Ben Anderson (Keele) and Matthew Kelly (Northumbria).

What Happens When Rural Modernity Ceases to be Modern?

In: Linda M. Ross, Katrina Navickas, Ben Anderson, and Matthew Kelly (eds.) *New Lives, New Landscapes Revisited: Rural Modernity in Britain* (Oxford University Press/British Academy, 2023), pp. 258-280.

If we are to avoid further catastrophic climate change over the next century, the global industrial economy will undergo a transition as fundamental to rural landscapes as the developments that brought about the 'great acceleration' after 1945. This chapter considers Chatterley Whitfield colliery and Fawley power station, two 'new landscapes' that have already undergone this transition. Defined by coal and oil respectively, both are now emblematic of a dirty, polluting history, yet only recently represented a scientific and engineering modernity produced for and by a prosperous, forward-facing workforce. With extraordinary rapidity, the infrastructure and 'new lives' that made these 'new landscapes' has already moved from modern future to backwards past, its destruction serving to confirm, rather than refute, the march of modern progress.

The demolition of chimneys and cooling towers can be a dramatic spectacle, attracting crowds and media attention to a moment of creative destruction that seemingly marks the supersession of one envirotechnical energy regime by another. By obliterating the old, high explosives create a new landscape, rendering high-modernist development into a concrete-laid waste open to a fresh cycle of renewal. New lives are made possible as new landscapes become possible. Notwithstanding the affective power of the spectacle, the apparent caesura it opens up should not obscure the deep connections people have with existing infrastructure-made landscapes - and, indeed, the ghost presence of this infrastructure following demolition.[1] This chapter is therefore informed by what Alice Mah has termed 'ruination', the process that begins well before redundancy notices and plant closures and endures long after them. As Mah shows, infrastructure does not cease to be meaning-making with its closure: it is not constituted of 'static objects', but has different and changing relationships with the communities of which it remains a part.[2] This chapter approaches Mah's concept from two directions. In the first of our two case studies, we follow Mah in our community-

[1] See Steven High and David W. Lewis, *Corporate Wasteland: The Landscape and Memory of Deindustrialization* (London, Cornell University Press, 2007), pp. 23-40.
[2] Alice Mah, *Industrial Ruination, Community, and Place: Landscapes and Legacies of Urban Decline* (London, University of Toronto Press, 2012), p. 3. See also Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Imperial Debris: On Ruins and Ruination* (London, Duke University Press, 2013); Sherry Lee Linkon, *The Half-Life of Deindustrialization: Working-Class Writing about Economic Restructuring* (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2018), pp. 1-7; Jefferson Cowie and Joseph Heathcott (eds), *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization* (London, Cornell University Press, 2003), pp. 1-2.

focused examination of the ruination of a Staffordshire colliery, to understand how closed and derelict sites of post-war optimism become the focus for a changing and dynamic heritage. In the second we examine the lifecycle of an oil-fuelled power station in southern England and emplace the dual ruinations that saw the power station commissioned in the early 1960s, as part of the social compact that produced rural modernity, and then decommissioned in the early 2010s in response to environmental regulations. Without denying the profound dislocation or the social and economic hardship wrought by the loss of jobs, livelihoods, and communities when facilities close, we argue that closure can be contextualised historically as part of a post-war project of state-led modernity that established a logic of fossil fuel path-dependency from which sites and people only escape with difficulty.

This chapter also takes the extensive literature on 'deindustrialisation' into a new landscape. While the industrial closures of the last half-century have been driven by a global capitalism unleashed on workforces by decisions made predominantly by Western politicians and powerful financial institutions, to the next round of closure we must add to this group that part of the environmental lobby that has chosen to harness, rather than challenge capitalism to meet necessary zero-carbon objectives.[3] The global export of coal and steel production, for example, is rightly attributed to the rise of neoliberalism or market capitalism and had nothing to do with environmentalism, but the impetus behind the current drive to zero carbon, particularly in energy production, clearly is environmentalist, bringing a new dynamic to 'deindustrialisation' and posing just as many social and economic challenges.[4] The essential task set by 'zero carbon' cannot be gainsaid, and many communities will benefit from ending extraction in fragile ecosystems, but the human costs of this transition - as well as those of opening up new extractive industries to support the promised zero-carbon future - are rarely acknowledged by advocates of environmental solutions that retain the modern interest in 'progress' that was also at the heart of the post-war state.

Our two case-studies demonstrate how the intersections of pasts, memories, presents, and futures are entangled in difficult-to-resolve cases of decommissioning. Chatterley Whitfield colliery, near Stoke-on-Trent, allows an examination of how far coal mining should be understood within the same post-war compact as 'rural modernity' - indeed, as a core part of it. The section argues that,

[3] For a useful discussion, see Peter Newell and Dustin Mulvaney, 'The political economy of the "just transition" ', *The Geographical Journal*, 179:2 (2013), pp. 132-140.
[4] Though in a slightly different context, the same link is made in Ewan Gibbs, 'Scotland's faltering green industrial revolution', *The Political Quarterly*, 92:1 (2021), pp. 57-65.

following closure, the industrial architecture and institutions of post-war modernity supported the site's unique mining museum, and continued to inform what decisions could and could not be made about the site. Its subsequent physical abandonment, however, has allowed not just a reintroduction of nature to the site, but of competing narrations of its heritage as well. Here, the decision to allow a site to step outside of the never-ending logic of the 'modern' has allowed communities to tell their own, competing stories.

At Fawley power station on the right bank of Southampton Water, the story mirrors that of Chatterley Whitfield. Here, what was once heralded as the UK's most efficient power station rapidly transformed into its most polluting, but its subsequent narrative betrays the logics of the modern in which such sites are caught. The closure and demolition of Fawley heralded not a return to agriculture, nor an investiture in the New Forest National Park - the site would not be stripped of its rural modernity. Instead, the demolished presence of post-war modernity dictated that the space must be made modern for the 21st century - here, by the private construction of a 'new town', complete with digital infrastructure and appropriate claims of environmental sustainability.

Chatterley Whitfield

The place of a colliery in this volume might seem odd alongside the power stations, motorways, and pylons of the late 20th century, but coal was central to post-war rural modernism nonetheless. While nationalisation has been explained as a project of social justice and managed decline, it also stood alongside planning in the British state's Labour-driven vision of an industrial social democracy.[5] Until the late 1960s, coal-fired power stations dominated UK electricity production, contributing a third of power in 1960, and supplied largely by British coal.[6] It is all too easy to see as inevitable the subsequent replacement of coal by oil and gas, steadily decreasing coal output and employment after 1957. Certainly, this was not the future of coal imagined at the outset of nationalisation in 1947, or in the 1950 *Plan for Coal*, when the central problem was meeting demand in an era of full employment.[7] Even the 1956 revision of the *Plan* predicted optimistically that 'the

[5] Jim Tomlinson, 'A "failed experiment"? Public ownership and the narratives of post-war Britain', *Labour History Review*, 73:2 (2008), pp. 228–243. See also Ewan Gibbs, *Coal Country: The Meaning and Memory of Deindustrialisation in Postwar Scotland* (London, University of London Press, 2021), pp. 21–41.
[6] Martin Chick, *Electricity and Energy Policy in Britain, France and the United States since 1945* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2007), p. 7.
[7] *Plan for Coal: The National Coal Board's Proposals* (London, National Coal Board, 1950), pp. 1, 20–24.

problems of overproduction in the coal industry can scarcely arise', and demanded yet higher production targets.[8] The industry also appeared secure in the concentration of electricity production in 'Megawatt Valley' along the Trent and a belt of coalfields from North Staffordshire to South Yorkshire, slated for expansion by the National Coal Board (NCB), and the fulcrum for Britain's new 'supergrid'.[9] Industrial leaders and planners alike understood the coal industry as inherent to post-war infrastructure projects, and as such, a permanent fixture within the social contract of the newly expanded 'industrial modernity' promised by Fairbrother, something that the NCB's magazine left no doubt about to its employees.[10]

Chatterley Whitfield, a colliery that made much of its status as the UK's first 'million tonner', emerged as central to this imagination of modern coal mining for at least the first decade or so of the NCB, boasting 'week-by-week development plans' until 1967 and a target of two million tons.[11] Yet once contraction in the coal industry began in the late 1950s, the colliery went rapidly from showcase to problem: 'modernisation' now meant not investment, but closure.[12] Nationally, Harold Wilson's government's *Fuel Policy* of 1967 formalised a shift to oil, gas, and nuclear power in the state imagination of the future.[13] Regionally, the colliery no longer fitted either. Its infrastructure was ageing, and it was far from both the West Coast main line, and the planned route for the A500 'D' road. The NCB's response was the 'superpit'; closure and contraction would be offset by giganticism and centralisation projects whose architecture, as well as name, recalled the pylons and power stations of the supergrid. Chatterley Whitfield's complex mélange of buildings in styles from late-Victorian warehouse to Art Deco and Ruhr-style heapstead, and an underground of abandoned or collapsed shafts and worked-out seams, meant that serious investment went elsewhere. Output and employment at the site declined 70 per cent by the early 1970s, and the site closed shortly after an underground connection to the Wolstanton superpit.[14]

Both Chatterley Whitfield's rise and fall as a premier Staffordshire pit were accompanied by the languages of modernity. The promise of expansion and centralisation in 1950 was predicated on the

[8] *Investing in Coal: Progress and Prospects under the Plan for Coal* (London, National Coal Board, 1956), p. 11.
[9] *Plan for Coal*, p. 6; John Sheail, 'Power to the people: Power stations and the National Grid', in Paul Brassley, Jeremy Burchardt, and Karen Sayer (eds), *Transforming the Countryside: The Electrification of Rural Britain* (London, Routledge, 2017), pp. 38–50 (41).
[10] For example, 'Progress through coal', *North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce Journal*, 8 (1951), 2–4; *Coal: National Coal Board Magazine* ran regular features on collieries, miners and their families, but also contributions that discussed the benefits of the new society, and miners' place within it.
[11] Lambton Burn, 'Down Hesketh Pit', *Coal*, 11 (1947), pp. 15–18.
[12] See Gibbs, *Coal Country*, pp. 31–36.
[13] Gibbs, *Coal Country*, p. 33.
[14] CW(D)108, in CWMMDA/J T Worgan's Archive Scans/Chat Whit output stats.

assumption of closures at smaller pits and a focus on the more 'productive', 'efficient', and 'modern' coalfields.[15] At those pits that stayed open, mechanisation, and, at Chatterley Whitfield, the NCB's first computer, helped to provide a modern aesthetic that justified such decisions even as it decreased employment.[16] The miner too looked different. Gone were the whippet, flat cap, axe, and pick imagined by F. L. J. Vodrey in 1977:

> he could no longer be heard clattering down the street, his footwear now were boots, with steel toe-protectors in the toes, and hard hat to protect his head, and with a clip on the front to hold his head lamp, and a belt to carry the battery.[17]

The miners, he continued, now arrived in normal clothes, and changed at the colliery; they rode trains under-ground, and returned clean - something that benefited women in the community as much as the men. The state, providing pit-head equipment in place of personal tools, created a miner to suit its new image - even if these changes can be traced to an earlier period.[18] The late 20th-century version was clean, safe, expert, and professional, a set of values that surely operated in addition to, rather than replacing, the emphasis on collective physical prowess and masculine bodies found in much other research.[19] As well as the pit itself, the pit-head baths at Chatterley Whitfield provided a space in which that combination might be played out: miners scrubbed each other's bodies, and sang communal hymns in what remained a stronghold for Methodism.[20] The post-war miner was also increasingly diverse. Chatterley Whitfield's growth in the immediate post-war era meant that its workforce included 'migrant' communities from much of Europe's South and East.[21] Many were 'Displaced Persons': Polish servicemen who remained in Britain, or refugees from camps across Central Europe through the 'European Voluntary Workers' Scheme'. Later, the British state supplemented these workers with more explicit schemes of labour recruitment such as the

---

[15] *Plan for Coal*, p. 3.
[16] CW(D)107, in CWMMDA/J T Worgan's Archive Scans/Chat Whit Iron Jack IBM Computer.
[17] F. L. J. Vodrey, 'Chatterley Whitfield: History & achievements' (c. 1977), CWMMDA/JTWORGAN'S ARCHIVE SCANS, pp. 2-6. See also Transcript of interview with Bill Brookes, David Souden, ' Report for the Oral History Project within Chatterley Whitfield Regeneration Project Conservation Plan', (unpublished report commissioned by English Heritage/Stoke-on-Trent City Council, 2000), 2000), p. 87, available at CWMMDA/CW LIBRARY docs, books etc/Chatterley Whitfield Oral History Project Report, D. Souden 2000.
[18] The art-deco Pit-Head Baths of 1938 for example, were a result of the Miners' Welfare Committee first established in 1926. See 'A history of Chatterley Whitfield Colliery' (2013) CWMMDA/J T Worgan's Archive Scans/A History of Chat Whit, p. 10.
[19] Arthur McIvor and Ronald Johnson, *Miner's Lung: A History of Dust Disease in British Coal Mining* (London, Routledge, 2007), pp. 259-269.
[20] See for example, Stephanie Ward, 'Miners' bodies and masculine identity in Britain, c. 1900–1950', *Cultural and Social History*, 18:3 (2021), pp. 443-462. Souden, Oral History Report, pp. 49-51.
[21] Brookes Transcript, p. 3; 'migrant' is problematic in this case, as many were more properly refugees, and continued to see themselves as temporary exiles even as the British states redefined them as 'workers'. See Diana Kay and Robert Miles, 'Refugees or migrant workers? The case of the European volunteer workers in Britain (1946–1951)', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 1:3/4 (1988), pp. 214-236 and Linda McDowell, *Hard Labour: The Forgotten Voices of Latvian Migrant Volunteer Workers* (London, UCL, 2005), pp. 87-120.

'Westward Ho!' programme targeting Eastern Europeans.[22] These new communities preceded and set a pattern of movement for the later Windrush migration period, and were similarly instrumental to the post-war settlement. While British citizens arriving from the Caribbean found themselves in mining after encountering colour bars elsewhere, migrant workers from Europe remained formally 'aliens', and could be directed and coerced into understaffed sectors.[23] The 'Balt Cygnets' scheme brought thousands of Baltic-state women to work in hospitals and the new National Health Service, and established a pattern for the targets of Westward Ho!, who arrived to tackle a post-war labour shortage in Britain's heavy industries and agriculture. While by the time the *Empire Windrush* arrived, Chatterley Whitfield was contracting, many black miners worked in British collieries, including at Chatterley Whitfield and its close neighbours in North Staffordshire.[24]

These groups routinely feature in miners' memories of working in the pit, and continue to be members of social circles amongst North Staffordshire miners and heritage activists.[25] If the animosity to 'foreign' miners found by other researchers ever emerged, moreover, it is yet to feature in recorded memories of the colliery, though there are isolated examples of inter-migrant conflict, and references to Caribbean migrants are rare.[26] It would be wrong to regard the pit bottom, where epithets were used readily, as a multicultural haven, but it is clear that like many pits, Chatterley Whitfield fostered significant intercultural respect and exchange.[27]

Little of this was apparent in the Mining Museum which opened after the colliery fully closed in 1977, though members of the European cohorts worked as guides and volunteers. Indeed, at first glance, Chatterley Whitfield Mining Museum offered a narrow view of mining. Yet despite the popularity of the impressive drive gear in the Hesketh Building, iconic headgear (Figure 12.2) and the pit ponies, the museum was not so much an exhibition of objects, as of skills, masculinities, and hard labour. Guided tours included active demonstrations of pit-bottom maintenance or undercutting coal faces by hand, all led by an enthusiastic and highly skilled group of ex-miner volunteers:[28]

---

[22] Stephen Catterall and Keith Gildart, 'Outsiders: Trade union responses to Polish and Italian coal miners in two British coalfields, 1945–54', in Stefan Berger, Andy Croll, and Norman Laporte (eds.), *Towards a Comparative History of Coalfield Societies* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2015 [2005]), pp. 164-176.
[23] Kay and Miles, 'Refugees or migrant workers?'; *Caribbean Voices: Memories of Stoke-on-Trent and North Staffordshire's Caribbean Community*, directed by Ray Johnson (Staffordshire Film Archive, 2011), 19:51. The 'hostels' in which each group successively lived on first arriving in an area were first built to accommodate 'Bevin Boys'. See, for example, CWMMDA/CW DOCS SCANS/Richard Alfred Lucas (Lucke) ex-miner CW.
[24] Souden, Oral History Report, p. 50. McDowell, *Hard Labour*, p. 105. The Black Miners Museum Project, https://blackcoalminers.com [accessed 23 January 2023]. See *Caribbean Voices*, 19:51, 37:20, 39:40.
[25] David Bell, *Memories of the Staffordshire Coalfields* (Newbury, Countryside Books, 2010), p. 119.
[26] Catterall and Gildart, 'Outsiders'.
[27] Souden, *Oral History Report*, p. 50; 'Smallthorne Miners' Hostel', www.smallthorne-history.org.uk/ smallthorne-miners-hostel/ [accessed 17 May 2022].
[28] Jim Worgan, 'The decline and fall of Chatterley Whitfield Mining Museum: A personal reflection by Jim Worgan',

> They became volunteers for what was one of the best aspects of the museum … the ex-miners … guides. They were one of the prize things: Once people paid their money the whole of their visit was in the hands of ex-miners, the volunteer guides, and that was a star turn.[29]

An emphasis on skill was intrinsic to the decision to use a part of underground workings as the core exhibition space - a decision which meant planning had to be agreed with the NCB, and the museum space effectively treated as an active coal mine. Moving visitors around the underground exhibition in its first, 700ft-deep guise required a safety process integrated into the experience itself. Visitors donned miners' helmets and lamps from the lamp store, read regulations that were both exhibit and warning, and descended in an impressively cramped cage. Led by Brian Burton, a small group of men re-engineered the pit bottom of the Winstanley shaft for ventilation and a new roughly circular route for the tour. Other than this, they left the roads and much of the equipment in place; they could hardly have done otherwise, since much of it was embedded in, and (in the case of roof supports in varying degrees of collapse) intrinsic to the space itself.[30] The result was a walk around what to any non-expert would have been a profoundly mysterious and confusing array of equipment, if it were not for the guides.[31]

The last two decades have seen a reassessment of the meaning inherent to the skills 'lost' with deindustrialisation, and especially to the largely male ex-employees of heavy industries such as mining.[32] For Arthur McIvor, the sudden loss of work entailed a loss of those identities, and a long-term legacy of physical and mental illness that needs to be set alongside the other harms of heavy industry on the body.[33] The emphasis on skill and expertise, and the physical demonstration of these skills - including not just mining, but, for example, knowledge of safety procedures - can be understood against this research.[34] This is true not only for the tour guides, but for much of the staff

---

CWMMDA/J T Worgan's Archive Scans/Decline and Fall of Chat Whit Museum JTW 2001; Ph 1988 348-349 CWMMDA/CW Photo Archive.

[29] Transcript of interview with Brian Burton, CWMMDA/CW LIBRARY docs, books etc/Chatterley Whitfield Oral History Project Report, D. Souden 2000/Transcripts of Interviews/Brian Burton, p. 3.

[30] Brian Burton transcript, p. 4. Burton considered only about 10 per cent of the pit bottom to have been 'artificially created' for the museum.

[31] See Ph 1988 348-349.

[32] While the pits continued to be an exclusively male preserve after the 1842 Mines Act banned women and children, 'pit brow girls' remained a core part of a surface workforce picking and cleaning coal well into the 20th century. At Chatterley Whitfield, women continued to work in administration – and especially the running of a computer in the years around 1960 - catering, and in the on-site coal analysis laboratory. The underground tour also had one - lone - female guide.

[33] Arthur McIvor, 'Deindustrialization embodied: Work, health, and disability in the United Kingdom since the mid-twentieth century', in Steven High, Lachlan Mackinnon, and Andrew Perchard (eds.), *The Deindustrialized World: Confronting Ruination in Postindustrial Places* (Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press, 2017), pp. 25-45 (27-31).

[34] Worgan, 'Decline and fall', p. 22.

of a museum that would not have been possible without the application of coal-mining expertise, knowledge, and understanding. Volunteers drafted designs and plans for the museum using skills developed while proposing coal-mine extensions, and the site employed engineers and a mine manager in addition to standard museum staff. When the closure of North Staffordshire's 'superpit' at Wolstanton forced the first 'underground experience' to close, the planning and design for the 'New Mine' followed the same pattern, using the same people.[35] So too the activities of the Chatterley Whitfield Friends continue to place an emphasis on mechanical skill; their Memorial Garden is part tribute to those who died on the site, and part tribute to the skills of mining, demonstrated in outdoors exhibits that include a working cart-run through wooden roof supports.[36]

At the outset, the promoters of Chatterley Whitfield Mining Museum could be optimistic that their venture had a long-term future, but it relied on a public sector ecosystem which recognised the mutual benefits of supporting a cultural and social infrastructure. In this sense, the museum was a continuity with the closed colliery in another way - it served as a cultural and social hub, supported by the mining industry, just as the NCB and its affiliated organisations sponsored a social and sporting infrastructure. According to Brian Burton, the effective founder of the museum, support came from not just the NCB, but also new museums at Ironbridge or Gladstone Pottery.[37] While long-term direct financial support came from Stoke City Council, the museum also benefited from renting offices to the NCB and a branch of Manpower Services Commission (MSC), a public agency which ran the Youth Opportunities Programme in the 1970s, and which also supplied labour at no extra charge. The museum could use haulage transport for free, and the close inter-relationships of the British state also meant that it housed an 'Energy Hall' sponsored by the Midland Electricity Board. These mutually supporting elements of the late 20th-century British state gradually untangled during late 1980s Thatcherism, in the aftermath of the miners' strike, during which the museum was targeted by picketers.[38] The effective privatisation of youth training provision meant the local replacement of MSC by a private provider, Laing Employment Training Organisation. While the new provider maintained a relationship with the museum and remained on site, declining supervision of on-site trainees in a period of increasing theft harmed what appears to have been a constructive relationship. The museum appeared to benefit from the closure of another mining museum at Lound Hall in

[35] Brian Burton transcript, p. 4.
[36] https://chatterleywhitfieldfriends.org.uk/remembrance-garden/ [accessed 19 January 2023].
[37] Brian Burton transcript, p. 2.
[38] Brian Burton transcript, p. 4.

Nottingham in 1990, and was briefly custodian of the vast 'British Coal Collection'.[39] Triumph here was itself symptomatic of British Coal's own hollowing out – shortly after the announcement, British Coal announced its total withdrawal from the Chatterley Whitfield site, starving of resources the same organisation it had only recently awarded its most extensive material archive.[40] Increasingly, the museum began resorting to independent fundraising and seeking private investment, but its chairman, and most significant benefactor, Ron Southern, announced his retirement as Stoke City Council Leader.[41] Within a few years, council funding to the museum had been cut by two-thirds, even as the same corporation stepped in to save a local pottery museum, and rejected funding from nearby Newcastle- under-Lyme.[42] While the exact cause of this sudden abandonment remains unclear, the future of the museum was in question once the public-sector ecosystem in which it emerged began to collapse. That same process also spread beyond the colliery into surrounding communities, where the social and leisure infrastructure once provided by the post-war state and NCB has gradually disappeared.

While the visible heritage of coal disappeared from the skyline of Stoke-on-Trent, its toxic legacies remained - a heritage of deindustrialisation, nationalisation, and the post-war settlement between state, worker, and landscape. Coal dust was embedded in the lungs and bodies of its workers, sulphates from colliery, pottery, and iron waste underlay the houses many continued to live in.[43] As myriad studies of coal legacies, and much of the literature on deindustrialisation demonstrates, this continuing ruination of people, environments, landscapes, and communities pervade the memories of such sites, and thus of the collapse of a post-war compact.[44] For those interviewed in 2000, dust recalled ineffectual water spray treatments, and a state resistant to compensation claims, irrespective of the well-advertised efforts of the nationalised industry to protect its workforce.[45] The legacies of mining on local landscapes are also both one of the post-war modernist state and of a voracious extractive industry. Much of the dark and geo- metric shapes of spoil heaps and railway cuttings preceded the Second World War, but the new state compact also transformed these sites into a new landscape typified by sports and leisure facilities

[39] The NCB became 'British Coal' in 1987.
[40] See Worgan, 'Decline and fall', pp. 4-14.
[41] Worgan, 'Decline and fall', p. 16.
[42] Worgan, 'Decline and fall', p. 17.
[43] The 'Red Ash' problem, particularly prevalent in North Staffordshire, results from using sulphate-rich industrial waste beneath concrete flooring. Though not toxic to humans, it causes structural damage to homes such as bowed floors and undermined walls. See Ian Longworth, *Sulfate Damage to Concrete Floors on Sulfate-bearing Hardcore: Identification and Remediation* (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2008).
[44] For example, McIvor, 'Deindustrialization embodied'; McIvor and Johnston, *Miners' Lung*.
[45] Souden, Oral History Report, pp. 87-89.

and derelict 'brownfields'. Of the 600 acres of derelict land designated for clearance in North Staffordshire and Stoke- on-Trent in 1963, for example, 85 per cent (and 17 out of 24 schemes) were to provide sites for leisure, sports, or to improve 'amenity' in the area.[46] While these legacies continue to produce both harm and benefits in communities such as those connected to Chatterley Whitfield, we need to understand them not as legacies of a declining 19th-century industry, but rather as one of the early human costs of the 'Great Acceleration'.

The colliery at Chatterley Whitfield, however, got a reprieve. As it became clear the museum would close, its last manager arranged for much of the site to be designated an ancient monument, while its spoil heap and railway successfully transitioned to a well-used local nature reserve with minimal heritage provision.[47] The new status has, almost certainly, saved the colliery buildings from demolition, but it has also left them in a position of long-term heritage stasis and physical decay, as well as, more positively, natural 'rewilding'. The dangerous condition of most of the site means that it largely sits behind a security fence, with even limited access restricted to guided tours and heritage professionals. It has also been a target of repeated ambitious, expensive, and largely failed regeneration proposals from politicians, local authorities, and heritage bodies - though these also helped to establish the Chatterley Whitfield Friends group itself.[48] In general, schemes have relied on refitting the site for a 21st-century modern, typically interpreted as a leisure, arts and retail park powered by on-site renewable energy - particularly wind, solar, and geothermal heat-pumps.

A challenge for such schemes is to offer an appropriately 'modern' future whilst retaining the creative heritage that is a core part of its story, and continues on the site even in its current state.[49] As the memorial garden, guided tours, and heritage centre run by volunteers at Chatterley Whitfield suggests, where sites cease to be one modern but do not become another, they can provide opportunities for community agency and heritage production outside of the logic of capitalism. They also provide sites on which the meanings of that heritage is contested across generations, class, and institutions. While the Friends represent a continuing community of work, largely led by men with

[46] Hansard HC Deb, 15 March 1963, vol. 673, cc208–11W.
[47] James Hutchinson to J. W. Worgan, 7 December 1993 in Worgan, 'Decline and fall', p. 29; '£14 million awarded to Chatterley Whitfield', CWMMDA/CW Library docs, books etc/Chatterley Whitfield, £14 million Award.
[48] For example, AEA Technology, 'Chatterley Whitfield – a centre for renewable energy [report for English Heritage]' (2001), in CWMMDA/CW Library docs, books etc/Chatterley Whitfield – A Centre for Renewable Energy; Llewelyn Davies, 'Chatterley Whitfield action plan: Final report', CWMMDA/ CW Library docs, books etc/Chatterley Whitfield Regeneration Plan, Llewelyn Davies (2001); ERM, 'Economic appraisal of redeveloping the former Chatterley Whitfield coalfield site in North Staffordshire', CWMMDA/CW Library docs, books etc/Chatterley Whitfield, Economic Appraisal of Redevelopment (2004); 'Chatterley Whitfield preparation and programme for developer involvement – cabinet agenda planning session, City of Stoke-on-Trent', CWMMDA/CW Library docs, books etc/ Chatterley Whitfield, Preparation & Programme for Developer Involvement; 'Chatterley Whitfield July 2003', CWMMDA/CW Library Docs, books etc/Chatterley Whitfield, Brief History and Regeneration Project (2003).
[49] See Mah, *Industrial Ruination*, pp. 175-194.

personal or family connections to North Staffordshire mining, local young people are now less likely to have family connections to the colliery. Their engagement with the site as a rite of passage nevertheless continues a liminal role for the transition to adulthood attested to in Chatterley Whitfield's previous guises as both productive colliery and museum, yet threaten the Friends' access to the site, as well as the respect which miners' families sometimes feel the site requires.[50] As the last complete colliery in North Staffordshire, and with a still-present, unique museum exhibition lying just underground, Chatterley Whitfield has also been a target for the largely middle-class 'Urban Explorers' so beloved of avant-garde academics.[51] A more-than-human presence of foxes, barn owls, and other birds of prey recall an environment long lost to the colliery, yet now protected by it, and integral to the diversity of the Whitfield Valley nature reserve.[52] These different versions of Chatterley Whitfield compete for space within the confines of the site. So far at least, proposed schemes for redevelopment leave little room for dynamism or change in how different communities interpret or construct the past.[53]

Understanding how to interpret and conceptualise a changing and dynamic heritage has become a preoccupation of researchers concerned with the future of memories of deindustrialisation.[54] As the physical infrastructure of 20th-century carbon culture is (too slowly) replaced by a new landscape of renewable infrastructure, and communities of labour dwindle through death and mobility, memories of industry are creatively remade for a new context, prompting one study to question the 'half-life' metaphor of continual, gradual, and inevitable dissipation. Chatterley Whitfield suggests that similar criticisms might be levelled at 'ruination', defined by Laura Ann Stoler as 'an *act* perpetrated, a *condition* to which one is subject, and a *cause* of loss'.[55] Chatterley Whitfield continues to represent the ruination of deindustrialisation for the same communities who experience it, but *as a* ruin it *does not* ruin; rather it has become a site in which different groups can narrate and make sense of their loss precisely because it is no longer modern.

---

[50] Notes on 'Decommissioning the twentieth century workshop: Presences', online, 15 March 2021, Decommissioning the Twentieth Century, Keele Data Repository.
[51] For example, Bradley L. Garrett, 'Urban exploration as heritage placemaking', in Hilary Orange (ed.), *Reanimating Industrial Spaces: Conducting Memory Work in Post-Industrial Societies* (London, Routledge, 2015), pp. 72-91; Tim Edensor, *Industrial Ruins: Space, Aesthetics and Materiality* (Oxford, Berg, 2005). For a critique, see High and Lewis, *Corporate Wasteland*, pp. 46-63. See, for example, Chatterley Whitfield Colliery, Staffordshire, www.bcd-urbex.com/chatterley-whitfield-colliery/ [accessed 25 January 2023].
[52] 'Presences'.
[53] See Tim Strangleman, 'Deindustrialisation and the historical sociological imagination: Making sense of work and industrial change', *Sociology*, 51:2 (2017), pp. 466-482 (71-2).
[54] Orange, *Reanimating Industrial Spaces*; Ewan Gibbs, Susan Henderson, and Victoria Bianchi, 'Intergenerational learning and place-making in a deindustrialized locality: "Tracks of the past" in Lanarkshire, Scotland', *International Labor and Working-Class History* (2022), pp. 1-24 (3).
[55] Ann Laura Stoler, 'Introduction: "The rot remains": From ruins to ruination', in Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Imperial Debris: On Ruins and Ruination* (London, Duke University Press, 2013), p. 11. Emphasis in original.

Emplacing Fawley

Interwar maps of the west bank of Southampton Water inscribe a rural landscape with Cadland Park and Cadland House as its centrepiece. The house and park were part of the Cadland Estate, acquired by the Drummond family in 1772, comprising several thousand acres on the south-east corner of land where Southampton Water meets The Solent, much of which remains with the family today. By the 1970s, similar mapping enterprises described a peri-urban, industrial landscape dominated by modern industrial infrastructure and extensive urbanisation. This rapid transformation was catalysed in 1947 with the strategic decision by the Ministry of Power to make a compulsory purchase order for a large stretch of land alongside Southampton Water, which included approximately a third of the Cadland Estate. Cadland House, including parkland landscaped by Capability Brown, and 40 estate cottages, were demolished; intertidal mudflats were reclaimed. A substantial extension to the existing Esso oil refinery followed, opened by Prime Minister Attlee in 1951 and active today. This represented the first stage in the development of a major industrial complex, that included Marchwood Power Station (1955) and the development of industries that either rely on refinery product - International Synthetic Rubber (1958), Monsanto Chemicals (1958), Union Carbide (1960), and the Hythe Gasworks (1964) - or supported it - Air Products (1961). The development culminated at its southern end with the completion of the oil-fuelled Fawley power station in 1969.[56]

A puff piece published in *The Times* in February 1956 extolled the regeneration of the region. Preservationists might have been alarmed by these developments, the Council for the Preservation of Rural England (CPRE) saying that 'once the "effective natural barrier" of Southampton Water was crossed, the whole area of the New Forest would be endangered', but regional boosters regarded the Esso refinery as the 'outstanding post-war development' in an area undergoing a period of rapid regeneration. Southampton had been heavily bombed during the war but now mixed 'modernity with ruins', renewing its claim to be the 'Gateway to Britain'. Its new university, chartered in 1952, promised to bring further engineering expertise to a city already associated with pioneering aeronautics, but it was the rural west bank of Southampton Water that had 'comparable advantages'

[56] R. H. Lester, 'Industrial development around the Esso Refinery, Fawley', *Geography*, 58:2 (April 1973), pp. 154-159.

unmatched elsewhere in southern England.[57]

If we're looking to emplace the history of the 'great acceleration', as manifest in the increased energy demands that determined the new lives of post-war Britain and the growth of the petrochemical industry, the west bank of Southampton Water provides a prime location. In this new industrial complex was manifest the rapid development of the carbon economy and its transformation of rural places, instantiating the public-private but statist underpinnings of the new landscapes created by modern energy infrastructure. Emblematic not just of the new post-war optimism but also the centrality of private interests to the delivery of public goods was the advertisement taken out by Esso celebrating the opening of the Central Electricity Generating Board's Marchwood Power Station in 1957. Esso would supply the oil.[58] Once Fawley was commissioned, *The Times* regularly carried news of the numerous private contracts, and the employment they generated, that its construction made possible.[59]

But just as Fawley can be emplaced in terms of social democracy and the mixed economy, so the lifecycle of the power station was determined, first, by post-1979 market liberalism, and second, by commitments to decarbonise energy generation. The privatisation of electricity generation in 1990 transferred the power station from public into private ownership, while the European Union Large Combustion Plant Directive (1988/2010) ensured the power station was shut down in March 2013. What, in the 1970s, was promoted as the UK's most *efficient* power station, fired up when there were shortfalls in the grid, was later condemned as its most *polluting*. That shift in optic, in how the power station was evaluated, provides another way of explaining the historical shifts that have determined the use of the site.

Once Fawley was condemned, it became a declining asset, ripe for redevelopment. Notwithstanding its iconic chimney, used as a navigation aid by sailors in the Solent and providing orientation for local communities, and circular control room, a favourite for Hollywood location scouts, attempts to have the power station listed failed, enabling its purchase in 2015 by a private consortium. In 2020, the planning authorities approved a fiercely ambitious masterplan to transform the site into a new business and residential complex, a new town according to the promoters. Fawley Waterside is as potentially transformative as the high modernist, statist developments of the 1950s, 1960s, and

[57] *The Times*, 11 February 1956.
[58] *The Times*, 5 June 1957.
[59] Reports in *The Times* include 14 September 1962, 20 September 1962, 19 April 1963, 9 July 1963, 26 July 1963, 15 October 1963, 3 January 1964, 8 January 1964, 11 February 1964, and 13 March 1964.

1970s. The founder and chief executive of Fawley Waterside is Aldred Drummond, owner of the Cadland Estate and property developer or, as he puts it, a specialist in 'building communities'. Drummond was apparently determined to regain ownership of the former lands of the family estate, and he exemplifies how old wealth has been able to capitalise on the opportunities provided by market liberalism. Fawley Waterside emplaces financialisation, global capital flows, and the accelerated accumulation of wealth in private hands.

That there are clear differences between the transformation of the site in the 1950s and 1960s, a public–private initiative purportedly in the interest of the national community, and the transformation currently in prospect, largely for the benefit of private interests, should not obscure how profoundly environmentally disruptive were post-war interventions. Post-war governments empowered themselves to act in ways that led to the transformation of rural environments. Specifically, the planning process that led to the decision to build the Fawley power station provides an illuminating example of how the development of energy infrastructure was managed in the south of England where fuel supplies - coal - could not be extracted locally.

In the 1950s, officials considering how to meet the growing demand for electricity in the south of England placed the question of fuel supply at the centre of their discussions. Coal provided the standard answer, and with the wartime shortages overcome, the coal industry was increasingly dependent on the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB)'s readiness to build new coal-fired power stations. But to adopt coal either entailed transporting it long distances or building power stations elsewhere, along with expensive and controversial pylons to carry the electricity south.[60] Locating new power stations in the Midlands might please the National Union of Miners but as Katrina Navickas's chapter in this volume demonstrates, the CEGB was right to fear that the spoliation of local environments for the benefit of distant communities could rouse local opposition, particularly if threatening to enliven perceptions of the north/south divide and place local or regional socio-economic needs in conflict with an emergent sense of environ- mental justice.[61] The opposition roused by the proposal that one of a string of coal-fired power stations on the River Trent should be at Holme Pierrepont, close to Nottingham and inside the city's Green Belt, evinced how even in a county heavily dependent on the coal industry questions of amenity, and especially public health,

[60] Roy Gregory, *The Price of Amenity: Five Studies in Conservation and Government* (London, Macmillan, 1971), p. 92.
[61] See Ed Atkins, 'Building a dam, constructing a nation: The "drowning" of Capel Celyn', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 31 (2018), pp. 455-468.

limited the CEGB's options.[62]

The brave new world of nuclear power offered an alternative solution, and in the late 1950s the coastal villages of Earnley, south-west of Chichester, and Hamstead, on north-west side of the Isle of Wight, came under consideration. Earnley was rejected on technical grounds, though public anxiety about situating a nuclear power station in a densely populated area exercised the local authorities. Belatedly, the ecological value of the site was acknowledged 'as one of the last remaining wild bits of the Sussex coast', the site's prior use by the RAF having apparently obscured its 'scientific' value.[63]By contrast, the National Parks Commission, supported by the Nature Conservancy, and much public opinion, objected to the use of Hamstead on amenity grounds.[64] The CEGB gamely contended that landscaping might minimise the impact of a power station at Hamstead, which as Ian Waites explains was deployed to such striking effect at West Burton, but it eventually conceded that the 'psychological' effect of a nuclear power station on the Isle of Wight could not be overcome.[65]

Pressure from Sir Christopher Hinton, chair of the CEGB, injected some urgency into the search for an alternative site. It has been suggested that the nuclear proposals were a strategic ploy intended to soften the opposition to Fawley; in any case, it seems nuclear was never a serious option for a power station on Southampton Water. The site was initially considered for a coal-fired power station, which might seem surprising given the presence of the Esso oil refinery and the oil-fired power station at Marchwood, but pressure from the NCB and the National Union of Miners, recalling vulnerabilities to oil supply during the war, fomented concern about fuel security. The case for coal soon looked threadbare. To increase the region's dependence on distant coal supplies would lead to higher transport costs, including the costs of a jetty into deep water for the delivery of coal by barge, and higher bills for consumers.[66] Fear of future oil import taxes were met with the claim that proximity to the refinery promised efficiency, though little evidence suggests fuel security concerns ever posed a serious threat to the plan. These arguments were immediately salient, but they also reflected a larger shift in UK energy policy that tended to favour alternatives to coal and were part of the

[62] Roy Gregory tells the story, reflecting on the eventual decision to locate the station at Ratcliffe-on-Soar on the outer edge of the Nottingham Green Belt. See Gregory, *The Price of Amenity*, pp. 89-132.
[63] Rural District Council of Chichester to CEGB, 10 April 1959; Note by E. B. Worthington (NC?) on Earnley, 19 March 1959 (FT 3/533).
[64] NPC to C. F. C. Bower (NC), 31 July 1959; M. J. Woodman to N. F. Haylock (Society for the Protection of the Solent Area), 10 April 1959 (FT 3/533).
[65] 'Proposed sites for nuclear power stations on the south coast', 14 December 1960 (FT 3/533).
[66] 'Proposed sites for nuclear power stations on the south coast'; G. S. Campbell to *Southern Evening Echo*, 21 August 1961 (POWE 14/1316); *The Times*, 25 March 1961.

managed decline of the industry.[67]

More challenging to the proposers was concern about the station's local envir- onmental impact. These objections broadly took two interrelated forms. First, fear of the effect of atmospheric and chemical pollution on local and regional ecologies and, second, a more general concern that the extension of the industrial complex further south would encroach on relatively unspoilt country, signalling a general openness by the planning authorities to the further industrialisation of the Hampshire coastline. Voices looking to halt further industrial encroachment called for the new power station to be located north-west of the refinery and close to Marchwood. However, a 2,000KW power station located on the River Test would require either eight cooling towers and a 500-acre site or a seven-mile-long dis- charge pipe to Stanswood Bay at a cost of £10 million. At Fawley, only a 130-acre site was required because a system of culverts would channel waste waters into the strong tidal currents that animated Southampton Water.[68]

Objections were inevitable and followed the pattern established by the many local public inquiries of the period. Cowes Urban District Council, Winchester Rural District Council, and the CPRE lodged formal objections; Fareham Urban District Council and New Forest Rural District Council made 'precautionary' objections; and among the small number of objections made by members of the public were those of Maldwin Drummond of the Manor of Cadland and his tenants. These latter objections were part of a coordinated effort. Drummond was already aggrieved by the failure to fulfil undertakings related to the dredging of Southampton Water, a condition of earlier developments: contractors had not met their commitment to tackle drainage problems inflicted on Cadland tenancies by the dumping of silt on marshland that preceded industrial developments. Now Drummond registered his objection to the proposal on the grounds that it would intensify apparent problems already associated with the industrialisation of the area. Some objections were specific to the new development. Costly improvements to Ower House would be undermined if fine views over Southampton Water were obscured, and Drummond feared the requisition of estate land for improved roads and the siting of pylons needed to carry the 400KW cables that would transmit the newly-generated electricity from the power station. Some reasons were more general. Drummond's land agent wrote about the likely 'disturbance to rural life, particularly shooting on the estate': increased population density would lead

[67] Gibbs, *Coal Country*, p. 4.
[68] M. V. Bartlett, CEGB, to L. F. Saw, HLG, 25 July 1961 (POWE 14/1315); Senior Engineering Inspector to Richard Wood, Minister of Power, 18 May 1962, pp. 4, 6 (POWE 14/1316).

to traffic congestion, the greater incidence of trespass, and fire risk to woodland.[69] Drummond's tenants primarily objected on agricultural grounds, though one lamented the loss of his view of Southampton Water: he did 'not wish to lose this amenity'.[70] Nice try. Amenity, of course, was usually understood in social rather than private terms. The sensibilities of an individual tenant farmer or homeowner was unlikely disturb the sleep of a planning inspector.

Such objections had the potential to develop into a fully-fledged planning dis- pute if Hampshire County Council, the planning authority, withheld its consent and thereby required the minister to order a local public inquiry. The council, however, accepted the need for new power stations and was principally concerned that one of the two locations south of the refinery under consideration would take the Southampton Water industrial zone not just into the Green Belt agreed in 1958 but also into the area centred on Calshott spit that was central to the council's leisure strategy. The council was already in negotiations with the Crown Estate Commissioners for the long-term lease of the spit, a Second World War legacy holding of the RAF. Faced with the prospect of a formal objection by council, the CEGB turned its attention to the more northern of the two sites, a combination of reclaimed land and saltings.[71] The council now kept the possibility of a formal objection in reserve as it sought assurances that the Ministry of Housing and Local Government would support its case for taking possession of Calshott, tantamount to guaranteeing the lease transfer. Although the CEGB was riled that their plans depended on a quite separate political process, significant planning decisions often involved a string of ministries and related land-use questions. In February 1962, the council got its assurance and promptly announced it would not object to the plans. The objecting district councils and the Cadland Estate and tenants swiftly followed suit, one tenant writing that 'if Cadland Settled Estates withdraw their objection I will withdraw mine'.[72] The National Parks Commission and the CPRE adopted a pragmatic position, passively informing the ministry that it would not, respectively, offer comment or seek a local inquiry.[73] Somewhat comically, Lord Huntingdon, spokesperson for the Solent Protection Society, commented that if 'the design and layout of this station is of the highest standard it could provide a

[69] R. Bacon to Ministry of Power, 21 September 1961 (POWE 14/1316).
[70] To Ministry of Power, 19 September 1961 (POWE 14/1316).
[71] *The Times*, 21 March 1961, 25 March 1961, 29 April 1961, 30 May 1961.
[72] Albert Smith to the Ministry of Power, 22 and 24 March 1962 (POWE 14/1316).
[73] H. F. Donglay (NPC) to Ministry of Power, 15 March 1962; Herbert Griffin (CPRE) to Ministry of Power, 29 March 1962 (POWE 14/1316).

striking and effective termination to the sprawling industrialisation of the Fawley area'.[74] Doubtless he was relieved that the decision effectively shelved the Hamstead proposals, but this seems a little disingenuous.

Only the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society held out. As a gesture of goodwill, the Minister of Power ordered a hearing be held at Jubilee Hall in Fawley to allow the Field Club's case to be heard and answered by an engineering inspector. There was no prospect this process would change the decision. Familiar arguments were rehearsed about why Marchwood was unsuitable and why the great height of the chimney (650 feet), only the third of its kind, was necessary. To the Field Club's fear that thermal down draughts caused by large stretches of cool water would submerge the New Forest in a sulphur cloud, the inspector explained that such was the height of the chimney, by the time the discharged sulphur dioxide came back down to earth it would have been sufficiently widely dispersed and diluted to be harmless. In any case, the oil to be supplied by the Esso refinery, a mix from Libya and the Middle East, would be relatively low in sulphur (3 per cent). The Field Club was also assured of the CEGB's respect for the Green Belt. Should further capacity be required, the power station would only be extended north, towards the refinery.[75] The Field Club was rightly unconvinced by these environmental assurances and refused to withdraw its objection, but due diligence complete, it came as no surprise when the minister gave his consent in June.[76]

In 1972, Roy Gregory observed: 'What with National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Areas of Great Landscape Value, Green Belts, Nature Reserves, and Sites of Special Scientific Interest, it was becoming increasingly difficult to find sites that did not provoke opposition from one amenity interest or another.'[77] In contrast to the numerous planning disputes that punctuated the development of rural modernity in post-war Britain, the Fawley process was largely unaffected by the new designation archipelago. Instead, the construction period attracted much favourable press coverage. *The Times* was particularly taken by Fawley as a symbol of technological advance and celebrated the new scale of rural modernity; its stories often read like a glorified press release. Automation at Fawley would rely on the 'largest and most comprehensive power station control system in Europe, prob- ably in the world', the 100ft diameter butterfly valve was the biggest used in

[74] *The Times*, 18 August 1961.
[75] These details are drawn from the Engineering Inspector's 18-page typed report to the Minister of Power, 18 May 1962 (POWE 14/1316).
[76] R. I. P. Jowitt to A. C. Campbell, Ministry of Power, 4 July 1962 (POWE 14/1316).
[77] Gregory, *The Price of Amenity*, p. 91.

any power station, and the planned tunnel under Southampton Water connecting the power station to the city would be two miles long. Photographs of the construction site, particularly the famous control room, featured on several occasions in the newspaper's 'Picture Gallery' and to illustrate other stories, while the newspaper sold advertising space close to these stories to companies keen to boast of their involvement in the project like Mitchell Construction and English Electric.[78] In due course, plans for a still larger oil-fuelled power station at Killingholme near Immingham in Lincolnshire, the latest addition to Megawatt Valley, saw the press turn its attention away from Fawley.[79]

As one of a new generation of oil-fired power stations completed on the eve of the oil crisis in 1973, Fawley's use was significantly inhibited by surging oil prices. Its highest annual output was recorded during the miners' strike in 1985, when it was one of 22 oil- and gas-fired power stations tasked with meeting peak demand when coal stocks began to fail. Inevitably, this politicised the site, though the National Union of Mineworkers' attempt to 'picket' the pipeline from the oil refinery to power station failed to bring out unionised Esso workers on the grounds that the oil would pass a picket line, while the threat that crude tankers would dock without tugs ensured the tug crews of Southampton Water stayed in line.[80] Thus, from the moment Fawley power station was commissioned in the 1960s through to the 1980s, the site can be used to emplace the managed decline and ultimate destruction of the UK coal industry, but this should not be attributed prematurely to the environmental agenda. The decision to run down the UK coal industry, which depended on state subsidies, was mainly driven by marketisation and the global trade in commodities. In the late 1980s, the prospect of a coal-fired power station at Fawley was revived by a Conservative government determined to take advantage of cheap imported coal. Plans for Fawley 'B', 'bigger than St. Paul's cathedral', included a coal importing terminal and the promise of an annual landing capacity that would cover the five million tonnes of coal needed for Fawley 'B' and the three million tonnes to be rail-freighted to Didcot power station in Oxfordshire. Plans were derailed not by concerns about air and marine pollution but by the government's plans to privatise the industry. It could not guarantee that the new distribution companies would buy from Fawley 'B'.[81]

---

[78] *The Times*, 7 January 1965, 19 March 1965, 5 April 1965, 1 May 1965, 28 May 1965, 30 October1965, 13 December 1965, 21 June 1966, 29 June 1966, 25 July 1966, 23 May 1967, 24 September 1968, 28 November 1969, and 20 April 1970.
[79] *The Times*, 30 July 1970.
[80] Frank Ledger and Howard Sallis, *Crisis Management in the Power Industry: An Inside Story* (London, Routledge, 1995, 2018), pp. 125-127, 197, 234.
[81] *The Times*, 28 November 1987, 8 December 1987, 6 April 1988, and 28 October 1988.

*

The Fawley Waterside scheme was approved in a very different context to that faced by the CEGB in either the early 1960s or the late 1980s. For example, the designation of the New Forest National Park in 2005, part of New Labour's revival of the National Park agenda, helped strengthen the hand of the objectors and there can be little doubt that planning processes had become more complex. Environmental requirements were more stringent, requiring inputs from a wide range of statutory and non-statutory bodies, but as had been the case in the early 1960s, the plans had a following wind thanks to their alignment with government priorities, though this time it was housing rather than energy policy.

Some objectors fastened onto Tom Tiddler's Ground, a piece of rough grazing inside the site of the original power station *and* the National Park, slated with redevelopment as part of the scheme, but the objections of local authorities were mainly concerned with traffic congestion in and around the A326. Sixty years on from the power station planning process, local concerns were surprisingly similar. What effect would an increase in population pressure - dog-walkers were of particular concern – and traffic congestion have on the agri-habitats of the National Park? Like all early 21st-century housing projects, the reception of the Fawley Waterside masterplan was shadowed by the spectre of inadequate infrastructure. There was some irony in opponents like the Friends of the New Forest, a long-established 'amenity society' in the classic mould, making arguments against the plans of Drummond *fils* that echoed positions once taken by Drummond *pere*, but ultimately this was to no avail. The New Forest National Park Authority approved the planning application, accepting that the loss of Tom Tiddler's Ground, never more than a diversion, would be offset by the significant biodiversity gains promised by the new development.[82]

Beginning in 2019, Fawley power station was demolished piece by piece, each stage in the process orchestrated as a media event that culminated in the detonation of the iconic chimney early on the morning of 31 October 2021. At the time of writing, the control room is intact, though in September 2022 on-site demolition workers told me that it was soon to go. For now, electricity bought from France, carried by cables under the Channel and Southampton Water, feeds the Fawley transformer station, whence it travels the cables strung from the famous pylons that prance across the New Forest. Soon, little trace of the power station will remain, though the power station's

[82] See www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/documents/planning-committee/extraordinary-planning-meeting-28-7-2020/ [accessed 23 February 2022], especially 'Report Item 1 – 19/00365/OUT-Land Adjacent to Fawley Power Station'.

subterranean structures, among its most significant engineering achievements, will become the basis of car parks, foundations, and other utilitarian structures.

During the demolition process, the site was used by a Danish firm for painting and storing turbine blades. The environmentalist might take satisfaction in this 21st-century use of a site associated with 20th-century energy production, but in the age of anthropogenic climate change, it is illusory to imagine that demolition can erase the material effects of the power station or that those effects can be offset by the environmentally sustainable aspects of the Fawley Waterside masterplan. The lifecycle of Fawley power station, an intrusion onto a southern English rural pastoral, can be used to emplace the transition from post-war social democracy to early 21st-century neoliberalism; to centre the carbon deposits formed over millennia the power station so inefficiently burned also emplaces deep time, scrolling forward as well as back.

Conclusion

In her discussion of 'imagining change' in deindustrialised sites, Mah questions the 'one-size-fits-all' logic of redevelopment, which assumes a 'context of economic growth', a 'model of arts- and property-led regeneration', and that the 'best ultimate future' is a post-industrial knowledge economy.[83] Chatterley Whitfield and Fawley offer complementary narratives of how sites that were once modern become caught in a logic that renders them vulnerable to the imposition of that 'best ultimate future'. Chatterley Whitfield's escape from this is only partial and continues to be seen as temporary - at least on the part of those proposing schemes for its redevelopment. At Fawley, meanwhile, the ghost of the power station continues to define the land as ripe for modernity, even after the demolition of the iconic chimney. Though the station had stood on the site for just two generations, that was enough to ensure the continued co-option of this land as a space for legitimate development, in the guise of a sustainable and technological 'new town'. Processes of closure, and the long-term 'ruination' of communities that they cause may well outlast the present circumstances of either site. Nevertheless, when rural modernity ceases to be modern, its sites are not simply recovered by those landscapes in which they were placed with such care in the mid-20th century, and nor do they automatic- ally transform into heritage. The logics and path-dependencies

[83] Mah, *Industrial Ruination*, p. 177.

established during the post-war era instead mean that these landscapes are often placed in permanent requisition of the modern.