garden Cities” as a way to “alleviate existing conditions and . . . prevent Slums,” adding that he was “indebted” to Vivian “for much information on this subject.” Bragg’s sentiments were echoed by Toronto reformer Frank Beer, who, in a 1914 article in the British Garden Cities and Town Planning journal, thanked Vivian for strengthening Canadian interest in co-operative housing. As Beer recounted, Vivian shocked Canadians out of their “complacency and self-satisfaction” by illustrating that “not only were slums being formed right in the hearts of our prosperous cities, but that some of these slums had a proud pre-eminence in comparison with all that he had known elsewhere.” For his part, Vivian welcomed this press coverage: in a February 1911 letter to Grey, Vivian approvingly, if not somewhat hyperbolically, observed, “All papers and magazines are giving attention to the matter [of planning].”

Yet, though Vivian’s tour did boast these early successes, the long-term impact of Vivian’s work was far more limited than he and his proponents had hoped. Grey, for his part, expected that Vivian’s work would lead to the building of Garden Cities and Suburbs across the country. He wrote as much to Vivian: “I shall be greatly disappointed if . . . your visit does not show itself in permanent results” and also instructed William Lyon Mackenzie King, “Let me know if there is any way in which I can help to secure permanent results from Vivian’s visit.” However, instead of instigating new plans, Vivian’s tour really only bolstered projects whose aims were complemented by the ideas he endorsed.

In Montreal, for example, Vivian’s October 1910 visit generated awareness of the Garden City style amongst the city’s planning community that, as geographer Larry McCann argues, likely shaped the design of Mount Royal, a corporate suburb that was conceived around the time of Vivian’s tour. In the early 1900s Montreal was Canada’s most economically important, cosmopolitan, and populous city: between 1900 and 1911 its population rose from 266,826 to 466,197. This rapid growth, however, largely intensified existing problems of poverty, inadequate
housing, and public health. In the years preceding 1910, an interest in civic improvements and urban planning steadily rose within the city’s reform community, who founded dedicated civic improvement groups such as the Province of Quebec’s Association of Architect’s (PQAA) Civic Improvement Committee (1906) and the Montreal City Improvement League (1909) to advocate for new solutions to urban ills.99

Through his own travels to Montreal, and friendship with elite reformers like Elsie Reford, Jeffrey Hale Burland, and the city’s mayor, Joseph Geurin, Earl Grey kept informed of Montreal’s urban issues and of rising support for urban planning. He hoped Vivian could channel this enthusiasm towards British planning innovations, stating, “No city on this continent … stands in more need of Garden Suburb principles being applied to its development [than Montreal].”100 Arriving in Montreal in late October 1910, Vivian did help introduce the Garden City into the city’s civic planning discourse. Alongside Grey, Vivian influenced leading Montreal reformers to embrace the Garden City approach and, in the months following his visit, Reford, Burland, and Geurin alongside Lady Grace Julia Drummond (née Parker), Sir Hugh Graham, and Charlotte Learmont (née Smithers) each toured Hampstead Garden Suburb, with Geurin effusively reporting on all he saw there.101

Yet, while Vivian’s explanations of the Garden City built an interest amongst Montreal’s planning advocates, such support grew alongside that for American innovations like the City Beautiful and comprehensive city planning. Throughout the early 1900s, for example, both foreign expert Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. and Olmsted’s colleague, Rickson Outhet, advised on comprehensive city plans for the city. Outhet, a Canadian landscape architect who trained with the Olmsted firm in Boston before establishing his practice in Montreal, was contracted by the PQAA in 1908 to help develop the Civic Improvement Committee’s comprehensive plan for Montreal.102 Throughout 1908 and 1909 Outhet brought the committee’s vision together, creating a series of architectural drawings that illustrated the breadth and finer details of the plan’s suggestions.103 Following on Outhet’s commission, the Montreal City Improvement League hired Frederick Law Olmsted Jr., a pioneer of comprehensive planning, as an advisor. Olmsted Jr.’s ensuing September 1910 visit to the city, and his work on the league’s plan, only further solidified support for the American practices he represented amongst Montreal’s planning advocates.104

In the wake of Olmsted Jr.’s and Vivian’s visits, the planning styles they advocated for co-existed within Montreal’s urban reform discourse and likely converged to shape planning activities such as Mount Royal, a corporate suburb and real estate scheme introduced in the fall of 1910 by the proprietors of the Canadian Northern Railway in a bid to defray the expense of constructing a three-mile tunnel underneath Mount Royal itself.105 In his study of the Mount Royal, McCann suggests that Frederick Todd, the landscape architect charged with designing the suburb, was influenced by both Olmsted Jr.’s and Vivian’s visits as he drew his scheme between 1911 and 1912. For one, Todd was familiar with Olmsted Jr.’s approach to planning: he trained in the Olmsteds’ Massachusetts’s office and moved to Montreal in 1900 in part to handle the firm’s Canadian contracts.106 Todd had also “participated fully” in Olmsted Jr.’s September 1910 visit to Montreal and even contributed to Olmsted Jr.’s work with the Civic Improvement League by drafting a map for the league illustrating some of the traffic circulation improvements Olmsted recommended.107 Furthermore, though no direct evidence links Todd with Vivian, Todd was presumably acquainted with the British expert through his involvement with groups Vivian met with and addressed while in Montreal, such as the PQAA and the City Improvement League. Even if the two men did not meet, it is likely that Todd heard of Vivian’s speeches indirectly from colleagues within these organizations.108

As McCann contends, Todd seemingly kept both Vivian’s and Olmsted Jr.’s planning advice in mind as he crafted his scheme for Mount Royal in the two years following the experts’ 1910 visits to Montreal. In his analysis of Todd’s 1912 plan, McCann notes that the design clearly blended elements of the Garden City style, such as the setting out distinct functional zones, with City Beautiful influences, such as curving streets, urban parks, and radial thoroughfares.109 While Todd went on to create a similarly Anglo-American-inspired plan for Coldbrook Garden City, New Brunswick (1912–13), Mount Royal stood as the first Canadian plan of its size to integrate such British and American elements.110

While Vivian’s exact impact on Frederick Todd and the creation of Mount Royal may be difficult to pinpoint, his direct effect on housing reform in Toronto, namely, the founding of the Toronto Housing Company (THC) in 1912, is more easily traced. Vivian did not introduce the city’s reformers to urban issues in 1910. Well before his arrival, Toronto’s sanitary and public health officials worked to address overcrowding, poor conditions, and hygiene by calling on the city to enact nuisance laws, implement land and building-use regulations, and authorize home inspections.111 In addition, throughout the early 1900s, a few reform groups attempted to address housing concerns directly. In 1904, the city’s Associated Charities tried to establish a co-operative housing initiative, but ultimately failed to generate enough support. A similar 1907 scheme, spearheaded by jeweller Thomas Roden and supported by the Canadian Manufacturing Association, was abandoned thanks to economic depression. And, in the same year, a proposal for municipal housing, put forward by the city council’s Civic Housing Committee, was rejected as well.112

At the time of Vivian’s visits to Toronto, in September and October 1910, the city’s economy was in recovery, but there had been no corresponding improvement in housing conditions.113 During his two stops in the city, Vivian openly criticized Toronto’s housing issues and, in so doing, “shock[ed]” local reformers into recognizing the true extent of the situation.114 His denunciation was further underscored by a 1911 report by Dr. Charles Hastings, the city’s medical officer of health. Like Vivian, Hastings warned that Toronto’s “slum” neighbourhoods
were similar in circumstance to those found in large European centres, and similarly supported the creation of garden suburbs and co-operative housing plans. In response, throughout 1911, several groups took interest in establishing a co-operative housing venture in Toronto and, in early 1912, members of several influential, established institutions, including the Toronto Civic Guild, the Toronto branch of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, the local Board of Trade, the University Settlement, the National Council of Women, and Toronto’s City Council began to devise plans for a co-operative housing plan. The outcome of these meetings was the formation of Toronto Co-Partnership Garden Suburbs Limited, soon renamed the Toronto Housing Company. Although the groups that prompted the THC’s creation all had a pre-existing stake in housing reform, Vivian’s visit provided the “starting point” for a renewed interest in matter. His time in Toronto paved the way for the THC’s formation and its ensuing attempt to establish a co-partnership garden suburb on the British model. As THC President Frank Beer acknowledged within the group’s first annual report, “Consciousness of a need for an organized effort for the improvement of housing conditions was aroused in most Canadian cities by ... Mr. Henry Vivian.” Once established, the company moved quickly. During its first year, the THC attracted 166 shareholders, purchased five acres of land from the city council and 685 feet of land in the city’s northwest, and leased “a block of vacant land” from the Toronto General Hospital Trust. In 1912 the THC further demonstrated its interest in the Garden City approach Vivian supported by securing 200 of land northeast of the city with plans to establish a Garden City–style district there.

Though the THC may have held high hopes for its proposed Garden City, the scheme ultimately fell through and the company sold the land. The THC was also forced to abandon its plans for co-operative ownership by tenants and instead relied on private investment under a limited-dividend arrangement. Yet, despite these issues, the THC did create two small housing projects within the 1910s. By 1915, 204 cottages were ready for occupancy in Riverdale Courts, which lay east of the Don River on Bain Avenue, and thirty-two cottages and six houses had been built in Spruce Court, a site situated closer to Toronto’s centre, west of the Don River. The design of these courts, constructed under the supervision of British-born architect Eden Smith, in part “traced their lineage” from Hampstead Garden Suburb, again reflecting the THC’s interest in the British Garden City and Suburb style Vivian endorsed.

Conclusion

Although Vivian’s Canadian promotion of the Garden City approach likely influenced Frederick Todd’s plan for Mount Royal and definitely shaped housing reform in Toronto throughout the 1910s, such efforts were pushed forward and influenced by Vivian’s work, rather than introduced because of it. In general, Vivian’s tour failed to instigate and inspire new actions: he had little enduring effect on Canadian planning. Unfortunately, neither Grey nor Vivian seems to have recorded his thoughts on the tour’s ultimate lack of impact. Though, upon his return in 1912, Vivian did remark that few “practical steps [had been] taken in many of the towns in Canada,” he was so impressed by the sustained interest in planning he encountered that he pronounced himself “satisfied” by Canada’s progress. While Grey passed away in 1917, Vivian lived until 1930, and it would be interesting know what, if any, his thoughts were on the progression of Canadian planning in the years after the First World War.

Yet, despite the tour’s failure to inspire a rush of Garden City and Suburb building across Canada, the place of his visit in the early history of Canada’s planning movement does deserve recognition. Henry Vivian stands as an important member of the early cohort of foreign planning experts who visited Canada and disseminated planning ideas in the years before the First World War. While he did not take up Canadian planning contracts or accept, as Thomas Adams did, a permanent position as a national advisor, few amongst this early group of practitioners ventured as far across Canada, or spent time in as many towns and cities, as Vivian did. In doing so, he provided a personal link to the wider international planning movement, and was often amongst the first foreign planning experts his Canadian audiences would have met.

Furthermore, while Vivian’s tour was not a permanent success, it stands as a contemporary one. He publicized the Garden City movement across Canada, influenced domestic planning discourse, and also helped pave the way for the British planning experts who followed after him. In the wake of his tour, Vivian developed a reputation as a sort of Canadian expert amongst his British planning colleagues. In early 1911 Raymond Unwin and Patrick Geddes reached out to Vivian for advice on the feasibility of taking their travelling Cities and Town Planning Exhibit to eastern Canada. Furthermore, Thomas Adams was also aware of Vivian’s Canadian expertise, and the Garden City associates likely discussed the nation’s planning development in the years before Adams’s own Canadian residency. For one British colleague, however, Vivian’s Canadian achievements were such that he saw no need for any other Garden City expert to follow in his stead. As Ebenezer Howard, creator of the movement, wrote to Grey when declining a chance to plan his own lecture tour of Canada, “A second visit from [Vivian] would probably be more useful than from anyone else.”
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