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GROWING LONDON:
SKETCHES IN THE WESTERN SUBURBS
ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

This thesis is concerned with an aspect of the suburban development of West London, mainly between the 1830s and 1890s. It examines the economic behaviour of the personnel and institutions involved in making suburbs and providing opportunities for investment in transport, housing and other forms of social overhead capital.

A first chapter describes the expansion of West London with the aid of maps and illustrations of the physical setting. Another five chapters attempt to analyse the process of investment by studying financial institutions, land and building development, local railway promotions, the provision of public works and the building of churches. The thesis illustrates how profits were made in suburban development and shows how a ready supply of finance enabled building production to expand. It argues that an important element in the process of capital formation was the accumulation of the savings of professional people and small capitalists in the commercial metropolis, including those engaged in land and building development. And it concludes that the growth of the London suburbs was not much dependent on external finance but was mainly a product of their own reinvestment.
The thesis also contains a note on some recent approaches to English urban history of the nineteenth century. There are several appendices on landowning, building estates, building societies, insurance investments, and the capital expenditure of local authorities in London. A select bibliography lists and comments on the main sources which have been used.
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INTRODUCTION

"To trace the origin and progress of a great suburban parish in extent, population, and commerce is more worthy of the pains of the student, than to make himself acquainted with the recital of wars and crimes, or nine-tenths of the matter which usually fills the annals of modern Europe".

(T. Faulkner, The History and Antiquities of the Parish of Hammersmith (1839), p.3)

The subject of the thesis: the process of investment

This thesis represents one phase of the author's interest in English urban history which dates from about 1956. It is a local study but is not intended to be a work of local history, at least in the accepted or usual sense. It is concerned with the economic, mainly financial operations, which went into making and maintaining a piece of suburban London, mainly between the 1830s and the 1890s.

It may be helpful to start explaining this by showing how the growth of London can be related to the economic system. In this respect the most important aspect of London's

1. In 1956 I submitted a thesis to the University of Leicester for the degree of M.A. This was on the use of short term building and repairing leases by the Crown and corporate owners on English urban estates in the nineteenth century. In 1961 the International Review of Social History published my article on the politics of urban leaseholds, a study of radicalism in late Victorian cities in England and Wales.
history in the nineteenth century was the growth of the commercial metropolis regarded as an aggregate of firms, including industrial, commercial and financial firms, located within its boundaries. The commercial metropolis was one part of an international economy and shared in the growth of trade and shipping and the expansion of Britain's overseas connections. The economic activities of London attracted people to it and part of the wealth made in the City, the centre of the commercial metropolis, was taken out in new housing and better living conditions.

The history of the growth of London is mainly a history of suburban development. The suburbs were a product of demographic growth, economic wealth and social aspirations; and they housed eventually some of the extra five million people added to the population of London.


2. In 1880 the total value of London's trade was greater than that of Liverpool. Professor Briggs describes late Victorian London as the 'World City' in Victorian Cities, (1964), pp. 323-31.

3. References will be found in the note on 'Recent work in British urban history of the nineteenth century.'
between 1811 and 1901. In particular, they were the living quarters of the middle classes in Victorian London.

Suburban development called for the provision of a framework of public utilities and other urban installations, a supply of houses and other urban amenities, and (because of the spatial aspect) the building of railways in order to transport some of the inhabitants of residential suburbs back and forth from home to work. Hence the building of suburbs involved a demand for land, labour and capital in the form of building materials, rolling stock and the like; and this meant a demand for money capital in order to command these resources. Hence the making of the suburbs can usefully be regarded as an investment of money capital in developing new districts. This thesis sets out to analyse the process of investment and to examine some of its mechanisms.

It is possible to distinguish analytically three elements in the process of investment. First, there was the building operation which provided the opportunities for the investment of capital. The suburbs were built up

---

1. The population of metropolitan London increased from 1,110,000 in 1811 to 6,580,000 in 1901.
rapidly and without much regard to considerations of long
term social interest.\(^{(1)}\) They were the creation of numerous,
separate economic initiatives; and the business of
building them was an economic operation carried out mainly
for private profit. See

Secondly, there was the operation of maintaining
the fixed capital of the suburbs intact and of supplying
some of the missing social capital. This part of the process
involved some public investment, mainly the capital expenditures
of the institutions of local government in London. And,
thirdly, there was the business of mobilising funds in order
to finance investment in transport lines, public utilities,
the building of houses, shops, churches, drainage works and
other improvements in social and sanitary conditions.

The process was affected by organisational changes
in the money and capital markets, by technical discoveries
(in transport, gas and electricity production, and many minor
things, such as the improvements made to drain pipes) and even

---

1. Professor Checkland points out that the builders of Victorian
cities could exclude "from their risk calculations difficult
considerations arising from the social interest, especially
as it would develop in the longer run, and could thus
produce startling growth". S.G. Checkland, The Rise of
by political events, such as the creation of the Metropolitan Board of Works in 1855. It was also influenced at many points by changing social aspirations and conceptions, especially towards the end of the century when the government of London was beginning to grapple with some of the more fundamental problems of urban life: problems which the rise of the suburbs had helped to aggravate and even to create.

To the investment of money capital there must correspond, in the long run, the accumulation of savings. The generation of savings was, in the first instance, a function of the commercial development of the City, but as expansion got under way it might be expected that savings made in other activities would be attracted into it. Moreover, capital investment in developing suburbs might itself generate savings to be invested in further growth and become a means of enlarging the commercial metropolis. One of the most important of the questions which this thesis hopes to answer relates to the way in which expansion was ultimately financed. To what extent was the growth of the Victorian suburbs in London a product of their own re-investment, and to what extent did it depend on external
finance?

The process of investment can be regarded as a response of the economic system to 'growth' factors. The physical product of suburbia was the result of this response. It can be regarded as so much fixed capital accumulated over time. In this thesis then we are implicitly considering one element in the country's economic growth in the nineteenth century which has not received much systematic analysis of the kind attempted here. This element was the accumulation of social 'overhead' capital.

The setting

The setting for this study is the western suburbs of Victorian London. Even in the seventeenth century the rural parishes to the west of London were being described as suburban districts. This was at a time when their main function was to supply the London markets with flowers, vegetables, milk and bricks. During the eighteenth century they also helped to keep Londoners healthy by supplying clean water and by providing isolated places for the building of hospitals and the provision of new burial grounds. Other parts found favour with the wealthy.

---


2. Water was supplied to Bond Street from Paddington as early as 1661. The oldest burial grounds were at Craven Hill and St. George's, Hanover Square, both in Paddington. The Lock Hospital was also moved to Paddington in 1820.
nobility as summer retreats: according to Sophie von la Roche, many Londoners in 1786, "who have no country seats of their own, in summer move into Kensington houses for the sake of the good air, the gardens and the fair prospect" (1).

By the beginning of the nineteenth century wealthy city workers were trickling into the western suburbs in order to set up homes there. As early as the 1820s these districts were being described by the London housing directories as suitable places for residence. With the improvement of roads and the building of railways this trickle became a flood.

In the 1830s the maps of West London show a continuous belt of building stretching from the City into the parishes of Marylebone, St. Pancras, Paddington and Chelsea up to the edges of South Kensington. Further to the west lay fields, market gardens, small villages and straggling hamlets, most of them reached by a few main roads whose sides were dressed with houses as far out as Hammersmith. Other substantial houses, rows of cottages, streets and squares were clustered round various focal points - Notting Hill, Campden Hill, Kensington Gore, Earls Court and Hammersmith village, and southwards towards the river Brompton was

yielding up its heath to houses.\(^\text{(1)}\)

The main westward thrust of building development in Victorian London was influenced by the pattern of road and railway communication. Building moved north westwards through the Victorian suburbs of Marylebone, St. Pancras and Hampstead\(^\text{(2)}\). A western and south western thrust carried building through the suburbs of Paddington, Kensington, Hammersmith and Fulham.

These four parishes mainly provide the physical and social setting of this study; and for convenience the term West London will be used to describe them.

The total surface area of West London, as defined here, was about 7,500 acres. In 1845 about three-quarters of this was still used for farming or brickmaking\(^\text{(3)}\). By 1880 Paddington was almost completely built over and Kensington had less than 500 acres of open land; but in Fulham and Hammersmith the built up area extended to only about a quarter of the total area of the parishes. Despite these spaces new migrants were now going

---

1. Best shown in a street survey of Kensington published in 1837 (Kensington Central Library).
3. See the details of land utilisation in appendix B.
over the river into Putney and Wandsworth and beyond the Metropolitan boundaries to the outer suburbs of Ealing, Acton and Southall. In the late nineteenth century these outer suburbs were the districts of most rapid growth in London.

The way in which contemporaries regarded this growing tide of building is conveyed by an article in the Illustrated London News in 1881 on the growth of West Kensington:

"The richer classes of London have migrated to the western suburbs, while the middle classes have gone farther north and farther south --- On the other hand, though Hammersmith, Brook-green, Shepherds Bush and Wormwood-scrubbs are neither very attractive nor aristocratic, the movement of town extension is still westwards and Holland Park is hardly now suburban, being completely enclosed by the populous quarters of West London. --- It was not many years since — (West Kensington) was at least semi-rural, and the fair open country was fully within sight. That was 'before the town invasion'. Then came the 'invaders', the men of bricks and mortar, with advanced skirmishers of the shovel and spade --- Temporary huts and sheds were put up for the accommodation of bricklayers and carpenters, who began, after a time, the work of actual construction. It was rapidly carried on where the speculative builders had plenty of money or credit; the tall houses, detached or semi-detached, or in closed lines improperly called 'terraces' which ultimately became the sides of streets, rose up in a few months, roofed and windowed and calling for tenants; and they seemed, like the serried battalions of a gigantic army to be marching and counter-marching --- That is the way in which London extends to the westward, not by growth but rather by territorial conquest --- Our anxiety is to know when and where this will stop. It may be that the next generation will see London at Uxbridge".


The next generation did see London at Uxbridge. During the interwar years the Administrative County of Middlesex became completely suburbanised; and in 1965 the name of the County will finally disappear when Middlesex is swallowed up in metropolitan London.

This study is limited to West London because it was thought preferable, in a relatively short piece of work, to attempt a detailed analysis of a part, rather than the whole of London. It also selects particular kinds of investment for study, and excludes or merely notices capital outlays which did not contribute or contributed only indirectly, to suburban development. Thus the more obvious features of the physical landscape of West London, the main line railway and canal in Paddington, the museums and palaces of South Kensington and the exhibition buildings at Earls Court, hardly figure at all in this study. Similarly the growth of suburban industry and commerce is examined only in so far as this provided capital for investment in building the suburbs.

Chapter 1 will try and outline the growth of West London in the nineteenth century. The aim is to give some idea of the opportunities for investment created by suburban growth. Chapter 2 takes a first step in analysing the process of investment. It is concerned

---

with identifying the personnel and the institutions engaged in making the suburbs and in channelling capital into new districts. It provides a framework for the detailed studies of land and building development including the building of churches and expenditure on public works attempted in chapters 3–6 inclusive. The conclusion discusses the main elements in the process of capital formation as these have emerged in the thesis. The text is supplemented with appendices which include a note on some recent work in British urban history. Finally, there is a select bibliography which includes notes on the location and type of records used in this thesis. It may be of some help to other students of the growth of Victorian London.
The Unit of Study: West London

CHAPTER 1

The Westward Expansion of Victorian London

"Westward the stream of Humanity glides:-
'Buses are proud of their dozen insides,
Put up the shutters, grim Care, for today-
Mirth and the lamplighter hurry this way".
(Henry S. Leigh 'An Evening Song', Carols
of Cockayne, 1869)

"He (the suburban) is proud when he is
identifying his interests with those of
Kensington, and indignant when his interests
are identified with Poplar".

Conditions of Expansion

The beginnings of West London were in the small villages
that dotted that part of Middlesex before the nineteenth century. By the start of Victoria's reign some of these local people were being submerged by the westward migration of Londoners. The genesis of this migration is to be found in the City. The commercial development of London drew in people from other parts of the country and the subsequent congestion and rise in the value of land in the City helped to drive them out again into the suburbs. Even in the eighteenth century some City workers had given up living over shops and offices; and by 1850 it could be said that "the great City merchants live at the West End, or a little way out of
town and leave their counting houses and warehouses to the keeping of their porters; even the clerks, for the most part, have suburban cottages". After the mid-century the clerks increasingly became the most numerous element in suburban society: they formed, by 1901, the largest single occupation group in the suburban County of Middlesex. The importance of commerce to suburban development was reflected in the growing discrepancy between the day and night population of the City during the nineteenth century: whereas the night population fell off from 128,833 in 1801 to 19,657 in 1911, the day population increased from 170,733 in 1866 to 364,061 in 1911. One effect of the daily movement of the population implied by these figures was the congestion of the main roads into and out of the City which at times produced a kind of thrombosis in these main arteries.


3. Reports, City Day Census, 1881-1911, Corporation of London.
The social aspirations of City workers and the attractions of country districts as places to live in were also important in the dynamics of suburban development. The suburbs seemed to offer a more satisfying and healthy kind of life, especially suitable for bringing up children. The western suburbs of London offered all the natural attractions that the potential suburban looked for: space, pleasure gardens, smokeless air and, until the 1850s, a reputation for being free from epidemics which the mortality statistics had not tarnished. They also offered a chance of living in or near fashionable residential districts frequented by the aristocracy and gentry. These districts were being developed before the Victorian period opened. When Faulkner came to write about Kensington in 1820, the parish was already known as a residential area for persons of quality, to use his phrase; builders had merely to capitalise on this reputation. According to the London Directories the houses in Tyburnia in South Paddington were principally occupied in the 1840s by the aristocracy.


2. T. Faulkner, The History of Kensington (1839); also History and Antiquities of Hammersmith (1839).
and opulent London merchants. Tallis's Illustrated London noticed that the "tendency of fashionable society to centralise itself in the western parts of the metropolis has converted Tyburn and its vicinity, into one of the most elegant and recherché districts in which the abodes of rank are situate, not even surpassed by the attractive drives and promenades of aristocratic Belgravia".

What were the reasons for the westward extension of building into the Georgian and Regency suburbs? First, this was the continuation of a process which had been going on since the Great Fire. From the sixteenth century there had been a drift westwards from the City and Strand area, attracted by the magnet of the Court at Whitehall Palace and later at St. James. By the end of the eighteenth century the lines of metropolitan expansion were firmly blocked out in Westminster and Chelsea and the parishes of Kensington and Paddington were being turned into a fashionable annex to the West End. Chelsea had its pleasure

1. Published 1851. Also Lucas's Paddington Directory (1843), p.viii. According to the census of 1831 there were 618 families of migrants in Paddington: see J. Booth, Archives of Paddington (1932).

gardens; Paddington and particularly Kensington boasted a suburban industry of spas, tea gardens and preparatory schools. The aristocratic phase created the great houses of West London and park land scenery. In Kensington, Holland House became an important social centre for the Whig nobility and on Camden Hill the houses of parvenu aristocrats clustered so closely together that the place became known as 'The Dukeries'. South Kensington also had the advantage of royal patronage: in 1689 William III chose to live there because it was a healthy district and good for his asthma. This royal interest encouraged the building of private houses and the creation of the 'Old Court Suburb' as it became known. One important district was King's Square, later Kensington Square, a metropolitan feature set down in the open fields and by Victorian times the centre of artistic and intellectual life in Kensington.

Secondly, expansion westwards involved neither bridge nor road building. Three Roman roads and high roads of traffic from London to the rest of the country radiated from the edge of the built up area. They were neglected until the early nineteenth century when the growth of traffic stirred some of the turnpike


trusts into activity. The best road was the great western road to Brentford and the main channel of suburban development:

"The Western Road goes streaming out to seek the cleanly wild, It pours the City's dim desires towards the undefiled". (2)

The Kensington Turnpike Trust which looked after both the Western and the Fulham Road was a civilising influence in western districts. The efficiency of the Trust improved noticeably after 1800 and when it was handed over to the Metropolitan Commissioners at the end of 1826 it was probably in a stronger financial position than it had ever been. The Trust used the receipts from tolls to pave, drain and widen roads and to bring gas lighting all the way from Hyde Park Corner to Kensington in 1825. The removal of the tollgates between 1830 and 1846 helped to relieve some of the congestion that had developed at these points. (3)

1. The Edgware Road was described by Middleton as being 4 inches deep in sludge after long rains in summer and 9 inches all winter: View of the Agriculture of Middlesex (1798), p.395.


3. The main source for the history of the Trust is E.J. Ffrooks, The Kensington Turnpike Trust, ms., Kensington Borough Library. contd.
Thirdly, physical conditions played an important part in this phase of suburban development. Land in many parts of Hammersmith and Fulham was difficult to drain and the lakes and swamps to be found there put builders off or attracted the worst type of builder. Along the flanks of the lower Thames valley, however, were deposits of gravel and clay resting on stiff blue clay and solidified mud known as loam. The gravel provided good drainage and springs; the clay sometimes had artesian wells. Bayswater, as the name suggests, was one district favoured with local water supplies.

Large areas on either side of the western road lay on gravel, but in Hammersmith there was more brick earth than gravel and north of the Bayswater Road more clay than either of these deposits. In fact, the north western thrust of pre-Victorian London was limited by the clay belt of the Taplow Plain which extended into the heart of Middlesex. For some time Gloucester Terrace formed the outer edge of the line of

---

Plan of
The Parish of
PADDINGTON,
the County of
MIDDLESEX.

By
GEORGE COTTRELL
1828

Paddington, 1828
terraces which had been moving inexorably westwards since the
Great Fire. In 1841 London ended abruptly just beyond Gloucester
Terrace, in the west, and just beyond the canal at Paddington, to
the north west. Beyond these points, on the clay plain, were
pasture farms and a few small villages. In contrast, among the
orchards and market gardens of the Thames gravels, a line of
houses, and high class suburbs, stretched out to Hounslow.

Fourthly, the thrust of London westwards was reinforced
by the development of new services to meet the needs of a growing
population. In the district of St. John in Paddington, the
population doubled between 1811 and 1831 and doubled again
between 1831 and 1841. Naturally the capital of speculators
was invested in exploiting the possibilities of further growth.
Thus West London began to acquire further differential advantages
in the form of water and gas undertakings and passenger transport
(1) to the City. In 1825 the route from Paddington to the Bank
boasted 54 hackney carriages making 152 return journeys. In

1. For the process of sociological differentiation in London at
this time, see O.H.K. Spate, 'The Growth of London, 1660-1800'
in Historical Geography of England before 1800 (ed., H.C. Darby,
1936), pp. 539-541. Observers who commented on it include
B. Noel, The state of the Metropolis (1835) and C.J. Richardson,
Recollections of the last Half Century (1856). It was
incidentally, the local inhabitants of Paddington, led by Sir
Francis Burdett who helped to force a select committee on the
supply of water in London in 1828; J. Wright, The Dolphin
(1826) and the Water Question (1828).
1838-9 after the invention of the horse omnibus, it was one of the busiest routes on the outskirts of London and omnibuses ran beyond Paddington to termini at Notting Hill turnpike gate and (1) the Broadway, Hammersmith. These facilities, established in response to growth helped to attract some of the people involved in the suburban explosion of Victorian years.

The Rate of population growth

The dimensions of the explosion in West London are indicated in Table 1 . In 1841 nearly 75,000 people lived in West London; by 1901 this number had increased sevenfold to 544,090. This growth was predominantly a response to the demographic pressures affecting the whole of Metropolitan London. Dramatic shifts in the metropolitan population made the pace in suburban development and provided incentives for investment in bricks and mortar. The demographic trend in West London (2) exhibited three distinct, though overlapping phases. The first of these lasted until 1861 and was related to the movement...


TABLE 1

The Growth of Population, 1841-1901
(Registration Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Paddington</th>
<th>Kensington</th>
<th>Hammersmith</th>
<th>Fulham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>25173</td>
<td>26834</td>
<td>13453</td>
<td>9319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>46305</td>
<td>44057</td>
<td>17760</td>
<td>11886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>76084</td>
<td>70108</td>
<td>25419</td>
<td>15539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>96813</td>
<td>120299</td>
<td>42691</td>
<td>23350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>107098</td>
<td>163924</td>
<td>71916</td>
<td>42890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>117584</td>
<td>170171</td>
<td>97283</td>
<td>91639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>126795</td>
<td>177628</td>
<td>112239</td>
<td>111247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Fulham became a registration district in 1880.
3. North West Paddington was added to this registration district.
of population facilitated by the omnibus services. It was marked by the filling up of an area that can be described as part of the outer arc of central London: most of Chelsea, and part of Paddington and Kensington came into this. The district of St. Mary, Paddington, for instance, reached a peak of growth between 1841 and 1861 when the population increased at the phenomenal rate of 178 per cent between 1841 and 1851, and a further 128 per cent in the following decade. Natural increase made up a third of this but migration accounted for the rest. The district of St. Mary was more prolific (and poorer) than that of St. John where the number of births and deaths were much lower and more evenly balanced. Beyond this arc the district of Brompton was growing at the same rate as that of St. John (56 per cent) between 1841 and 1851 but its peak was still to come; while the district of Kensington Town was growing rather faster. In the following decade the momentum of growth slackened temporarily in Brompton but reached a peak in Kensington Town.

After 1861 three demographic movements went on: a net decline in the population of the district of St. John and a declining rate of growth in some older districts combined with an accelerating rate of growth in newer districts.

## TABLE 2 (1)
The Rate of Population Growth, 1851-1901

**Intercensal Percentage Increases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary, Paddington</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John, Paddington</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Town</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brompton</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter, Hammersmith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Hammersmith</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 1861 and 1881 the districts of Kensington Town, Brompton and St. Paul, Hammersmith reached and passed their peak rates of growth. This increased momentum was due to the opening of new districts by the metropolitan railway system: Notting Hill

1. Changes in area affect these rates slightly.
2. In 1891 the sub districts in Hammersmith were completely re-organised.
in the 1860s, and Earls Court in the 1870s.

Between 1881 and 1901 all the registration districts of West London added to their population except for the district of St. John. Two districts had an accelerating rate of growth: St. Mary, Paddington absorbed considerable extra numbers between 1881 and 1891 and Fulham reached a peak of growth in the same decade. The suburban extensions of the metropolitan railways and the tramways opened up new districts on the fringe of West London and in the outer suburbs beyond the metropolitan area. Part of the demand for residences in Hammersmith between 1891 and 1901 was diverted to Acton and Ealing when these were connected to London by rail and tram.¹

Suburban development, 1841-1861

The process of investment was related to the demand for houses and amenities in new districts and the changing needs of older districts. The most fundamental influence on the development and social structure of particular places was the growth of transport services; but the type of suburban development going on in any particular place also depended on its locale and the policies and activities of the landowners, builders and others engaged in

making the suburbs. It is necessary at this point, therefore, to indicate, if only in outline, the physical and social setting.

In general the development of omnibus services merely reinforced the pattern of development in being at the start of the Victorian period, and did little to open up the regions that lay at a distance from the main roads. This was because of the limitations in the range and carrying capacity of the omnibus.

Even so, building operations were sufficiently extensive between 1842 and 1863 to transform the character of many districts in West London. Buildings spread north and west in Paddington and filled in the vacant land around St. Mary's Church which was situated to the north of the dense trading and industrial quarter of the Paddington Canal estate. Here workmen lived in cottage houses erected in between the warehouses, reservoirs, refuse yards, bleaching grounds, and small manufactories that were quartered on the banks of the Canal. The north western thrust of Paddington was influenced by the building of the workshops and


2. There was no major north-south route in the western suburbs: Select Committee on Metropolitan Communications, Parl. Papers 1854-5 (415) x, QQ.1383-1392.

terminus of the Great Western Railway in 1837. At various points along the Harrow Road and at Kensal Green, an outpost of Paddington to the north-west, houses were built for engineers, stokers and smiths. The best part of Kensal Green, despite the sombre background of tombstones and gas works (from 1844) lay to the north of the railway line. The worst part was Kensal New Town built after 1835 in an isolated spot between the railway and the canal. By 1850 it was a colony of railway and laundry workers. Closer to the residential districts of Paddington the growth of a working class population was beginning to threaten the reputation of new districts such as Blomfield Terrace and nearby streets. By the 1860s the Medical Officer was drawing attention to the spread of small businesses - rag, bone and bottle stores, shops and beer houses - into the back streets of residential districts and into rooms originally intended for horses and vehicles.

The existence of working men in the neighbourhood was one reason why the trustees of the Paddington estate insisted on builders keeping to the covenants in their agreements in order to

maintain the exclusive character of South Paddington. The Victorian development of the estate started with the erection of Westbourne Terrace, described by one writer as the finest flower of the urbanism of the 1840s. The transformation of Bayswater was finally effected in the 1850s covering the squalid waste land with handsome terraces and squares of solid, porticoed family houses built for prosperous merchants and professional men.

In Kensington estate owners ensured a similar type of development by carefully controlling the activities of builders, and the latter, along with shopkeepers and the publisher of a suburban magazine, made the most of the connection with the 'Old Court Suburb'. Building development brought a number of new districts into being that socially and architecturally represented particularly well the prosperous and cultivated middle classes.


3. A copy of the 'Court' magazine is in Kensington Borough Library.
In the 1840s, George Godwin designed large and formal (Italianate) semi-detached houses at the Boltons in West Brompton. The Vallotten estate or Kensington New Town was developed between 1837 and 1855 with semi-detached houses, churches and a shopping centre. Its appearance was quite unlike the ranges of very expensive mansions built on Crown land in Kensington Palace Gardens, or those erected on the site of the Great Exhibition, in Cromwell Road and Exhibition Road, an area known as the "quadrangle of fashion". As the historian, W.J. Loftie remarked:

"Everything at South Kensington, even it may be said, the rows of houses sprang directly from the Great Exhibition of 1851".

The domestic architecture of mid Victorian Kensington was dominated by terraces of big private houses with stuccoed

1. E. Norman Butler, Kensington New Town (n.d. Kensington Borough Library); Builder, xxvii (1869), p. 629. Leigh Hunt preferred the smaller streets of Kensington New Town to the "Unambitious barrack like streets of a former generation; nor in acquiring solidity have they for the most part, been rendered heavy and dumpy; the too common fault of new buildings in the suburbs", The Old Court Suburb (1855), p. 24.

fronts and heavy columned porches and a range of coach houses and stables at the back. The Churches, large and expensive, notably exemplified the Gothic Revival. The money donated to these and the upkeep of gardens and squares was not merely an expenditure; it was, rather, an investment in keeping up appearances and keeping out the poor.

South Kensington provided town houses for the titled and the gentry and offered to wealthy city workers a chance to acquire the trappings of gentility with a mansion in a fashionable district and a line in the blue books or fashionable directories of London. One of these, brought out in 1863, listed a quarter of the population in the Kensington Town district, who came into the author's categories of "the titled, untitled, professional and commercial - including all those whom education and intelligence - tested by their professional and commercial pursuits - have rendered equally deserving an honourable and gratifying mention, forming as they do the bulk

1. See the interesting article on 'Keeping Up Appearances' in Cornhill Magazine (September, 1861). During the 1840s and 1850s the editors of Punch frequently pilloried the extravagance and ostentation of the middle classes in South Kensington.
of what is termed good society".

The builders of Notting Hill in North Kensington had to establish the reputation of the district rather than capitalise on one already there, and the new inhabitants who they attracted there resented the courtly connections of South Kensington. The first suburb, built up between 1842 and 1858 was in effect a number of separate and isolated districts.

A minor extension of Bayswater was built on the eastern boundary but with smaller and less expensive houses. Norland Town was built on the western boundary but except for Royal Crescent and the roads behind failed to attract the wealthy, mainly because of the temporary settlements of gypsies and pig keepers in the 'potteries' nearby. Between these two districts lay the Ladbroke and Kensington Park estates separated from the Bayswater Road by one or two rows of small houses erected during the 1830s.


The best quarter of the Ladbroke estate was developed between 1845 and 1852 according to the plans of the architect, T. Allom. The estate had an open and striking layout with the streets arranged in a series of concentric circles divided by squares and gardens. In Ladbroke Square the houses were of mimic grandeur ranging in price from £1,500 to £2,000; but in the nearby roads and streets terraced houses were interspersed with semi-detached villas each with catch-penny titles and outside ornament or 'chaste decoration', to use the commercial phrase. The Ladbroke 'quarter' housed people of moderate wealth chiefly lawyers, clergymen, doctors, merchants, bankers, and a few scientists and literary people. As late as 1910 Charles Marriott was impressed by the appearance of completeness that this quarter had:

"Ladbroke ..... is laid out with almost Continental symmetry in a sort of gridiron with a Church in the middle, and it gives me a stronger impression of social stability than any other part of London I know ..... Uncompromised and uncompromising, an airier Bloomsbury innocent of ducal associations, Ladbroke upholds the proper dignity of the English middle classes".

(3)

2. Information from the rate books of the square committees in Kensington Borough Library.
Part of Hammersmith and Kensington
James Wyld, c. 1860s
Stanford's Library Map of London and its Suburbs

Fulham, 1877

This map will be found in the back flap.
This sort of building did not go on to anything like the same extent in Hammersmith. A map of the Parish drawn up by the vestry clerk in 1853 shows numerous small and scattered building developments. By 1853 the railways were appearing in the north of the parish and some of the lanes shown on an earlier map of 1845 had grown into roads; one important new stretch of road on the western boundary linked a newly developing area to the north with the older settlements in the south near the river. A few of these districts had successfully acquired middle class tenants - notably Brook Green and Ravenscourt Park - but in many other parts pockets of insanitary housing, small manufactures, and undrained land deterred the builder of good class houses and attracted a migratory population of working men for whom builders ran up cheap cottages in swamps and excavated brickfields. The following Table shows how Hammersmith and Fulham compared with Kensington in terms of property values in 1861:

1. Some notes on a Map of the Parish of Hammersmith published in 1853 (Hammersmith Borough Library).

2. Annual Report, Fulham Board of Works, 1859-60, 1873. The manufactures included factories (Castlenau), iron works (Blythe Lane), distilleries and breweries (Chancellors estate) and, more widely scattered, bleaching and laundry works, brick burning and pig keeping.
TABLE 3

The Value of Lands and Property in 1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Rateable Value £</th>
<th>Houses and Shops assessed to House Tax no.</th>
<th>Schedule 'A' £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>6340</td>
<td></td>
<td>423984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td></td>
<td>100159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>813</td>
<td></td>
<td>62370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem in Hammersmith was not merely that of attracting middle class householders but of keeping them there. This was mainly due to the level of the poor rate which was much higher than in neighbouring parishes. This accounts for the pessimism shown by the West London Observer in 1856 when describing Hammersmith as the terra incognita of London:

"For years rents have been going down and rates going up ... our respectable population has become more and more uncertain and migratory ... our good old families leave or die out, their mansions stand deserted; and the few substantial newcomers remain but to spy out and prove the 'the dearth of the land' feel its burdens and then depart for more favoured locales." (2)

The social divisions of West London were already formed in outline before the railways arrived and the legacy of these years affected the character of future development in particular.

2. West London Observer, 6th December, 1856.
places. Hammersmith after 1860 attracted the merchant's clerk rather than the merchant. In Hammersmith and in Fulham few districts made the grade as high class suburbs; for the most part these parishes were bywords for social mediocrity in the late nineteenth century. (1)

Suburban development, 1861-1891

The railway builders of West London constructed metropolitan lines in the 1860s and added suburban extensions in the 1870s and 1880s. The tramway builders laid their tracks on the edges of West London from the 1870s onwards. They were pushed out of the wealthy residential districts closer in. The pattern which these lines formed on the ground is shown in diagram 1. (2)

1. See the description by W. H. Draper, Hammersmith: A Study in Town History (1913), and W. C. Hazlitt's comment in 1912 that "few places in London have so thoroughly lost within the last two generations their old aspect and attraction, and are now hopelessly abandoned to the vulgarer forms of modern suburban life", The Hazlitts, ii (1912), p.165.

The Rail and Tramway System in West London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.D.R.</td>
<td>Metropolitan District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.R.</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.C.R.</td>
<td>Hammersmith and City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.N.E.R.</td>
<td>London and North Eastern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W.R.</td>
<td>Great Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.R.(L.S.W.)</td>
<td>Kensington &amp; Richmond, London &amp; South Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.J.R.</td>
<td>Junction Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L.R.</td>
<td>West London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

Tramways
- Before 1855
- 1855-1875
- 1875-1900
By the end of the century there were, in effect, two systems. The north western system was formed by the Metropolitan and its subsidiary the Hammersmith and City Railway, the main line Great Western Railway and the London and North Western Railway. Passengers were carried by these lines from the City through Paddington, Notting Hill, Kensal Green, the north western extremity of Hammersmith and out to Acton. The south western system was formed by the Metropolitan District and the London and South Western Railways. Passengers might travel from Victoria through South Kensington, Earls Court and then either westwards through Hammersmith, Turnham Green and on to Ealing or south westwards from Earls Court down through Fulham or on the lines of the South Western across the river and on, by the back door route, to Richmond, or alternatively, back to Waterloo.

The two systems were joined up at various points to form three circles or horse shoes. The inner circle was formed by the metropolitan railways. Addison Road, Kensington was the key point in the middle and outer circles which used the West London Railway, built in 1836 and extended in 1863 to form the junction line. Beyond the metropolitan boundary, the North and South West Junction Railway linked the two systems indicated in its title.
Railway and tramway building helped in the making of residential suburbs of quite a different character to those of Bayswater and South Kensington. This was because the introduction of season tickets by the main line railways enabled the rich to travel to places deep in the country. It was said that in south London "the people who can afford to spend £60 a year in season tickets fly further off and carry Wandsworth and Clapham into the heart of Surrey". The rich continued to settle about South Kensington in West London but most of them went farther out to live in villa houses in Ealing or Barnes, Richmond, Windsor and other Thames side villages in the south western suburbs. For the most part West London filled up with people in the lesser professions, small traders, warehousemen and clerks. Working men and their families displaced by the building of terminals and offices in central London also migrated into cheaper districts.

How did this work out in building development on the ground? From the late 1860s the extensions of the District


Railway began to open up a wide arc of territory in west and south west London. The building of the line to South Kensington in 1863 encouraged further building in Brompton which even in 1860 was, according to Croker, "all built on or being built over, which makes the precise locality of crescents and rows puzzling to old gentlemen". The extension to Earls Court in 1868, according to the chairman of the line, quickly resulted in the displacement of a poor population of villagers by "a much better class of houses. Earls Court is being covered up with buildings, street upon street and square upon square, as everybody may see".

The lanes that formerly crossed this district exchanged their titles for other more impressive or aristocratic ones; Walnut Tree Walk became Redcliffe Gardens, Thistle Grove-Drayton Gardens and so on. In the following decade Earls Court to the south and west of Cromwell Road, broke out in red


2. T. Crofton Croker, A Walk from London to Fulham (1860).

brick and terra cotta in a style described by W.J. Loftie
(1)
as 'Queen Anne gone mad'. The appearance of the mid Victorian
suburbs impressed foreign observers. Taine remarked of
similar districts in south London that:

"As a rule ....(these suburban houses) ... are
built in rows or in groups of five, six, twenty,
all identical and visibly built by the same
contractor, like so many examples of the same
vase or bronze. They turn out houses as we
turn out Paris fancy goods. What a multitude
of easy, comfortable, of wealthy households.
The whole implies large profits from quick
turnover, an opulent free-spending middle-class
very different from our own, financially
straitened and looking twice at every penny
spent". (2)

Francis Guizot thought that the neatness of the houses, the
footpaths, panes of glass, iron balustrades and knockers on
the doors, imparted to the city "an air of careful attention
and an attractive appearance, which almost counterbalance the
absence of good taste". (3)

1. W.J. Loftie, Kensington Picturesque and Historical (1888)
p.222.
2. Taine's Notes on England, 1860-70 (translated by Edward
3. Francois P.G. Guizot, Embassy at the Court of St. James (1860)
Part of Kensington

Stanford's Library Map of London and Its Suburbs, 1877

This map will be found in the back flap.
The north western advance of building produced districts similar to Earls Court but not quite as successful. In Notting Hill the failure of builders in the 1860s gave a run down appearance to some of the houses built to the north of the City and Hammersmith railway but the district of Portobello to the east was laid out with almost geographical precision and built up with solid Victorian houses intended for moderately wealthy occupants. Further to the west in Notting Hill a different sort of development occurred. Latimer Road, on the western edge of Notting Hill, was until the 1860s a kind of hamlet cut off from the west by the embankment of the West London Railway and little accessible from other directions. The construction of the City and Hammersmith brought in hundreds of navvies, some of whom settled on the swampy lands in the neighbourhood. They were employed on the long series of arches that carried the line over Latimer Road and the brickfields then covering the site of the White City.

During the 1870s and early 1880s building was

---

1. This development is discussed further in Chapter 4.
2. F.M. Gladstone, loc.cit., p.150.
retarded in the north west through poor communications,
but in the west the District penetrated further into
Hammersmith and Fulham. By 1873 the District had reached
North End Fulham, an extension which was said to have
produced 439,000 extra passengers within a year. The
advance of building into Fulham and Hammersmith threatened
the old houses established there. Lady Burne Jones commented
sadly on how the old elms were cut down and the garden ground
laid to waste near her home at Grange House, North End. Soon
the narrow lane which ran beside their garden became a street
and a row of houses instead of a walnut tree showed above the
wall. The final blow came when the old-fashioned but plebeian
name of Fulham was dropped in favour of West Kensington Park.
It was long before Burne Jones could bring himself to use this
without protest.

1. Forbes's evidence to the Commons Committee, Metropolitan
District, Ealing Extension Bill, loc.cit., pp.135-140.

2. Fulham Local History Society, Occasional Publications, no.1
(1963). For Grange House see M. Lockhead, The Victorian
Household (1964), pp.174-181. Other complaints about the
passing of familiar landmarks were made by the local
historians of which there were many at this time. Those
who wrote about West London include E. Walford, Old and New
London (1876), J. Ashton, Hyde Park from Domesday Book to Date,
West Kensington Park was literally a builder's invention and representative of the late Victorian 'white collar' suburb. The lay out of the estate was influenced by economics rather than aesthetics. Builders produced a speculative grid iron layout which was functional and utilitarian economising the use of land. They built roads to give convenient access rather than as decoration and they built houses to sell quickly by meeting the demand of 'respectable' lower middle class people for solid but moderately priced homes. Builders relied on superior fittings and reasonable rents (£30 to £60 per annum on this estate) to attract tenants.

It was not only in the size of houses, the density of building and the absence of squares, that the late Victorian suburb contrasted with earlier forms. The amenities were also quite different. First, the mid Victorian suburb was predominantly Anglican in religion whereas West Kensington was characterised by its numerous substantial nonconformist chapels. Secondly, the schools of the mid Victorian suburb were private.

2. Based on advertisements in the West London Observer and local directories.
and boarding and with a largely classical curriculum; those
in West Kensington were predominantly day and with a commercial
bias. Thirdly, the social life of the mid Victorian suburb
was unorganised and informal. The only commercialised enter-
tainment was the pleasure garden and a West End or suburban
theatre such as the Atheneum at Hammersmith founded in 1856.

Pleasure gardens were provided by enterprising publicans who
turned their spare land into bowling alleys and archery grounds.
The chief feature of the social life of the late Victorian
suburb was the pursuit of outdoor, athletic recreations. The
suburbs of West Kensington boasted a tennis court, and pavilion,
a cricket ground and club house and a swimming bath attached
to a private hotel. The athletics club was one of the
strongest social institutions in the district. C.F.G.

Masterman, an acute critic of social conditions saw that the

1. Ibid.
2. Handbill, Hammersmith Borough Library. The theatre was in
existence during the 1850s and for some years after.
3. The fashion was set by Ranelagh and carried on at Cremorne
in Chelsea and copied in innumerable tea gardens in the
suburbs. The Florida Tea Gardens in Kensington was typical.
At one time, 1837-41, Notting Hill also acquired a race course,
the Hippodrome.
advantage of the suburb was its "storehouse of accumulated physical health and clean simplicities of living". Despite some fierce criticisms of the suburban way of life he willingly recognised that the infinite boredom of villadom had been replaced by a scene of busy activity with "interest in cricket and football results, book talk, love making, croquet and tennis parties for young men and women". (1)

These advantages real or not were sufficient to encourage experiments in planned suburban estates in the late nineteenth century of which the earliest of any importance was the creation of Bedford Park at the western edge of London in Chiswick, a district opened up by the extension of the Metropolitan District to Ealing. Other debased replicas of West Kensington were formed in the farther reaches of West London. In the north west building jumped across the open space of Wormwood Scrubs in the 1880s and started up again with quite substantial houses on the Goldsmith's estate on the borders of Hammersmith and Acton. (3)

3. Leases of the Goldsmith Estate, Royal Commission on the Livery Companies of the City of London, Parl. Papers (C.4073) xxix, returns, (Great Companies), Part II.
The building of a tramway from Shepherds Bush to Acton encouraged the building of terrace houses, which began to alter the look of the parish which so far had been distinguished by some Victorian villas and a colony of laundry workers at South Acton. As one local historian remarked in 1913:

"During the last twenty years the rebuilding of Acton as a modern suburban place of residence has steadily progressed. The speed was not rapid at first, but from the time of the builder's discovery that it was a desirable location, having the lowest death rate of any neighbourhood round London, it soon became overstocked with houses, built rather with a view to smallness of cost and the utilisation of the sand and gravel excavated on the sites, than to the attractiveness and convenience of the dwellings." (1)

This description fitted other places outside the metropolitan boundary, such as Kilburn, or within the boundary, in the western part of Hammersmith, and above all in Fulham, where a great tide of building transformed three quarters of the parish in twenty years. Significantly, H.G. Wells in *Tono Bungay*, chose Walham Green in Fulham, as the home of his hero's wife whose father talked of 'large business engagements' but was in fact a clerk at the local gas works. The family

posed as simple gentle folk. Like many of Wells' characters they were caught up "not only in the sprawl of London but in the dubieties of social mobility." The inhabitants of districts such as Walham Green were just as keen to keep the poor at bay as the merchant princes of the mid Victorian suburbs, but their task was the more difficult because they were nearer to them.

Working men tended to settle on poorly drained land, near railway lines and up against existing working class districts. Thus one of the earliest colonies to be formed in Fulham - the New Town - was built in the 1870s on very low lying land. In fact all the 'mud and water' districts of Fulham - Moor Fields, Sands End and Fulham Fields - were built for the working class or those just above them. On a number of occasions the Medical Officer drew attention to the building of workmen's cottages in a way that threatened to ruin the health as well as the appearance of the parish. His comment on the building of Fulham Fields was typical of these:

"The speculative builder in many parts of Fulham Fields is much to be reprehended and discouraged. I need only refer as an example to what is generally styled Fulham New Town, a locality where the basement of the houses have been built below the level of any available sewerage and led to the flooding of cesspool matter." (1)

And in the early 1880s he blamed the Battersea builders for coming into the parish and running up cheap working class property. The best districts in Fulham and Hammersmith were those in which the district board managed to lay down sewage lines before the builders arrived on the scene. (2)

The migration of workingmen caused new and intensive building on the fringes of the built up area and amongst working class housing in other parts of West London. The Hall Park estate situated in a district of Paddington that was built over in the 1850s was one such development. A vacant piece of land of \( \frac{7}{2} \) acres was covered in the late 1870s with over 300 houses and with an average density of 12 people to each house. (3) College Park, a suburb of railwaymen on the

1. Annual Reports, Fulham Board of Works, 1868, 1873, 1875, 1883. The Social Science Association discussed the quality of suburban development in 1879 and almost every speaker agreed that the advantages of the country were being offset by faulty building, bad drainage and insufficient water supply, Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, (1879), pp. 454-63, cited in W. Ashworth, loc. cit., pp.157-160.

2. Annual Reports, op. cit.,(1879), referring to "extensive building operations of a superior kind ... now being carried on in both parishes....".

edges of Kensal Green was another. Streets of two-storied dwellings were built during the 1870s to house nearly 5,000 people. The only amenities were the public houses, four nonconformist chapels and an Anglican mission hall. The only park was Kensal Green cemetery and the open spaces, the broad metals of the Great Western and North Western Railways.

In contrast to this uncontrolled growth the district of Queens Park in the north west of Paddington was consciously planned with high density building in the 1880s. The Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Company at last made real the dream of Charles Pearson, the chief founder of the Metropolitan Railway, that one day a workmen's town might be built along the line. They attempted to plan a model community with lecture halls, co-operative stores, coal depot, dairy farm, baths, washhouses, reading rooms, discussion clubs, coffee taverns and other substitutes for the public house: in fact, all the amenities which the older working class districts in West London were acquiring in a piecemeal way and

1. The Record, 15 November, 1907.
over a long period of time. The company built a variety of houses on the 76 acres of Queens Park achieving simple architectural effects at corner houses and at the centres of the terraces. They divided these houses into five classes charging rents that ranged from 6/- for the lowest class to 13/- a week (except for the corner houses and shops which were let on special terms). These rents were too high for any but the best paid artisans.

The growth of working class districts in West London was facilitated by the cheap fares of the rail and tramways. The Metropolitan Railway became very much a workingman's line with 31 early trains. It was the first railway in London to issue cheap tickets and, according to Mayhew, even in 1865 carried labourers, carpenters and builders, many of whom lived at Paddington or in Silver Street, Notting Hill. According to the Public Health and Housing Committee in 1891 the Metropolitan District also had an exceptionally good service of 27 workman's trains daily

---

1. Information from Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Co.Ltd., A. Short Account (1883), and Select Committee on Town Holdings, Parl. Papers, (1887) (260), xiii evidence of R.E. Farrant, deputy chairman.

on the system from 5.19 to 8.40 a.m. but was not sufficiently publicised. In contrast, the London and South Western was a 'superior line' with dear tickets and a one way service only. Only 7 out of the 36 stations from which this Railway issued tickets were in the metropolitan area. The Great Western provided the worst service of them all, "which was regarded by residents in the districts as having acted for years past as a powerful check to its development, as compared with other parts of suburban London." A police constable at Ealing stated that he had to call workmen as early as 3.30 a.m. to enable them to walk to Shepherds Bush - a distance of about four miles - the nearest station at which they could get a workman's train to take them to London.

The growth of West London's population also led to the expansion of omnibus services and the introduction of penny stages which further encouraged working class migration. By

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. Earlier the Western Metropolitan and Suburban Workmen's Train Association noted that houses had been built in Willesden, Hammersmith and Battersea but were unoccupied because there was insufficient cheap trains, Railway Times, 22 January, 1870, p.93.
1885 there were 28 separate routes from Bayswater and Paddington to the City and social distinctions were being created amongst the 'buses which ran along them. These distinctions affected both the 'longs', provided by the big undertakings and the 'shorts' which were run by small masters. On the Bayswater route the green Bayswaters (John Bulls) and some of the reds were regarded as high class vehicles.\(^{(1)}\)

The precise role of transport in suburban development is difficult to determine as everything depends on date and locale: the middle classes were the first and the working classes the last to move but they all kept on doing so while the available means of transport were also changing. There is no space in this thesis to study these movements into and out of the suburbs. The advertisements of houses to let and for sale suggest that the residents were continually on the move.\(^{(2)}\)


2. The best sources for such a study are the census returns in the P.R.O. and the C.R.O. (Somerset House). They are being used by W. A. Armstrong of Birmingham University in his study of the social structure of York, 1841-1851.
One of them was Hazlitt who was driven out to Barnes by changes in Addison Road, Kensington in 1862, a move which he described as a retreat before civilisation.

Two social tendencies marked the development of West London, operating as if they were obeying some inexorable social laws. One of them was the tendency for migrants to find out and settle amongst people of similar wealth and social standing, the other was the tendency of certain districts to deteriorate in social standing and in physical appearance. The borderline of respectability in some districts was rarely stationary and frequently the "new streets served only for a period as a barrier between the better class of residents and the inhabitants of the old localities by whom they were at last absorbed".

2. For a sociological comment: see F. Musgrove, The Migratory Elite (1963), pp.106-111; and for comparison, M.B. Simey, Charitable Effort in Liverpool (1953), pp.10-14, 23.
This process of continual change and adaptation was linked not only with the growth of transport facilities but also with the development of suburban industry and commerce.

The influence of commercial and industrial development

By 1846 there was a considerable body of trades in West London: most of them were small shopkeepers, market gardeners, cow keepers, brickmakers or publicans. A few were engaged in small manufactories - breweries, iron and soap - and local crafts (such as bonnet making). At this time the most important industries in West London were still those that served the London food and housing markets. By the late nineteenth century only a few concerns were left - for example, J. Lee, market gardener and E.C. Tisdall, dairy farmer, were sufficiently prosperous to keep land out of the building market. The rest were replaced by a variety of small commercial and industrial enterprises.


The growth of suburban industry and commerce came about in three ways. First, the expansion of London's population turned village high streets into thriving trading communities. By the 1860s Paddington had lost its village character and was absorbed in industrial London, but Hammersmith at this time was still a local market serving people from the villages of Acton and Ealing nearby who came into town on market days. At this time Kensington High Street was still a twisted narrow stretch of road lined with little shops and dwelling houses and no fewer than twenty-two public houses. It was not until the Kensington Improvement Scheme was launched in 1867 that the road was widened and by 1870 fifty-five superior houses and shops had gone up in High Street, King Street (now Derry Street), Young Street, Ball Street and Burden Mews.

Secondly, the development of residential suburbs created opportunities for the investment of savings in supplying the wants of new inhabitants: shopkeepers, publicans, schoolmasters and the providers of entertainment

---

1. House of Lords Record Office, evidence of traders to Lords Committee, Acton and Hammersmith Railway Bill, 26 June 1874.
2. Annual Reports, Metropolitan Board of Works, Kensington Improvement Scheme, Parl. Papers, 1867-1870.
were the first into the suburbs, sometimes establishing their concerns before the houses were fully occupied. They were followed in some districts by a host of lesser traders, hawkers and street sellers, and in slum districts by the owners of pawn shops and brothels.

Thirdly, the establishment of metal and engineering trades provided employment in 1901 for about 8 per cent of Hammersmith's occupied population. This was the start of a migration which occurred on a much larger scale during the inter war years leading to the industrial development of Acton and other districts in what became known as the West Middlesex industrial zone.¹

Commercial development intensified the social divisions formed in the first half of the century. Most estates in South Kensington and South Paddington had leases forbidding the establishment of business concerns and trades or controlling the number and situation of shops and these

were sufficient to restrain the advance of commerce at least in South Kensington which in consequence retained its suburban aspect to the end of the century. Yet the same self interest which made a tenant of an upper or middle class estate keep his house in repair or oppose the building of a railway station or public lavatory might also lead him to convert or sell his house for professional or commercial purposes.

Shops, churches, schools, and other amenities were distributed according to the social standing of particular districts. The linen drapers, haberdashers and silk mercers followed the tide of fashion advancing into Gloucester Road in 1863, Westbourne Grove in the 1860s, the High Street, Kensington, the Brompton Road and King Street, (2) Hammersmith in the 1870s. The linen drapers were amongst

1. See the discussion on urban estate management in Donald J. Olsen, Town Planning in London in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (1965), part III 'Preserving the New Towns'.

2. For example, William Hatch, 23, Gloucester Road (1863); William Whiteley (Westbourne Grove, 1860s); the brothers Ponting, High Street Kensington (1870s); James Hunt & Co, King Street, Hammersmith (1870s?). Information from Modern London (1877) and West London Observer (1877). For a description of shops and shopping in Kensington and Westbourne Grove see Alison Adburgham, Shops and Shopping, 1800-1914 (1964) chaps. 14, 15; also below p.274.
the pioneers of the commercial world bringing the 'carriage trade' to West London, introducing large plate glass windows and new forms of advertising. Some of them developed into department stores: one of the first to do so, though not the first in London, was William Whiteley who became known as the 'Universal Provider of Westbourne Grove'. By the time Whiteley had acquired ten shops in the 1870s many of these traders were serving the whole of London and not merely suburban districts just as were the museums erected in South Kensington in the 1860s (and the Albert Hall) and the Exhibition halls including the giant Olympia erected in Earls Court in 1889.

West London provided better markets for the department store than the co-operative store; and only two co-operative retail societies were operating in 1901, The West London Society (registered 1893) was started by the West Brompton branch of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. It took over the Harrow Road and Queens Park Society in 1902.

---


Roads which were not fashionable such as the Harrow, Portobello and Edgware Roads acquired a host of small traders and places of entertainment, notably skating rinks, a cycling track and the Metropolitan and Kensington Music Halls in the 1870s. Many of these traders spilled over into the side streets of lower middle class districts especially in Hammersmith, Fulham and parts of Notting Hill: grocers, beer sellers, and dealers of all sorts found places in amongst the halls, institutes, chapels, public houses and private schools which lined some of these streets.

Shops, private hotels and small businesses were the spearheads of a social deterioration visibly evident in South Paddington and Notting Hill during the late nineteenth century. South Paddington illustrates particularly well the decline of a once fashionable area. From the mid-century the edges of the Paddington estate were being affected by the encroachments of commerce and when the Ecclesiastical Commissioners became part owners in 1868 they inherited an estate that was already burdened with the routine of manage-

1. The Kensington Music Hall, Portobello Road and the Metropolitan Music Hall Co., Edgware Road. In 1892 there were 13 thestres and Music Halls in West London, most of them in Hammersmith, Return of Theatres and Music Halls, London Statistics, ii (1892). The biggest cycling track in the district was the Velodrome in Putney.
ment - applications to set up laundries, beer shops, and the like - without being able to control very effectively the direction in which the estate was going. Until the late 1870s the houses erected on the best parts of the estate in the 1830s and the 1840s were used as private residences but when the leases came to be renewed the era of sub-letting these as private hotels and boarding houses (1) began. Further to the west, in Bayswater, the business of Whiteley added to the social cachet of a district whose social tone was set by a residential leisured class of Anglo-Indian families. In the 1880s Bayswater had become a symbol of Imperial London:

"From the Ghats of Kensington Gardens Square to the Ghats of Calcutta, the storied boarding houses of Bayswater to those on the banks of the Hugli, the change is but little thought of by the wives and children of an Imperial race to whom the Suez Canal becomes even more familiar than the Canal at Paddington." (2)

The social life of the district was sustained by tea shops,

1. Details of estate management will be found in the files of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, especially file nos. 50236 and 12522.

2. Bayswater Annual (1884). The district had its own newspaper, the Bayswater Chronicle founded in 1860 to provide reading that was "free from vulgarity and acceptable to the family circles of the district".
private circulating libraries and political and social clubs.

More shops followed in the wake of the successful Whiteley.

In Chepstow Place which leads off Westbourne Grove the
Arctic Fur Store opened in 1870 and the following year a
silk mercers and furriers was opened at 129 and 131 West-
bourne Grove. In 1873 Tom Ponting opened a fancy drapers
there and William Owen opened the Bayswater Trimming Shop,
a business which rapidly expanded into Hatherley Grove
nearby. Finally Bourne and Hollingsworth set up a small
drapers shop in Westbourne Grove in 1892 but did not stay,
probably sensing that the district was well past its best.

By this time Bayswater was divided into two parts: a
shabbily genteel district surrounded by preparatory schools,
'colleges' for young ladies, and homes or 'refuges' for the
surplus, unmarried and impecunious women in the district;
and another part which housed the small traders and shop
employees of the stores as well as chapels and social
institutes. By 1900 Bayswater had also absorbed a number
of foreign immigrants as the variety of churches belonging
to different religious faiths indicates; it is much more

---

1. Ibid., and Alison Adburgham, op.cit., pp.157-8.
2. Ibid.
By 1900 then West London was a district of striking contrasts and Arthur Sherwell was able to use Booth's statistics to show how wealthy Kensington harboured within its borders patches of poverty and squalor. Booth found that 32.8 per cent of the inhabitants of Kensington Town were living in poverty. Yet this district contained a greater proportion of the upper classes than any other district in London except Mayfair. The contrast was no less sharp in Paddington: in the two wards of Lancaster Gate the proportion of overcrowded houses was 2.15 and 2.58 per cent of the resident population; but in Church ward it was no less than 32.76 per cent of the population. These two parishes contained within them extremes of poverty and wealth.

The Process of Re-Development

Suburban development was not a 'once-for-all' process but an evolution through successive phases or cycles of growth, each of which required new injections of capital to carry it forward and offered opportunities for this investment. The physical process was one of continuous re-development. Whilst new buildings were advancing

This sort of decline represented only a partial failure of estate management. The development of slums in North Paddington and Kensington represented a failure of the community as a whole. One example of a housing area that declined into a slum was St. Peters Park in North Paddington built between 1868 and 1878. This was a district that went wrong, mainly because the houses were badly built and too closely packed together. The estate was unable to hold its respectable tenants and by the 1880s even the 'respectable' working class were moving out, leaving their savings behind in provident and benefit clubs. Another district in Paddington that went the same way was Cirencester, Woodchester, Clarendon Streets and others adjoining, shut in between railway and canal. According to Booth many of the "houses are let out in furnished rooms from day to day, and amongst the residents, thieves and prostitutes abound. According to the clergy, the rooms are even tenanted by day and night, box and cox fashion".

1. The decline in the estate is evident from the complaints of the tenants to the ground landlords, Church Commissioners, File no. 41784, part 6 and 58026, part 2. See also C. Booth, Life and Labour of the People of London, (1889-1903), series 3, 'The Inner West', pp. 123-4.

2. Ibid., pp. 119-126, especially p.122.
A marked feature of the slum districts was the over-crowding of houses by a rootless, migratory poor. Such people lived in a densely packed district in the north of Kensington in the wards of St. Charles Golborne and Norland, particularly the Notting Dale area which by 1900 had become a West End 'avemus'. Notting Dale had always had a shifting community, looking for quick money and without the skills and stability of an artisan area. The district had attracted successive migrations of gypsies, pig keepers, rag and bone traders, Irish navvies, low grade laundry workers, and by 1900, an army of people who lived off the West End: hotel, theatrical and music hall employees, cab touts, sandwich men and 'dossers' of every description. Since 1900 the problems of Notting Dale have been made worse by further migrations - Poles, Czechs, West Indians - and the spread of urban decay to the crescents of four and five roomed family houses built in this northern part of Notting Hill.

1. Annual Reports, Kensington Vestry (1900) and George R. Sims, 'Off the Track in London', *Strand Magazine* (1904).

2. Pearl Jephcott, *A Troubled Area, Notes on Notting Hill* (1964). Urban decay of this kind was associated with sub leasing and profits made by house farmers, the landlords to the tenants. The exposure of landlord 'scandals' started by the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, 1884-5, is continued in the publicity given to 'Rachmanism'. Rachman was a Paddington landlord. The latest enquiry into London housing is the Milner Holland Report, Committee on Housing in Greater London, *Parl. Papers* 1965 (Cmd.2605)
across West London the old buildings were knocked down or adapted to new uses: eighteenth century mansions, such as Gore House, and Victorian extravaganzas such as Tower Cressy and Kensington House, were sold to provide land for museums and smaller houses; and the country mansions were converted into private schools. At the same time village almshouses and cottage property built on glebe or charity lands were swept away for better class housing only to be reproduced on the fringes of the built up area.

In the nineteenth century building swept across the first suburbs covering the market gardens and brickfields, the pleasure gardens - even Cremorne was sold for building in 1876 - and grave yards, and in some districts the back gardens and yards of mid Victorian houses. That West London was not completely engulfed in bricks and mortar

---

1. Gore House was knocked down to provide room for the Albert Hall; Kensington House, a palace in a district of middle class houses was built in 1873 for £250,000 and knocked down in 1883, see M. Harrison, London by Gaslight, 1861-1911, (1963), pp. 4-7.

2. For example, Tolmins 'New Town', a patch of cottage property in Paddington was cleared in the 1820s to make way for the houses of Tyburnia. The small estates of the Camden Charity and the Chelsea Glebe were redeveloped in the 1850s and 1870s respectively.
was due to the many squares in Kensington which were kept up by the vestry after 1856, the commons of Fulham and Hammersmith, and the recreation grounds of Fulham and Paddington rescued by the vestries from pieces of waste and 'back land'. The map of Fulham in 1876 shows the process half complete with the institutions of the first suburb, mansions, hospitals and cemeteries clearly marked in the south west corner but lapped by the oncoming tide of new housing.

One final example may serve to illustrate the process of change and adaptation which this chapter has been trying to indicate. Camden Hill in Kensington was a suburb of noble mansions in the eighteenth century. Building of a different kind began on the northern slopes from about 1820 following on the improvements in the water supply made by the West Middlesex Water Company. Addison Road was cut across Lord Holland's farm in 1824 and Cato and Homer villas started up there. Camden Hill Square was completed in 1827, the rate books showing the residents to

1. The following account is based on a number of sources but chiefly, William Gaunt, loc.cit., pp.77-81, 133-7; Brig. Gen. R. Ridgeway, A Short History of Camden Hill Square and its immediate surroundings (1932) and Kensington Public Libraries, Camden Hill, Its Historic Houses and their Inhabitants (1949). Most of these writers cite the Autobiography of G.K. Chesterton and Lord Ilchester, Henry Fox, first Lord Holland (1920).
be professional and businessmen, retired solicitors, clergymen and single 'gentlewomen'.

Another phase in the history of the district began in the 1850s when the Phillimore estate was leased for building purposes. This phase was marked by the destruction of the remnants of the aristocratic suburb. Some of the houses had already been converted: Camden House was turned into a fashionable and expensive school for young ladies in 1735 but the school was closed in 1847 and the Pitt family who owned it let the gardens to a local firm of builders.

The house was preserved for a time and converted into a theatre, but in 1862 the whole building was gutted with fire, the owner having previously insured for £29,000. The remains were eventually bought by the Metropolitan Railway Company.

Wycomb house was another aristocratic residence to fall to the builder, giving way to the semi detached houses of Camden Hill Gardens, built 1869-1872. By this time Lord Ilchester was in possession of Holland House and disposed of Little Holland House, planning a new street, Melbury Road, built with studio houses now converted into flats. The whole district, with its streets, the names evoking historical associations, seemed to the young Chesterton like a "chart to illustrate Macaulay's Essays".
By the end of the century it was entering on a third phase of building. A district of small houses was formed in the narrow streets round the water tower and reservoir which soon became a slum, equal to anything in the East End, according to the vicar of St. Georges. And now the process has been reversed with £150 workmen's cottages selling, modernised and painted for £10,000 to £15,000. The suburban development of Camden Hill was a long process stretching over two hundred years; but in other places these changes occurred more rapidly as an explosive, mobile, inwardly suspicious and hostile society outgrew its first instalment of physical equipment and re-shuffled its uses.
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Stanford's Library Map of London and its Suburbs

Fulham, c.1889

This map will be found in the back flap
4. Royal Crescent, Notting Hill, 1842

5. Part of Kensington Palace Gardens, Rhodes' Map, 1842
6. Suburban Chapel, Westbourne, c. 1850

7. Brompton Hospital, 1846
8. Lancaster Gate in the 1850s

[The text is not clearly visible due to the image quality, but it appears to discuss a historical topic related to Lancaster Gate in the 1850s.]

Mossop London, 1887

John Mossop, Kensington

[The text is cut off and not fully legible, but it seems to be a description or commentary about Lancaster Gate in the 1850s.]
9. Great Western Railway Hotel, Paddington

52. 'An impressive example of the structural dimensions and commercial magnitude which a mercantile establishment is capable of attaining under the beneficial influences of unremitting enterprise and an able and energetic directorate.'

Modern London, 1887

10. John Barker, Kensington
Fig. 11 Gothic Villas, Addison Road, Kensington, in 1965, built 1842-1846, Ladbroke Estate

Fig. 12 Houses in Ladbroke Square, Kensington, in 1965, built 1842-1846, Ladbroke Estate
Fig. 13, Houses in Stanley Gardens, North Kensington, in 1965, built c. 1850s, Blake (Kensington Park) Estate

Fig. 14 Redcliffe Gardens, Earls Court, in 1965, built 1868-1874
Fig. 15 Houses in Hillgate Place, Kensington, 1965

Fig. 16 House Front Edith Road in 1865 on the borders of Hammersmith and Fulham, built 1870s
Fig. 17 Corner of Walterton Road and Elgin Avenue, Paddington, in 1965, built 1870-1878, St. Peters Park Estate

Fig. 18 Backyards of houses in Walterton Road
"The fiscal problems of the raw suburbs are quite different, of course, from those of central cities. From a septic tank and artesian well civilisation, sleepy semi-rural communities on the edge of an urban mass have suddenly been projected into the nightmare of financing water mains, sewage lines, new schools, professional fire companies and so on - and all in the briefest space of time. Their problems in this regard have been worse than that which the older cities had experienced in the course of their growth. The older cities, by and large, covered much more territory than the little new communities; hence, while growth was occurring at the edges of the cities, there were settled neighbourhoods inside the City boundaries to help finance their growth".

(Raymond Vernon 'The Economics and Finances of the large Metropolis', in The Future Metropolis, edited, Lloyd Rodwin, 1962, p.50)

The last chapter was concerned with the physical expansion of London and some of the symptoms of social change associated with it. One of the reasons for doing this was to suggest that suburban development was not a 'once for all' process but an evolution through successive phases, or cycles of growth, each of which required new injections of capital to carry it forward into the next phase. The new suburbs were, in one sense, frontier
districts: they were under-subscribed with capital but capable of tremendous growth and the intensive use of the social capital provided to sustain growth. Hence the development of suburbs involved not only a demand for new installations to supply essential services, or the extension of installations already established in existing, settled districts; but also a replacement demand as the old equipment wore out or became obsolete, or failed to function efficiently. The most striking example of this - but only one of many other cases - was the replacement of one form of transport by another which, for a time at least, relieved the periodic overloading of the public transport system in London.

The following chapters are concerned with examining how this capital was supplied. It may be helpful to begin this by looking first at the channels for the investment of capital in making the western suburbs of Victorian London and in maintaining their social and sanitary conditions. This chapter identifies, therefore, some of the personnel and institutions which demanded money capital and invested it in various parts of the suburban enterprise. It also makes a start on the main task of examining the sources of capital and the returns which investors made; but this will be pursued further later on.
Transport undertakings

In the early nineteenth century, builders filled in the settled districts and extended the edges of the town. The improvement of road surfaces increased the value of land along the turnpike roads leading out of the town and induced the men employed by the trusts and others to run up streets of houses and to lay out small estates. By the 1820s the stage was reached when the development of new suburban districts depended on the provision of transport facilities and additional public utilities. (1) This section is concerned with the transport undertakings which raised capital and invested it in opening new suburbs to the builder.

At first, the provision of passenger vehicles involved relatively modest capital outlays. The first omnibus proprietors to concentrate on the more distant suburbs, rather than the settled areas, were usually small concerns with only one or two vehicles apiece. They appear to have been provided by local tradesmen, coach builders, house builders and the like who managed to raise sums of £340 to £800, which was the money required to set up in business with an omnibus

1. Kensington was short of water in the 1820s, according to Brig.Gen. R. Ridgeway, A Short History of Kensington (1935).
and three to eight horses. Unfortunately no business records of the West London concerns exist to show where they borrowed this money (if they did so) or how much profit they made from it. Some of the small proprietors continued to hang on to their routes and keep in business for a long time, in the case of one concern for over forty years; but many others were eventually bought out by larger undertakings with greater capital resources. By 1839 one or two firms owned over half of the vehicles operating in West London. One of these, R. Blore and Co. was running over 31 vehicles between Edgware Road and the Bank. By 1856, the London General Omnibus Company, promoted three years earlier with a capital of £400,000 had bought up 196 omnibuses belonging to the small proprietors operating on suburban routes in West London.

Before the 1850s the capital invested in providing omnibus travel to the western suburbs could not have been

---

1. Based on the other occupations shown for omnibus proprietors in the London Commercial and local directories. The cost of an omnibus was estimated to be £120 by J.E. Ritchie, Here and There in London (1859), pp.188-199. See also E. Chadwick, 'Results of different principles of legislation and administration in Europe', Journal of the Statistical Society, xxii, (1859), p.392, note.

2. Omnibuses of the firm of George Cloud, the first omnibus proprietor to run a service to Hammersmith in the same year as Shillibeer's unsuccessful venture in Bayswater were bought up by the L.G.O.C. in 1856.

more than about £100,000 and much of this was invested in services running to the settled districts rather than to the new suburbs.

Early attempts to promote passenger railways had been conspicuously unsuccessful. Punch made quite a joke out of the failure of the passenger traffic of the West London Railway, promoted in 1836. This was a disastrous speculation both as a goods and passenger line, and it disappointed the hopes of the backers, mainly landowners and builders, that it might bring Belgravia out to Earls Court.

1. The first attempt to project a railway from the City into West London to connect up the City with the main railway lines was made in 1835-6. The City or Southwark Bridge and Hammersmith Railway was a very speculative venture with fictitious subscribers. Report and Minutes of Evidence, Railway Subscription Lists, Parl. Papers, 1837 (429), xvii.

During the 1850s transport, or rather the lack of it, must have been the chief factor responsible for the slackening in the momentum of building in some parts of West London. In the districts of Brompton, Notting Hill and St. Peters, Hammersmith the total number of new houses built was less in the decade 1851-61 than in the previous decade. Local newspapers ventilated the complaints of the inhabitants of some estates in Hammersmith and Brompton about inadequate omnibus services, and those builders who erected houses on sites in Notting Hill at a distance from the omnibus routes had difficulty in selling them. In the era of the horse omnibus, builders in these districts were dependent on the enterprise of local proprietors, and short of running their own 'buses - which one or two builders in Notting Hill actually did - they were limited to offering financial inducements. There is not much evidence to show how this happened but in North London, in Islington and Holloway, one observer claimed that "builders and parties in the district ---- raised money amongst themselves

1. These builders are discussed in chapter 4.
2. G. Treadaway, a tailor and speculative builder at Notting was a director of the Notting Hill 'Bus Company according to local trade directories.
to get the omnibuses up there, with a view to the improvement of their property".

Numerous attempts to promote new transport undertakings were made but apart from some small companies, like the Notting Hill 'Bus Company, the majority of concerns either did not materialise or failed as commercial ventures. Thus the Metropolitan Saloon Omnibus Company, promoted in 1856 with capital drawn mainly from the residents in Brompton was unable to maintain its service in competition with the L.G.O.C. on this route. By 1858 it was in severe financial difficulties. An attempt by the L.G.O.C. in the same year to promote a tramway to run along the Bayswater Road to Notting Hill gate failed because of municipal opposition.

During this decade at least three separate railway companies were projected to link Hammersmith with the City, but only one of them passed standing orders and then had to be given up.

1. Select Committee on Metropolis Turnpike Roads, Parl. Papers, 1856 (79), xlv, Q.1391-3.


3. Ibid., p.90.

MYSTERIOUS.

Omnibus Driver. Have you set down that Party as got in at the Crescent, Jim?
Conductor. Yes.

(An interval of five minutes.)

Omnibus Driver. You recollect that there wet Sunday I druv you down?
Conductor. Ah?
Omnibus Driver. Well, do you remember a werry re-markable surprisin' circumstance I was a relat'in' of to you that afternoon?
Conductor. To be sure I do.

(Another pause.)

Omnibus Driver. Well then—
Conductor. What! you don't mean to say as that—
Omnibus Driver (definitively). That's the PARTY, Sir!

(Inquisitive Old Gent on the Box, who has ar­rived at his destination, is upset for the rest of the day.

THE GREAT HAMMERSMITH RAILWAY.

A Railway project, of much greater importance than the Russian affair, is now offered to the British public—and also, indeed, to the French, whether the Credit Mobilier will voucher to patronise the speculation. The Hammersmith Railway Company, recently established, proposes to effect a series of internal communications not inferior, to say the least, in importance, to the junction of the Baltic with the Medes, St. Petersburg with Moscow, and Warsaw with Königsburg. To connect the great emporium of Acton with that vast centre of commerce, Hammersmith, and this, through the populous regions of Fulham Fields, over the bosom of the mighty Thames, with Battersea, and to place that hire of industry in relation with the grand agricultural and manufacturing district of Wandsworth, is the object of this gigantic enterprise. In addition, it will bring the opulent parish of Hammersmith into more intimate relation with the other vast and wealthy suburb of Kensington, by means of a junction with the lucrative and prosperous West London Railway.

Application is to be made to Parliament early in the ensuing Session, for the sanction of this enormous undertaking, to the accomplishment of which a serious, but not perhaps insurmountable engineering difficulty presents itself. "Railway, No. 1," from busy Acton to the greatly frequented thoroughfare of Back Church Lane, will have to cross the Great Western Road. A double gate crossing this leading outlet to London would form an almost intolerable obstruction to the multitude of omnibuses and other carriages, private and public, which are constantly running upon it; hence the necessity for a very deep and long cutting, or a tunnel of equal length, or a bridge, which would perhaps prove a bore of equal magnitude with the tunnel.

The Hammersmith Railway Company may be recommended to consider whether it would not be advisable to modify their plans a little, and lay down a line direct from Hammersmith to the Bank; a policy obviously suggested by the impossibility experienced by the wayfarer of finding a place in any Hammersmith-bound Hammersmith bus between the hours of 4 and 8 A.M. The purchase of important property situated on the required line might offer some impediment to this operation, but this no doubt might easily be got over by the Hammersmith capitalists.

Should Parliament, though perhaps it may not, approve of this stupendous speculation, there will be nothing whatever to prevent it from being carried out but the want of funds, which, considering the splendidly paying condition of existing railways, we cannot doubt will be speedily forthcoming. No further remarks can be necessary to induce all persons anxious to invest their capital, or their savings, to make immediate application for shares in the grand, compendious, and colossal Hammersmith Railway.
As early as 1843 the Commissioners for Improving the Metropolis thought that a railway to West London was a practical proposition. In 1853 one advocate of a railway line pointed out that the district "was so far independent (by reason of its immense local traffic) as to offer on this ground alone, a fair inducement for the investment of capital, and to warrant it being carried out by a separate company —". Yet it was not until 1864 that the first suburban railway penetrated Notting Hill.

The main reason for the delay was that suburban railway communication depended on prior investment in the provision of a terminal and a route through the City. The two main factors affecting this were shortage of capital and the difficulty of finding and acquiring a suitable site. A City Line was expensive due to the capital outlay required to purchase City property and involved complicated negotiations with City interests. It also involved a new form of traction


2. P.M. Parsons, Proposed London Railway, To Afford Direct Railway Communication Between the City and Westminster and all the Western Suburbs etc. (1853), p.4.
the underground railway, which made for more difficulties in raising the capital. Local residents and property owners in the suburbs had not the resources or standing to raise the large sums of money required for a City line. They were dependent, in the first instance, on the City promoters and financiers.

In London, as in Glasgow and probably other big cities, the growth of an urban (and suburban) transport system was a far more complex process than consideration of demand factors alone would indicate. The building of the Metropolitan and the Metropolitan District lines from the City into West London illustrates this perfectly, but the story is too well known to be repeated here. The main point to notice is that once the City lines were in being they became one of the main agencies for mobilising capital for suburban extensions. It is important to examine

how they did this and to what extent they used suburban capital to further their objects.

The directors of both the Metropolitan and Metropolitan District adopted a variety of techniques to raise new capital. First, they issued new shares and stocks at intervals usually with some preference attached to them. These were taken up by existing shareholders, residents along a projected line, and the main line companies such as the Great Western and the Midland who wanted a City connection. The Metropolitan also issued them in payment to the contractors of the new lines. Secondly, they persuaded City friends to project nominally independent companies and, thirdly, they supported, and in some cases bought out, local companies.

These techniques can be illustrated from the suburban railway promotions of 1864-1882. In 1864 at the tail end of the railway boom, the Metropolitan formed a connection with Hammersmith by taking over the Hammersmith and City Railway which had built a line to Notting Hill with capital subscribed by the Great Western Railway and local investors, mainly the owners of building estates. In the

1. There is a list of City and suburban railway and tramway promotions in West London, 1856-1882, in Appendix G.

2. Discussed in detail below pp.262-3. The London and South Western also seems to have operated in this way, south of the river. For instance, in 1886 the company absorbed the Wimbledon and West Metropolitan Railway whose directors were connected with the building of Wimbledon Park.
same year the Company helped to found the Metropolitan District Railway, apparently as a stop-gap device to raise capital for the completion of the inner circle. The District was mainly the work of the engineer to the Metropolitan and his railway associates, backed by the powerful firm of contractors, Peto, Betts, Kelk and Waring Brothers. Between 1864 and 1868 it built the very expensive line between Westminster and West Brompton out of the authorised (1) share capital of £3,600,000 (plus one third more in loans). Efforts to extend this line into the cabbage and asparagus fields of Fulham came to nothing. The local promoters of a Fulham Railway could not find the finance and the District had difficulty in raising its original share capital. The financial crisis of 1866, particularly the failure of Overend, Gurney and Co., had a damaging effect on the railways of West London. One local line, the Kensington Station and North and South Junction Railway, was abandoned altogether and the operations of the District Railway were temporarily suspended (2) because of the failure of the contractors, Peto and Betts.


2. West London Observer, 29 February, 1868; Parl. Papers, (Abandonment of Lines) 1873 (59-71), lvii. S. Gurney was a surety for the Kensington Station line.
It was not until 1870 that the District chairman began to cast envious eyes on the potential traffic of the western and south western suburbs, and proceeded to stake a claim in these territories by supporting nominally independent companies. First, the directors of the District supported a line projected mainly by Fulham interests - the Barnes or New Richmond Railway as it became known. The Company was dissolved when the London and South Western refused to allow a connection with their lines at Barnes.

In 1874 the District came to a working arrangement with the Acton and Hammersmith Railway but this line was rejected in the Lords because of technical reasons, even though it appeared to have considerable local support. Two of the witnesses who spoke in favour of the line, J.T. Treherne, a solicitor and property owner who had built houses on the land of the Birkbeck Freehold Land Society at Acton, and

---

1. Earlier attempts to run into Fulham were the Barnes, Hammersmith and Kensington Railway (1863), the Fulham Railway (1867) and the Fulham, Hammersmith and City Railway (1872). The way in which the South Western successfully held off attempts by the District to connect with Barnes and Kingston is described by S. Fay, A Royal Road (1883), pp.112-3; J.S. Gibbs, 'Railway Development at Kingston on Thames', Railway Magazine, no.104 (1958), pp.566-7.
F.J. Turner, who was developing a building estate at Acton offered to raise all the capital themselves and produced a memorial signed by the principal landowners in the district. G. Brown, a Hammersmith builder government contractor and cooper, and owner of considerable property in West London, argued that the line would benefit both the trading and building interests in Hammersmith, opening up over a thousand acres to the north west. Another supporter of this line was Alfred Cubitt Bean who had a good deal to do with building operations in the locality and was also the engineer and surveyor to the Board of Works, Fulham District.

The District extensions to Hammersmith Broadway and Shaftesbury Road between 1872-74 were carried out in a different way. They were built by two companies which appear to have been promoted by the city and railway friends of the District's chairman, and not local interests. The Directors of the Hammersmith Extension and Hammersmith Junction Companies were Messrs. Goodson, a director of the Great Eastern Railway, Pratt Barlow, chairman of four other small lines and E. Vignoles,

described as a "bird of passage" and engineer to several
lines on the Continent. The companies were just a device
for raising new capital without the shareholders of the
District realising what was happening. Thus the District
guaranteed a payment of 4½ per cent on the share capital
which was higher than the interest being received by the
existing shareholders. The contractor for the extensions,
C.T. Lucas, was paid with the District's preference stock.

Between 1877 and 1880 the District attempted to
push further to the south west across the river and west­
ward to Ealing and beyond, by supporting railways originally
promoted by the trading and building interests in Hammersmith
and the property owners of Fulham and Ealing. In the event
the Ealing and Turnham Green Railway (1877) failed to raise
sufficient capital to complete its lines and the directors
of the Walham Green and Fulham Railway were persuaded to join
the Board of the District. Both extensions were made with
District capital and the support of local inhabitants. When
the Ealing extension was going through Parliament in 1872

1. House of Lords Record Office, Francis Gilbert (engineer)
and C.T. Lucas (contractor) to Commons Committee, Hammersmith
Extension Railway Bill, 13 May, 1873. Another promoter
named was Pym, a well known speculator. The solicitors were
Hargrove, Fowler and Blunt.
twenty four local witnesses trooped through the committee rooms to speak on its behalf. The main opponent of the line was Baron Rothschild who had an estate at Ealing which he used for breeding horses. In 1882 the Metropolitan made a serious attempt to combat the growing influence of its rival in the west and came to a working agreement with an independent company, the Latimer Road and Acton Railway, promoted by the same group of builders and property owners that had previously supported the Acton and Hammersmith Railway. But the way to Acton was not to be opened up so easily. An Act was passed in 1882 and some construction begun; but once again the finance could not be raised to complete the project.

In fact, between 1872 and 1882 the only local promotion to be successful was the Metropolitan and Hounslow Railway Company which built a line beyond Ealing to Hounslow entirely with the capital subscribed by local landowners.

1. Ibid., Commons' Committee, Metropolitan District Railway Ealing Extension Bill, 25 April, 1877. They included G.S. Hinchliff (builder, Acton); J. Stark and T. Chamberlain (builders, Hammersmith); C.T. Bartley (stationer); J. Griffin (auctioneer and house agent); A. Barclay (owner of house property).
2. House of Lords Record Office, Commons Committee, Latimer Road and Acton Railway Bill. An earlier attempt was made in 1874 when Messrs. Burchell, the solicitors of the Metropolitan attempted to promote the Ealing, Acton and City Railway.
bent on increasing property values. An earlier but unsuccessful attempt to build a railway to Hounslow had been made in 1865 and although some of the landowners in the district (for example Colonel Murray and Mr. Mann) were shareholders of the London and South Western they had only managed to persuade that company to establish one rather inadequate station. In 1877 the local inhabitants of Ealing and district resolved to support a new railway. The Earl of Jersey and C.J. Graham, a solicitor with property interests, (land and houses) at Cranford, near Hounslow, were the chief promoters; and the only local opponent of any substance was Colonel Clitheroe. As Mr. Robert Vigors pointed out to the Committee which investigated the promotion: "All the landowners have land suitable for building purposes and some have already leased for building purposes in anticipation of the line being built". The success of this line suggests that the promoters of earlier ventures which foundered neither had the resources themselves nor the standing to raise funds in the City, or alternatively, found that it

served their interests best to go in with the Metropolitan District. It may also be that what capital the local promoters had was tied up in trade, building or house property at a time when the railway they had brought into being needed further finance.

Altogether just over a million pounds was invested by the Metropolitan District in suburban extensions down to 1882, which was an outlay of about £85,000 to £100,000 a mile. It is not possible to say, in the absence of share registers, precisely how much of this capital was contributed by investors living in the suburbs or with interests in suburban development. It was probably a more substantial proportion of the capital of the Metropolitan District than the Metropolitan. The latter was able to attract investors from all over the country, and particularly industrial districts, and by 1868 a group of substantial Manchester businessmen had secured control over the affairs of the company. (1)

Neither suburban railway extensions nor suburban tramways in West London were profitable investments. The

---

1. Barker and Robbins, loc.cit., pp.159-161. A number of local shareholders attended the meetings of the Metropolitan District.
Metropolitan reduced its dividend on shares to 2 or 3 per cent once it embarked on these extensions and for a time paid these dividends out of capital. The Metropolitan District had difficulty in paying anything at all on its ordinary shares during the 1870s and even when suburban traffic increased the company never paid more than 4 per cent to the preference shareholders and sometimes less.

The tramway companies were even less remunerative. Little is known about the Harrow Road and Paddington Tramway Company (1886) except that by 1899 it had opened only $2^{1/2}$ miles of track for an outlay of £80,353. Earlier companies were not at all profitable. Two companies started in 1874 and 1876 respectively, managed to lay just over 2 miles of track for an outlay of just over £22,000, raised entirely by loans. They were taken over by the

---

1. Ibid., pp.270-273. The underground cost about £10 million to build but much of this went on the urban system and the provision of omnibuses. Steam, as Harold Perkins points out, should have ousted the horse in London but the capital economy of the horse enabled it to survive: Business History, vii, no.1 (1965) pp.59-60.

2. Return of Street and Road Tramways, Parl.Papers, 1899 (701-II), lxovvi.

3. Parl. Papers, 1880 (264-II), lxiv. They were the Shepherds Bush and Turnpike Road Acton Tramways and the Southall, Ealing and Shepherds Bush Tramways.
West Metropolitan Tramways Company, formed in 1881 by a group of Fulham builders. Capital of £121,694 invested in 8 miles of tramway paid no dividends at all. In consequence both the stock and the physical condition of the line depreciated. The company was eventually rescued by J. Clifton Robinson, the pioneer of electric traction. The new concern – the London United Tramways Co.Ltd., – soon extended its services and paid a dividend of 8 per cent on its shares. By 1901 the capital invested in nine miles of track open to the public was £664,684.

The extension of the suburban tramways and some of the suburban railways depended on the injection of new capital by wealthy promoters. Yet the major financial gains accrued to the owners of land and property in the districts opened up by this investment rather than to the railway and tramway companies. The point was made by Sir

---

1. Including Gibbs and Flew, Ltd., one of the biggest firms of speculative builders towards the end of the century, Stevens (the contractor for the line) and T. Aldred: obituary of Stevens, Press cutting, Hammersmith Borough Library.


3. This was much resented by some of the witnesses to the Select Committee on Town Holdings, Parl. Papers, 1887 (213) xiii who argued, for example, that landowners were the chief beneficiaries from railway building in Beckenham but had not continued next page/
Ernest Cassell who projected the first electric underground railway, the 'Two-penny Tube' from Bank to Shepherds Bush. At the opening in 1900 he pointed out that the line looked like being an unprofitable investment, and that the surest way to have made money would have been, not to build it, but to have let someone else do so, and to have bought land at its western terminal.

Landowners, builders and developers

The effect of rail and tramway building on the development of a new district was often quite dramatic. Even before the lines were on the ground, land was being advertised for sale and to let. At Chiswick, seventy two plots of building land, Chiswick Glebe, close to the new tramway were advertised four years before the tramway laid a piece of track. Francis Gilbert, the engineer of the

continued from previous page:
contributed to the capital invested in these lines (QQ, 640-1063). See also T.C. Barker, 'Passenger Transport in the Nineteenth Century', Journal of Transport History, vi, no. 3 (1964) pp. 166-174.


2. West London Observer, 14 May, 1870. The tramway started building from Shepherds Bush to Acton in 1874 but stopped for lack of funds.
Hammersmith Extension Railway summed up the effects of railway building when he told one railway committee:

"The moment a line is deposited and there appears a chance of carrying on, the speculative builders of London all rush to the ground to cover it with houses - Mary cases have arisen where the Act has not got through one committee before the builders were on the spot and commencing to sell". (1)

One effect of rail and tramway building was to inflate land values in a new district and thus to create the possibilities of speculative gains from rising land values as well as profits from building and selling houses. The extent to which land prices rose is a problematical matter. At various times land in the vicinity of London was reported to have increased in value by fifty per cent up to a hundred per cent. These discrepancies were due to a number of circumstances. One factor was the condition of the land and its agricultural value; others were the character of residential development nearby and

to the distance of the land from the centre of the town.*

Thus the price of building land per acre fell off rapidly at a relatively short distance from the housing frontier: for example, building land in Notting Hill sold for £800 in the 1850s but at Kilburn a little further to the north, and about four miles from the City for as little as £300. When the railways came to Notting Hill, the price of building land rose to £1,800 in four years and £2,400 in six years. In the Hounslow district, much further out to the west, the building of the Hounslow station by the London and South Western Railway in the 1860s increased the value of adjoining land from £100-£200 up to £1,000. These

---


4. House of Lords Record Office, F. Watson (property owner) to Lords' Committee, Hounslow and Metropolitan Railway Bill, 3 August, 1880.
variations in the price of building land per acre can be further illustrated from sales quoted in the Builder between 1878-1881. At Willesden, building land was selling for only £400-£500 although it was advertised as being within a few minutes walk of the station; building land at Wimbledon went up to £2,800 after the London and South Western Railway built a line there, and building land at North End Fulham (West Kensington) was said to have increased from £800 to £4,000 an acre after the extension of the Metropolitan District reached the area. Land that was wanted by a railway company showed a greater rise. It was reported that when the Metropolitan District offered £3,000 for an acre of land to Lord Beaumont, who had been buying up land in the district, he made claims ranging from £8,000 to £18,000. In the end the jury awarded him £7,250 for the piece. Such 'windfall' gains were exceptional, however; unless the land was sold to a railway or a municipal body. For the most part, speculation involved some capital.


investment in the improvement of building land or the
provision of houses. In the first case the capital gain
might be made in one of three ways: first, by selling the
land at an 'improved' price; secondly, by selling the
ground rents created by leasing the land for building
purposes; and thirdly, by waiting until the building
leases 'fell in' when the opportunity arose, unless the
property had fallen badly out of repair, of rack-renting the
buildings. The gains which might be expected on the last
two counts can be illustrated from a sale of freehold ground
rents created on an estate of three and a half acres in South
Kensington consisting of 77 houses, 3 public houses and
stables. The ground rents of £250 per annum were sold for
£20,500 (or about £3,600 an acre) in 1880. They were
reckoned to be worth at least £5,600 at current prices when
the reversions occurred after a further 39 years. Earlier
sales of ground rents contained estimates of ultimate value
rather lower than this one, usually from five to ten times

1. Compare this with the Danish experience: S.E. Rasmussen,
the original ground rent. This can be illustrated from the sale of some freehold ground rents, worth £845 a year, created on 99 villas, shops, the 'Walmer Castle' public house, stables, workshops and a Baptist Church on the Westbourne Grove Estate at Paddington, a locality in which it was claimed, "houses of a moderate class are eagerly sought after, and consequently let as soon as completed, offering a particularly eligible opportunity for Investment, especially of Trust Monies". When the rents were sold in 1853 they were estimated to have an ultimate rack rental of £5,175. In fact, the leases of three of the original buildings were renewed for £350 in 1882.

Who then were the participants in building development? And which of them were investing for 'growth'? The main role of the landowner in the process of investment was to afford opportunities for the investment of capital by others. This was done by selling land to new purchasers, or developing estates by leasing land for building

purposes. In the second case the normal form of contract was a building agreement which usually contained provisions for building leases once a certain number of houses were erected. The original development in Paddington and South Kensington was mostly on 99 year terms but in suburban districts farther out leases were often shorter than this.

from 60 (or even less on corporate estates) to 99 years.
The term of building leases bore some relation to the anticipated scale of capital investment. Landowners were able to influence this by inserting conditions in a building agreement that, among other things, a stipulated sum of money be invested in roads, sewers, and houses of a specified type and amount. A typical building agreement from an estate in Kensington, dated 1844, was described to the Select Committee on Town Holdings. It contained provisions for building "in a substantial and workmanlike manner, messuages or dwelling houses of the value in the whole of £5,000, at the least", and for the joint construction of the roads and sewers by the lessors and lessees. Thus building agreements and leases were some of the instruments for mobilising capital onto an estate.

The cost of building development to landowners was the sacrifice of a full economic rent for the term of the building lease. Landowners charged ground rents which were

1. Minutes of Evidence, Select Committee on Town Holdings, Parl. Papers, 1887 (213), xiii, QQ. 1385-1395, 1418-1423, 1576-1579, 4739-5244, passim.
2. Ibid., QQ. 3311-3315, evidence G.B. Gregory, solicitor.
normally lower than grass rents and might be nominal, or peppercorn, rents at least for a few years, after which the rent would rise gradually to its full figure. If a builder could dispose of his houses quickly enough, he need not spend any of his capital on rent. It was commonly held in Victorian London that the leasehold system enabled a builder to start up in business with less capital than if he had bought land.

Some landowners laid out capital in improving their urban estates. Landowners who could not dispose of their land with complete freedom raised money, usually by mortgaging estates, in order to secure local or private Acts which would enable them to lease or sell land, and would also give secure legal titles to builders. Some examples will be given later of landowners who went further than this and invested capital in making roads and sewers, and even participated in building development, putting up a row or two of houses and lending money to builders. Even in these cases landowners normally passed the major risks and sometimes the

1. Ibid., QQ.5090-5095 (Garrard, surveyor), 7404-1409 (Castle, agent), 8464-8466 (Gatliff).

2. This was particularly important to corporate landowners: 97 local and private Acts relating to corporate urban estates and building land in England were passed between 1800-1865. For details of some of these, see my M.A. thesis, Leicester, 1961.
responsibility for development to the lessees or new purchasers of land. The first or 'head lessee' and the first purchaser of building plots might develop themselves, or, alternatively sub-lease or re-sell the land, or part of it, to others. Some landowners avoided these intermediaries and leased bit by bit to builders.

The investors in a building development were the 'developers' and the builders. The primary function of the developer (or to use the American equivalent, the real estate promoter) was to invest capital in creating the basic conditions which would make an estate 'go'. The object of this investment was to attract builders and to form ground rents which might then be held as a long term investment or sold for capital gain. Edward Yates, a builder in south London, claimed that "from a business point of view" he was chiefly interested in getting the ground covered and securing his ground rent. He thought that in the suburbs "where a man wants his land covered" he will worry the builder as little as possible so long as his ground rents were secured.

1. Town Holdings Committee, op.cit., Q.4739-5244.
The developer of an estate might be any one or all of the participants in a building development. Developers who were freeholders were often described as 'building owners'. They not only appeared in various guises but also adopted different ways of raising capital. Developers included estate and land development companies formed to invest in a particular estate or to buy up suburban land. They also included syndicates, partnerships, building firms and private individuals. In West London building firms and single investors were in the majority. They managed to raise the capital (amounting in some cases to £50,000 or more) for the preliminaries of estate development and the larger amounts needed to bring even a small estate to completion.

1. Examples of these forms include, The Marylebone and Paddington Joint Stock Trading and Building Company (1849), The West Kensington Estates Company (1861), The British Land Company (1856), The Frugality Investment Company (1856), the Hornsey Freehold Estates Tontine Company, Ltd. (1856), and the Golders Green and Finchley Road Syndicate (1891). Property Companies were usually only concerned with investment in urban property, see 'City of London Real Property Company, Ltd.', (C. of L.R.P.Co., 1964).
Builders and the financiers of house building

The channels for the investment of capital in house building were even more complex because they not only included the many builders who created the openings for investment, but also the financiers who supplied the builders with loan capital. Two features of the system can be picked out for comment at this stage.

First, the builders in London usually produced houses in anticipation of the demand for them. This meant that their profits depended partly on the costs of building operations (including the cost and availability of finance), and partly on the relation between the housing output in a particular district and the demand for houses. Irregularities in output can be expected in the case of housing as of other investment goods. But the striking feature of building construction in London from the 1820s was the long swings in the activity of residential building. The course of house building activity did not follow the path of the trade cycle

---

or the cycle in other investment goods. Fluctuations in house building were larger in magnitude, less regular and more widely spread. They were regional movements as well. The building market in London was in several respects exceptional, notably in the pressure of the demand for houses, and the long swings did not coincide in timing with those occurring in other cities in other parts of the country. The building booms came to a head in London in 1850-51, 1867-68, 1879-80, 1893-4 and 1901-2 or 3.

Secondly, there were not only a great many house builders in London but they operated in different ways. It has been claimed, however, that the housing industry did witness an organisational innovation during the first half of the nineteenth century in the rise of the large scale building contractor. Thomas Cubitt was the prototype of a new kind of master builder who organised men, materials and capital onto a building site and by employing a paid labour

force cut across the system of sub contracting prevalent in the industry. He was one of the largest house builders in Regency and early Victorian London with his own workshops at Grays Inn Road and beside the river in Pimlico.

The rise of men such as Cubitt was a significant development. They organised continuous large-scale building firms and eventually achieved economics of scale through the application of machinery in the making of bricks and wood turning. They were also able to raise substantial amounts of capital either by mortgaging land and houses, or by forming limited liability companies. One of the largest firms in West London, Gibbs and Flew became a limited liability company in 1880. It has been said that "by the 1870s there were some 250 building firms in London operating on a fairly large scale, and to a greater


or lesser degree using Cubitt's methods".

Yet it is not clear just how important these firms were in the housing industry. The evidence of contemporary witnesses is difficult to assess. For example, Edward Capps, a south London builder, claimed in 1857 that a man could not expect to make much out of a jobbing trade alone and had to speculate in order to make money, producing houses in the way that other men produced boots, and preferably on a large scale. But this sort of statement is an unsatisfactory basis for generalising about an increase in the scale of building.

There is little doubt that the number of building employers increased in London especially during the first half of the nineteenth century. By 1857, according to one estimate, six 'master builders' in London employed as many

---

1. S.G. Checkland, op.cit., p.168. cf. The Report of the Land Enquiry Committee in 1914, vol.2, p.81: "In some localities, especially in London and in rapidly growing towns, large numbers of houses have been supplied by builders, sometimes individuals and sometimes limited companies, employing a considerable amount of capital. But taking the country as a whole the brunt of the building of working class houses has fallen upon the small speculative builder....".

as 1,500 men, and the largest 100 'master builders' employed 28,000 of the 38,000 London building workmen, compared to
some 9,000 men employed by the remaining 450 firms. This
does not mean to say, however, that all these firms were
ccontributing in a substantial way to the housing industry.
In 1834, a London Master Builders Society was formed
ostensibly "to promote a friendly feeling and the inter-
change of useful information among those engaged in general
building in and around London". By the 1850s it contained
most of the leading building employers in London including the
large independent constructional firms - such as Peto and
Betts - who built railways and public buildings at home and
abroad. It also contained a number of smaller firms
engaged in local public works in London. Many of these
builders had nothing to do with house building; others
combined 'contract' work with speculative house building.
Hardly any of them seem to have been specialist house

1. J.T.R. Hughes, op. cit., based on G.S. Lefevre and T.R.
   Bennett, Trade Societies and Strikes (1860) and Economist,
   6 August, 1859.

It was only in the later nineteenth century and in connection with another organisation that house builders were formally enrolled as master builders. The London Master Builders Association formed in 1872 had speculative builders from the beginning (for example, Scrivener and White and Gibbs and Flew) and later opened its membership on a "popular basis" to small builders.

It must not be supposed from this that only building employers called themselves 'building contractors' or 'master builders'. In a sense any builder, whether large or small who made a building agreement with a landowner to develop a site was a building contractor. And many house builders coined the terms 'contractor' or 'master builder' simply in order to impress customers. In any case there is other evidence to suggest that building employers were only one amongst many types of

1. The main source for this is the Select Committee on Trade Unions, Parl. Papers, 1867 (3873), xxxii, Q.Q. 2579-2587 evidence of the secretary; also Building News, v (1859), especially p.663. The business operations of four leading British contractors are discussed by R.K. Middlemas, The Master Builders (1963), but three of these were financiers and organisers, not master builders.

2. Information from Dr. H.J. Dyos who has examined the minute books of the Association.

suburban house builders. Dr. H.J. Dyos has shown that one builder, E. Yates, put up houses on a large scale mainly by using the conventional methods. In chapter 6 of this thesis some examples will be given of firms that operated from a builders yard rather than a workshop, contracting the various trades, hiring labour from 'gangers' and mortgaging the houses under construction to financiers or to the new suburbians.

Builders such as these might gain some of the economies of scale; but the greater number of them were small, local concerns with a very small output. The evidence for this is to be found in the District Surveyors' Returns of the number of houses and shops built each year. They show that in a single year - 1880 - 83.3 per cent of firms in London were building twelve houses or less and their aggregate output was 47.7 per cent. The firms no doubt

2. See also 'Contractors and Sub-contractors' Builder, x (1852), pp.693-4, xi (1853), p.29.
3. Part I of the District Surveyors' Monthly Returns give details of builders, owners and number of houses constructed.
4. Dr. Dyos is working on the London figures for a number of years.
included some cottage builders, who were notoriously small concerns of humble origins, but they must have included a great many suburban house builders. A reckoning based on a number of years and related to particular districts shows a smaller proportion - but still substantial number - of firms engaged in building on a small scale. At the peak of the house building activity in Hammersmith and Fulham, in the years 1878-1880, some 163 firms or individuals (some of them unconnected with the building trades) provided twelve houses or less. And, although builders on this scale provided no more than a third of the houses built, the rest were constructed by 29 firms with an output of less than four twenty houses, and 23 firms with an output of sixty houses or less, and 4 builders with an output of more than sixty houses.

The financial arrangements which these builders made were often very complex. Edward Ryde, the President of the Surveyors' Institute made this point in relation to the builders of large estates:

"The builder —— taking a large block of land must be himself a man of some capital; then he is connected with men who advance him money and of course they are not always of the same class; they are as various as possible —— they generally spend the first

1. Tables showing the structure of house building are in appendix D.
money on the drains, the sewers, and the roads — (Money can be raised on the building agreement, and) when the builder is associated with a man whom we will call the capitalist, he has to deposit his agreement with the lender — the ground landlord himself - sometimes makes advances as the houses go up; up to the first floor so much money is advanced; up to the next floor so much, and so on; and the builders cannot get a mortgage until they have finished it in carcass, and have got their lease". (1)

The builder, he admitted, very often broke down, "and what generally happens in my experience", Ryde concluded, "is that the builder has got into debt with the brick merchant and sometimes these men come in to take over the contract".

Another sort of speculative builder was the subject of a letter to the Builder in 1880. The author describes the typical case of Mr. Chiselem, "who may have been a lawyer, or a mercantile clerk who has been disgraced". He makes the point that this sort of builder could put up 40 houses with advances of money from a landowner and his solicitors and a temporary loan from the bank. The builder's career, the writer claimed was "long or short, (2) depending on his skill in finance". The same point was made by an observer of house building in Chiswick:

1. Select Committee on Town Holdings, Parl. Papers, 1886 (213) xii, QQ.7909 et seq.

2. Builder, xlvii (1880-1), pp.424-5, letter from 'Kensaltonian' (Kensal Green ?).
"It is but in a few instances that these new erections are put up with a view to either permanent possession or occupation: like Peter Lindar's razors, they are made - to sell. — Many of these terraces, places and villas are built and the work personally directed by men who never had any previous experience of building, but who encouraged by the prospect of 'advances' held out to them by ground rent-creating speculators, go into the business as builders." (1)

These sentiments, or similar ones, were expressed by many writers in such periodicals as the Builder to whom speculative house building, speculative builder, and the "attendant harpy", the money lending solicitor, were terms of abuse.

Speculative builders then ranged from penniless adventurers to substantial men of means and limited liability companies. They included small jobbing firms, building employers and builders who expanded their output by taking open sites in the suburbs and sub-leasing the land and sub contracting the building operations. In short, speculative builder in the nineteenth century was something of a term of art.


Private investors in essential services

This preliminary account of the main personnel and institutions engaged in making the suburbs can be completed by identifying the channels for the investment of capital in providing suburban amenities other than houses or transport. They can be divided into two classes: first, commercial entrepreneurs who were not directly concerned with providing fixed capital but who financed the normal flow of goods and services needed by suburban inhabitants; and, secondly, financial and political associations of private individuals concerned with providing the finance for essential services and social 'improvements' in the suburbs.

The most important members of the first group were the shopkeepers, publicans and private schoolmasters. The majority of shopkeepers started out by investing their own savings in new concerns and most of them seemed to have worked on very small capital margins, judging from the number that appeared in the bankruptcy returns for West London. Those

1. According to the Handybook of Shopkeeping, the early suburban shop rarely succeeded: "The few inhabitants prefer to supply themselves from established shops, and the local shopkeeper is only asked to supply wants that actually happen --- it seems, therefore, desirable for the small capitalist rather to run the risk of a more expensive rent in a well populated district than to resort to places of slow and uncertain demand". Cited R.S. Lambert, The Universal Provider: a Study of William Whiteley and the Rise of the London Department Store (1958), p.59.
who expanded did so by reinvesting their profits in new premises and purchasing the stock of bankrupt traders. The shopkeepers who ran large establishments were in the classical mould of the Victorian entrepreneur, building up their concerns with hard work and self-denial. This was the way in which Whiteley expanded his commercial empire until at the end of the century his business had a turnover of more than a million pounds a year, ten per cent of which represented net profit. By the end of the nineteenth century more and more of the bigger firms in the retail trade, and in closely related types of distribution, such as catering, laundry services and hotel keeping, and the distribution of milk, turned into limited companies (though private ones usually) as a stage in a progress towards greater growth combined with greater stability.

Publicans and schoolmasters appeared to operate in a similar way to shopkeepers. If anything it was easier to become a publican than a shopkeeper because breweries and distilleries were always willing to finance new houses or

extensions to existing ones in order to expand their sales. Hence the business of keeping public houses was easy to enter and attracted all sorts of people who came into it as 'speculators'. The same might be said of some of the schoolmasters who invested savings in private 'adventure' schools, or established proprietary schools financed with share capital. The earliest joint stock school in West London was the Kensington Proprietary School established in 1831; and one of the most famous was the Norland House School in Notting Hill, a branch of the Public Day School Company, Ltd. These were reputable schools, but many other schoolmaster proprietors seem to have built up the 'goodwill' of a school in order to sell out at a substantial profit to others. There is some evidence of this in advertisements of schools for sale in London, which show quite a remarkable traffic in schools some of which had not been going for very long.

The growth of commerce and industry was a potential source of capital for investment in other parts of the suburban enterprise. But the organisations concerned with providing essential services also made substantial additions to the fixed capital of the suburbs. At first, private individuals might provide some amenities without combining in formal associations. The provision of essential services depended in the first instance on the enterprise and resources of landowners and builders in new suburban districts and the wealth and improving zeal of the first suburban residents. The former might invest money in providing certain basic amenities. Thus enterprising landowners sank wells in the London clay districts and supplied new inhabitants with pure water. More usually, landowners insisted that the builders of their estates provide a minimum of roads and sewers. The first suburban residents might also improve their surroundings at their own expense, contributing funds towards the building

1. In Paddington wells were sunk in the London clay at Westbourne, Artesian Road and the Sovereign Brewery in the Queens Road, Bayswater Annual (1885), p.2. These and other wells further out are referred to by local historians: for example, F.M. Gladstone, Notting Hill in Bygone Days, (1924), p.43, and G. Redford and T.H. Ricks, The History of the Ancient Town and Borough of Uxbridge (1928), p.88.
of churches, and setting up square and garden committees in order to maintain and guard these suburban amenities. The provision of a Church, its size and position, even the architectural style in which it was built, was important to the successful development of a housing estate. The church set the tone of an estate. Sir John Summerson has remarked that the London churches of the 1850s were "large less because of Victorian piety than because a building estate of the 'fifties' would never 'go' without a good big church". A later section discusses the extent to which church and chapel building in West London can be regarded as an investment in maintaining social conditions.

Another way in which the first suburban residents might attempt to improve their surroundings was to invest capital in promoting new joint stock companies or to mobilise funds through improvements in the efficiency of local government. Alternatively, they might buy shares or offer extra financial inducements to existing concerns in order to persuade them to provide a better service. In the last resort they might bring political pressure to bear on them.

1. Ten of these committees were formed in Kensington before 1850.

Some of these devices were mentioned in the discussion on railway extensions. The first step was for a group of leading inhabitants in a suburban district to hold meetings and canvass local support for better services. They might then form an 'acceleration committee' to petition the existing companies. If this failed they might then try to promote their own railway line. On the other hand the inhabitants of wealthy districts already in touch with the City via the omnibus or private carriages, did not normally regard the railways as improvements. They opposed the building of new railways and stations that would affect the value of their property and the standing of the neighbourhood. The inhabitants of Bayswater and South Kensington banded together in 'Protection Societies' during the 1860s in order to raise funds for carrying on legal battles against the railways.

The joint stock companies investing capital in the provision of essential services and other amenities included both City promotions and 'local' concerns. With the exception

1. The inhabitants of Acton and Hammersmith went through all these stages in promoting the line of 1874: House of Lords Record Office, Commons' and Lords' Committees, Acton and Hammersmith Railway Bill, 1874.

2. House of Lords Record Office, petitions against the Metropolitan District Railway, Ltd. No. 2 Bill, 4 July, 1864. One Association was called the West End Tramways Opposition Association.
of the water and gas companies (and the Metropolitan Railways, of course) the majority of them were relatively small undertakings. In the early nineteenth century, joint stock companies were formed to build bridges, look after burial grounds and to carry away some of West London's sewage. The Company Acts of 1855 and 1862 extended the range of concerns that might claim limited liability. The pressure behind these Acts was not that of industry or the professional money market but small investors seeking an outlet for their savings and reformist organisations such as the Christian Socialists. From this time on joint stock capital was invested in a range of social improvements and looked for a fair return on this outlay. In West London, joint stock concerns provided workmen's houses, built baths and wash-houses and even erected the Hammersmith Town Hall.

1. Some examples were: the Hammersmith Bridge Company, the Kensal Green and Brompton Cemetery Companies, and the Metropolitan Sewage Manure Company that had works in Kensington. For the share capital, see Parl. Papers, Return of Joint Stock Companies, 1846 (504), 55.


3. Other examples were The Kensington Improved Dwelling Houses Association (£10,000), the Hammersmith Town Hall Company (£2,000) and the Hammersmith Baths Company, Ltd (£5,000). One of the largest of these concerns was the Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Co.Ltd. (£100,000 in 1884).
The capital of these local companies was never more than a few thousand pounds: thus the capital of the West Brompton and Chelsea Dwelling House Company Ltd., was £10,000 in 1,000 shares of £10 each and that of the Notting Hill and Bayswater Baths Company, Ltd., was £6,000. This sort of company usually paid a rate of interest from 4 to 4½ per cent.

The big battalions of investment were the undertakings that installed the equipment for supplying gas, water and electricity. Local companies formed to supply gas and water were not unknown in London: for example, the Wandsworth and Putney Gas Light and Coke Company was formed in 1834 and the Harrow Gas Company in 1832 by local residents in these districts as private partnerships for making gas which they then supplied at cost price for the benefit of the inhabitants. The first company to supply gas to West London was a similar sort of venture that was established in 1820 - an early date for gas - to light the Turnpike Road from Kensington to Brentford. This was, in fact, the only company to survive against the competition of bigger, more heavily capitalised and aggressive City companies.

1. Return of correspondence from the Gas Companies in Report, Metropolitan Board of Works, Parl. Papers, 1867 (709), lviii. Also House of Lords Record Office, Minutes of Evidence, Commons Committee, Brentford Gas Bill (1821), Harrow Gas Bill (1855).
With the exception of the Brentford and the Western Gas Companies, the gas and water undertakings that supplied West London started out as speculative ventures promoted by a combination of engineers and financiers. Most of them were founded before the Victorian period; and for most of their early history were beset with administrative and financial difficulties. Private companies to supply water were established in the Georgian suburbs: by 1829 three companies - the Chelsea (1725), the West Middlesex (1806) and the Grand Junction (1810) - had raised £645,000 in share capital. They actually invested much more than this with the help of debenture and mortgage loans: the Grand Junction laid out over a million pounds in capital plant mainly with the help of loan capital.

The water companies were unprofitable concerns at first though by the 1840s they had overcome earlier troubles.

1. For a general introduction to these problems, see Herman Finer, Municipal Trading: A Study in Public Administration (1941), chap.3.

2. The West Middlesex was a City speculation, the Grand Junction was promoted by Samuel Hill, a director of the Stone Pipe Company and received support from the Manchester Water Works Company. For the early history of these companies see H.W. Dickinson, The Water Supply of Greater London (1952); Brig. Gen. R. Ridgeway, A Short History of Kensington (1935) and Select Committee on the Supply of Water to the Metropolis, Parl. Papers, 1825 (355), especially statistical tables.
Until the 1830s they cut prices and went looking for customers. Fierce competition and the cost of new reservoirs and pumping stations sometimes established before the demand was really there left the companies financially exhausted. They began to pick up after 1834 when the companies agreed on supplying distinct service districts. By the 1840s they were paying 6 to 7 per cent on shares. \(1\)

The gas companies took rather longer to settle down and form working agreements. The Imperial Gas Company was the first of these concerns to supply West London; and was for many years, the largest concern operating in the district with a franchise which included the whole of London north of the Thames, extending, after 1824, as far as Fulham. Both the Imperial and the Brentford found the outer suburbs expensive to supply. This was because the length of main required, the costs of distribution and the proportion of capital to rental was much higher in suburban than urban districts. One consequence of this was that suburban inhabitants usually paid more for gas than City dwellers. \(2\)


2. Return of Correspondence, loc.cit.
The Imperial was affected by internal troubles at a time when it needed to develop supply and reduce costs and, in consequence, abandoned its rights in Kensington to the Brentford in the 1830s. The Brentford in turn voluntarily retired from Fulham in favour of the London Gas Light Company and then from Kensington in favour of the Western Gas Company. The London Gas Light Company, founded in 1833 was a frankly speculative undertaking with a price policy which consisted in charging 25 per cent below the current price whatever that price might be in any district that it invaded. The financial losses which this involved provided sufficient discouragement to any promoters who might still be looking to the gas industry as a speculative investment. In fact the only other company to be founded in West London, the Western Gas Company, competed on the basis of quality rather than price by producing canel gas with special coal brought from Wigan.

The Western Gas Company, founded in 1844, with a capital of £230,000 and works at Kensal Green was in part

1. The brief notes in this paragraph are based on the accounts in S. Everard, The Gas Light and Coke Company, 1812-1949 (1949), especially pp.100, 157-170, 198.
another local promotion: the Board of Directors contained at least three men with business interests in the western suburbs, notably C. Makin, an engineer and property owner at Notting Hill who later helped to finance and direct the Metropolitan Railway Company. Its share registers show that the company attracted the money of many small investors—clerks, tradesmen and ladies, and also trust funds. Other gas undertakings in London also seemed to have attracted this kind of capital. On the other hand, small investors, though the most numerous holders of shares, provided only about half of the total capital of the Western Gas Company. The rest of the capital was contributed by merchants from London and Leeds.

The competition of the Western Gas Company was the immediate cause of districting amongst the five companies supplying West London. The price of gas fell steadily during the ten years to 1854: expressed in terms of thousand cubic feet, the price of coal gas fell from 7/- in 1847 to 4/6d in 1854, and canel gas from 8/- in 1850 to 6/- in 1854. At the

1. London County Record Office, Annual Report, Western Gas Company (1846) which gives a list of directors.

2. Out of a total of 3849 shareholders in four major gas companies in 1867, 1113 were ladies, 225 were clergymen and 771 were trust or joint account holders: Return of Number of Shareholders in each of 13 Gas Companies, Parl. Papers, 1867 (709), Iviii. The share register of the Western Gas Company in 1852 is shown in Appendix G.
beginning of that year the companies at length agreed to maintain prices and a deed of districting was drawn up which brought competition, except in the City, to an end, once and for all. The Metropolitan Gas Act of 1860 which followed an unsuccessful attempt by Cross to buy out the companies accepted the district arrangements and merely sought to regulate the maximum rate of dividends. The Western Gas Company which had been struggling to gain a foothold now began to expand its business. This was reflected in a sudden rise in rentals from £2,162 in 1861 to £10,804 in 1868. By August, 1870 the company was earning a net profit of £50,343, sufficient to pay a dividend of 10 per cent and to have enough surplus funds to justify a reduction in the price of gas from 5/6 to 5/- per thousand cubic feet. From the 1860s to the 1880s all the London gas companies prospered. They were able to pay from 7 to 10 per cent on shares by keeping the price of gas at about 5/6 to 7/6 per thousand cubic feet.

1. Select Committee on the Metropolis Gas Bill, Parl. Papers, 1867 (520-1), xii, statistical tables.
2. For discussion and an attack on the Act and the Companies, see 'The Government of London', Our Times, June-August, 1881.
Gas Companies supplying West London, 1860-1901

By the 1880s just over £3 million had been raised by the water companies of West London, and £10 million by the gas companies (now amalgamated with the Gas Light and Coke Company). Further capital was raised in the late nineteenth century and invested in improving pipes and replacing obsolete plant and machinery. The amount was also swollen by the increased use of electricity. When the electricity companies came into being in the last decade of the century the cycle of intense competition followed by monopolistic arrangements was repeated once again. In 1891 eight companies had been promoted to supply West London with electricity; but by 1900 only four of these were in operation. They had laid out a total of just over half a million pounds in supplying West London (including Marylebone) with electric lighting. Like the gas and water undertakings earlier they had already begun to operate working agreements. Thus the amount invested in supplying gas, water and electricity to West London must have come to something like £14 or £15 million and more than the amount laid out on the metropolitan railway system. Despite this expenditure the supply never really caught up with the

1. Ibid.
2. London Statistics (1891) and Annual Report, Kensington Vestry (1900).
demand and the price of these services embodied charges made to cover profits, which rarely fell below 7 per cent. What then was the role of joint stock companies as channels of investment? The metropolitan railways and public utilities appear to have drawn their initial capital from financial promoters and then from substantial businessmen. Certainly the Metropolitan Railway, and to a lesser extent the Metropolitan District Railway and the Western Gas Company found the larger part of their capital from the businessmen of London and other cities than from small investors. On the other hand, there was probably a more numerous body of small investors, especially tradesmen and builders, in these metropolitan concerns than in the national companies.

With the exception of these City concerns the majority of other joint stock companies that added to the fixed capital of London had relatively small capitals and issued shares of low denominations, usually of £10 or less. They were usually concerned with making improvements in which local and often small investors had a personal interest. This was so in the case of suburban railway

companies sponsored by local interests and bridge, housing, and 'town hall' companies. They can be regarded as just one of many devices to channel suburban wealth into improvements thought to be socially desirable or likely 

1. For a discussion of the different types of joint stock companies in the nineteenth century see J.B. Jefferys, 'The Denomination and Character of Shares, 1855-1885', Economic History Review, xvi, no.1 (1946).

churches in populous parishes". In the Victorian period, government financial assistance was made available through a permanent agency, the Loan Commissioners, established in 1817 and converted into the Public Works Loan Board in 1842. The operations of the Loan Board were quite extensive but in the suburban districts of London they were restricted to making loans for the building of workhouses and public baths. After 1856 the Board also made loans to a number of associations concerned with housing working-men. The one exception was in the matter of education where the government's financial assistance steadily increased. Until 1872 its money was disbursed by the National and other societies concerned with providing elementary and to a lesser extent 'middle schools, and training colleges; but the question of how the Church raised all the money for its tasks cannot be discussed here. (1)

The London vestries made little use of government finance. One reason for this was that local bodies

began to acquire lending and borrowing powers of their own. For example, from 1858, the Local Government Act Office had powers to help finance sanitary improvements in Victorian towns, and vestries and other local agencies had powers to raise funds on the security of their rate incomes. London was not included within the orbit of the L.G.A.O. except for special purposes. The Metropolis Management Act of 1855 created the Metropolitan Board of Works with overall responsibility for certain aspects of London government and with powers to finance certain kinds of improvements. These powers were extended in 1875 and 1876 to cover baths, libraries and further sanitary works.

Public investment in London meant, in the main, investment carried out and financed by local government bodies. In the first half of the nineteenth century these institutions were numerous, inefficient and suited to running the affairs of rural parishes rather than


2. Public Works Loans Acts, 1875 and 1876 (following the Public Health Act of 1875).
suburban districts. Metropolitan Commissions looked after the roads and sewers. The former took over from the Turnpike Trusts, in 1836. The Commissioners of Roads were more efficient than most London bodies at the time, but they concentrated on maintaining the main roads rather than the estate roads that more directly concerned suburban inhabitants. The Westminster Commissioners of Sewers (replaced in 1852 by the Metropolitan Commissioners) represented the interests of the bigger and more established landowners than the new developers and builders. They were criticised for being a self-nominated, irresponsible body. The only other instruments of


2. One such attack was made by John Leslie, one of the Commissioners and a tailor and habit maker of Conduit Street. The Commissioners claimed in 1847 that they had added 145 new members mostly magistrates and professional men, most of them freeholders in districts subject to a sewer rate. They also added 19 tradesmen, mostly builders: Sewers (Westminster), Parl. Papers, 1847 (686) Iviii, pp.123-212. The Commission constructed one sewer in Bayswater for £3,500.
government before 1824 were the parish vestries and their small retinue of part-time officers. The only important official was the clerk to the vestry.

The growth of London and the rising tide of political aspirations brought changes in the structure of local government and adaptation to new uses. These reforms came about in two ways. First, local inhabitants and new suburban residents helped to create new institutions in an attempt to raise more funds to be used in financing parish 'improvements'. One method of doing this was to set up boards responsible for capital expenditure on main works. A variety of these were formed: lighting, paving and highway boards set up by means of Improvement Acts; district boards that shared responsibility with the Metropolitan Board of Works for all main works in metropolitan districts after 1855; and local boards of health that were formed in districts beyond the metropolitan area after 1858. The different dates at which Improvement Acts were adopted in rural areas provides almost an index of suburban development. Thus an Improvement Act was

1. The Out parishes, such as Acton, were still governed by magistrates. In 1840 according to Pigot's London and Provincial Directory, Acton was governed by a chief magistrate, two head-boroughs, one constable, two ale connors, and an inspector of weights and measures.
adopted in Paddington in 1824, but in Kensington not until 1854. Hammersmith and Fulham only became civil parishes in 1832 and had not petitioned for an Improvement Act before 1855, but in 1835, a board of surveyors was established and in 1841 the parish was divided into lighting districts.

The extra-metropolitan parishes acquired Improvement Acts and local boards of health after 1858. In Acton the solicitor and landowner J.C.T. Treherne seems to have been the moving force behind the establishment of a local board as well as the Acton and Hammersmith Railway.

There is no reason to doubt that in Middlesex, as in another rural County recently studied by a social historian, the local boards often owed their existence to a few local individuals who wished to improve the amenities of the country districts in which they had chosen to live. This

1. Geo IV, c. xxxvi, 17 June, 1824.


3. 11 places in Middlesex (including Ealing) had three boards by 1868, Return of Local Health Boards, Parl. Papers, 1867-8 (489), iviii, C. Jones, Ealing from a Village to Corporate Town (1948), p. House of Lords Record Office, evidence of J.T. Treherne to Commons Committee, Acton and Hammersmith Railway (1874).

was certainly one of the main reasons for the Improvement Acts in the parishes of West London before 1855.

The second aspect of reform was the creation of the Metropolitan Board of Works and the subsidiary boards which this organisation spawned. They were not formed merely as financial devices but as elements in the politics of metropolitan control. The major political question in London in 1855 was to determine whether the local parish vestries should remain in existence and how they should be controlled, just as the major question in 1888 was to decide how the suburban districts that had developed beyond the metropolitan boundary should be governed.

The London solution to metropolitan government was an indirectly elected central board providing administrative efficiency without destroying the autonomy of the local vestries.

1. The subject of new researches by Professor David Owen.

2. The London County Council was formed in 1888. The effect of the Local Government Act on Middlesex government has not been examined. J.M. Lee points out that the Act was in a sense "the revenge of the towns against the country gentlemen who, since the fifteenth century at least, had been interfering in the business of the boroughs". op.cit., p.47.

The great achievement of the Board was the main drainage of London on which it laid out over £6 million by 1886. It also widened its scope in ways not envisaged in the original Act, spending a further £20 million in new capital works. Most of this went towards renewing and redeveloping the metropolitan centre in the form of grants and loans for embankments and street improvements, slum clearance, bridges and the purchase of recreation grounds.

One consequence of the setting up of the district boards was that a corps of professional workers, headed by the Medical Officers of Health, was eventually formed in the parishes, most of them dedicated to spending on parish improvements. The medical officers often attempted to justify this expenditure on grounds of civic economy, that in the long run outlays on sewers and other parish improvements would yield a return by attracting a good class of inhabitant and thus maintain and improve property values. As the editor of the West London Observer, a believer in improvements, remarked: "A judicious application of a liberal grant to carry out necessary improvements is less an expenditure than an investment of money".

1. West London Observer, 12 December, 1868. The enforcement of Public Health regulations, where this occurred, may also have encouraged private spending by suburban inhabitants.
Loan finance had an important part in the capital outlays of the Metropolitan Board and other boards and vestries. When the London County Council was formed over a half of the Council's expenditure on revenue account was in interest and repayments for the great capital expenditure of the Metropolitan Board of Works. Long term debts of £30 million were inherited from its predecessor. Another £8 million was owing to the Board from other authorities, the Metropolitan District Asylum Managers (just over £1 million), the School Board for London (£3½ million out of £6 million) and the local vestries and district boards (£3½ million). But the establishment of the L.C.C. did not decrease this debt, on the contrary, by 1907 the Council's long term debts were over £73 million of which £19 million was due to other bodies. In contrast, between 1918 and 1938 capital expenditure, except on housing, was relatively low; and it never reached the level of 1902-6.

The last chapter discusses the extent to which some of the local institutions of government were used as channels of investment and the influence of other competing demands on

the finance which they had available. One of the themes investigated there is the relationship between the finance of local capital expenditure and the local politics of West London. By this is meant not the influence of party politics but quite literally the politics of protest: the attempt by suburban residents to influence the level and direction of capital expenditure on parish 'improvements'.

This preliminary survey illustrates the complexity of the mechanisms involved in the process of investment. Funds were contributed towards providing fixed capital by private investors, rate payers (sometimes with reluctance) and the donators to churches, hospitals, and the like. The investment of capital in many parts of the suburban enterprise also depended upon a ready supply of loanable funds, provided by investors in mortgages, and municipal bonds. The next chapter discusses the nature of the market for loan capital.
CHAPTER 3

The Supply of Loanable Funds

"To the building interest the supply of cheap capital is a matter of vital necessity, and so is the power of tiding over a temporary crisis, without being compelled to bring property to a forced sale at ruinous prices, at a time when purchasers are driven out of the market".


The contribution of the London money market

The next step in analysing the finance of suburban development is to examine the financial institutions which gathered and disbursed loanable funds. And the first matter to be considered in this connection is the contribution of the City and West End financial institutions. To what extent can the finance of suburban development be regarded as an extra mural operation of the London money market?

The favourite investment of most London banks was the bill of exchange that facilitated commercial transactions. But some of the private 'West End' (as distinct from the City) banks had developed a special business in mortgage loans to selected customers. For example, the bulk of the lending of both Child's Bank and Hoare's Bank in the early nineteenth century was on
mortgage and bond, mainly to the aristocracy and gentry. (1)

Some of the private banks also supplied the financial needs of professional people, solicitors, clergymen, army officers and the like. Thus the customers of these banks might well include speculative builders or the owners of building estates, where these were professional people, gentry and other men of standing; but they were unlikely to include small building firms. The names of the directors of private banks - for instance, Bosanquet, Buckmaster, Esdaile - appear in the Middlesex Land Registry as signatories to the mortgage agreements taken out by the owners of building estates in the first half of the nineteenth century. But the very fact that these names have to be searched for amongst hundreds of other mortgage transactions suggests that they were not a very important element in building finance.


3. Easily identified from the index to the Registry. As late as 1871 Goodwin and White, builders of Cambridge Gardens, Notting Hill, borrowed £1,800 on the mortgage of property from Hoare, Chapman, Sperling and Winter but they borrowed much larger amounts from other sources. *Middlesex Cited, Land Registry*, i, no.25 (1881).
The London joint stock banks claimed to dislike holding mortgages, preferring to make short advances on the security of joint promissory notes signed by the debtor and his surety of title deeds, and with two exceptions, this seems to have been the practice which they followed. The exceptions were the London and County and the London and Westminster Banks, the earliest and, for a long time, the most important of the London joint stock banks. Both of them lent on mortgage to builders and the owners of building estates until the 1860s and the Westminster Bank also provided some of the finance for the building of Victoria Street in Westminster. These loans were made by several managers including the irresponsible John Sadleir whose activities created a scandal in London banking circles in the 1850s. In 1856 the committee set up to investigate the mortgage investments of the London and Westminster found that it had about £500,000 tied up in 'dormant securities' arising from "transactions of long standing where builders and speculative solicitors have misled or deluded your

Managers — though it must not be forgotten that a very large portion arises from transactions of the Head Office irrespective of those appertaining to Mr. Sadleir". Some of the builders referred to were operating in West London.

A common practice of banks in provincial cities was to make short term advances and to let them run for five years or more, without enquiring too closely into the uses of this money. This also seems to have happened in London, though the evidence is not very weighty. At least one London vestry — but this may have been an exceptional case — borrowed freely from a private banker to finance paving and sewer works and repaid the loans from the rates and other levies on the local inhabitants. This was the Paddington vestry which borrowed £33,000 in six separate loans for these purposes between 1852 and 1860. Earlier they had also borrowed £17,000 from E. Hopkinson, a Regent Street banker and Treasurer to the Vestry, in loans ranging from three

1. T.E. Gregory, op.cit.

2. One of these was a Hammersmith builder (the mortgages are in the collection at the Hammersmith Central Library). Another was the Rev. Dr. Walker, a speculative builder in Notting Hill, whose activities are discussed below pp.252-254.

months to three years which they used to finance the building and maintenance of churches. But in 1346 they gave up this practice and raised a loan of £19,000 to be repaid within twenty years from the London Life Association. They raised this money and a subsequent loan from the Church of England Assurance Society for £6,000 on the security of rate income.

Before the mid century the London banks did not do much business with small shopkeepers and traders who put their savings in savings banks and, as we shall see, the deposit and investment accounts of building societies. But in the later part of the century customers of the London banks did include shopkeepers, building societies and builders. This was a result of the growth of branch banking. Before 1870 branches were opened in Paddington and Notting Hill but apart from the Metropolitan Bank which stopped payment in 1879 no branch had been opened beyond this point. It was not until 1873 that the London and County, a pioneer in this sort of banking, opened a

1. Loans A/c, Paddington Vestry, one vol., 1824-1860.
2. Building societies eventually became more important than the Savings Banks, of which there were only four in West London. See H.O. Horne, A History of Savings Banks (1947), pp. 46, 374-385.
Building Societies regularly made use of these branches and borrowed money from the banks (and other land and building societies) in order to finance new mortgages. The loans made by the banks were always subject to recall in the event of pressure on liquidity and this caused difficulties for the building societies and also for builders. Many of the builders who failed did so because they were financing the purchase of materials and the like with the credit of brick-makers, timber merchants and banks.

How did this compare with the system in operation in the Paris building trade? According to one official enquiry of 1884, the employers in Paris formed associations and borrowed money from the Sous-Comptoir on the security of land and foundations. When the construction of houses was more advanced they came to the Crédit Foncier for larger loans and even then the ordinary Paris banks were willing to lend a third time for building. The financial institutions which made comparable

1. Hilton Price, Handlist of London Bankers (1890). The archivist of the Westminster Bank claimed that hardly any records of the advances made by the branches have been kept.
2. Some examples are given below pp.193-4.
3. This is clear from inspecting the surviving records of bankruptcy cases at the Public Record Office.
loans to the London builders were the insurance companies and
the building societies rather than the banks.

The mortgage investments of insurance companies

The insurance companies were relatively late arrivals
in the capital market. In the eighteenth century, and to a very
limited extent before then, a few companies started to favour
mortgages as alternative assets to the Funds. For instance, the
Equitable and the Sun Fire Office had about £776,000 laid out in
this way before 1815, mostly on the security of country estates
in England and Ireland. The decline of mortgage loans during
and just after the Napoleonic wars was a temporary phenomenon,
made up in part by the rise, and subsequent fall, of the annuity
(1)
system of lending. From the 1820s more and more insurance funds
were invested in mortgages.

This expansion in the mortgage business of the
insurance companies was an important development in the capital

1. For the history of insurance investment in the late eighteenth
century and the 'drying up' of mortgage loans in the War, see
A.H. John, 'Insurance Investment and the London Money Market of
the Eighteenth Century', Econonica, n.s. xx (1953), L.S. Pressnell,
'The Rate of Interest in the Eighteenth Century' in Studies in
the Industrial Revolution (ed. L.S. Pressnell, 1961), P.G.N.
market and requires some preliminary explanation. It was due, on the one hand, to the growth of insurance business during the nineteenth century, and, on the other hand, to the unsatisfactory nature of Consols as an investment for the funds of these companies. Unlike the banks, the insurance companies did not have the same need to maintain a large liquid reserve, and when the price of Consols rose in the first half of the nineteenth century the directors of the big offices looked to mortgages and bonds as an alternative and more lucrative form of investment. A high price for Consols meant, of course, a low rate of interest on the investment of new money and, in a growing fund, the rate for new money was at least as important as the market price of existing assets. This close inverse relationship between mortgages and Consols was also shown in the way that the Equitable Insurance Society used a sliding scale of interest rates whereby they charged a lower rate of interest on mortgages (than the legal maximum of 5 per cent) when the price of Consols was high.

By the 1850s the insurance companies were being described as the big money lenders in London:

"Large sums are yearly accumulated by the companies, which have now become the great money lenders, and besides their investments in the funds, they are large holders of railway debentures and extensive mortgagees of the estates of the great aristocracy, particularly in Ireland. They share, with the Bank of England, in loans to corporations and public bodies, and all large money transactions". (1)

This was something of an exaggeration: individual members of the middle classes continued to supply most of the new savings for investment whether in the mortgage market or through the Stock Exchange.

There is, however, no doubt that insurance funds were being invested in many different types of securities between the 1840s and 1870s: the debentures of railways and trading concerns, both at home and overseas, bonds, annuities and domestic mortgages. Until the 1880s insurance funds were being invested in mortgages more than in any other security, though probably the greater part of this money was paid to country landowners on the security of farming land and country estates. In 1856-7

3. The investments of the Sun Fire Office are analysed by P.G.M. Dickson, op.cit., pp.234–263. Additional information including the balance sheets of leading offices is provided in the appendix of this thesis.
the four leading societies in London had two-thirds of their total funds, amounting to several million pounds, invested in mortgage assets. The following section will attempt to show that two consequences of importance to the finance of urban development followed from this general expansion in the investments of insurance companies. First, the relationship between Consols and mortgages altered in the second half of the century: if anything, investments in Consols and mortgages tended to move together. Secondly, some, though by no means all, the insurance offices were willing to advance money in fairly large amounts on the security of mining land, municipal rates and building land and house property.

Amongst those who borrowed from insurance companies in London were landowners wanting to improve their urban estates, municipal bodies for drainage, street improvements, public works and buildings and certain types of house builders. In the early nineteenth century the Royal Exchange Assurance contributed £300,000 towards the construction of Regent Street and the Equitable

1. Compiled from the statistical tables and balance sheets in the appendices to the Select Committee on Assurance Associations, Parl. Papers, 1852-3 (965), xxi. See also G.E. May, 'The Investments of the Life Offices since 1850', Journal of the Institute of Actuaries (January, 1912).
provided a similar sum for improvements in the Strand.

Before 1856 the Clergy Mutual and Rock Insurance advanced £48,000 to the Metropolitan Commissioners of Sewers, and between 1856 and 1868 these, and other companies, provided one-fifth (£481,000) of the loan capital of the Metropolitan Board of Works. The Bank of England and the National Debt Commissioners (2) provided the other four-fifths. The insurance companies also helped to finance the capital expenditures of the London vestries and district boards in this period, and thereafter they contributed towards the building of workhouses and hospitals in the counties round London. So far as can be ascertained, nine insurance companies made loans totalling £183,784 (in amounts of £10,000 to £20,000) to the vestries and boards in West London.


2. The Clergy Mutual Life Association contributed £92,000 for making two London parks; the Economic and the London Life Associations advanced £150,000 between them for drains and sewers and the Hand-in-Hand made a fire brigade loan of £10,000. London County Record Office, Return, Metropolitan Board of Works, 6 March, 1868.

3. Some examples are given in appendix E. The total indebtedness of the London vestries and boards is shown in appendix I.
between 1856 and 1888.

As with the banks, evidence for the contribution of insurance companies to building finance in London can be obtained from the Middlesex Land Registry. This shows that a relatively small number of offices were involved in making loans to house builders. For instance, the number of companies making loans to builders in West London between 1840 and 1878 was fourteen, of which three dealt with more than one builder in nearly every year and the rest made only occasional loans. In fact, this business was almost entirely carried out by three companies: the London Assurance Corporation, the Royal Exchange Assurance and the Hand-in-Hand Assurance Company. The first two of these made a really significant contribution to the finance of house

1. From the annual reports to the Kensington and Paddington vestries and the Fulham District Board. The last of these had some difficulties in raising finance. Thus, in 1859, they applied to various companies for a loan. The Sun said they did not lend on the security of local rates, the British Empire claimed to lend capital only in connection with life assurance and the Equitable declined to tender. In the event they borrowed £10,000 from the Loan Commissioners for Public Works at 5 per cent. Between 1862 and 1874 they raised £3,500 from the British Empire Life Assurance at 4½ per cent., £40,000 from the Royal Exchange Assurance at 5 per cent and £25,000 from the Imperial Life Association at 5 per cent. West London Observer, 4 April, 1859. Annual Reports, Fulham District Board (1869-72).
building in London, for they contracted over a hundred mortgages in the metropolitan area of Middlesex between 1840 and 1864, mostly with builders operating in the parishes of St. George, Hanover Square, Paddington and Kensington. They also made occasional loans to builders operating in the outer suburbs in the parishes of Hackney, Hampstead, South Mimms, Twickenham and Barnes.

It is possible to state precisely the loans made to some of the builders in West London by two of these companies for selected years. Thus the London Assurance Corporation laid out £89,400 in this way between 1858 and 1868, and the Hand-in-Hand, who dealt with fewer builders, advanced £100,450 in mortgage loans to five builders in West London.

These loans were made to builders who ranged from West End firms like Jeffereys to local firms such as Pocock. Some of them built houses all over West London, others concentrated their activities in one locality or on one estate; but

1. There were actually 153 entries in the index to the Registry relating to 112 individuals most of whom have been identified as builders. The borrowers were mainly operating in Paddington (39), St. George, Hanover Square (27), and Kensington (20).

TABLE 3

Some Loans to Builders in West London, 1858-1878

1. The London Assurance Corporation, 1858-1868

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Loan (£)</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.C. Wyatt</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>4 ¹⁄₄</td>
<td>Paddington (Tyburnia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Thomas</td>
<td>1861-2</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>St. John's Wood, Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs. Rigby</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paddington (Tyburnia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Pocock</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Notting Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Tippett</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paddington (Bayswater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Aldin</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>South Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A. Halliday</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pembroke Gardens, Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Tildesley</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>St. John's Wood, Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Jefferey</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>South Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Tildersley</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maida Vale, Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>89,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Loan (£)</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin &amp; White</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clunnicarde Gdns, Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin &amp; White</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>28,150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs &amp; Flew</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>West Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.F. Gibbs</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Ashfold</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hogarth Road, Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.B. Johnstone</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Tildersley</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>105,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Some details of the scale on which these builders were operating will be found in Chapter 6.

Source: MS. listed above, p. 162, note 2.
they were all firms of standing, most of them having been in
existence for ten years or more. The conditions which governed
these and other loans made to house builders can be illustrated
from the records of one of the companies, the London Assurance
Corporation. This was an office which was heavily involved
in the mortgage market in the nineteenth century.

The directors of the London Assurance Corporation
first decided to invest in mortgages in 1832. They were
influenced in this by the expansion of the life and fire
business after the turn of the century which yielded more
funds for investment, and also by the erratic fluctuations in
the price of Consols between 1828 and 1832 which encouraged
the directors to think about a broader investment policy.
Their decision to make loans on mortgage coincided with a
drop in the bank rate to 3 per cent and a boom in speculative
company promotions during the mid thirties. In consequence,
the committee responsible for the new business proceeded very

1. The rest of this section is based on the minute books of the
Committee of Treasury, a body appointed by the Court of
Directors but sitting independently. For a general outline
of the main events in the history of the London Assurance

2. The value of the Corporation's funds depreciated to the
extent of £70,843 between June, 1828 and December, 1831, but
appreciated to the extent of £81,067 between 1831 and 1834,
B. Drew, ibid, p.120.
Cautiously, turning down applications for loans from harbour and theatre companies, steam packet lines and factory owners. They also refused to deal with house builders and turned away Thomas Cubitt, perhaps the best known of all the early Victorian builders, in June, 1835, because he was thought to have over-valued his security. In fact, the whole of the first issue went to country landowners and the total amount actually laid out in this way declined from £152,971 in September, 1834 to £135,515 in February, 1836. Later in that year the directors announced that "as a general question, the Corporation were not disposed to lend money for a term of years at less than 5 per cent."

It was not until the end of the 1830s that the London Assurance Corporation began making loans to builders. They had resolved on investing a further £100,000 and the revival of building activity in the West End probably encouraged them to set up an office in Regent Street. In September, 1839 they agreed to lend J. Howell the sum of £25,000 for the completion of houses in Regent Street.

2. Ibid., 31 August, 1836.
3. Ibid., January and September, 1839.
In the following year the directors decided to diversify their investments. They announced that they were no longer willing to tie up funds in big loans to landowners, but had decided to "effect loans in smaller amounts, either in land, or in houses building, and to be built." By the end of 1841 they had advanced £76,000 to builders and the total value of their mortgage assets (£308,101) came to more than all their other investments put together. From then mortgage advances increased, with some ups and downs, to 1873, when they were valued at £1,740,262.

The Committee of Treasury decided all applications for loans except on a few occasions when other directors intervened. They were aided in this work by a surveyor, R. Hesketh, who reported on the value of any estate offered as security and the likelihood of the speculation succeeding. Applications from builders were turned down either because they were thought to be too risky, because of insufficient security, or because the security offered was

1. Ibid., 7 May, 1840. In reply to an application for a loan of £155,000 for 7 years at 4 per cent on the security of freehold estates and mines in Staffordshire.

2. Ibid., 4 October, 1841.

thought to be 'inferior' property. For instance, the Committee turned down an application for £1,000 in 1843 because the houses in Fulham Road offered as security were thought to be of "an inferior description, in a bad situation and occupied by very poor weekly tenants - the whole unworthy of the notice of the Corporation." (1)

The Committee preferred to lend on the security of houses, or at least carcass (unfinished) houses, but the majority of builders with whom they did business obviously disliked saddling their houses with mortgages, and wanted to raise funds on the security of leasehold building plots. In such cases the committee usually asked for the rents of the estate as a collateral and paid out with loans in instalments. Such an arrangement was made with Charles Aldin in 1865 who wanted £20,000 towards building 61 houses. Aldin had taken a lease of market gardens in South Kensington in 1857 and had already invested in houses, sewers and roads. The loan was approved, provided Aldin was willing to offer both the unbuilt portion of the estate and the rents of the completed

---

houses as security, and provided he agreed to insure all his houses with the Corporation.

A similar arrangement was made with J. Tippett in 1865. This builder wanted to borrow £6,000 in order to complete five houses in Powis Square, Notting Hill. The property was more modest than that usually approved by the Corporation and was estimated to let at rents of £140 per annum when finished. The loan was arranged because Tippett owned a lot of house property in Bayswater (some of which had been built with money borrowed from the Sun Insurance Office the year before) and he proposed to give collateral security upon other surplus rentals until the houses in Powis Square were sufficiently productive to pay the interest on the loan.

These builders were typical of the firms which the Committee were prepared to support: mainly contractors erecting big houses rather than builders of small houses or cottage property. Although they usually advanced money for limited purposes and for periods of five to seven years they sometimes allowed these loans to run much longer than this.

1. Ibid., 1 February, 15 February and 18 October, 1865.
2. Ibid., 20 December, 1865. The loan was made out for £4,500.
They also established connection with a few builders which lasted for many years. These favoured customers included some of the leading building contractors in Victorian London, such as Thomas Cubitt and G. Wythes. Builders of this calibre could be expected to bring a lucrative business in fire insurance.

However, the mortgage policy of the London Assurance Corporation and the conditions which governed loans varied according to the amount of money already invested and the amount of building going on. This can be illustrated from the pattern of lending in the 1840s and the 1860s. In the former decade the committee invested just over £300,000 in mortgages between 1840-41, about a third of this to builders, including a major loan of £40,000 to Thomas Cubitt. By 1842 they were being very cautious about any project which looked like involving them in a large outlay. As they pointed out to G.K. Huxley, the owner of a leasehold estate at Notting Hill:

"In the present state of the Investments, it is not desirable to engage in an undertaking which, it is expected, will require loans to the extent

1. They made regular loans to Cubitt, the last of which was paid off in 1864. In the case of Wythes, they took the unusual course of lending £30,000 on the security of railway

Ibid., 8 February, 1865.
of about £150,000 but they would prefer, for the present, lending such sums as they can spare, in smaller amounts and only under very eligible circumstances." (1)

The following year an agent in Liverpool wrote to say that in Liverpool and Birkenhead there was a good field for the employment of funds in mortgages on the security of building land and house property, which may be done through "most respectable and responsible Lawyers here, securing at the same time a great increase of insurances of the best kind." The Committee expressed themselves open to suggestions but as none seemed to be forthcoming went ahead making small loans (£1,000 to £8,000) to London builders.

During the 1860s the pattern of lending suggests that investments in Consols and mortgages were moving together. Mortgage advances to builders simply responded to fluctuations in house building activity: the annual total of loans to builders rose to a peak of £113,100 in 1865, fell off to £19,400 in 1866 (which probably reflected

1. Ibid., 1841-2, especially 4 October, 1842.

2. Ibid., 16 August, 1843. Loans to builders 1840-42 include: M.C. Wyatt (£25,000, 4½%, Paddington); King Bros. (£6,000 5%, Islington); L. Cubitt (£12,000, 5%, Lowndes Square); T. Cubitt (£79,000, 4½%, Belgravia); G.W. Jones (£4,000, 5%, Barnes); and 1842-46. J. Tombs (£2,500, 5%, Knightsbridge); Mullins (£1,000, 5%, Chester Square); G.W. Jones (£7,700, 5%, Barnes); T. Bull (£1,000, 4½%, Dorset Square); D. Murray (£1,800, 5%, Brompton Crescent); L.A. Burton (£4,000, 5%, St. Johns Wood).
the dear money of that year) and climbed back again to
(1) about £100,000 a year in 1868-69. At the height of the
boom the Committee were turning away a procession of
builders, many of them offering security which had been
acceptable on other occasions, and in 1870 loans fell away
again. Perhaps the Committee were more noticeably timid
at this time because of experiences with J. Bailey of Kilburn,
who had recently failed with £27,000 still outstanding in
(2) mortgage loans.

During the 1880s, loans to builders were much less
frequent. According to one writer insurance companies
were reluctant to lend on the security of house property
in this decade because of the depression in house prices:

"Among other classes of London property which come
before life insurance companies for mortgage
purposes are dwelling houses in the West End and
Suburbs. As is well known, big houses ... and ...
what smaller residential property, too, in what
may be called the inner suburbs has suffered
immensely from over building and the continued
tendency of the inhabitants to go further out." (3)

1. Ibid., Minutes, 1860-1870.
2. Ibid., 20 March, 1867. The surveyor was managing the estate
of 66 houses which had come into possession.
3. P.C. Crump, 'The Investments of British Insurance Companies',
J.R. Hart, 'Mortgages', Ibid., pp.70-88.
This does not explain the continued decline in loans to builders in the 1890s, connected with an over-all decline in mortgage holdings. By 1900, mortgages were less than one-third of the value of the assets of the Corporation. According to the Board of Trade returns, the proportion of mortgages in the total assets of all life offices had fallen to 39.3 per cent. in 1900. In fact, mortgages were no longer a sufficient and appropriate form of finance to the companies, and the debentures of home and overseas trading companies became increasingly important in the portfolio of many offices because they offered a better yield and were less trouble to the lender. There was also more competition for 'good' mortgages as new lenders moved into the market. The funds of big charitable organisations had previously been invested in ground rents but now the pressure of growing business was forcing these institutions and the friendly societies to take up mortgages on the security of rates, land and houses. By the 1880s, friendly societies were beginning to figure in the entries of the Middlesex

1. The balance sheets are given in appendix E.

Land Registry. One of these, the Hearts of Oak Society, advanced money for building a new Town Hall and several clubs in Hammersmith, helped members to purchase houses, and in 1896 took the more important step of investing in a building estate at Hornsey, (North London).

The most important aspect of the investment policy of the London Assurance Corporation to the suburban development of West London was the contribution which this company made to the finance of speculative building. And this is why so much attention has been given to it. It must be made clear, however, that the Corporation gave as much, if not more support, to the landed interest with loans on the security of country estates in England and Ireland, and imposed limits on the amount they were prepared to invest on the security of building land and house property. They were very selective in making loans to builders and turned down more applications than they accepted. In any case, insurance funds did no more than supplement the mortgage market. The demand for capital (in both town and country)


2. They also made loans to the London vestries and purchase the bonds and debentures of dock, water, gas and railway companies operating in other parts of London. The details of these loans are included in appendix E.
was sufficiently great to absorb the surplus funds of the insurance companies without discouraging the growth of specialised lenders.

The Growth of specialised lenders

The demand for capital to drain and improve agricultural estates led to the development of specialised lenders in the form of land improvement companies. In the towns a number of specialised lenders developed to provide finance for the capital expenditures of local authorities, the improvement of urban estates, and the building of churches and schools and houses.

It was pointed out earlier that local bodies in London, the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Vestries and district boards acquired lending and borrowing powers after 1855.

Between 1855 and 1870 the Metropolitan Board of Works supplemented the loans made by the insurance companies on the security of rate incomes, but, even in this period, certain London parish bodies, such as the Kensington vestry, raised the greater part of their loan capital from this source.

After 1870, this institution became the most important source of loan capital to vestries and district boards. Between 1870 and 1885, the Board made available £2,134,231 to the vestries and district boards, another £1,783,128 to the Guardians and a further £5,631,356 to authorities set up for special purposes.

The details of these loans, in so far as they affected West London, will be discussed later. It is sufficient to point out here that much of this lending was due to the new school and hospital building programme after 1870. One reason for the increasing contribution made towards the

1. Annual Reports, Kensington Vestry, 1856-1888.

2. London County Record Office, Loans Book of the Metropolitan Board of Works, 1852-1884.
finance of local 'improvements' was that after 1870 the Board was able to offer the best financial terms. The Board lowered the rate charges for loans from 5 to 3½ and even 3 per cent in the years of falling interest rates after 1870; the insurance companies, on the other hand, were reluctant to go below 4½ per cent or to shorten repayment terms. When the London County Council was set up this authority became responsible for providing most of the loan capital of the London parishes and boroughs.

The main private institutions concerned with financing new building in the suburbs were the building societies, including in this a number of organisations, such as the church and school building societies, which made grants rather than loans. The most important providers of loan capital were the land and building societies which functioned to provide house purchasers, investors and builders with small sums of money and also provided a new outlet for the savings of tradesmen and others. The majority of these societies were local concerns rather than City promotions. They were founded as a direct consequence of building and commercial development in the suburbs. This will be made clear in the next
section, which examines the growth and operations of building
and land societies in West London.

The development of the freehold land and building
society movement was not simply a response to economic
pressures. The directors and supporters of building
societies were often actuated by a belief in the civilising
influence of house ownership and a sense of service to the
community. In London it was natural for the societies to
have as directors prominent members of the local community,
persons who were active in the parish councils and in the
promotion of amenities. Those who were willing to give up
leisure time in order to attend the meetings of building
societies were just as likely to be members of committees
connected with the building of churches and hospitals.

Similarly, the freehold land societies were
popularised in the first instance as political organisations.
During the anti-corn law campaign they were important
weapons in the armoury of the radical liberals, used to
create freeholds and the parliamentary votes which went
with them. In the 1850s the aims of the movement
broadened sufficiently to become acceptable to all parties
but the London societies still continued to gather support
from those who managed to combine an investment with
political or social aspirations. During the 1850s and 1860s freehold land societies represented one facet of suburban radicalism.

Much has been written of the moral and political beliefs of the founders of land and building societies. The reason for this is obvious enough. The historians of the movement have been mainly concerned with celebrating the centenaries of particular societies and recording information of interest to the general reader. One consequence of concentrating on the domestic history of the societies has been to avoid discussion of such important matters in the economic history of the movement as the rate, and causes, of dissolutions, and to neglect the economic significance of building societies, in particular, their part in providing finance for house building and investment in property.


2. For a general account of the movement see J. Seymour Price, Building Societies, their origin and history (1958). This answers few of the questions in which economic historians are interested (see the review by T.C. Barker, British Journal continued/
The next section can do no more than touch upon these larger matters. It is primarily concerned with attempting to evaluate the role of land and building societies in financing the suburban development of West London.

Freehold land and building societies in West London

Building Societies had been operating in some parts of the country since 1775, but it was not until the 1840s that the first societies started in Middlesex. By 1853, the number of land and building societies operating in Metropolitan London was 363 of which 15 were promoted in the western parts. In the following two decades another 30-40 societies were promoted in West London but many of these terminated after a few years, leaving 22 societies


1. About 60 of these were freehold land societies.
actually in operation in 1874. The largest number of promotions occurred in the last third of the nineteenth century, due probably to the growth of small incomes in this period. Between 1870 and 1889, 12 permanent societies and 56 terminating societies were promoted in West London. By 1901 15 permanent societies were still in existence with total liabilities (mainly share capital) of just over £600,000.

These statistics do not go very far to suggest the role of building societies in the finance of suburban development. The next step is to distinguish between the organisations involved in this business. The freehold land

1. The main sources for the statistics of the movement are the directories (listed in the bibliography), the registrations under the Friendly Societies Act, 1836 (Public Record Office), and the registrations and incorporations under the Building Societies Act, 1874. Parl. Papers.

2. See also H.O. Horne, loc.cit., especially pp.388-9, 392.

3. More details are included in Appendix F. These figures are taken from the Annual Report of the Chief Registrar, Return of Building Societies, Parl. Papers, 1902 (108, 108-1), xcv.
societies operated by raising capital from the members, buying estates and leasing or selling the building plots. They normally assisted the new purchasers, who were not necessarily members of a land society, with loans. The building societies were of two sorts, permanent and terminating. The latter brought together builders, investors, and intending house owners in order to buy land, and build or purchase houses, but in this case the members were also the borrowers. The principle feature of these societies was that a number of persons agreed to pay a certain amount (usually 10/- a week) into a common fund, from which advances were made to each in rotation, or alternatively, by the ballot and sale of advances. In theory the societies terminated when all the subscriptions were in and the funds used up. The chief feature of the permanent building society was the separation of savers and borrowers. The permanent societies were really saving, investment and loan associations; but they also made

1. Ballot and sale societies in which members drew lots. The minute books of the Paddington building society which started life as a terminating society contain graphic descriptions of this monthly event in the life of the community. In this society members' children went up to the platform and drew the coloured balls.
provision, with subscribers' shares, for those members who wanted both a stake in the society and loan facilities. The permanent societies normally, but not always, made advances on the security of property.

These differences were mainly organisational, rather than differences of function. Freehold land societies, for example, were often indistinguishable from building societies in both membership and functions; and terminating societies were frequently converted into permanent societies. The crucial differences were between the resources, character and policies of the land and building societies.

Freehold land societies - even the smallest - were normally more heavily capitalised than building societies, especially after the Company Acts of 1856 and 1866 facilitated the raising of large capitals to be used in the purchase of estates and the provisions of loans. It was the declared policy of most societies, including the early ones, to finance the purchasers or lessees of building

1. Many societies called themselves land, building and investment societies. Building societies were prohibited from investing in land by the Act of 1832.

2. Before the Act of 1856, the societies were, strictly speaking, prevented from holding land by the Law of Mortmain. This had been circumvented by the directors acting as land agents.
plots which, in West London, at any rate, normally meant the
builders of the houses.

About fourteen freehold land societies were
operating in West London between 1851 and 1881, buying estates
mainly in the outlying suburbs of Notting Hill, Shepherds
Bush and Fulham where land was cheap. They drew capital
from many sources. Some of them were local promotions:
one of the first was the Paddington, St. Marylebone and St.
Pancras Freehold Land Society which bought eight estates
between 1851 and 1854 at a capital cost of £36,000 and
boasted 3,900 members and a capital of £40,000. One of the
last of the local societies to be promoted was the Paddington
Land and Building Society, founded in 1867 as a limited
company with powers to raise £10,000 in £10 shares. Others
were city promotions, such as the London Assurance Freehold

1. Local societies (e.g. the West London Freehold Land Society)
advertised facilities for giving "loans" to builders and
others in the West London Observer in the 1850s.

2. The land and building societies in West London are listed
   in appendix F.


4. Building Societies Guide and Land, Loan and Investment
   Directory (1871).
Land Society which bought a small estate of 6½ acres in Shepherds Bush in 1854. And others were national organisations with capitals running into hundreds of thousands of pounds. The National Land Company, the biggest of them all, bought two small estates in Shepherds Bush in 1874 and 1875 and the United Land Company (formerly the Conservative Land Society) was selling off building plots on three estates at Albion Road, Hammersmith (formerly Beulah Lodge and Gardens), another at Fulham and a third at Twickenham. The last was the only estate intended for first class suburban houses. Despite the large capitals which these and other societies had, their activities as financiers were limited to the particular places in which they had estates.

The building societies were more numerous but generally less well endowed. Although West London was riddled with terminating societies the majority of them had capital resources of no more than a few thousand pounds.

1. Freehold Land Times and Building News, 15 February, 1855.
2. Freeholders Circular, 29 June, 1872 and 9 October, 1875, West London Observer 14 May, 1870. By 1871 the British Land Company had powers to raise £210,000 and the United Land Company £250,000. They paid an average of 8 per cent on the shares and charged from 5 to 6 per cent for advances.
The largest were the Paddington Mutual Benefit Societies, three of which had acquired between them a capital of just over £25,000 in 1884. Contemporaries sometimes distinguished between societies promoted to help lower middle class or working class people to buy houses, and other societies connected with speculative building.

Most of the terminating societies in the new housing areas of West London (and a number of joint-stock land and building companies) were really devices by means of which builders pooled their resources, acquired new capital and guaranteed the sale of houses. They were virtually building clubs, brought into being to finance a row of houses (such as the Hammersmith Grove Association, founded in 1847) or a square (such as the St. James Square Benefit Society, founded in 1849).

In more developed housing districts the terminating societies were mainly concerned with making advances for the purchase of houses and shops. Particularly from the last third of the nineteenth century, they were consciously

---

1. Directory of Building Societies ... with an analysis of balance sheets (1884).
3. They are listed in the Middlesex Land Registry in these years. It is clear from inspecting some of the mortgages that they were lending to builders. They also had builders as directors.
'self-help' organisations, sometimes with a distinctive form. For instance, the Starr Bowkett societies, of which the number of promotions ran into the hundreds, had no interest charges for either shares or advances. The terminating societies with names like Hearth and Home, the Methodist, the Petersburgh and the Reliant, were so many standardised expressions of 'self-help' lending money to clerks, shopkeepers and tradesmen for the purchase of houses or parts of houses in somewhat seedy residential areas. In the district known as St. Peters Park, North Paddington, the inhabitants were constantly on the move and in consequence good class roads tended to degenerate rapidly into slums. At the start of this process in the 1880s there were fourteen building societies involved in making advances to shopkeepers and workingmen. They ranged from national organisations, such as the Temperance Permanent Building Society to small local affairs such as the Second (1) Harrow Road Mutual Building Society. In the last three decades of the century the terminating societies were less important than those of earlier days in the finance of new building and more important as agents for transforming the

1. Church Commissioners, File No. 47184, Parts 4/5, mortgages.
social complexion of housing estates.

The contribution of the permanent societies to suburban development is more difficult to assess. It depended on three factors: first, the number of societies started and the extent to which they built up large capitals, secondly, the extent to which they did business locally or went further afield to make mortgage advances, and thirdly, the policy which they adopted with applications for mortgage advances. In this last respect it is important to know whether they advanced money to builders, house purchasers or investors in house property.

The first of these considerations is illustrated in Table 4, which shows the capital resources and mortgage advances of some of the largest societies in the district in 1871 and 1884. The leading society in West London, and the tenth largest (in terms of capital) in London was the West London Permanent Society, founded in 1851. By 1880 at least one society and in some places as many as five (1) societies were based in each of the parishes. But only a handful of these had succeeded in building up a substantial business in mortgage advances.

---

1. A full list, so far as can be ascertained, is given in appendix F.
The Permanent Building Societies of West London in 1871 and 1884. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Capital (£) (1884)</th>
<th>Mortgage Advances (to 1871) £ (in 1884)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West London Economic</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>21,858</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London Permanent</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>108,189</td>
<td>154,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western and General</td>
<td>1851(?)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Building</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London General</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>139,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater District</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>15,901</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Suburban</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>23,205</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>21,550</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Town</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: --- not in existence, -- not known

1. The main source for these figures are the directories, and the parliamentary returns (from 1875). The latter do not always give capital figures or even membership figures.

2. Probably more than this. The figure is taken from an advertisement in the West London Observer.

3. Ibid.
The West London Building Society was an example of the type. It was promoted by a group of people drawn from the shopkeepers, estate agents and builders of Chelsea, men who combined business enterprise with a belief in the moral and civilising influence of house ownership. The directors were experienced in building society affairs and had good connections with the Freehold Land Society in the district, also with the Commercial Bank of Chelsea. From the start they organised the Society on sound lines, with guidance from Arthur Scratchley, an actuary and the chief advocate in his day of the permanent system of building societies.

The directors started by trying to attract working men as depositors and shareholders. In common with most other London building societies in mid-Victorian years they had little success in doing this. The failure of the building societies to attract working men was explained to a Select Committee in 1850 by the trustee of one society in South London:

"Then with respect to building societies; the one of which I am a trustee started some five years ago, with a considerable majority of

working men; but in the course of its operations, on looking over the list today, I find that there are few who can be strictly called working men left; the punctuality of the payments, the fines, and the arrangements which are essential to the proper working of a society, acting upon men who are occasionally thrown out of employment, and without means altogether, have compelled them to withdraw themselves." (1)

This opinion was later confirmed by the Royal Commission on Friendly and Benefit Building Societies which reported in 1871 that in the "metropolis, the working man seems generally to form only a minority in the permanent societies, as compared with the middle classes". The West London was no exception: depositors appear to have been mainly domestic servants and single women with a sprinkling of smaller professional people, and the shareholders were predominantly tradesmen and builders. The rate of interest paid on deposit money varied with the state of the money

1. Select Committee on the Savings of the Middle and Working Classes, Parl. Papers, 1850 (508), xix, q7, 507.

2. Report, Royal Commission on Friendly and Benefit Building Societies, Parl. Papers, 1871 (c. 452), xxv. However witnesses had different views on this. One difficulty about this evidence is to know what they meant by working men. It is not clear whether they were referring to weekly wage-earners, artisans or casual workpeople.

market; that paid on investment shares depended on the financial condition of the societies. The West London managed to pay 10 per cent on some classes of investment shares in the 1860s.

The capital of the Society grew very slowly at first. This was because it was unfamiliar to local investors, and, what is more, the confidence of potential members was undermined by some irregularities upon the part of one or two officers. Repeated attempts to attract new investors by advertising, holding soirées, and establishing branches, more than doubled the number of shareholders (to 557) between 1851 and 1855, but it was not until the 1860s that the capital had grown sufficiently to encourage a really substantial mortgage business.

**TABLE 5**

West London Benefit Building Society: Growth in Business, 1851-1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade Ending</th>
<th>Assets (£)</th>
<th>Advances (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>18,186</td>
<td>24,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>78,186</td>
<td>130,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>148,234</td>
<td>222,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first fifteen years or so borrowers from the Society were predominantly tradesmen seeking finance for investment in house property or building speculations rather than the purchase of single houses and shops. This is suggested – one can make no stronger claim – by the size of the loans and the kind of property offered as security. During the 1860s the average figure for mortgage advances was £300-£500, sufficient for investment in two or three small houses. Occasionally the Society kept running accounts with a few selected borrowers. The limit on advances was usually twelve years but this, and the type of security accepted by the directors varied considerably from time to time.

At first much of the business was confined to Chelsea and the suburbs nearby, mainly the less favoured streets in such districts as Notting Hill. The Society made no contribution to either building or investment in the best districts of West London. By the 1870s the range of these activities was being extended to South London and the outer suburbs in Middlesex and presumably

---

other societies of a similar standing to the West London were doing the same. This outward flow of funds from the permanent societies was compensated, however, by a supply of mortgage advances from societies promoted in other parts of London and the City. Probably about a dozen societies, apart from local promotions, had the resources to become involved in mortgage transactions in West London, The London and Westminster Building Society, the Temperance Permanent and the Birkbeck were certainly making loans to builders in the suburbs of Notting Hill, Shepherds Bush and Brompton from the 1860s; and by the late 1870s so far as can be ascertained, four other societies were making advances on the security of house property in Hammersmith. They were the Sun, the City Mutual, the Monarch and the Conservative.

The relationship between building society promotions and finance, on the one hand, and other forms of investment,

1. And professional staff. The part-time directors disliked using their leisure time in travelling to inspect property.

2. The Middlesex Land Registry contains some of the mortgages of the Birkbeck and Temperance Permanent, the two largest societies in London in 1871. The Kensington Central Library have some mortgages of the London and Westminster Building Society. For the other societies, see the reference book of the Hammersmith and Acton Railway, 1879.
particularly investment in housing, was very complex and requires further explanation. The promotion of building was one of the ways in which finance was made available to sustain the boom. This occurred in 1847-8 when there was something of a building society bubble in London, and again in 1867-8. Building Societies, both terminating and permanent, were easy to start, and borrowed money from the banks or used deposit money to finance mortgage advances. The West London, for example, traded with bank loans and deposit money during the early 1850s. But the business of trading with loan capital exposed the Society to pressures in the money market and to failures in the building trade. In 1853-4 advances stood at £3,215 but by 1858 this figure had dropped to £561. 1855 was a particularly difficult year: profits fell away, arrears on shares went unpaid, withdrawals exceeded deposits, borrowers failed and property came into possession and was sold at a loss. It was not until 1863 that the Society recovered from the setbacks of the 1850s and in that year

1. For the building society promotions in the 1840s, see Anon, Building Societies and their Traducers (1844); The Times, 12 January, 1844 and 5 October, 1844 and J.H. James, A Guide to Benefit Building Societies (1849), p.23.

2. Minute Book, West London Building Society, i (1851-1856). The rest of this paragraph is based on this source and volume ii (1856-1865).
advances stood at £10,728 - more than the total of the previous ten years.

Other new societies, eager to secure business, behaved in the same way. Thus the Paddington Land and Building Society, Ltd., issued 301 shares in 1868, but in 1870, only £6 per £80 share had been paid in. Yet the Company advanced £4,090 over this period, presumably with borrowed money. In the first five years of the life of the Magnet Building Society only 25 shareholders were acquired, yet mortgages totalled £2,817 between 1868 and 1873. The records of this Society show that in 1868-9 and in 1878-80, they made quite large advances to builders. One of these was Thomas Tilbury who borrowed £12,000 between 1879-80 secured on various properties in Tilbury Terrace, Percy Villas and Anderson Terrace, Kensal Town. Percy Villas was


2. The Magnet Building Society was founded in 1868 by members of the trading community in Paddington. The directors included a butcher, dairymen, ham dealer and a dyer. In addition to making advances to builders, they also made smaller loans of about £300 each to borrowers, mainly tradesmen, on the security of houses and shops. Details from Minute Book, *Magnet Building Society*, i (1868-1885).
Fluctuations in the Mortgage Advances of Building Societies (1)

(1) WEST LONDON BUILDING SOCIETY
(2) MAGNET BUILDING SOCIETY
(3) CHELSEA BUILDING SOCIETY
(4) WESTBOURNE PARK BUILDING SOCIETY

eventually let by the society at rents from 10/- to 12/- a week. The directors complained about the poor conditions of the property which was occupied by a "rough class of

1. Based on the Annual Reports.
tenants" on whom they had to distrain for the rents. (1)

Judging from the rest of the property in possession in 1881 - which was considerable - the Society had been making advances on the security of small terraced houses in Paddington, Fulham, Hammersmith, Willesden and Camberwell.

On the other hand building societies were also founded when the money market was alleged to be tight. For example, two societies were promoted in 1856 by builders anxious to keep in business. The Crown Land and Permanent Building Society was ostensibly concerned with "offering facilities to tradesmen, builders and professional men". (2)

In fact, the Society was a cloak for the activities of C. Maidlow, the manager, who was also a builder operating from St. Johns Wood, Shepherds Bush, Walworth and the City.

Maidlow had just recovered from an action brought by two creditors of his business, namely, a local developer and (3) the Temperance Permanent Building Society. Another

1. A similar complaint was made of houses in Cheesons Road, Fulham, 3 August, 1882. This was the security of a firm of builders, Messrs. Maycock and Brightley.


3. Public Record Office, B9/313. A debt of £4,512 to the Temperance was secured on six houses in Alma Square and another of £2,994 to J. Ponsford, a builder, was secured on a public house and two shops and four unfinished houses. Maidlow was an ex beer retailer, dealer and chapman.
organisation, promoted in 1856, was the Notting Hill and West London Perpetual Investment, House, Land and Building Association, Ltd. The object of this enterprise was "to advance money to builders on their becoming members to enable them to complete the buildings now at a standstill for want of money".

The facilities of societies like these did not amount to much in their early years, even when they borrowed money to finance advances. What then was the policy of the larger societies, such as the West London Building Society, after it had become established in local confidence? The capital of the West London grew rapidly during the 1860s due largely to the reforms carried out by the directors with the aid of new officers, such as C.R. Stanestby, an estate agent and an important figure in building society annals. Shares were re-organised, much of the loan capital (which still amounted to £15,678) in 1857) paid off, and a more adequate reserve established. In consequence the directors adopted a more cautious policy during the boom of 1868-9, carefully inspecting each application for a loan and temporarily

contracting operations "rather than make advances, however promising, on unlet and speculative property." They made few advances in the second half of 1871 when building in London was very depressed, and, in consequence had surplus and unemployable funds. In this situation they had two courses open to them. One possibility was to stimulate mortgage loans. During the early 1870s the directors tried to do this by reducing the rate of interest charged on advances from the 7 per cent charged in 1868-9 to 5 per cent. They also extended the repayment periods on loans to 17 years and even started to make loans on the security of their own shares rather than house property. An alternative course was to invest surplus funds in securities, which the West London Building Society did in 1878. They also turned builders away in this year, preferring to make long loans to the purchasers of single houses. The general principle underlying these moves was explained by the chairman

1. Dr. H.J. Dyos points out that E. Yates, a South London builder, had used building societies in the late 1860s but had to turn to solicitors in 1871. C. Brooks also mentions that the Woolwich made few advances in the second half of 1871 in The First Hundred Years, The Woolwich Equitable Building Society (1947), p.60.

2. Some societies had started to invest in securities in 1871. The London and Westminster Building Society for example suspended operations in 1871 because of the large amount of capital locked up in unproductive securities. Building Societies Gazette, 1 March 1877.
in his annual report:

"The experience of both this and of other building societies has shown that it is desirable, so far as may be compatible with perfect security, to offer much easier terms to borrowing members than were attempted in the infancy of building societies; and thus to encourage the application of building society principles to a higher class of property and to a larger and less speculative class of borrowers, than such societies have usually attracted."

(1)

These sentiments were echoed by the chairmen of other societies, including the chairman of the Birkbeck who explained that his Society was investing surplus funds in bonds and debentures and in loans to house owners on good security, "though they could have made a great deal of money during the past year had they been inclined to lend money to builders who wished to erect streets of houses, but they saw that buildings were being run up ...... built like a pack of cards, to sell and not to last."

(2)

During the 1880s and early 1890s, building societies in West London (and elsewhere) seemed to have been less willing to finance speculative building than previously.

(3)

2. Building Societies Gazette, 1 August, 1878.
3. With some exceptions as the celebrated failure of the Liberator Building Society showed.
Three reasons can be suggested for this. First, a number of societies promoted at this time had more pronounced social interests. For instance, Westbourne Park Building Society was founded largely through the efforts of the Reverend Dr. Clifford and others of the Westbourne Park Chapel and Institute. The Society and its branches at Queens Park and Kilburn, were a part of the general apparatus of sick clubs and slate clubs organised by the Institute in addition to the educational facilities provided for the young people, clerks and shop assistants in Paddington.

Secondly, new societies found sufficient business with traders and investors in house property. The advances made by the North West Building Society in Paddington in 1886 were typical of this sort of business. The Society borrowed £2,000 from the Paddington Land and Building Society at 4.5 per cent on 28 March, 1886 and made four advances to local tradesmen of £700, £750, £375 and £275 at 5 per cent for 12 years on 28 March, 1886. The North

---

1. Collection of letters etc. (on the founding of the society), Anon, *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: Historical Notes to Commemorate the pastorate of Dr. Clifford, 1858-1908*, (1908). The annual reports of the Westbourne Park Society show that they started with a capital of £5,717 and had expanded to a capital of £788,000 by 1910.

Paddington Building Society, incorporated in 1885, also had a small business with traders and house purchasers in Paddington, North Kensington and Hornsey. Most of their mortgage advances were for sums of £300 and £250. It was not until 1900 that the Society adopted a more adventurous policy and, in that year, made a loan of £1,000 on the security of houses at Orpington, Kent. Societies such as these had no larger capitals than many of the terminating (1) societies promoted in the last two decades of the century.

Thirdly, the directors of the established or larger societies were, with some exceptions, even more cautious in making mortgage advances than previously, despite the continuing growth of capital. The annual reports of the main societies in London repeatedly emphasised the need for restraint in the conduct of business during the housing depression of the early 1880s and also later. For instance, the Chelsea Building Society, founded in 1879 was dealing in 1883 "most cautiously with the applications for loans on

1. In fact, the North Paddington evolved from the 2nd St. Peters Park Building Society, incorporated in 1879. The minute books, 4 vols., 1879-1905, are not very informative, probably because the career of the society was uneventful and its membership small.

2. Many of them were reported in the Building Societies Gazette.
securities of a dubious character and by those engaged in erecting property of an inferior description." Similar remarks were made by the directors of other societies in 1889, a year which the chairman of the Temperance Permanent described as one calling for the exercise of great judgment in the selection of properties because of the "changing circumstances of suburban districts." Even in 1891-3, when building in London revived again, the Chelsea directors were still claiming to be avoiding loans on unfinished property so as not to encourage speculation.

One conclusion to be drawn from this discussion is that the main contribution made by building societies to the finance of new building in West London (especially the building of small houses) was limited to about thirty years, from the 1850s to the building boom of 1878-9, but even during the 1870s some of the established societies were turning builders away, particularly if they required large

3. Annual Reports, Chelsea Building Society (1891, 1893). It proved difficult to identify the proportion of builders (if any) amongst the borrowers of this society.
loans or advances on the security of unfinished property.
The impression sometimes given by some historians of the movement that building societies did not normally finance house builders is mainly due to concentrating on the history of the movement in the late nineteenth century.

**Solicitors as financiers**

The developers and builders operating in suburban London in the nineteenth century sought finance wherever they could; and many of them succeeded in securing loans by contacting a firm of solicitors. This final section is concerned with indicating the special role that solicitors had in the finance of suburban development.

Solicitors had long been engaged in money lending activities and the London and country attorneys of the eighteenth century drew part of their income from managing landed estates, negotiating loans and lending money.

By the early nineteenth century they were very much in

---


demand both as experts in conveyancing and as men of business. Solicitors undertook a good deal of the new administrative work created by the growth of London at a time when suitably trained men were not available. In West London as elsewhere they held important posts with the Turnpike Trusts, bridge companies, public utilities and local vestries.

Solicitors also acted as the agents to suburban landowners and as secretaries to building societies, and in both these capacities they were naturally brought into houses. Thus the offices of the firm of Richardson, Sadleir and Richardson in Golden Square were the headquarters of at least three building societies and the firm also made loans to (1) builders in Kensington.

Unfortunately no records of these or any other firms with business interests in West London have come into public hands. However, the financial records of a south London solicitor, E. Chester, show that he also had an interest in building societies and that between 1869 and 1872 he made numerous small loans of £200 to £2,300 to tradesmen, builders and publicans in Wandsworth, Kennington, Stockwell, Walworth, (2) Hammersmith and Putney.

1. One of these was the Notting Hill Building Society. C. Richardson also came into possession of the Norland Estate (see pp. 247-8, below).
2. London County Record Office, Business Records, Chester ms.
More information is available about the activities of solicitors on particular estates in West London. The most common route to money lending was through the agency of a suburban estate. Most often this position was held by a lawyer in London; but provincial lawyers, usually country solicitors, did much landed business and often looked after the urban holdings of provincial landowners. They were, however, only one of many estate officials. The more important landowners tended to employ specialised estate agents and the owners of very small holdings often used professional land agents. Surveyors also had responsibilities for urban estate management. But the owners of urban estates usually turned to their solicitors when they wanted to borrow money, and the developers and builders in the suburbs frequently employed them as rent collectors, estate managers and financial advisers. The leases of land and houses at Notting Hill show that between 1842 and 1878 at least twenty firms and probably more were

deeply involved in the estate business.

Unlike members of the Bar, solicitors as a rule stood little chance of amassing a fortune out of legal practice alone and conveyancing, which occupied an ever increasing proportion of a solicitor's time, was generally regarded as being not particularly remunerative. Solicitors turned, in consequence, to outside business interests - finance, speculative building and that most lucrative activity, the promotion of railways.

It was a short step from conveyancing and estate work to arranging loans and then to speculating on their own behalf. Most firms who have been identified as operating in West London supplied their own as well as their clients' money to builders; and some of them actively engaged in building speculations. For instance, the firm of Roy, Blunt, Duncan and Blunt became heavily involved in building speculations in the early Victorian suburb of Notting Hill. At first this firm carried on a conventional business,

1. M. Birk, Gentlemen of the Law (1960), pp.227, 249. He quotes the Daily Telegraph for 1895 which published a list of 43 solicitors who died within the previous five years leaving fortunes averaging £117,000: the most fruitful source was railways.
occasionally raising loans for country clients. They also acted as the solicitors to the Hammersmith Bridge Company. After 1837 the partners split up and attached themselves to various builders. Duncan advanced money to builders in St. Marylebone and with a partner took on a building venture at Notting Hill; whilst W. and G. Roy had a hand in several building speculations in the same area. The younger Roy not only financed builders here and elsewhere in London but with money borrowed from other solicitors bought and sold land on his own account. Perhaps his most profitable deal was in 1846 when he leased land from Felix Ladbroke at a peppercorn rent, invested in sewers and roads and, after paying off the balance of a loan, cleared £18,000 from the sale of improved ground rents. As Roy also helped to promote the West London Railway and acted as the solicitor to the London and Southampton Railway, in which both he and his clients held shares, the major part of

1. London Assurance Corporation, 22 October, 1834.

2. Information from two sources: the Middlesex Land Registry has details of the mortgage loans (see B.4/28 and B.6/398, 1846 and B.10/62, 63 for 1852). The other is the MSS. of the Ladbroke Estate in the London County Record Office (see mortgage, 8 January, 1855; abstract, 1855; declaration of Trust, 1865).
of his income must have come from this mixture of financial
(1)
and legal business.

The activities of two other firms, chosen from many similar cases, reinforces the point that solicitors did not confine themselves to one area or a single builder and that they did not merely negotiate loans but acted as speculators as well. One of these was Thomas Angell, a local solicitor resident in Paddington and a member of the vestry. Between 1846 and 1867 he became interested in three building speculations: one of these was in the Grove, Hammersmith, another was situated on the Paddington estate and a third speculation was at Stoke Newington. In the case of the last venture Angell attempted to raise £22,000 (2) for building 31 houses and a tavern. Another firm was that of Fearon, Clabon and Fearon, solicitors of Lincoln's Inn, who evidently had a number of builders as clients, for

1. Prospectus, London and Southampton Railway; West London Railway (i.e. the Birmingham, Bristol and Grand Junction Railway).

in 1867 they were negotiating loans for a builder at
Dulwich as well as builders at Notting Hill. When a
developer failed in 1871 they took over the building
speculation and in the next five years developed Colville
Square and district along the eastern boundary of Notting
Hill by financing the builders who took the leases. In
this case the firm had a building speculation thrust upon
(1) them.

The type of capital finding its way into one
estate development is shown in Table 6, which gives the
indebtedness of G.H. Blake, a landowner and developer of a
building estate at Notting Hill. The money which he
raised was used to improve the estate and to finance the
builders. It would not be unreasonable to argue from this
case that at least a part of the money raised by solicitors
was not blind capital seeking an extra half per cent but
funds held in trust for widows, younger sons and daughters.
This explains perhaps why the developer was able to raise
finance in 1856-7, years in which there was said to be a
shortage of funds for building. All these loans were made

Some leases are kept by the Kensington Public Library
(see B.R.A./573, leases of Colville Square).
### TABLE 6

The Indebtedness of G.H. Blake, Landowner and Developer,

Notting Hill, 1852-1863

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To Whom Due</th>
<th>Arranged by</th>
<th>Amount: £s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>G. Smith, Rev. Bayley</td>
<td>Smith and Bayley (Solicitors)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Janson and Cooper</td>
<td>Lake, Kendal, Lake (Solicitors)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Haughter</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Simmonds</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Miss Seth</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Weightman</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Allom</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Pocock (Landowner and Builder)</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>G. Lake</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>9,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(On behalf of Miss Lake, G. Lake, B. Cree, Rogers Trustees, Mrs. E. Lake's Trustees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>G. Lake and J. Lake</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark and Iye</td>
<td>Paid Direct</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Auctioneers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cato (Civil Engineer)</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Carlow</td>
<td>Lake, Kendal, Lake</td>
<td>6,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(On behalf of Else's Trustees, J. Lake, W. Lake's Trustees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To Whom Due</th>
<th>Arranged by</th>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Honeywood, Harrison and Cobb (On behalf of Misses Honeywood, Lady Coopers Trustees, G. Lake, Lake's Trustees, Moor's Trustees, J. Lake)</td>
<td>Transfer of mortgages by Honeywood, Harrison and Cobb</td>
<td>31,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Honeywood, Harrison and Cobb (Solicitors) and C. Lake</td>
<td>Paid Direct Ditto</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Honeywood, Harrison and Cobb (On behalf of W. Honeywood, Huggins and Cato, Palmer and Wimble, Mrs. Thompson, B. Greene, Miss Lock, Weinholt and Lake, Miss Denne, Messrs. Solly and Denne, Miss Jane Lake, B. Lake, J. Lake, G. Lake, Sarah Lake, Marion Lake, A. Lake, C. Lake, M. Lake)</td>
<td>Reorganisation of mortgages by Honeywood, Harrison and Cobb (1)</td>
<td>53,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honeywood, Harrison and Cobb (On behalf of St. John Jeffreys, C. Lake, F. Slater, Ramell and Lake, Huggins and Cato, R. Lake)</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>18,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Source: Blake MSS. London County Record Office
at a rate of 4\frac{1}{2} to 5 per cent interest. In fact no case has been discovered of a solicitor lending or borrowing money at more than 5\frac{1}{2} per cent, even when building society loans were as high as 7\frac{1}{2} per cent.

The extent to which trust funds were used for making loans to speculative builders is difficult to demonstrate, but the legislation of the late 1870s which restricted the disposal of trust funds in this way was sufficiently important to the housing industry to attract comment. Even after this time, however, solicitors continued to use these funds. The Chief Registrar quoted one case of a solicitor of 43 years standing who financed speculative building to the extent of £75,000 between 1889 and 1900. These advances were made from his own money, clients' money, and trust funds.

Despite the growth of financial institutions in the nineteenth century, the capital market was still imperfect. First, a good deal of borrowing was undertaken on a personal basis. For example, developers and builders starting out in business raised money from friends, relatives, landowners and other builders. Secondly, the supply of loanable funds depended to some extent on

---

1. The Institute of Builders argued that the recent decisions by which the money lent by trustees on mortgages was limited had been one factor in causing the depression in building. This evidence was given before the Royal Commission on the Depression in Trade and is commented on in the Builder, L (1886-1), p.63.

2. Board of Trade, Bankruptcy Returns, Parl. Papers, 1903 (318), xciii, p.20.
the policies and financial condition of particular institutions such as the building societies and the owners of urban estates. Thirdly, solicitors were able to tap an apparently inexhaustible reservoir of loan capital which they made available at 5 or 5\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent. This part of the market appears to have been little influenced by the competing uses for capital in the commercial metropolis or overseas. Solicitors were the main source of building finance when the funds supplied by other institutions were drying up.

The number of financial institutions, the different ways in which they behaved, and the many sources from which they borrowed money to lend to builders probably explains some of the difficulties which economic historians have had in generalising about the supply of building finance in the nineteenth century. Moreover the effect of monetary and capital conditions on the business of a particular builder depended on the sort of financial contacts which he had made, and also on the scale of his operations, the kind of houses he built and the extent to which his business rested on the insecure basis of credit rather than loan capital. This is pursued further in the next two chapters which examine the investment of savings in developing real property and building houses.
CHAPTER 4

The Development of Real Property

"London .... is what it is from the fortuitous condition of the various properties over which it has rambled .... and the rationale of the subsequent growth of the largest town in the world is to be found in the attorney's office and the builder's counting house. It was the simple unchecked competition of rival estates sent into the market to hustle against each other."


"Many fortunes have been made and some have been impaired by speculations in houses or building land, which depend for their value in great measure on circumstances over which the owner has no control. A sagacious purchaser may perhaps see that a railway must sooner or later be made through the property, or that it is likely to become more eligible for residential purposes. It can hardly be called toiling and spinning to receive the rents for the time being, and watch the turn of the market."


This chapter identifies the sources of capital invested in developing real property. It examines, first, the purchasers of land, the way in which they responded to the opportunities of developing urban estates. It then attempts to show how the profits made in developing real property were re-invested in urban enterprise.
Buying up the land

The western parishes of London had been a favoured area for buying up land a long time before the nineteenth century. These purchases had been acts of social investment in social position as much as in economic enterprise. The western parishes had also known the speculator in real estate long before the suburbs were built over. They were affected, for example, by the great land boom of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, when courtiers and financiers carved into the old manor of Kensington to such effect that the gains which they made in speculative land deals were comparable to any made during Victorian times.

The majority of private owners of land in the western parishes of early Victorian London had acquired their estates during the eighteenth century; but the corporate owners had held their estates since the sixteenth century.

1. For the stories of how 'Bub' Dodington cleared £1,300 in 1581 and Sir Walter Cope netted a profit of £1,400, see W.J. Loftie, Kensington, Picturesque and Historical (1888) pp. 62–68.

2. The western parishes beyond Westminster escaped the break up of large corporate estates and their absorption by London during the Reformation. The Church estates were used to endow new sees. For example, Edward VI transferred the Manor of Paddington from the Bishop of Westminster to Ridley, Bishop of London.
The landowners can be readily identified by examining the maps drawn up between 1838 and 1847 for the purpose of redeeming the tithes, in which the ownership of land was charted for the first, and as it turned out, the last time. Table 7 shows the structure of landowning in the four parishes of Paddington, Kensington, Hammersmith and Fulham in the early 1840s.

The largest estates in the western parishes of London belonged to the Church who were, in normal circumstances unable to sell land. The Bishop of London held sway over a 1,065 acres in Paddington and Fulham and, as the manorial lord of Hammersmith, controlled another 230 acres there; and the Dean and Chapter of Westminster owned an estate of 230 acres in North Paddington. The Bishop's holdings were part of church property that extended from Hackney in the East to Fulham in the west with an acreage that was equivalent to some of the largest estates in the County of Middlesex. The Bishop's estates situated as they were in close proximity to London, yielded even in 1842 far more revenue than the parks and grazing lands of the county aristocracy.

1. The Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's also held 24,000 acres of land in Middlesex and another 21 estates belonged to the Prebends attached to the Cathedral. For the extent and value of Church holdings at different dates in the London area, see the Returns of the Ecclesiastical Commission: Report of the Estates Commission, Leasehold Property, Parl. Papers, 1882 (148), I and Select Committee on Town Holdings Parl. Papers., 1887 (260), xiii (evidence, C. Harrison).
TABLE 7
Landownership in West London, 1839-44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Landowners (no.)</th>
<th>Landowners (per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 plus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8
The Principal Freeholders in West London, 1839-44
( Owning estates of 25 acres or more)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Acreage (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church, Charity, College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristocracy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railways, Canals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Gentry, Bankers, Professions, Tradesmen, Builders)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 41 4,391

1. Representing about 70 per cent of the total land in the four parishes.

Source: The Apportionment Maps for Paddington, Kensington, Hammersmith and Fulham.
Only ten private owners had estates of more than a hundred acres but twenty five had estates of 25 to a 100 acres each, many of them situated in Kensington, a parish in which the only church land was the vicar's glebe. These leading private owners were mainly members of the aristocracy and landed gentry with property in other parts of the country. Some of them were members of families of ancient lineage such as the Talbots of Middlesex and the St. Quintins of Yorkshire who had bought agricultural land near London in order to consolidate their territorial position. But they also included more recent recruits to landed society who had bought or acquired land in the eighteenth century. The most spectacular example of social mobility was that of William Edwardes, first Baron Kensington, originally a ship's purser from Wales who had acquired both land and title in 1769 with a runaway marriage to Elizabeth Rich, daughter of the 5th Earl of Warwick. More typical


2. Burke's *Complete Peerage*. The 3rd Earl of Harrington was already a nobleman when he acquired an estate at Earls Court by marriage to the daughter of John Fleming, a City merchant.
perhaps was the purchase of 800 acres at Notting Hill
during the eighteenth century out of the wealth of Sir
Richard Ladbroke, a banker and a leading citizen of London,
Lord Mayor and Colonel of the City Militia. The banking
business of Ladbroke, Kingscote and Co., was eventually
taken over by Glyn Mills and Co., whose founder, Sir
Richard Glyn, had a career in the eighteenth century which
also progressed from finance to politics and then to land-

(1)

owning. Yet another example of this was the purchase of
land by Sir Joseph Neeld who inherited a large fortune
(estimated at £890,000) from his great uncle, a London
goldsmith, in 1827, and with this money bought land in
Paddington and in the district of Chippenham for which

(2)
borough he was an M.P.

The lesser freeholders, owning estates of from
25 to 100 acres were a more socially diverse group,
including aristocrats and landed gentry but also
representatives of the professions, merchants and bankers,
tradesmen, builders and brickmakers. Thus the freeholders
in Hammersmith included the Rev. Askew, a clergyman, John

1. Ladbroke Estate Act, 1 & 2 Geo iv, c.26 (Private);
2. Builder, xiv (1856), p.208
Bridges, a City goldsmith, James and Stephen Gomme, a firm of auctioneers, and a family of builders and brickmakers with the name of Bird.

The demand for land in the western parishes near to London was such that it was neither desirable nor possible to build up and retain very large estates, and by 1842 all the parishes had attracted a numerous body of freeholders who owned less than ten acres of land each and an even larger number of freeholders with holdings of less than one acre each. Hammersmith had the largest number of these small owners, probably due to the expansion of the river side village into a relatively large local settlement.

The buying up of land can be regarded as the initial phase in a migration of capital into the western suburbs of London. The possibility of making money out of land and building development accelerated this migration and new investors came into suburban districts to buy land for building speculations and to work the soil for bricks and gravel. The process was already well underway by 1842. An early example of the new investor in urban enterprise was Robert Gunter, a London pastrycook, who bought land in Chelsea and Kensington in the late
eighteenth century and employed George Godwin, the
architect and for over forty years the editor of the
Builder, to lay part of this out in what is now known as
Gunter's Grove and district. The estate yielded a
modest fortune to Gunter's son, a lieutenant in the Irish
Guards, who sold one small piece of the estate for the
princely sum of £10,000 in 1842.

In the 1820s and 1830s professional people,
particularly solicitors, purchased a number of building
estates: C.H. Alexander, a London solicitor bought land
in Kensington during the 1820s and laid this out as
Alexander Square and district; James Whitchurch an
attorney from Southampton bought 50 acres of land on the
borders of Hammersmith and Kensington in 1837 at the price,
it was said of £10 per acre; and in the same year Charles
Richardson, another solicitor, bought and started to
develop the Norland estate at Notting Hill.

1. Gunter Estate Act, 1 Geo. iv, sess. 1820; London County
   Record Office, Gunter estate, leases and mortgages.
2. W.C. Hazzlitt, The Hazzlitts (1912), p.79; F.M. Gladstone,
   Notting Hill in Erygone Days (1924), p.1412; Middlesex
   Deeds Registry, E3, nos. 134, 137-8 (1842).
The house builder was also in possession of parish lands by 1839, financing his purchases with borrowed funds or with the profits made in building houses. Two notable examples of this kind of freeholder were T.H. Marriot and W. Anderson. The former was an ironmonger and speculative builder whose activities ranged from Knightsbridge to Hammersmith. The latter was an engineer to the Grand Junction Water Works Company who died in 1844 still owing £11,000 on account of his latest building speculation in Paddington. Anderson operated on two estates and as middleman and financier in the creation of an early Victorian slum in Kensington, the rookery called 'Little Hell' on the lands of the Camden Charity in the 1820s.

The arrival of these adventurers in suburban building before 1839 was a preliminary to the rush of speculative land buying which in the space of forty years completely transformed both the character and the structure of land-owning in the suburbs. Many of the owners of agricultural

---

1. The main sources for this paragraph are: Scott Estate, leases 1824-1841 in the Hammersmith Borough Library and Anderson Estate, leases 1825-1844 in the Paddington Borough Library.
estates, recorded in 1842, were replaced by capitalists and builders.

It is unnecessary to detail all the changes in landowning which, in some districts, resulted in the complex sub-division of the original building estates. The first owners were sometimes just speculators in land who made profits by preparing this for building and selling it in small building plots at 'improved' prices. Building and land companies in West London normally disposed of their holdings in this way. The investment which they made was intentionally short-term and did not involve them in the hazards and responsibilities of long-term estate development. Moreover, some of the first investors purchased estates with borrowed money and when they were unsuccessful in forming ground rents had to pay this back usually by selling land at 'knock down' prices. Some examples of this will be given later. Occasionally an investor might buy up several pieces of land in order to form a more compact building estate; but in general the trend in the distribution of suburban land was towards a multiplication of owners and a more minute sub-division of holdings.
The owners of the principal building estates are listed in appendix B. It is clear from this list that capital invested in the purchase of building estates was drawn from many parts of the country and not just the City of London. Private investors came from as far away as Cornwall, Southampton and Nottingham; and some of the land companies were provincial organisations. R. Birkin, a Nottingham manufacturer and said to be "a very wealthy gentleman" was an example of the former; the Midland and Reading Land Companies were examples of the latter.

The new investors in land in West London were predominantly private individuals, mainly professional men, but also merchants and manufacturers and builders. They were the 'capitalists' to whom the advertisers of building land addressed their sale notices. One of these is worth quoting as an example:

"Freehold ground rents may be considered as the best, safest and most advantageous investment of capital, for while the Public Funds are subject to great variations of price, and liable to

---

1. Birkin acted on the advice of his solicitors and bought a piece of Ravenscourt Park through them from Scott's trustees for development as a building speculation. This was at the end of the century: Plan of Land to be Let on Building Lease in Ravenscourt Park, Hammersmith Central Library.
occasionl depreciation in the rate of interest, the owner of freehold ground rents has a permanent property, which experience has abundantly proved to be superior to any other source of income and they have the remarkable and exclusive quality of increasing in value by long enjoyment .......

The formation of ground rents has been the study and occupation of many of the most intelligent men of the day, and is accomplished by the purchase of freehold land, to be let on building leases. The continuous increase of the Metropolis, by extension into the suburbs, affords frequent opportunities for such operations; the present sale of ground rents exhibits a striking instance of the success of a well conducted plan of this kind. Part of the same estate consists of building land in Chelsea and Fulham, of considerable extent, to be sold at a price which may enable purchasers to effect a similar result." (1)

Joint stock companies never formed more than a small proportion of the enterprises involved in land and building development. It is true that building companies were promoted during booms but few of them seemed to have lasted for very long. Freehold land companies were promoted for different reasons, as we have already observed, and operated in the outer suburbs where the land was cheaper. It was exceptional for estates in West London to be larger than 50 to 100 acres, and the majority of them were much smaller than this. They could be managed, therefore, by private individuals. It was not

1. London County Record Office, Gunter Estate, sale notice, 1856.
until the late nineteenth century when large tracts of land in Fulham and the outer suburbs in Middlesex came into the market that investors with greater financial security than private individuals usually had become really important. This trend was continued after 1918 when the electric railways opened up the large clay plain which lay between Acton and Uxbridge.

**Investment in improving estates**

The expansion of London brought lucrative opportunities to the existing owners of agricultural land as well as attracting new purchasers of building estates. How did the landowners respond to the opportunity of developing their urban estates and attempt to attract capital to them? And how far did they commit their own capital in creating the basic conditions which would make their estates 'go'? The best course to adopt in answering these questions is to give some examples illustrating different estate policies.

The first examples are of landowners who, in effect, threw away their opportunities either because they had not the resources or the powers to fully exploit their
estates or because they lacked the foresight to do so.

Perhaps the most striking example of an improvident sale of land in the late nineteenth century was that made by Spencer involving land in Chelsea that was later to become valuable suburban property. The only comparable event to this in West London was the sale of the Ladbroke holdings in North Kensington in 1847 but this was due mainly to the death of the owner and the failure of the main developer. The corporate owners in London managed their estates particularly badly in the early nineteenth century and the chapter estates granted the major part of the increase in revenues from building to their tenants. The history of Church estates in Georgian London, including the Bishop

2. This is discussed below, p. 247.
3. Tenants of the Church had been in possession for so many years that they were able to lay claim to considerable tenant rights. See Royal Commission on Episcopal and Capitular Revenues, Parl. Papers, 1862 (470), viii, QQ.460, 466 and Select Committee on Town Holdings, op.cit., (1887), QQ.4008-4010.
of London's estate in Paddington, was a chapter of lost opportunities.

Failure of enterprise upon the part of suburban landowners sometimes resulted in the formation of slums. A number of landowners leased their estates for very short terms or leases for lives and at very low rents. They succeeded in encouraging the investment of modest sums by small builders and middlemen. For example, in the early nineteenth century, the small owners of land on the eastern boundary of Notting Hill made this available to a migratory group of pig masters who settled in the district. Other plots were then sold to about thirty two 'building' owners, including local builders and building societies, who put up about 3,000 cottages (average rental about 3/9d a week) on 3½ acres of land. The district was entirely without any social amenities. In 1838, Southwood Smith drew the attention of the Poor Law Commission to a monster nuisance, a large stagnant pool call the 'Ocean', but in 1849 the area was still undrained, the houses described as 'mere hovels' surrounded by banks of offal, and the water supply coming

from a rented pump nearby.

Cases of uncontrolled and small scale development of this kind were not uncommon in West London, particularly in Fulham. They represented a failure of enterprise and control on the part of suburban landowners as well as a weakness in building regulations. Later on most of this property was cleared to make way for a better class of houses. Thus the Gravel Pits—an estate of 22 acres in Kensington—was leased by the Camden Charity for building purposes in 1786 for a rent of only £22: most of the profits from this development of small cottages went to the middleman who subleased for £100. In 1869 the Charity knocked these houses down and re-leased the land for building purposes. This was one of the improvements which helped to increase the income of the Camden Charity from £667 in 1853 to about £3,500 a year in 1869. The case of Lord Kensington was very similar to this, partly because he was unable to control the activities of his copyhold tenants,

1. The main source for this is in the London County Record Office, Metropolitan Commission of Sewers, Report on the Drainage of the Potteries (1849).

who erected about 220 houses in the first half of the
(1) century, mainly cottage property. Lord Kensington's
copyhold land yielded a rent of only £677 and the property
built on it can hardly be regarded as an improvement to the
land. He aspired, however, to an estate of substantial
houses and to this end he supported the building of the
West London Railway and he borrowed £26,000 from the London
Assurance Corporation in 1847 in order to buy out the
interests of his copyhold tenants, and knock down the
property. About six acres of this land was leased in 1873
to Charles Hunt of Orchard Terrace, Kensington, at ground
rents amounting to £1,045. Hunt was asked to put up a
hundred houses within five years, the rental value of each
(2) house to be not less than £50–£80.

The best example of improved management was the
development of the Paddington estate, which lay in the fork
made by the Bayswater Road and the Edgware Road. Begun in
the Georgian state of 'metropolitan improvements', this

1. Copyhold tenures discouraged investment because they were
disliked by substantial builders, Select Committee on the
Enfranchisement of Copyholds Bill, Parl.Papers, 1851 (550)
xiii, QQ.1037, 1143.

2. Lord Kensington's Estate, Leases, agreements and report of
a legal case in 1911 (Kensington Central Library); Minute
Book (Treasury), London Assurance Corporation, 6 August,
1842.
The Paddington Estate

(George Gutch, Surveyor, 1828)
estate of 611 acres was still under construction eighty years later, although by that time most activity was to the north of the old village centre. It was easily the largest and most protracted development in West London and illustrates particularly well one way in which landowners attracted the investment of large sums of money in developing the estate and, because of its size, the district of south Paddington and parts of north Paddington.

The Paddington estate belonged to the Bishop of London but improvements were initiated in 1795 by Thomas Thistlethwaite, one of the heirs of Sir John Frederick, whose family had been tenants of the Church in Paddington for generations. By means of several Private Acts the tenure of the estate was altered and arrangements made for developing 200 acres of building land. In 1797 and 1815, 86 acres of land were made available to the Grand Junction Canal Company with leases renewable for ever at rents of just over £15 an acre. In thirty years time this land was being valued at £800 an acre. The rest of the estate was

1. The history of this estate is summarised in a printed pamphlet, *Short Statement of the Paddington Estate* (1895).

2. The first measure dealing with a hundred acres was the *Paddington Estate Act*, 35 Geo., iii, c.83 (Private, 1795).
leased to the previous tenants in return for a perpetual rent charge.

The arrangements made for developing the building estate were both improvident and complicated. The ownership and management of the estate were divided. After 1795 three proprietors, including the Bishop of London, were entitled to the ground rents. The management of the estate was put into the hands of three trustees, representatives of the beneficiaries and responsible to them on all matters of estate policy. The fact that the Bishop of London succeeded in securing only one third of the improved value of the land was in keeping with the management of corporate land at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and was really due to the long tradition of leasing estates for three lives at nominal rents but with the power to charge fines on the renewal of the lives.

The development of the building estate falls into three phases. In the first of these the estate was

1. The proprietors were Lady Morshead and Thomas Thistlethwaite and the Bishop of London. The trustees included H. Thistlethwaite, Sir John Horshead and Thomas Cocks, the banker.

2. A system which masked the rise in land values.
converted into a building enterprise, the plans drawn and
the management settled which prepared the way for the
subsequent building of the crescents, squares and colonnades
which made up the physical scenery of fashionable Tyburnia.

During this phase which lasted to the 1820s, progress in
building was slow and the investment made by the Trustees
relatively unproductive. The trustees laid out £20,000
in the purchase of springs, the construction of drains and the
making of roads. They also made roads and sewers and formed
squares as the building progressed. The rate of progress was
so slow, however, that between 1810 and 1824 the rents of the
estate improved by only £347. During this time, or rather
from 1805 when the first tenders went out, only 36 builders
entered into contracts for about 570 houses and of these
about a tenth failed to complete. In this phase then the
trustees succeeded in encouraging only a modest investment
on the part of local builders, mainly brickmakers, carpenters,
market gardeners and the like.

1. The main sources for the early history of the estate are
the minute books of the Paddington Estate, vols.1-iii, the
abstract accounts, 1810-1819 and the Building Contracts.
The development of the estate in this stage is discussed
further in appendix A.
In the second phase, which lasted until the late 1850s, building progressed more rapidly and most of South Paddington was covered with houses. As early as 1843 a local directory was able to refer to the area as one "principally occupied by the Aristocracy and the opulent London Merchants and Citizens." In 1825 more acres were taken in hand and £20,000 raised in order to pay legal expenses, which were very heavy on this state, and to form new roads and sewers. By 1838 the number of builders taking up contracts in the year at last reached double figures. In this year too the trustees were fortunate in making a deal with the Great Western Railway Company on the site for a new terminal in Paddington which brought them a windfall gain of £23,000 plus a rent of £7,000 a year.

The 1830s to the 1860s were the most productive years in the history of the estate. Ground rents started to rise in a spectacular way: between 1833 and 1843 the revenue from this source increased by over 200 per cent and in the next decade another increase of 50 per cent brought the total of

2. Great Western Railway Act, 1 Vict., c.xcii (1838). The station was a temporary one destined to last for sixteen years.
ground rents to £27,703 per annum.

During the 1840s and 1850s the estate was attracting the attention of City and West End builders with the resources to form sewers, make roads and put up really big houses five stories high above the level of the curb. On this estate the builders were developers as well as house builders though many subleased or subcontracted some of the building work. They leased plots varying from 5 to 20 acres. One of the largest 'takes' was that of C.H. Atkinson who, in 1856, contracted for 32½ acres of building land at Maida Vale. He was to bear the expense of building sewers and drains as well as building houses. Within two years he had failed with only four houses in course of (2) construction by the firm of Brickmore and Stubbs. In contrast, another builder operating on the estate in the 1850s invested as much as £700,000 in completing his contract.

1. The position at ten yearly intervals was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ground rents</th>
<th>All rents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>£1,375</td>
<td>£8,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>9,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>5,797</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>18,637</td>
<td>20,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>27,703</td>
<td>28,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>31,466</td>
<td>32,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rental Books of the Paddington Estate.


3. Ibid., 27 April, 1857. Other builders operating on this estate are referred to below, p.134.
The third phase in the history of the estate was marked by a long period of litigation between the owners which delayed the completion of the building land. 

By the time matters were sorted out the unbuilt portion of land was back land and a rubbish dump for the surrounding houses. Once again the trustees invested what they could in preparing the ground for builders and drew on the fund made up from the sales to the Metropolitan Railway Company. Thus in 1883-4 Elgin Road was made at a cost of £2,175 and the adjacent building plots leased to three builders. By 1885 the estate was almost completely built over.

The Paddington Estate illustrates how ground landlords attempted to combine maximum economic gain with the creation of a spacious and coherently planned housing estate or, as contemporaries put it, the 'broad treatment of properties'. They asked builders to make very heavy capital

1. The tortuous history of the legal battle between the beneficiaries will be found in the files of the Ecclesiastical Commission, No. 30299, Parts 1/2. Also House of Lords Record Office, Minutes of Evidence (Commons), Paddington Estate Bill, 1871.

2. Details of the development of the last part of the estate are in Ecclesiastical Commission, File No. 34733, Parts 1/2.
outlays and at the same time charged then the highest rents the market would bear. Moreover the leases which they offered bristled with covenants regulating the width and type of houses to be built and the materials to be used in building them; and the specifications which they laid down about the width of roads and party walls went well beyond the requirements of the Building Act. No special inducements were given to builders in order to counteract these severe terms beyond the normal procedure of graduating the payment of rents and in some cases offering a building contract for a peppercorn rent during the first two years. The only real concessions were made to those builders willing to operate on the fringes of the estate who paid from 3s to 5s a foot in contrast to those builders who took plots adjoining the line of building, or next to a square, at 15s to £1 a foot. Such terms discouraged builders coming forward who lacked substantial backers.

How did the trustees manage to induce these builders to come forward? This question needs to be asked

---


2. Paddington Estate, Minute Book, vol. iii, 12 August, 1845 and 8 January, 1840. Also the Building Contracts.
not only because of the covenants in the building leases
but also because the business of building the more expensive
type of houses was regarded by some builders as unprofitable
(1) and risky. As S.P. Cockerell, the architect and surveyor
in the early phase of the development, pointed out, it was a
common observation that "ground for pig sties will produce
more rent in the aggregate than for palaces, on account of
the comparative space required for each." (2)

The first point to be made is that the trustees had
powers to raise capital and invest this in forming roads,
sewers and squares. They also had powers to dispose of land
as sites for churches. The building of squares and churches
was regarded as particularly important by some of the trustees
not so much for aesthetic reasons as for economic reasons,
as a way of enhancing the reputation of the estate and
(3) encouraging builders to put up large houses. And once the
first of these was built and occupied builders were eager to

1. Select Committee on Town Holdings, Parl.Papers, 1887 (260)
xiii, QQ.
2. Minute Book, Paddington Estate, 8 June and 4 July, 1821.
3. Ibid., cf., Weale, London Exhibited in 1851, p.770: "Of course
the quantity of ground appropriated to these ventilators (i.e.,
squares) is merely calculated so that the increased rental of
houses enjoying a sight of a tree, may compensate for the loss
of ground from the immediate purposes of the speculator and
hence the proportion these gardens bear to the whole area in
any district is a measure of the value there set on this
privilege.".
put up the rather smaller houses in the side streets.

The trustees had powers to charge any outlays they made on certain of the profits of the estate, mainly the brick and gravel account and when these were used up, as they invariably were - to raise mortgages on the security of the rent. Later on they were allowed to use some of the profits made from selling land. It is doubtful whether the estate would have progressed at all without this re-investment of profits. As it was, progress was often slow and erratic. The main difficulty was that the powers of the trustees to raise finance either from the profits or from mortgage loans were limited by the parsimony of some of the owners and the restrictions of the many Acts which governed the conduct of the estate. For instance, they were unable to charge any improvements on the rents of the estate. When the available money was used up, as happened during the 1850s, then the estate was entirely dependent on builders for capital. Nor did they have any powers to finance these builders. The situation on this estate was summed up by Cockerell in 1820:

1. The first Bill was strongly opposed by Lord Thurlow and amended in the House of Lords. The restrictions were so severe that five more Acts were needed before 1825.
"A progress in building improvement is necessarily slower by lettings in small parcels at full rents and without private funds to aid its advance (which has been the case of this estate) than where large quantities of land are let to general speculators at lower rates to induce their exertions in obtaining large profit rents, by the advance of capital, to aid the builders and to execute all the general parts of a plan." (1)

There were times, in fact, when this policy had to be temporarily suspended. During the early phases of growth the covenants were relaxed for a short while and during the 1850s the outlying parts of the estate were leased, as we have seen earlier, to middlemen. This was because of the pressure of the beneficiaries and the criticisms which the beneficiaries made about the slow progress of building. On the other hand, the trustees were not under any severe financial pressure to speed up operations or to squeeze the estate, and during the periods when capital was flowing onto the estate, they could pick and choose amongst the applicants and drive hard bargains. The result of their policy was the eventual erection of a well designed housing area.

Other suburban landowners adopted the formula referred to by Cockerell of leasing large building plots and,

in some instances, the whole estate to a general speculator or middleman who bore most of the risks and in some cases the major responsibilities for developing estates. The system can be illustrated from two examples. In the first of these Lord Harrington contracted with a builder, William Jackson of Pimlico, to develop his estate of 46 acres in 1852. The building area was reduced a year later by a remarkable sale of land to the Commissioners of the Great Exhibition at £3,219 an acre, which was three times the price of building land a mile to the north at Notting Hill. In the meantime, Lord Harrington had built roads across the remaining 20 acres of the estate and was in a better position to exact a good price from the contractor. In the new agreement he asked Jackson and his partners (who included the famous railway contractor Sir Morton Peto) to

1. Details from 4th Earl of Harrington Estate Act, 17 & 18 Vict., c.25 (Private 1854). The building firm probably became Jackson and Brass, the builders of the Law Courts in the 1870s.

2. The Exhibition Commissioners purchased Gore House estate of 21½ acres for £60,000, the estate of the Baron de Villiers (originally part of a copyhold estate belonging to the Earl of Harrington) of 48 acres for £153,000 and 17 acres of the estate of the Earl of Harrington for £54,716.

3. Prince Albert Road cost £18,000 of which the Crown contributed £12,000 and the Earl another £6,000.
pay ground rents of £4,600 a year and 1/- for every thousand bricks made on the estate. They were also asked to invest £131,000 in making roads and sewers and in building 163 houses within five years of which 55 were to be first class residences. In addition to all this they were to put up £10,000 as a bond conditional on the due performance of the contract. Lord Harrington was the type of landowner who displayed the same sort of entrepreneurial initiative that characterised the management of the noble owners of the West End in Georgian and Regency times. Like them he had a keen eye for a bargain and sufficient capital resources to exploit the estate to his lasting advantage. His estate was sufficiently well situated to attract the attentions of substantial builders and middlemen able to draw on a potentially large field of investors in the City. He also employed a retinue of officials to organise the business of the estate: an architect, Walter Richardson, an estate agent to control the builders and a steward to collect the rents.

1. The covenants in the building agreement were also very full for the times. In addition to the usual clauses about not digging for gravel and sand except for building the estate and clauses relating to roads, sewers and paths, there was a long list of "noisy, noisome or offensive Trades" banned from the estate. In addition Jackson had to build 4 houses or completely finish two before granting any secondary leases.
In the case of the Harrington estate the ground landlord dictated the terms and the developer had the responsibility for carrying them out. In the second case, that of the Phillimore estate, the terms were a result of protracted negotiations in which the developer played a leading part. The Phillimores came from a rich family of Gloucestershire clothiers who bought land in London during the seventeenth century; but in the eighteenth century they managed these badly and fell heavily in debt. A row of houses had been built on the Kensington estate in the early nineteenth century but it was not until the 1850s that Charles Phillimore made a real effort to retrieve the family fortunes. In 1855 he offered attractive terms to J.G. Davies for developing 21 acres of the estate. These involved paying a rent of £1,400 and erecting 375 houses in twelve years, more if the frontage space was not fully occupied. Part of the estate could be set aside for shops, public houses, stables and coach houses. This was

1. Phillimore Estate Acts, 2 Geo., iii, c.16 (1762); 25-26 Vict., c.1 (1862).

2. This rent was low and graduated. Payment was secured with only a quarter of the estate built which meant in effect that the rest of the land was held at a peppercorn rent.
the first of three agreements. Terms were rearranged in 1856 and again in 1861 because the builder was concerned that the type and number of houses he was supposed to build would lower the tone of the neighbourhood and the value of the estate. Presumably he had decided that low density housing was likely to succeed better in the neighbourhood. In the third agreement he was to build a maximum of 225 houses which was 150 houses less than originally planned and to insert a covenant in the secondary leases preserving ground at the rear of each house as meadow or private garden. Moreover the houses planned in blocks were in fact built as detached or semi-detached residences.

Charles Phillimore was typical of the gentry owners in Kensington with family seats and political and social interests in the counties. They managed suburban estates from afar, content to leave the business of development to the head lessee. On the Phillimore estate the builder was given almost a free hand. He nominated and helped to finance the builders, he used his own building design, and bore the chief risks in the development.

Both Jackson and Davies were substantial building contractors but other landowners were not so fortunate and
attracted less financially secure developers. This was true of those owners with estates on the suburban frontier where the profits and also the risks of development were great.

The attempt to form a building estate on the Ladbroke Estate at Notting Hill was a typical example. James Ladbroke leased part of his estate to a developer for 99 years from 1942 and asked him to invest £12,000 within three years and to pay ground rents of £903 during the first five years. He employed an architect, Thomas Allom, to prepare the building plan and evidently intended to create a favoured residential quarter on the breezy heights of Notting Hill. But the developer, James Connop, was a partner in the firm of Connop and Duncan, billbrokers, inventors and middlemen, who were willing to back any sort of risky venture provided they could borrow the money. Within three years of taking the estate they had failed, despite an investment of over £50,000 raised

1. London County Record Office, Ladbroke Estate, Building Agreement, 5 October, 1840.

2. Two solicitors, C.H. Grove and H. Parkin provided most of the money. The former agreed to finance the builders of Ladbroke Square and to buy improved ground rents. In return he was to join forces with Connop in developing other parts of the estate, the latter bearing the main costs and Grove selecting the area for building and interfering in the management as he thought fit. Details from Middlesex Land Registry, B.8, 1842, no.447.
mainly from solicitors. In the meantime, James Ladbroke had
died and the estate passed to an heir, Felix Ladbroke who sold
it off in lots in 1848. Connop recovered from his insolvency
and was shortly afterwards speculating in railway scrip and
backing an expedition to prospect for gold in Australia, a
combination of activities which brought him before the
Insolvent Debtors Court once again.

The last example in this section is of a landowner
who went much further than any of those mentioned so far in
taking on the risks of development and investing capital in a
building estate. The case in point was that of Charles
Richardson, a member of the firm of Richardson, Smith and
Sadleir, a London firm of solicitors with offices in Golden
Square, who acted as money lenders to builders. It was in
lieu of a mortgage debt from a Kensington builder, W. Kingdom,
that Richardson came into the possession of Norland farm and
surrounding estate in North Kensington, next to the Ladbroke
estate. Between 1839 and 1841 he invested £63,000 in

1. Connop was bankrupt in 1830, 1845 and 1853: P.R.O., B9/122.
2. Above, p. 304.
3. The estate was owned in the eighteenth century by a London
brewer, Thomas Greene (who married into the Cadogan family)
and was sold by auction in 1792 to pay off his debts. It
passed first to E.L. Vulliamy, the architect, who sold the
estate to William Kingdom in 1839 for £14,058 (or £350 an
acre). The estate was assigned to Richardson in payment of
a loan of £20,000. Details from Church Commissioners,
Norland Estate, Abstract of Title, File no. 20639.
preparing the way for builders, part of which went on the purchase of a steam engine to supply water to the estate. To offset this capital outlay was little more than £2,000 in rents and royalties. In 1841 the building speculation appeared so unprofitable that the London Assurance Corporation refused him a loan of £50,000 in order to assist the builders. According to the surveyor of the Corporation only four houses were actually occupied and though ground rents of £1,331 had been formed most of the ground was let to a brickmaker for 10 years at £1,000 per annum and the rest to gardeners. When the surveyor reported for a second time later in the year the speculation looked even less favourable: five of the six houses built by Richardson himself were still unlet, the Royal Crescent built by a barrister, C. Stewart, had found only one tenant, and on top of this, three of the former holders of ground had given up their interest.

In these circumstances Richardson was forced to invest further. He raised therefore another loan of £30,000

1. The mortgagees of Richardson were Messrs. Shutland and Cleobury, solicitors, Oxford (£25,000) and Hopkinson, the banker (£11,500).

2. Minute Book, London Assurance Corporation, 7 April, 1841, 18, 41, 14 July, 1841; Middlesex Land Registry, 1842, B.l. nos. 360-1: leases of 15 houses at £15 each in Royal Crescent.
from the solicitors with which he helped to finance the builders. He also attempted to make the estate more attractive to suburban tenants. In 1842 he arranged with the Brentford Gas Company for a supply of gas and agreed to pay £7 a year for each lamp; and in 1843 he secured powers to levy a rate and drafted the builders onto an estate committee. But in 1845, the year when the developer of the adjoining estate failed, the Norland estate still appeared derelict with the Church of St. James half built and standing in a square of carcass houses. Finally Richardson was forced to sell part of the estate to raise more funds. Altogether he had invested £100,000 in ten years. Clearly Charles Richardson was a different type of landowner to the aristocracy and gentry of Kensington such as Earl Harrington or James Ladbroke. Whereas they supplied land and waited for builders or middlemen to improve it, he took upon himself the chief risks and responsibilities of development. In the

1. Norland Estate Improvement Act, 6 Vict., c.xxxiii (1842).

2. The Church cost only £4,941 of which a half came from Church building organisations because of the number of poor in the parish (the 'potteries' was nearby). In 1845 not enough subscriptions had come in to complete. See Church Commissioners, Church Endowments and Sites, File no.18217. St. James Square was not built until after 1848 with the aid of a building society floated for the purpose. M.L.R., 32 1848, 940-62.
case of the Norland Estate the landowner was the real speculator.

Investment in opening up new districts

Before the railways were built the scale of investment in particular suburban districts depended in the first instance, on the foresight and resources of landowners and the success with which they induced substantial builders and developers to invest capital in developing their estates. Particular districts were opened up in various ways. In Paddington, substantial builders invested capital in developing the building leases of the Bishop of London's estate; in South Kensington, leasehold developers or middlemen made the pace in developing the district: they included City and West End building firms, solicitors, architects and a terra cotta manufacturer. Notting Hill was opened up with the investment made by new owners of building estates. Charles Richardson was the first of a succession of 'building owners' who seized on the many eligible building plots made available by the sale of the Ladbroke, Portobello and other estates. These new owners invested considerable amounts of money in making their estates 'go'. The most important were those who came first into the suburb and made the initial investment. They
included some who failed, others who exploited the land and moved on, and yet others who stayed to make a modest fortune and to leave their mark not only on the physical landscape, but also in the civic life of the parishes of Kensington and Hammersmith.

The type of investors who speculated in land and building development can be illustrated from the eight owners of building estates in Notting Hill during the 1840s and 1850s. Six of them were lawyers, either barristers or solicitors, one was a City financier and one was a 'speculating' clergyman. The next section examines the capitals outlays which they made in opening new districts to the builder and the productivity of this investment.

Six of the new investors bought land in 1847-8 when building in London was temporarily checked. One reason for this was that land was being sold off in cheap lots in order to pay off the debts of the bankrupt developer of the Ladbroke estate. Another reason was given by the directors of the Grand Junction Canal Company which owned property in Paddington:

"We consider that in the present state of building speculations as affected by the conditions of the money market and the extent
to which these speculations have been carried on, it would be injudicious to take any active steps now for letting the land of the Company on building leases ... The numerous houses built and in progress nearer London, many of them are to let, show that there can be no real demand ... and that any engagement with builders will only prevent the Company availing itself of the full value of the land when a new demand arises ... (but) ... the present state of building speculations makes it advantageous for the Company to acquire additional ground, make exchanges etc." (1)

Capital began to flow into Notting Hill again during the early 1850s when investors who had bought at the low prices of 1848 began to improve estates and new investors (2) bought up vacant building plots. The start of the Crimean War in 1854, although a set-back for building generally in London, did not affect the investment of capital in building estates at Notting Hill and other parts of West London. Thus the Building News reported in 1855 that, despite complaints of a standstill, "wealthy proprietors have not hesitated to invest their capital in building projects, with a view to the realisation of a good interest for their money


2. In 1851 Chepstow and Fenbridge Roads were built on the estate of a new investor, a barrister. In the same year Whitchurch, a solicitor raised money from solicitors in Southampton, and extended his activities on the eastern border. Building Agreements are in the local collection at Kensington Borough Library.
rather than for the purposes of ready sale". According to this journal, which carried monthly reports on the progress of building in the locality, activity was maintained until 1856 when reports started to come in that builders and the owners of building estates were in difficulties. The Building News reported in 1857:

"On the western and northern portions of the ill-fated Notting Hill estate, we much regret to observe a great number of houses standing in carcass, and deserted, we fear, for want of necessary funds to finish them, they being indicated as for sale, at very low prices." (2)

The owners of building estates were in difficulties because they had been committing themselves to large and unproductive outlays in order to keep building going. By 1857 some of them had so many debts that they were unable to raise any more funds.

One of these owners was Dr. Samuel Walker, a clergyman from St. Colomb in Cornwall, who came to Notting Hill, it was said with £50,000 to invest in land. In 1851 he bought 51 acres of land at £1,000 an acre from the Misses Talbot, the owners of the Portobello estate. This was a relatively high price for the district and too high for the Westminster

2. Ibid., 24 April, 1857.
Freehold Land Society who made a bid for the estate but who preferred instead to buy an estate at Kilburn for £540 an acre.

Dr. Walker intended building a new town along the western reaches of Notting Hill, the high light of which was to be a Church built after the model of St. Colomb in Cornwall. Unfortunately he started to build from the Clarendon Road, where the roads were not made, towards London, and it was not long before the land was covered with unfinished houses built with the aid of finance which he supplied. By 1857 Walker was ruined and the Church, dubbed by the locals 'Walker's Folly' and 'All Sinners-in-the-Mud', stood half built and derelict for eight years after, the symbol of his disappointed hopes.

Another owner was Charles Henry Blake who became involved in the Kensington Park estate when his solicitor helped to finance builders at Notting Hill with money which

1. Kensington Central Library, Agreement for sale of land, 1852 and 1854; London County Record Office, Blake ms. Conditions of Sale and Sale notices, Dr. Walker's mortgaged property at Notting Hill, 1856; Freehold Land Times, 1 May, 1854.

2. Church Commissioners, Church Endowments and Sites, File No. 11898. Also F.M. Gladstone, op.cit., p.31.
The Kensington Park Estate

circa 1856
Blake had sent back from India. On returning home Blake took over the improved ground rents and bought more land on St. Johns Hill. Within five years he had borrowed and invested £116,000.

It is worth examining the reasons for this massive debt. First, Blake not only financed builders who took leases of small plots but took the unusual course of building 36 houses by hiring a builder. Unfortunately few of these houses found purchasers between 1854 and 1858 and in consequence none of the loans could be paid off. Blake made the mistake of hiring a builder David Ramsey who was an ex-nurseryman and already extensively engaged in other building contracts. This was a mistake. He had to finance Ramsey and guarantee his bills, and when the builder failed he had then to hire two other builders to finish the houses. One of these Locke and Nerham, finished 11 houses for £11,450 but the other threw up the contract because of the hostility of Blake's clerk of works,


2. Ramsey built 67 houses in 1851-52; and also put up houses on Walker's estate.
Philip Rainey, who wanted to take over Ramsey's old materials and build the houses himself. Blake fell in with Rainey's scheme and became a victim of considerable irregularities. Rainey put up houses which cost far more than the original estimates, altered the accounts and used materials to do work for other tenants on the estate. Finally he quit the business leaving a claim of £11,000 as the balance owing on his account.

A second reason for Blake's debts was the expenses which he incurred in other directions. Thus in 1854 he became involved in the disastrous financial adventure of Dr. Walker to whom he loaned £12,000. But the expense which nearly proved his undoing was unconnected with building speculations. In 1854 and again in 1855 Blake had reluctantly agreed to buy and place amongst his friends some shares in the projected Portsmouth to London Railway

1. London County Record Office, Blake ms., Building Agreement, 30 December, 1853; Abstract of the Title of C.H. Blake to Stanley Crescent; Statement of Liabilities and Assets for the Completion of 13 houses, 1855; Statement in respect to Mr. Blake's Building Operations etc., 1856.

2. This never came about because Walker bought some land for which he never paid. Blake tried to recover from the London and Westminster Bank one of Walker's largest creditors. Ibid., Agreement of Deposit, 1853 and Proposal to the London and Westminster Bank, n.d.
Unable to find buyers for the scrip he had to foot the bill of £25,000 at a time when all his resources were sunk in the development of the Kensington Park Estate. He tried desperately to raise funds in the London money market offering as security, his shares, land, property and even his plate and furniture. But the stockbroker whom he approached and the London Assurance Corporation both refused him loans. The best he could do was to raise the money from a firm of auctioneers by giving them an option to sell his property. Blake's transactions in railway scrip (itself of dubious value) forced him into an emergency measure which threatened to liquidate his entire business undertaking.

The years 1859-60 were a low point in Blake's business career. In 1860 he estimated that the annual income from the estate exceeded the annual outgoing by only £645.


2. He also tried to raise £10,000 on the advowson which he held as security for Walker's loan. The only other money he secured was a loan from Cato, a civil engineer, of £2,200 at the penal rate of 7 per cent. Ibid., Statements, 1855-60, 1857; Mortgage Proposals, 1858-9; Abstract Account, 1857.
The little money he received from selling one or two houses was swallowed by legal costs and a backlog of interest payments. What was worse his mortgagees were becoming discontented, and threatening to withdraw funds and foreclose on loans. Paradoxically, the fall in the market value of his estate saved it from the auctioneer's hammer. At the sale in 1859, apart from a few plots, the money from which gave him temporary relief, the bulk of the estate was brought in.

He was rescued by a revival in the demand for housing. In July, 1860 the Building News reported, in colourful language, the signs of renewed building activity in various parts of Notting Hill but particularly Lansdowne Road and Ladbroke Gardens:

"Further westwards (from Westbourne Grove, Paddington) where the thoroughfare widens like a huge fan, new villas, leading to Walker's Church are being run up to supply the demand, and even the 'Goodwin Sands' known formerly as St. Colomb's terrace and Coffin-row, and now as Ladbroke Gardens - where so many richly laden argosies have sunk - really begins to look as if there were some hope of it being reclaimed. Little patches of new work appears

1. Ibid., Statements, 1858-60.
here and there amidst the desert of dilapidated structures and decaying carcasses. When the whole is finished there will be some chance of an adequate return for a portion of the monies invested, but till that consummation is arrived at, there are few, we imagine who would care to dwell in that dreary desolation - and with the wind howling and vagrants prowling in the speculative warnings around them." (1)

With property taking on a more valuable appearance, the developers were able to rearrange mortgages and raise new loans. Thus in 1860 a firm of solicitors, Lake, Kendal and Lake, intervened in Blake's affairs and carried out what amounted to a refunding operation. They transferred some mortgages to their own account and recommended the rest to another firm of solicitors, Messrs. Honeywood, Harrison and Cobb. By 1863 Blake's debt was reduced to £30,000 and with cash in hand he could begin the next speculation.

There can be little doubt that investment in property development in Notting Hill during the 1850s was very unprofitable. Blake earned less than half a per cent on his total outlay of £120,000 in most years to 1862 and in at least three years his outgoings exceeded his interest


2. London County Record Office, Blake ms., Instructions to Settle Draft Agreement, 7 February, 1860; Indenture, 21 March, 1860; Statement of Account with Blake, 1860-1863. Blake agreed to appoint H. Lake as a receiver of rents until at least £18,000 had been paid off.
payments. There was always an element of chance involved in buying land and developing it for building. As one disillusioned speculator remarked: "It is a common saying amongst surveyors that when the notice board has become unreadable from age, the land is ripe for building purposes". Districts such as Notting Hill acquired a reputation for risky building speculations. This was remembered by an old inhabitant some years later:

"Sad tales could be told of not a few who sank their all in bricks and mortar. Lawyers and money lenders have in times past reaped a rich harvest at Notting Hill, but many a hard working men, falling into their hands, has been ruined." (3)

In fact, the depression in housing during the 1850s seemed to affect some districts in the western suburbs, notably Notting Hill, and also Shepherds Bush and other parts of Hammersmith more than others. These were districts on the frontier of building which had not yet established reputations as

1. Some indication of the difficulties is given in the number of pieces of paper in his records on which were jottings of the assets and liabilities.

2. Building Societies Gazette, 1 August, 1879, p.112.


4. For example, one of the first developers of Shepherds Bush, L.W. Lloyd, an architect, was declared a bankrupt on 28 March, 1850. The leases and mortgages of the Lloyd Estate (1848-1851) are in the Hammersmith Central Library.
desirable places for residence. This was appreciated by
the editor of the West London Observer, who started to
campaign for a railway line which might provide "an oppor-
tunity to redeem the parish in the metropolitan county".
The first attempt at projecting such a line was made in
1856 by some traders, builders and landowners in Ham­
smith. This was the Hammersmith Railway of 'Pinchbeck's
line', after the name of the engineer, also a Hammersmith
man. (1) Needless to say, neither this railway nor three
others which were tried received the necessary minimum of
subscriptions. In 1861 a new promotion was started. The
provisional committee of the Hammersmith, Paddington and
City Junction Railway included Sir John Phillipart,
chairman of the Hammersmith vestry who had supported the
erlier ventures, four of the largest property owners in
Notting Hill (C. Blake, C. Richardson, J. Whitchurch and
S. Phillips), landowners and builders in Shepherds Bush,
and three directors of the Great Western Railway. (2) The
promotion of this line (which became the City and

---

1. Capital £250,000 in shares of £5 each. West London
Observer, 10 January, 1857 and 5 January, 1861.

2. No subscription contracts have been found but the names
of the committee were published in the West London
Observer, during 1861.
Hammersmith Railway in 1864) coincided with the revival in building activity at Notting Hill. It was planned to run through this district rather than south westwards through Fulham as the sponsors of 'Pinchbeck's line' originally intended. The property developers and builders of Notting Hill also acquired shares in the Metropolitan Railway which was opened to Broad Street, Paddington in 1864 and used these to press for suburban extensions. It is difficult to know how much influence they really had.

Some of the most vocal speakers at the annual meetings were local builders, despite the fact that they had not managed to pay the subscriptions on their shares. (1)

Enough has been said to show how the provision of social capital in new districts depended, in the first instance, on the enterprise and resources of the owners of building estates as well as the leasehold developers and builders. In some districts the owners of building estates made the initial investment in building roads, sewers, churches and local railways. They also financed

---

1. The reports of the annual meeting were published in 
   Railway Magazine. See especially, 10 and 20 January, 1863.
builders; and at least one owner of a building estate actually hired a builder to put up houses.

One reason for this active participation in building development on the part of some of the owners of building estates, was given by Haedy, the steward to the Duke of Bedford, in 1851. He was explaining why the Duke had advanced the entire cost of laying sewers to the builders of the Figs Mead estate in Marylebone and purchased the ground rents of the estate. According to Haedy, this was just a part of good estate management, one of the means of ensuring that the estate did not become a second Camden Town.

Another and less worthy motive was attributed to some landowners by the correspondents in building trade journals. For instance, J.W. Papworth claimed that the "real speculator is often the landlord who lets ground and advances money, in the hope that speculative builders would put a good deal more money of their own or other people's in the shape of carcasses on his ground, and by failing would allow him as mortgagee to foreclose and get at a cheap rate carcasses to be finished scampishly and sold cheaply." There was, as we have seen, some truth

---

in the first part of this statement at least. Some landowners at Notting Hill caught the bug of speculative building and advanced money to builders in order to make profits from the sale of ground rents. Some of them had to make these profits in order to reduce their debts. They were, in a sense, debt-driven developers. This is why they financed builders when the demand for housing was slack. They hoped to keep building going and to sell sufficient ground rents and enough houses to pay at least the interest on their debts. Developers who failed were those who ran out of funds before the investment had time to bite.

The re-investment of profits in land development

The investment of capital in urban land eventually yielded a much larger return to the owners of estates than any corresponding effort in improving agricultural land. The Crown, the Church and certain members of the aristocracy were the most successful of the London landlords, if this is judged solely by the growing income from ground rents, improved rents and fines. The actual income of these owners at particular times is difficult to assess, but as Dr. Thompson points out, it was certainly vast and
increasing. The Duke of Portland estimated his London rents at £50,000 a year in 1844; and the Duke of Bedford had an urban rent roll from his estates in Middlesex of £73,061 a year in 1865. The urban estates in West London were not sufficiently extensive or developed to yield rents quite as large as these. But the rental of the Paddington estate was £33,175 in 1868, sufficient to provide the Thistlethwaite family, part owners of the estate, with a substantial rentier income. The third son, Augustus, was said to be worth £100,000 when, in mid Victorian years, he gained some notoriety as a man about town and as the husband of the courtesan, Laura Bell. Landowners benefited, of course, from the capital appreciation of their estates. Some measure of this can be given by comparing two land sales made

1. He gives some examples in English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century (1963), pp.266–8. See also David Spring 'The Landed Estate in the Age of Coal and Iron', Journal of Economic History, xi (1951) and Donald J. Olsen, loc.cit., appendix 1, 'Landed Income'.

2. In 1865 the revenue of the Bishop of London from London property was £20,667, that of the Dean and Chapter of St. Pauls was £10,809 and that of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster was £28,739: Return, Ecclesiastical Property (Metropolis), Parl. Papers. 1866 (389), iv.

3. Church Commissioners, Rental Books of the Paddington Estate.

in Kensington in 1853 and 1902. In the former year the Commissioners of the Great Exhibition bought land in Kensington at £3,000 an acre, which was double the price of building land at Notting Hill and six times the value of building land at Kilburn. In 1902 Lord Kensington sold his estate for £565,000, which was just over £7,000 an acre. The increase in the capital value of urban estates was one measure of the unearned increment which played such an important part in the political attacks on landowners during the late nineteenth century.

It is not possible to say precisely in most cases what happened to the savings made from these profits. They may have been channelled out of the process. The wealth of urban and suburban property supported a number of great country houses. If the Gothic pile of Eaton Hall was a monument to the London property of the Grosvenors, the same might be said of the country residences of Major-General Boileau, a Fulham landowner, Colonel St. Quintin, a Kensington


2. An attempt was made to tax site values in the Finance Acts of 1909-10. The land taxes were cited by the Tudor Walters Committee on Building Construction as a factor arresting building development and they were repealed in 1920.
landowner, and Sir John Neeld, a Paddington landowner. The profits from London urban estates may also have been used to improve agricultural estates, but this is a matter which requires further investigation.

There can be little doubt that a substantial proportion of the profits made in speculative land deals and the sale of ground rents were ploughed back into existing or new estate developments. This was the way in which land companies normally conducted operations, and some examples of private landowners doing this have been given earlier. Such an important element in the process of investment merits further investigation. This can best be done by continuing the account of land development at Notting Hill. The following study of business operations in this district after 1863 also indicates the sort of gains that could be made in speculative land deals after the building of the railways.

Plans to build a railway through the north-western suburbs helped to revive building activity and caused a certain amount of speculative land buying between 1861 and 1863. The people concerned in these purchases were all directors of the railway: C.H. Blake, a local developer and his solicitor, G. Lake; W. Burchall, the solicitor to
Plan of Land at Kensington, 1863 (Pertebelle Estate)
the company, and J. Parson, the chairman of the line

\((1)\)

nominated by the Metropolitan Railway Company. They

bought land through which the railway was to run for £800

an acre and then attempted to sell a small piece of this

back to the railway for £20,000. The rest of the land was

\((2)\)

sold or leased for building. The whole business came to

light in 1863 and Parson was eventually ejected from the

\((3)\)

Board of Directors.

G.H. Lake financed his purchase with money

borrowed from a relative (£4,700) and its subsequent develop­

ment with a loan of £19,500 from the Equity and Law Life

\((4)\)

Assurance Society. C.H. Blake financed his purchase with

---

1. The firm of Burchall and Parson was well known in railway
circles. The latter was a director of the Great Western
Railway and a founder of the Metropolitan Railway. Earlier
he had been concerned with the affairs of the Oxford, Wolver­
hampton and Worcester Railway. For the background see T.

2. London County Record Office, Blake ms., Portobello Estate:
First Purchase (1863); Confirmation of a four tenths share
(W. Burchall), south side of Lancaster Road (1868).

3. Amongst the other directors were at least two developers at
Notting Hill, the Revd. Marchmont, and Pocock, a builder:
Railway Times, 20 June and 25 July, 1863.

4. Portobello Estate, B.G. Lake, leases and mortgages, 20 July,
1863, 7 December, 1897 (Kensington Central Library, nos.
549-552).
money borrowed at 4½ per cent from the clients of Honeywood, Harrison and Cobb. The latter pointed out that they were not prepared to let the money stand for long because of Blake's insecure financial position, and though the loan gave him powers of lending without consulting the mortgagees, in all other respects "the powers and provisions have, as Mr. Blake is fully aware, been made very severe". One of these conditions was that Blake should put money from the sale of land into a special fund in order to guarantee the interest payments on his loans. However, the pace of development was such that by 1865 Blake and Parson had let 9 acres on building agreements and were receiving a rental of £1,356 from 170 houses, a chapel and a parsonage house. By 1867 the rental from this first purchase was £1,426 (of which Blake was entitled to £853) and 19 acres of land had been sold for £34,527.


2. Ibid., Accounts of the Kensington Park and Portobello Estates, 1863-67. These accounts which show the growth of income from all his business activities, are included in appendix C.
Blake re-invested part of the money from selling land in buying up further parcels of the Portobello estate. In 1863 he had bought a sixth-tenths share in 40 acres, in 1864 he bought a two-thirds share in another 30 acres, and in 1868 he bought a two-thirds share in another 40 acres. Thus he laid out £77,000 in buying nearly 60 acres of land between 1863 and 1868.

Table 9 shows that within seven years of 1863 Blake had made a return of nearly 20 per cent on his investment. He had made more than 50 per cent on a particular sale of land.

In so far as these gains represented a return on improving the land they cannot be regarded as pure profit but, judging from the rise in the price of land, they did contain quite an element of 'unearned increment'. In 1863 and 1864, Blake bought land at £800 and £1,000 an acre respectively; he was selling this same land to Building Companies (presumably unimproved) at £1,400 an acre in 1866; £1,800 an acre in 1868 and £2,400 an acre in 1870. Thus in seven years building land on this estate had trebled in value.

TABLE 9
(1)
The Portobello Estate, 1863-1870

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of 60 acres</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Payments</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>94,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From land sales, 1865</td>
<td>21,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;       &quot; 1867</td>
<td>34,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground rent sales, 1867</td>
<td>14,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;       &quot; 1868-9</td>
<td>39,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of rents, 1863-9</td>
<td><strong>112,233</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: This does not represent the complete account because in 1870 Blake still held land which he either developed or sold later.)

Blake also used part of the money coming from speculative land gains in reducing his debts. In 1863 these stood at a quarter of a million pounds; but in 1872 they were down to a mere £10,340. The rest of the money was ploughed back into developing his permanent estate, notably a piece of land belonging to Colonel St. Quintin which jutted into the middle of his estate. Between 1864 and 1867 he leased twelve acres of land, paying at first a peppercorn rent and agreeing terms which enabled him to build houses of the same type and frontage as those going up elsewhere on the estate. But in taking these leases he became responsible for the whole costs of roads and sewers even though the actual building was carried out by the firm of Goodwin and White.

1. Ibid., Accounts, 1869-72.

2. Ibid., Building Agreements, 31 December, 1864; 10 December, 1865, 29 March, 1866. The density of housing was about eight per acre and their value when finished from £700 to £1,000. According to a sale notice of 1870 the houses were in Suffolk brick with cement dressings, mouldings and a balcony surrounded with an ornamental balustrade which was relieved with ornamental vases. Those in Ladbroke Grove Road and Cambridge Gardens had four floors and a basement.

3. He leased another part of the estate to W. Rickett in 1864 for 99 years at peppercorn rents for the first two years and then £143 per annum. He asked Rickett to invest at least £13,650 in the building of 21 houses. They were to share other expenses of drains, sewers, roads and the like. See, ibid., Articles of Agreement, 1864.
One of the most important features of Blake's management of both the old and new undertakings was the scale of his investment in promoting the development of his property. He encouraged builders to take up plots in three ways: first by building a row of houses himself; secondly by leasing land to middlemen and granting them generous terms which included peppercorn rents for a year or two; thirdly, by financing some of the builders until the contracts were through. An example of the last two measures was in the lease which he made to J.W. Philips in 1871. The terms involved a rent of 1d for 7 years and £12 for the remainder of the lease. A mortgage loan of £600 was thrown in.

Blake not only provided some of the loan capital for the builders on the estate but he also bought ground

1. Ibid., leases, 1864-70. There is another set of building leases in the Kensington Central Library, B.R.A. 419, 423, 426, 476, 464-5, 326-4, 571-574. They illustrate how capital was mobilised for the building of the houses. For instance Blake and Lake leased land for Bemington and Wormington Roads to the Land and House Investment Society Company, Ltd., who re-leased to particular builders and assigned the property in 1875 to Bull, Palmer and Fry for £15,000. The builders of the property raised their finance from the original ground landlord (Blake), a solicitor (W.M. Wilkinson), and smaller sums from a gardener in Harrow Road and a livery and stable keeper in Kensal Town.
rents, once these were formed, and he even advanced money to intending house purchasers. That much of this was emergency finance is evident from the increase in advances after 1868 and the sudden reduction in the number of new loans after 1873. In that year the total amount lent to eleven builders was £10,414 of which a fifth was repaid before the year was out. In the following year the total of new loans dropped to £6,448. Over the whole period Blake advanced about £30,000 to house builders. Blake's role as the lender of last resort was of critical importance during this phase of development when building generally was at a low ebb.

At the first signs of trouble in 1868 Blake turned to the Scottish Insurance Society hoping to raise £9,000 from them on behalf of his builders. But the Office cautiously requested more information on the stability and responsibility of the borrowers and then declined to pay the first instalment because their funds were tied up in current transactions.

1. In the accounts of Blake there are advertisements for the sale of ground rents and houses in which he offers to advance part of the purchase money.

2. Calculated from the balance sheet of the estate included in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Executors, 1872-74.

With distress signals coming from the builders on the estate, Blake had to find the money himself. One of the first applicants for an advance was G. Heritage, a builder from Canning Town in Essex. He must have been in perilous straits for, after mortgaging all his houses to Blake and overdrawing his bank account by £160 he still had insufficient money to pay his men. The builder of Luccombe Street, A.J. Gait, was another who repeatedly asked for, and received, loans between 1868-71, some of them being supplied without the protection of a legal mortgage. Along the east side of Ladbroke Grove Road another little drama was enacted. Here Blake transferred the debts of the builders to his own solicitors.

Blake did not finance the middlemen operating on the estate. Some of these lacked the resources to tide them over the difficulties of these years. Thus in 1871 ejectment proceedings were started against a solicitor, Vacherot, who had failed to carry out his building agreements largely because

1. Ibid. Notice to Heritage, 23 November, 1869. At this time Heritage held three mortgage loans from Blake and wanted a further £750.

2. Details of loans to Gait and others are in the separate Estate Accounts, 1869-72. See also Proposal for Loan, 1872.
of the failure of his building firm, Ebbs and Son. The
most resounding collapse was that of the Reverend Henry
Marchmont who had been holding grimly onto his land since
1871. Marchmont's solicitors, Fearon, Clabon and Fearon,
took possession and as they were still there ten years
later must have developed it.

The builders whose tottering fortunes Blake upheld
were little men holding five or six houses at a 'take'.
Sometimes he took the initiative in providing finance, some­
times this came from his solicitors. Late in 1868 Kendall
wrote to Blake:

"I think it a pity to see these men break down
for the want of a loan. I am quite sure that the
position for these Builders is a critical one; (3)
and I hope that you will, therefore, give way".

Blake's financial resources allowed him to maintain a
reservoir of loan capital which could be tapped by builders
whenever other sources of capital were drying up. These
loans he provided at 5 per cent but for short terms. In this

1. Ibid., 1871.
2. Ibid., General Estate Account, 1871; Letter, Blake-Lake,
26 November, 1871. There are some leases of this part of
the estate in the Kensington Public Library.
3. Ibid., Letter, Kendall-Blake, November, 1868.
way he was able to mediate the effects of a national scarcity of capital on the rate of development of his estate. And at the same time he must have saved a number of builders from ending their business careers in the bankruptcy courts.

There is much to be learned about Victorian property developers from the career of C.H. Blake, despite the uncertainty, in the absence of many personal details, about the motives which induced him to devote his savings and most of his time to the development of property at Notting Hill. As we have seen he came into the business almost by accident. He then appeared to have caught the bug of speculative building. Yet he was not after short term gains (and those he made were ploughed back) nor great personal riches. At his death in 1872 his personal fortune stood at £35,000. Most of this was saved during the preceding ten years of his life because until then the rents from the estates were swallowed up in interest payments. His income jumped from the marginal sum of £484 in 1862 to £1,017 in 1863 and then mounted steadily to £3,233 in 1870. It provided him with a comfortable, though not ostentatious living, at Devonshire Place, St. Marylebone.

---

1. Ibid., Accounts, 1863-1870; Will, 11 April, 1872. See Appendix C.
Blake spent the last twenty years of his life in administering his estate at Notting Hill. Why was this? One answer seems to be that he looked on his investment as more than a monetary gamble but as an opportunity for displaying skill and initiative in the creation of a suburban domain. He did not fit the conventional image of the ground landlord thrusting supervision onto others and merely drawing the rents. He seems to have been genuinely interested in the affairs of the estate. He was the entrepreneur and in his early, inexperienced, days this desire for personal control led him into making mistakes. During the 1860s he looked after all the detailed business of the estate, checking each lease, approving every sale and inspecting the references of builders. His solicitors were accountants rather than managers: they looked after the books, collected and sold the ground rents, checked the certificates of the surveyor and raised finance when this was required. Until 1868 when poor health drove him into semi-retirement at Bournemouth, Blake spent many hours each day in

1. cf. In his autobiography the developer of the Edgware Manor Estate, purchased in 1919, speaks of the pleasures of moulding this slice of the London suburbs, planning and naming the roads as he pleased. See G. Cross, Suffolk Punch (1939), p.
Secondly, Blake, like many Victorians of his class, was concerned with providing for his family. His son drew £1,500 a year from the estate until 1872, and then became joint manager with G.H. Lake. The estate also provided handsome pensions for the rest of the family: a trust fund of £8,000 for Blake's daughters and a fund of £15,000 for any grandchildren. This concern for the family must have encouraged him to look for the capital appreciation of the estate. When the son inherited the property it was valued at £473,000. Three years later, Parson's share was bought out for £20,000.

If Blake is typical there is no reason to suppose any difference in principle between managing and developing a small urban freehold and founding a small manufacturing concern. In the infant stages the former may have been less profitable; but if a developer had the foresight to look to the future and was willing to plough back some of his profits, then he could expect to build up

1. There were also regular letters from Bournemouth. See also the letter from Kendall to Blake junior, 11 May, 1874.

2. London County Record Office, Blake ms., Will, 11 April, 1872; Minutes of Estate (1872-5); Valuation (1881).
a small personal fortune from the development of an urban estate of about sixty acres or so.

Capital for land development

This chapter has been mainly concerned with landowners who were property developers, or to use the contemporary phrase, building owners. The preceding account of their activities suggests that the sources of capital for land development were three fold. The first of these was the savings of landowners, middlemen and builders. Property developers included the established owners of land in the suburbs, some of whom actively participated in developing urban estates. But the main source of recruitment was the new purchasers of building estates. The typical private investors in land development in West London were professional people, predominantly solicitors, barristers, architects and clergymen. The second source of capital was mortgage and share capital. The former was raised mainly through solicitors again predominantly from the savings of professional people, widows and the like. The share capital was raised by land companies, but no records of share lists have been found to identify the investors in these
concerns. Loan capital seems to have been available whatever the state of the economy. The important consideration to the sort of people investing in mortgages was not the alternative uses for their money so much as the security offered for loans and the punctuality of interest payments. The third source of capital was the profits made in speculative land deals and the sale of ground rents, which profits were ploughed back into land and building development.

The operations of developers did not have much regard to the demand for housing. Estates were bought and sold both when capital was abundant and the demand for housing strong, and also when building was said to be at a standstill and the money market tight. Developers were less interested in selling houses than in creating ground rents and improving the ultimate value of their estates. They made loans available to builders at times when other sources of loan capital were drying up. As one correspondent to the Building Societies' Gazette remarked:

"The fact is that houses are not, at least in the Metropolis district, built in accordance with the rules of demand and supply, but to develop as it is called, estates and to create ground rents." (1)

The next chapter looks further into the supply of building capital.

1. Building Societies' Gazette, 2 April, 1900.
"The number of houses placarded 'To let or sell' in the suburbs of the Metropolis daily increases. It is marvellous what an impetus the metropolitan railways have given to speculative building..... Such houses are usually 'run up' wholesale by speculative builders, and have received the name of 'hammer houses', because they are intended to be brought under the operation of the auctioneer's hammer before they are inhabited, or their defective construction revealed". ('Houses, To Let or Sell' Building News, 16 June, 1865)

"All the risks of the retail market fall on him (i.e. the speculative builder); some time must elapse at best before he can make a profit, for it takes time, even with hurried and flimsy work, to build houses and make them fit to live in. There is no business in which profits are more uncertain and none I believe in which there is more insolvency; on the other hand, great fortunes have been made by well known builders in London and elsewhere". (Sir F. Pollock, The Land Laws (1896) p.156)

This chapter discusses three further matters connected with the process of investment. First, it continues the investigation into the sources of building enterprise and capital started in earlier chapters. Secondly, it shows how building production generated profits which were re-invested in expanding the output of building firms. Thirdly, it shows how builders operated to produce houses in excess of the demand for them at certain times and discusses the effects
of this on the operations of particular builders and the supply of building capital in particular districts.

Building firms in West London

We have already seen how the housing industry in London contained a great many firms and individuals, the majority of whom had small businesses. The first point to be determined is the extent to which local capital and enterprise was involved in building houses.

In this respect, it should be noted that West London was unique, perhaps, in the number of City and West End concerns who migrated there, especially to South Kensington and Bayswater in the 1840s and 1850s. Four of them are worth mentioning. Cubitt built some houses in South Kensington in the late 1840s. Charles Aldin was building in a small way in Westminster in 1845 and came into South Kensington to build 38 houses in the mid 1850s. William Jackson, the builder of Kensington New Park, was at one time in partnership with Sir Small Morton Peto; this firm later became Jackson and Brass, the builders of the Law Courts. And Charles James Freake, an architect and builder, was said to have made as much money from building houses as
Seth Smith and Thomas Cubitt, the two other best known builders in early and mid Victorian London. 

By the 1870s Freake had invested some of his fortune in an estate of 296 acres at Kingston.

Builders such as these were specialists in building large mansions. They had the skill, the organisation and the capital to deal with this business, and they were able to raise more capital - sometimes from forty to sixty times their own resources - from the insurance companies. It was probably because they succeeded in establishing such good financial connections that they continued building these houses rather than smaller ones in the outer suburbs.

Yet the majority of builders in West London - even the builders of large mansions - were local concerns. Thus the majority of builders of the Paddington estate in the first half of the century were either the local firms and tradesmen of that largely rural parish or builders who had been operating in St. Marylebone. In the boom of 1850-2 some of

1. Information mainly from the building reports in the Building News in the 1850s and the London Post Office Directories. Also M. Richards, The Functional Tradition in Early Industrial Building (1959) for some references and E.W. Cooney, loc.cit. The personal estate of Cubitt at his death was £1,000,000 according to his biographer, Sir Stephen Tallents, Man and Boy, (1943) pp.30-5.

2. There are references to Freake in Select Committee on Town Holdings, Parl.Papers, 1887 (260), xiii, evidence H. Martin surveyor, QQ. 1893, 9939, 2153-4.
them had outputs comparable to any of the West End firms. Thus J. Scantlebury, a builder from St. Marylebone, erected 126 houses with money borrowed from solicitors; and the five other builders who exceeded an output of 50 houses in this period all had local addresses. One of them, W. Reynolds, built 86 houses in one year. (1)

During the 1850s the Building News had references to the activities of the workmen employed on the houses erected by local builders in Bayswater and three of the firms who locked out their employees in 1856 originated in West London. (2) Again in the 1870s the builders with the largest output of houses were apparently local concerns. The Kensington firms producing 40 houses or more each year included T. Hugget, T. Hussey, Goodwin and White (Cambridge Gardens) and Corbett and McClymond. The last of these developed the Redcliffe estate of 70 acres, constructing all the roads and sewers and putting up 550 houses (with rents ranging from £50 to £160) shops and stables. They also


2. Building News, v (1859), especially p.663. Unfortunately no private records of the building firms in West London have been found. One of them was J. of Notting Hill and another was J. and C. Rigby of Paddington.
invested £1,000 in machinery for joiner's work.

In Fulham, in 1881, sixty builders had local addresses and seventy-five builders had addresses outside of the parish but of these only fourteen came from districts outside of the boundaries of West London. The immigrants came mainly from across the river, from South London, and their activities caused the medical officer to make some unfavourable comments on the operations of Battersea builders in Fulham. In other parishes—Hammersmith in the years 1878-80 and 1881 for example—the great majority of builders also had local addresses and very few whose headquarters were not in the parish came from farther afield than Kensington, Paddington or Chelsea.

Many of these local firms seemed to have been short lived and few of the firms operating in the 1850s were still in existence in the 1880s. No doubt they made their profits (or failed in the attempt) and either kept the houses for investment purposes or used the profits in other ways. They

1. District Surveyors' Monthly Returns; *Builder*, xxvi (1868) pp. 201-2.
3. For example, one builder, Jeremiah Little, had an estate of 116 houses and 7 large villas on his death. Presumably he had held on to these houses after building them. *Apportionment of the Estate of J. Little*, 7 July, 1875 (Kensington Central Library).
were recruited from all types of sources: landowners, the suppliers of building materials, the providers of loan capital, as well as those who launched into the business to give employment to their savings. The builders of Notting Hill between 1845-1852 were recruited from lawyers, clergymen, architects, estate agents, merchants, shopkeepers, publicans, market gardeners, building tradesmen and (1) labourers. The activities of some of them were discussed in the last chapter.

On the other hand, there was a core of local builders who kept in business for a number of years, and a few builders who expanded production sufficiently to become leading firms in Victorian London. Firms in continuous operation for a number of years were important as providers as well as users of capital. They are worth examining more closely.

Suburban development brought opportunities for making profits to many local building firms willing to take on contract work, and many of these combined the building of public works with house building. In 1833 Thomas Burton attempted to draw a sharp distinction between

1. District Surveyors' Monthly Returns.
the builders of public works, houses and shops. But in West London the building employers who laid down the drains and sewers of the Metropolitan Board of Works and who held drainage contracts with the local vestries also built houses. Building firms such as J. Thirst, J. Larter, and W. and G. Bird did this sort of work in the 1860s and also provided an average of about 10 to 20 houses a year. They also built suburban railway lines and stations, and carried out a number of other jobs such as carting dust and ashes. It was irregular and highly competitive work and presumably these small building employers engaged in house building partly to keep workmen busy and to maintain the flow of business. In this respect they were imitating, in a limited and parochial way, the activities of large constructional firms such as Peto and Betts who also engaged in house building.

1. Select Committee on Manufactures, Commerce and Shipping, Parl. Papers. 1833 (690), vi, Q.1664.
2. The Annual Reports of the Vestries and Boards list building contracts. J. Axton held the contract from the Metropolitan Board of Works to build a sewer through his own fields (including brick fields) at Starch Green: West London Observer, 8 November, 1856.
3. Their best known building speculation was at Southend. See Illustrated London News, 1 June, 1861; Dictionary of National Biography.
The industry also recruited firms whose business as brickmakers and building merchants had prospered with the growth of London. In the first half of the nineteenth century, brickmaking was a simple operation that was often done on the building site. It involved no more than digging up the clay and burning the bricks in clamps or with the up-draught method in use for hundreds of years. For this reason brick masters were often no more substantial than pig keepers and often less substantial than market gardeners.

Two developments in the nineteenth century encouraged some specialisation, and an increase in the scale of capital investment. One of these was the reduction in the amount of land near to London which was available for brickmaking. By the 1850s only Fulham and Hammersmith in West London had substantial brickfields and in the latter parish they covered about 8 per cent. of the surface area. Even here landowners were

1. For some details, Kenneth Hudson, Industrial Archaeology (1963), pp.140-141.

2. Mrs. Bayley quotes a woman in Norland Town who remarked: "Now pig keepers is respectable, but them brick people bean't some of them no wiser than the clay they works on": in Ragged Homes and How to Mend Them (1856).

beginning to write a stipulation into building agreements that any brick clay dug from the land was to be used on the building estate and not sold elsewhere. By the 1860s there were complaints that London builders were having to import bricks from long distances at fancy prices. Secondly, developments in the process of brickmaking — the use of improved kilns and stamped bricks — called for larger capital outlays.

In consequence a few builders began to specialise in brickmaking. An example of this was the firm of Broad and Sons of Paddington, a concern which developed from the family business of E. Harris and Co., who built some of the large houses in the Marble Arch district. In 1881 George Harris went into partnership with a local bookkeeper, Clement Broad, to manufacture bricks and supply materials for the timber trade. The first brickmaking site was some 150 acres of land at Hillingdon and West Drayton from whence bricks came to the depot at South Wharf, Paddington by means of a horse drawn barge along the Grand Junction Canal.

2. For brickmaking machines, see C.T. Davies, A Practical Treatise on the Manufacture of Bricks etc. (1884).
This firm was exceptional in keeping out of house building. Many local builders and brickmakers carried on both activities and expanded production by purchasing new fields and supplying bricks to other builders as well as using them in their own business. Thus in the 1870s four local builders had brickfields in the outer suburbs of Middlesex and others operated from the wharves along the Grand Junction Canal and the Thames. W. and G. Bird was a typical example of a local building and brickmaking firm in operation for most of the century. The family leased brickfields at Wood Green in the early nineteenth century paying rent for this and a royalty of 1/- on every thousand bricks made. The fields were worked in stools and a typical output in the 1850s was about 15 stools per annum or 700,000 bricks at a royalty of £525. Bricks were supplied to local builders. By this time the business

1. Information on landowners in Middlesex from Return of Owners of Land, Parl. Papers, 1873 (c.1047) lxxii (England and Wales). Some examples were: T. Clutterbuck (93 acres, Great Stanmore), R. Yeo (14 acres, Ealing), Messrs. Bird (15 acres in Middlesex). Builders operating from wharves included: Hook and Oldrey, Cowley Wharf, Kensal Green, Thorne & Co., Cremorne Wharf, Chelsea, and S. Tildesley, Irongate Wharf, Paddington.

2. George Bird, 1774–1857, married the daughter of a carpenter; William Bird, 1776–1843, married the daughter of a Baptist schoolmaster. There are some records (wills, leases etc.) in the collection at the Hammersmith Central Library.

had gone to the sons of the founder. One of these developed an estate at Brook Green, built houses in Paddington and Kensington and was still going strong in the 1880s when the firm was producing about 10 houses or so a year.

Many other people besides builders and brickmakers managed to run more than one business for periods of ten or more years. Amongst them were a builder and newsagent (W. and J. Snooks of Hammersmith), a builder, money lender, auctioneer and house agent in Fulham and Plumstead, and a builder, undertaker, upholsterer, auctioneer and valuer in Fulham and Highgate. Perhaps the best example of this was the confectioner C. Batty of Fulham who teamed up with a jobbing builder, W. Eldridge, and soon became one of the leading builders in the district with an output in the 1870s of about 50 houses a year until his failure in 1881.

Suburban development in fact brought opportunities for advancement to many working class builders and building tradesmen who formed the majority of local building firms. Working class builders might start out building cottage property with finance from local terminating societies.

---

1. *District Surveyors' Monthly Returns; London Post Office Directories.*
tradesmen and other builders. The only substantial concerns in this business were the middle class housing associations of which the most important in West London was the Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Company, Ltd., an organisation which had over 4,000 houses in the 1870s and which came into North Paddington in 1876 and built a workmen's town there, at Queens Park. For the most part, however, the builders of cottages and lower middle class housing were men of little capital or organisation who had to keep rents up in order to cover costs, including the cost of building loans. Yeomans Row and Terrace in Brompton, to take just one example, was built and financed by a local brickmaker, carpenter, shopkeeper and oil and colourman. The property was then bought up by T. Preddy, a local publican.

Working class builders came in for a good deal of abuse from sanitary reformers and building journalists in the nineteenth century being regarded as men who knew where "place bricks were to be found at a low figure, thought

1. Anon., Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Co. Ltd., A Short Account (1883). The present directors showed me the plans of the houses.

2. The leases and mortgages are held by Kensington Central Library: Smith's Charity Estate, nos. 490-514, and Baroness von Zandt's Estate, nos. 522-5.
green timber no disadvantage and had no prejudice against road sweepings in lieu of mortar". Nevertheless, some of the leading builders of both houses and churches in West London were recruited from the ranks of the small, working class builders. It was possible for builders to rise from humble beginnings as Cubitt had done in the first half of the century. J.D. Cowland was one example of this on a modest scale. He was a bricklayer who put up a few houses for G.H. Blake in the early 1850s and also built Cressy Tower and Hordbury Chapel and Schools. By 1868 he was employing 150 men in building, amongst other things, the Church of St. Mary Magdalene in Paddington. Another famous Church builder who apparently rose from humble beginnings was William Dove of Islington who built at least three churches in West London.

But G. Flew of Fulham provides the best example of the rise of a small jobbing builder. He joined up with W.H. Gibbs, a builder in Knightsbridge in the early 1870s and began to

1. Building News, 22 January, 1858; also Builder, xv (1857), 1858, xvi, letter from a sufferer.
3. According to one building lease (23 February, 1861, Kensington Central Library), B. Daw and N.F. Daw came from Torquay. It would be interesting to know - but difficult to find out - how many other builders were migrants to London.
specialise in the production of semi detached houses worth about £600 each. At this time they were building about 10 or so houses a year. From the mid 1870s the business expanded rapidly and by 1877 the firm were investing £12,000 borrowed from the Hand in Hand Insurance Society in building houses in Kensington. By 1879 when they moved into Fulham, they had an output of over 200 houses a year. This firm provides a good example of an expanding business which supplied houses by selling off ground rents formed on small estates and used this money to pay off mortgages and to buy up more land for new developments. It illustrates how the process of building production in the suburbs generated some of the capital for building development.

The over production of houses

The output of builders represented a major proportion of the new real capital that was being created in London; but the supply of this fixed capital fluctuated considerably. The pattern of building activity in West

---

1. Based mainly on the securities book of the Hand in Hand Insurance Company, the District Surveyors' Monthly Returns, and advertisements in the local press. This firm is discussed on p. 326 below.
London is indicated in Diagrams 1-3. The graphs represent movements in an index based on the fees charged by the district surveyors for new houses and shops erected in each year 1845-1852 and 1856-1901.

Building activity in West London suddenly increased after 1845, temporarily faltered in the years of capital shortage in 1848-9 and regained its momentum in 1850, in which year more capital was being invested in houses in Kensington and Paddington than in any other year in the nineteenth century. The boom collapsed sometime between 1851 and 1856. Recovery started in 1856-7 and was maintained until 1867-8, another boom year for house building in the western districts of London. The slump in activity that followed was more severe and prolonged in Hammersmith and Paddington than in other western districts. It was, however, but a preliminary to an upsurge of building which lasted for ten years and reached its peak in 1879-80. In this boom year the amount of capital invested in houses in Fulham and Hammersmith was greater than in any previous year. The 1880s were years of falling output in the London building industry.

1. Data for earlier years is available in Parl. Papers, 1831-2 (505),xliv; 1833 (22),xxxiv. The series for 1845-52 contains fees that were in arrears and is probably lagged. Data is available in Parl. Papers 1846 (286) (Sess.11),xliii; 1847 (735),lviii; 1851 (83) lxi; 1853 (306). The data for 1856-1901 is taken from London County Record Office, Abstracts of District Surveyors' Returns and London Statistics.
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but in West London the degree to which output fell varied considerably in particular districts. Building activity in Fulham was declining until 1897 but the level of building was still considerably higher than in the years before 1876 and the decline was interrupted with bursts of increased activity between 1886-1888 and between 1893 and 1895. In contrast, the decline in house building in Hammersmith was more pronounced and lasted until 1894. The irregularity of the course of building in Paddington and Kensington in the late nineteenth century was probably due to the lack of large tracts of land for building on.

Why did house building activity in London behave in this way? Or, more specifically, why did the booms ever come to an end? Investment in certain urban housing,

---

1. The fullest and most recent discussion is that by H.J. Habakkuk, 'Fluctuations in House-Building in Britain and the U.S.A. in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of Economic History*, xxii, no.2 (1962). He is concerned to provide reasons of a domestic origin why long waves in house building activity should have appeared in the nineteenth century, and in doing so to criticise those writers who have put undue emphasis on external factors operating through the movement of capital between one country and another or the movement of people between one country to another and from country districts to towns. For the influence of these external factors see Brinley Thomas, *Migration and Economic Growth* (1954), especially chapter 7; A.K. Cairncross, *Home and Foreign Investment* (1953); E.W. Cooney, 'Capital Exports and Investment in Building', *Economica*, xvi (1949) and 'Long Waves in Building in the British Economy of the Nineteenth Century', *Economic History Review*, xiii no.2. (1960) and F.M.L. Thompson, 'The Land Market in the Nineteenth Century', *Oxford Economic Papers*, ix (1957).
particularly metropolitan, was hardly ever unsound and unproductive because the demand for houses did not fluctuate much. As a writer in the *Builder* observed, the migrants to London kept up the demand and prevented any regular crash. Moreover, the interest received on capital invested in house property by way of rental was estimated to be at least 8 per cent in most years.

The ups and downs of building construction can best be argued in terms of relative over supply. Some support can be given to this view by the rise in the level of vacancies during periods of increased building activity. Thus the proportion of uninhabited to inhabited houses in West London fell from 6 per cent in 1851 to 5 per cent in 1861 during a period when building activity at places like Notting Hill had been curtailed. The proportion rose to 9 per cent in 1871. In Hammersmith the proportion of uninhabited houses rose from 5 per cent in 1861 to 13 per cent in 1871 and 14 per cent in 1881.

1. 'The Urban Tenant and his Landlord', *Builder*, lvi (1889-11), p.441.

Grounds for this argument can be found in the speculative character of building operations in London and the highly imperfect (in the economist's sense) nature of the industry. We have seen earlier that developers seemed to invest in estates without regard to the demand for housing and that as expansion got underway many new firms set up in business. It is worth quoting at this point the view of the Inspector General in Bankruptcy on the nature of speculative building in London:

"The speculative builder seems to consider it his business to erect buildings without due regard to the laws of supply and demand. The only limit on his operations is that which is imposed by his power of mortgaging. Frequently starting with very little or no capital, he has no difficulty in obtaining sites of land on lease; the lessor knowing that the moment the requisite materials are brought on the ground, the value of the land is certain to be improved in any case, is perfectly indifferent to the lessee's means. Having thus obtained the lease the builder proceeds to order the materials. Timber, bricks, cement etc. are obtained on long credit, the usual period being about six months. As the buildings progress there is no difficulty in obtaining advances on mortgages to the extent of about two-thirds or three-fourths of their actual cost. These advances are obtained long before the bills for materials.

1. This is the main argument of S.B. Saul, 'House Building in England 1890-1914', Economic History Review, xv, no.1.(1962) He claims that "building went in bursts during the nineteenth century covering all types of houses at the same time, ignoring considerations of material and labour cost and minor differences in rents, and drawing capital to it from many quarters."
become due, so that the builder is no longer hampered by want of ready money. Sometimes a building may be disposed of for cash, but as a general rule it is by mortgage and not by sale that the requisite funds are supplied —". (1)

This would apply to a great many builders in West London (though not to all of them).

It is reasonable to suppose that the supply of risk capital depended, amongst other things, on the anticipated profitability of house building and the possibilities of making speculative land gains, especially in districts that had been opened up by the railways. During the 1860s capital for railways and house building in West London moved together at first, but the collapse of the railway boom in 1865-66 was not accompanied by any slackening in the momentum of house building. Similarly the extensions of the metropolitan railway system in the 1870s encouraged considerable house building in the areas affected for some years afterwards despite the fact that the railway builders were having some difficulty in raising the money to complete their lines.


2. Discussed earlier in chapter 2.
The supply of suburban housing did not only depend on the profit expectations of builders and developers but also on the alternative uses of the money capital used in financing them. In London these alternative opportunities were mainly commercial and possibly investment overseas. It can be argued that a ready flow of capital and credit helped to push building forward in excess of current requirements at particular times. On this view the behaviour of the capital market in depression was important: when resources were idle, because other investment opportunities were slack, funds flowed over-abundantly into house building.

The movement of capital into house building in London during the boom of 1879 was welcomed by the Building Societies' Gazette:

"In all probability really good London house property has never realised such very high prices as at the present time. The long stored-up wealth of London and the surrounding districts happily diverted for the time being from the broad and temptingly easy path to

1. In cities where industrial capital was switched into house building the position was more complicated. In these cases industrial prosperity may have created buoyancy in the property market in the first instance. For contemporary comments on 'Overbuilding' in Sheffield see G.C. Holland, The Vital Statistics of Sheffield (1843), pp.56-66; for Birmingham see Building Societies' Gazette, 1 August, 1877 and the references for 1890-1907 quoted by S.B. Saul, op.cit., p.130."
Foreign Loans and Peruvian Colondas, seems to find more satisfactory employment in the houses and shops bounding the streets of busy London".  (1)

And the role of finance in producing excess capacity in the building industry was something which contemporaries also commented on. It was, for example, the main point in a paper read before the Institute of Surveyors in 1884-5:

"Builders have too often been greatly encouraged and assisted ---- by the extreme ease with which they have been able to borrow money with which to build; which indeed owing probably to the difficulty of investment caused by the depression of general business, has been in many cases lent to them in amounts sometimes actually exceeding the cost of their work; a state of things which has caused overbuilding in the suburbs of London to a very great extent, and encouraged every device by which a builder can reduce the cost of his work and undersell his neighbours".  (2)

On this interpretation of the origins of suburban building booms it is plausible to argue, as Dr. Saul has done, that they ended because of internal conditions: an over shooting of demand leading to a rise in vacancies, a fall in rents, an increase in bankruptcies and a movement of funds away from the building industry. Did this in

1. Building Societies' Gazette, 1 August, 1879.
2. The Surveyors' Institute, Transactions, xvii (1884-5) p.181.
in fact happen in West London? And what factors influenced the length of the downswing in building activity and the timing of the recovery in various parts of West London?

The next two sections are concerned with examining the effects of over production of the profitability of house building in West London and the capacity of the industry to respond to changes in market conditions, particularly the revival in the demand for housing.

Bankruptcies and insolvencies in the housing industry

It was widely believed in Victorian London that speculative building was one of the riskiest undertakings. This was claimed to be due on the one hand to the susceptibility of the industry to changes in interest rates, the drying-up of short-term funds and the narrow capital margins on which most builders worked and on the other hand, to cyclical changes in the demand for housing.

1. For example, 'Building risks and their incidence', Transactions, Institute of Surveyors (1878) in which C.K. Bedells claimed that this led many to adopt the motto (which he did not agree with) 'Fools build and wise men buy'. He believed that the risks had led to the introduction and development of the speculative builder and to the erection of an inferior class of houses.
The effect of changes in the supply of short-term funds is difficult to assess. A shortage of funds may have added to the difficulties of builders in depression. Thus it was charged that the impossibility of negotiating mortgages under high interest rates was at the bottom of the distress in the London building industry in 1856-7:

"Persons can now realise from 5 to 6 per cent very readily upon loans, or merely by deposits at joint stock banks and, therefore, are not to be satisfied with 4 or 5 per cent from builders encumbered with the business of mortgages and other securities." (1) Examples of the difficulties experienced by the developers and builders in Notting Hill and other parts of West London in raising finance were given earlier. Those who managed to survive this crisis did so by raising money from solicitors. The stringency caused by the Overend Gurney crash in 1866 was another example of a short term fluctuation causing an increase in the rate of building failures. On the other hand not all builders

were sufficiently dependent on credit to be affected. Even the Builder which made much of the crisis had to admit that many builders were able to keep going:

"The past twelve months have been a somewhat chequered time for what are known as speculative builders. With money at 10 per cent it was found almost impossible to obtain it at a rate which would make building profitable and, therefore, much work, only partially finished, was perforce stopped for want of means to push it forward. Some of the results of this state of affairs appear in the lists of bankrupts; but still there were many who managed to struggle on doing just a little to keep themselves and a few men employed". (1)

Is there any evidence for the view that over production of houses was the more important factor in causing building failures? It would be useful to put this to the test by investigating the returns of bankruptcy and insolvencies, but this was found to be a laborious and difficult task except on a very small scale. One problem in using these returns was that the meaning of

1. Reported in the Estates Gazette, 15 August, 1867.
2. For a contemporary comment, see The Law Times, lxxv (1883) p.130.
3. Published in the London Gazette and Perry's Bankrupts.
bankruptcy and the arrangements made for insolvency were continually changing with alterations in the Bankruptcy Laws. Another problem was that of abstracting the names of builders from the total returns and of comparing these with the total capacity in the building industry.

A sample investigation suggested that the greater number of building failures in London (more commonly insolvency or liquidation rather than bankruptcy) did occur just after the peak of building activity in 1881 (about 200) and the least number at the lowest point of building activity in 1871 (about 140) and in 1886 (about 150). If the industry really was being purged of its weaker members as building activity fell off, this would support the view that both over building and insolvency was due to the inability or unwillingness of builders to adjust to market conditions and to take note of the signs of falling demand such as the rise in the number of house vacancies. Specialist house

1. For the early history of bankruptcy, see E. Welbourne, Bankruptcy before the Era of Victorian Reform, Cambridge Historical Journal, iv (1932), pp.51-62. The system was changed by an Act of 1869 which sought to prevent the abuses arising from putting an estate under a trust deed. This change was thought by the Comptroller to have increased the number of recorded liquidations: Estates Gazette, 8 October,1878.

2. The task was too great for a larger sample and these figures are only approximate. Unfortunately though the Board of Trade Returns give building failures they do not distinguish London builders.
builders without any other business activities may have been the worst affected: they had to keep on building and selling houses in order to pay the interest on their mortgage loans. Lenders foreclosed when the security they were offered was in doubt or when the income on their loans was in default.

The point should also be made that builders were likely to fail if they specialised in building one type of house in districts where the fashion in houses was changing. South Kensington was such an area from about the mid 1870s and the builders of Belgravia had been similarly affected by changes in fashion during the 1850s. The Estates Gazette was creditably informed in 1878 (a boom year for suburban building) that one firm of builders in Kensington had houses unlet on their hands to the value of £10,000 a year: and that others were altering large new houses, worth £200 to £250 a year into flats. Ten years later a Chelsea builder operating in South Kensington failed with assets, it was said, of £9,452 but liabilities of £657,156, a tenth of which were insecured. The Chief

Official Registrar attributed his failure to the continuous depreciation in the value of house property in this district, and the inability of the builder to sell the large houses which he persisted in building.

Building operations in particular districts

Even when building was reviving elsewhere, the development of some districts was slow to get going again. This may have been due to the collapse of a number of builders. It may be useful, therefore, to compare the supply and profitability of building capital in two districts with contrasting experiences. North Paddington between 1865 and 1875 and Fulham between 1880 and 1885, provide some illustrations of the different responses of building firms to changes in demand conditions, and their capacity to make adjustments.

The builder who made the pace in the development of North Paddington and contributed most to the provision of houses there was Edward Vigers, a timber merchant and 'dealer in land'. He started in the business of speculative building during the 1850s, building houses on

1. Ibid., 14 January, 1888. The firm was W. Douglas, builder and contractor.
the estate of John Aldridge in Paddington. In the early 1860s he was speculating in building land at Notting Hill and in 1865 he tendered for a contract to develop 160 acres of land north of the Harrow Road as a building estate. The land was owned by Sir Joseph Neeld and the Dean and Chapter of Westminster who had been negotiating exchanges for the previous seven years in order to form a compact building estate.

St. Peter's Park as the estate became known, was a tricky speculation partly because it had no railway running through it and also because it was largely undrained. Vigers had to agree at the outset to building drains and sewers and a bridge across the Grand Junction Canal. He also agreed to build no less than six main roads across the estate. Moreover all this had to be accomplished and the rents paid at a time when Vigers had very little ready

1. Aldridge Estate, Building Agreements, 1849-1857 (Paddington Central Library), Blake ms. loc.cit., estate accounts, 1873.

2. For details of these negotiations, see Church Commissioners, St. Peter's Park Estate, File no.19717. The district was called Ashgroves and Marylands originally. Neeld's trustees originally held the land on a lease for three lives at £4 per annum. They paid £6,000 to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for a freehold interest and partition.
cash and was dependent on a builder and a few friends and 

(1) relatives for funds. The building agreement which he 
held was not much use for raising money on a wider front.

The object of a developer like Vigers was to push 
building forward as rapidly as possible in order to spread 
the initial capital outlay and pay off his debts. He 
might then be able to take advantage of a clause in his 
building agreement which enabled him to have land at a 
nominal rent, once ground rents of £50 had been allocated. 
His mode of working was to prepare a building plot marked 
out with iron pallisades and to sub lease this to as many 
as eight builders. He then used the houses as the 
security for further loans to be invested in the next plot.

At first building went rapidly forward, and he 
was able to reduce some of his debt by selling at so many 
years purchase the 'improved rents' (paid by the builders) 

(2) to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. By purchasing the

1. Notably J. Thirst, builder, Chelsea and Kensington; S. 
Pocock, brickmaker and builder, Kensington; T. Vigers, 
undertaker, Chelsea; J. Aldridge, landowner, Paddington; 
and S. Burbury, barrister and Vigers' chief financier. 
The mortgage deeds are held by the Church Commissioners.

2. Now the ground landlords according to the Episcopal and 
Capitular Estates Acts, 1851 and 1854.
A Building Development in Paddington
St. Peters Park Estate, 1872
A Building Development in Paddington

Notes to the Map

--- Boundaries of Building Estate

A. Sir John Neeld on agreement to E. Vigers

B. Dean and Chapter of Westminster on agreement to E. Vigers

1. 17 Acres 3r. 27p. Rents: £112 for two years rising to £896 in the tenth year

2. 16 Acres 3r. 2p. Rents: £105 for two years rising to £840 in the tenth year

3. 10 Acres 30p. Rents: £64 for two years rising to £510 in the tenth year

4. 29 Acres 2r. 17p. Rents: £1,480

Source: Church Commissioners, Building Agreements, 29 March 1865 and 1 April, 1865.
improved ground rents, the landlord was in fact giving a loan whose principal would never be repaid; instead, a certain percentage was added to the ground rent which he would receive. Thus in 1868 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners paid out £12,560 representing the sale at 20 years' purchase of improved ground rents amounting to £638 payable on 200 houses built along the side roads which threaded their way across the base of the estate.

The builders who took plots operated in a similar way. This can be illustrated from the building of Elgin Road by E. Bastard and T. Parnell. After taking a lease of the plot they raised second mortgages on the first house in order to finance the building of the next, negotiating the loans with solicitors. About £2,620 was raised in separate sums of £500 and £600 to finance the building of 7-31 odd Elgin Road. The builders attempted

1. The point was made by Donald J. Olsen, loc.cit., p.37.
2. Church Commissioners, File no.41784, part 1, First Purchase of Improved Ground Rents, 29 October, 1869.
3. Church Commissioners, No.1 Building Agreement and mortgage deeds.
to make a profit from selling the houses to investors who rented the property to tenants. On another part of the estate the rents payable on 53 houses were £10 ground rent, £626 improved ground rents and £3,583 rack or occupation rents. Building ran into difficulties towards the end of 1868. First, the bridge over the canal was still not built because of a long dispute with the Vestry over a right of way and, in consequence, the estate was still inaccessible to omnibuses. Secondly, building generally began to fall off in London after the peak year of 1867 suggesting that the demand for houses was satisfied for the time being. Thirdly, a number of builders overstrained their resources and failed. This was a serious matter to Vigers because he had been lending them money and

1. Ibid., File no.41784, part 3, auction particulars and letter, 25 January, 1864. The houses were in Lydford Road, Shirland Road, Waiterton Road and Fernhead Road. The investors in the houses included the Mortgage Co. of England, local builders and shopkeepers. The latter had borrowed from building societies.

2. G.F. Robinson, The Water Ways of Paddington (1928) for particulars about the canal bridges. This was the Carlton Bridge.
giving credit. Indeed the main source of his troubles came from supplying bricks, timber and other materials to builders on the estate for which, through the failures in the trade, he had never been paid.

Already in 1870 Vigers had to turn to the trustees of the Neeld estate, the Rev. J.E. Jackson and G. Goldeney, for a further loan. This was negotiated through the firm of Keary, Stokes and Goldeney of Chippenham, Wiltshire. In 1871 Cluttons, the agents to the Church, were writing that "on account of the long depression there has been in the building trade, and from unforeseen difficulties that have arisen, Mr. Vigers finds it impossible to carry out his agreements with respect to the whole of the land".

The following year, proceedings were started for liquidating his business by arrangement or composition under the Bankruptcy Act of 1869.

---

1. Church Commissioners, file no. 31968, part 3, letters from E. Vigers, 23 March, 1871; 4 August, 1871, 17 October, 1872.

2. Church Commissioners, mortgages, nos. 146, 138-140; 146, 859, 860, 167, 625, 626: 175, 936. Other solicitors were lending to builders. Thus the firm of Hardisty and Rhodes supplied the sums of £200, £300, £600 and £800 to E. Bastard at 5\% per cent. They transferred these loans to clients once building revived.

3. Ibid., Letters from Clutton, 30 May, 1870, 11 July, 1870, 4 July, 1871 and 20 December, 1872.

4. Ibid., Meetings of Creditors.
At least a quarter of the builders on this estate failed between 1870-1872 including the chief developer. During the previous three years Vigers had invested at least £20,000 raised mainly from solicitors, but the sales of ground rents yielded only £17,660. By 1872 he had an outstanding debt of about £8,000 and owed another £3,879 to the Church in rents and a further sum (1) to the trustees of Neeld. Only the intervention of his creditors and the sacrifices made by the ground landlords saved him from complete disaster. The former kept some building on the go with making loans to builders. They put the estate in trust and gave him three, extended to five years, for paying off their claims. The latter sacrificed profits for the time being: Neeld gave up a backlog of unpaid rents and suspended payment on the unbuilt land for three years; the Ecclesiastical Commissioners relieved Vigers from his responsibilities (2) under the building agreements and drew up new terms.

1. Ibid., File no.41784, part 1, and Deed of Surrender, 14 April, 1874.

2. Church Commissioners, New Building Agreements (1874).
It was some time before building revived in North Paddington and the fall in activity was more prolonged than in West London generally. It was not until 1876 that Vigers who was still struggling to pay his debts, managed to sell off another batch of ground rents and to pay back some of the money he owed. And it was not until the 1880s that he had settled sufficient of his old scores to raise new funds. By this time Vigers' son was in charge of the timber and building business.

This estate then was an unprofitable venture for a number of builders who failed because they were unable to adjust to market conditions. The failure of the builders to sell houses was the crucial factor rather than a shortage of finance. The crisis of 1868-70 retarded the development of the estate and altered its character. During these formative years builders scamped things like footings and put up cheaper houses behind the six roomed terraced villas.

1. Ibid. File no. 41784, part 2, sixth purchase, 11 January, 1876. The ground rents on 51 houses were £11 and the improved rents £426. Out of this sale Vigers received only £2,390 which he used to build houses. His total investment in the estate between 1865 and 1878 must have been about £45,000.

2. An unsuccessful effort was made through F.W. Vigers of 'Little Beeches', Reigate, to find the business records of his great uncle, Edward Vigers.
fronting the main roads. Though much land was vacant they converted the stables behind the houses into workmen's cottages, presumably because they thought these might have a better chance of selling. Building was kept going by mortgagees, chiefly solicitors, whose main interest was in recovering loans as quickly as possible. The houses were taken by investors who sub-let them to tenants, and in consequence the estate began to deteriorate. When Booth came to look at it he described St. Peter's Park as a district that had gone wrong.

The down turn in building activity in Fulham and Hammersmith in 1881 was also accompanied by the bankruptcy of a number of builders, though not so many as in St. Peter's Park. About thirteen or so builders failed in the two parishes in this year including Batty and Eldridge, J. Stabbs and W.C. Gribble who had been providing houses for ten or more years. C. Sanders, a wine merchant, who built 28 houses in 1878-1880, and G.W. Hutchins, a marble mason, who

1. Altogether six firms of solicitors were involved in making loans to the builders on this estate. They were: Keary, Stokes and Goldeney (whose clients were mainly farmers and widows in Wiltshire); Hardisty and Rhodes; G.A. Colman; Beale, Marigold and Co., and Miller, Smith and Bell.

2. The deterioration of the estate is recorded in the reports and letters in Church Commissioners File no.41784, part 6, 58026, part 2. See also C. Booth, 3rd series, 'The Inner West' (1902), p.123.
built 39 houses in the same period were instances of short-lived speculators. The only feature common to these firms was that they appeared to be building in one place. (1)

But there was one builder in Fulham who was not in any financial difficulties at all during the early part of the 1880s. In fact, the firm was making handsome profits. This was the firm of Gibbs and Flew who in 1882 had four building estates on hand in Fulham, namely the Cedars Estate, Margravine Gardens, The Salisbury Estate and Fulham Park Gardens Estate. In that year they became a limited liability company and were doing so well that despite the shortage of capital for building in London they managed to raise £100,000, increased in 1883 to £250,000 by public subscription. (3)

The share capital of the company was invested in plant and equipment. It enabled the company to expand operations further by purchasing six more estates situated in Fulham, and also Twickenham and Wimbledon; and by 1886 about 200 acres of this building land was in the course of

1. Perry's Bankrupts and Insolvent Debtors Magazine (1881).
2. Plan of Building Land in Fulham for Sale, 21 March, 1883 (Fulham Central Library).
rapid development. Gibbs and Flew, the manager of the West Kensington Estates Company, continued to build in the traditional way, borrowing money from solicitors and their clients. Each new mortgage loan was secured on a small piece of an estate and used to build about six houses. (1)

There is no doubt that this firm, unlike many other speculative builders, could adjust their output to changes in market conditions without jeopardising the business. For example, one of the directors' reports explained how, shortly after the constitution of the Board:

"there seemed indications of over building not only in the neighbourhood of the company's estates but throughout the metropolitan area, and the directors considered it prudent to curtail their building operations; but as the demand for the company's houses has of late been largely in excess of the rate of production, the directors have, since the beginning of the present year, increased their operations to meet demand ---". (2)

1. The following is one example from a small collection at the Fulham Central Library: Mortgage, 28 January, 1884 of £1,900 to J. Bircham and C.M. Koupell through Bircham and Co., solicitors. Ground rents formed on 28 houses in Rigault Road and Place, Fulham Park Gardens of £202 payable to H.M. Dunn.

2. Third Annual Report (1884). This report with comments is quoted in the Builder, xlvi (1884-1) pp.496-7. The number of lettings of the company's houses increased from 366 in 1882 to 459 in 1883 and had already reached 131 in the first quarter of 1884.
In 1683 they were showing a net profit of £47,365 and after paying a dividend of 12 per cent they still had a balance of £29,189. A sum of £25,000 was put into a reserve fund that year and the rest ploughed back into new purchases of land. \(\text{(1)}\)

The remarkable thing about the operations of this firm was not so much the scale of building, though this amounted to over a thousand houses in four years, but the success which they had in expanding output during a five year period when building activity in Fulham was falling off. The business of the firm did not conform to the normal cycle of prosperity and depression experienced by the industry as a whole.

Why were they so successful? One point made by the \textit{Builder} was that they not only made the builders' profits on the houses, but also the profits on the land and ground rents, which "are generally the greater source of profits and usually realised by the freeholder". \(\text{(2)}\)

Secondly, they could offset a fall in demand for houses of one size or description on one estate by building different

---

1. \textit{Ibid.}
2. \textit{Ibid.}
types of houses on another. They had not the same
temptation as a builder who concentrated his activities
on one development to push building forward irrespective
of the demand for houses in the locality.

Other reasons for the success of the firm were
offered by a reporter to the local press. He maintained
that the houses which they built at West Kensington Park
were better and cheaper than most suburban dwellings.
The firm specialised in building the type of house which
let at rents ranging from £30 to £60. They were all
"solidly built, and contain the latest improvements;
even the smallest class are provided with hot and cold
water, and bathrooms, with electric bells; while the
encaustic tiles, stained glass and marble fenders give
them an attractive appearance not often found in houses of
this class". The firm was able to do this through
buying materials cheaply and in bulk and avoiding credit.
They also owned their own brickfields, steam saw mills,
joinery, stone and marble works (for marble chimney pieces).

1. West London Observer, 4 October, 1884.
The workshops shown in the frontispiece to this thesis
probably belonged to Gibbs and Flew.
These internal economies of scale gave the firm advantages over most of their competitors.

In Fulham during the 1880s the organisation of the housing industry was such that one firm was able to go on expanding output and to capture a larger share of a diminishing market. Although housing in this period was said to be the cinderella of investment opportunities this firm was able to raise capital without any difficulty and to make substantial profits. Differences in the organisation of the building trade do help to explain the differences in the degree to which the supply of fixed capital fluctuated in particular districts.

Fluctuations in building activity were, of course, relative movements only: even at the lowest point of building activity in Fulham during the 1880s, more capital was being invested in houses than at the highest point of building activity in the late 1860s. This chapter has shown that the major source of building finance in West London was the small capitalist, including in this the majority of building firms which, large or small, seemed to have originated from quite humble beginnings. The next
chapter goes on to examine the part which these small capitalists played, along with others, in organising the finance for other forms of social capital required in new suburban districts.
CHAPTER 6
The Maintenance and Improvement of Social Conditions

"On the most important point of sanitary action (the Vestries and District Boards) have spent eighteenpence only per head of the population, and for improvements under 2s 9d per head during 20 years of their authority, whilst Newington has spent £13,000 on its Town Hall, and Shoreditch £30,000".

"There are men who look upon charity merely as an economical resource, and who conceive that it might be dispensed with in favour of rates of shillings and pence in the pound forgetting that this would destroy all opportunity for generous impulse and active faith ---".
(Sampson Low, The Charities of London, 1867).

"the effect of having a Church will increase materially the buildings on the estate and they trust that the Company as supplying the estate ... and having an interest in its extension will have the kindness to contribute".
(Application for a subscription to the building fund of St. John, Notting Hill, received by the Grand Junction Water Company, May, 1843. Quoted, G. Berry, Evolution of Water Supplies to the Royal Borough of Kensington, ms.1957).
Capital Expenditure by means of Improvement Acts

In the early nineteenth century one way of providing the finance for improving the social conditions of new districts was to raise a rate from the local inhabitants. This might be done by forming a committee to look after a square or communal garden or by securing an Improvement Act, giving powers over a larger area, a device adopted in Paddington. According to the rector, "things had gone to a very extravagant height with respect to tumult and disorder" in the parish meetings just before 1820. In 1824 the government of Paddington was changed and the simple open vestry became a select vestry representing the property interests in the parish. The boards set up by the Paddington Improvement Act and a later Act of 1844 were in no way different from the smaller boards formed by the private estate owners of St. Pancras. In Paddington the power of levelling rates and using them for


2. Select Committee on Select Vestries, Parl. Papers, 1830 (25) iv, p.49. See, for example, Vestry Minutes, 13 April, 1819.
improvements was placed firmly in the hands of landowners, developers and wealthy suburban residents. According to Sir Benjamin Hall only one-eleventh of the ratepayers, or 607 people had 3,642 votes, which was more than the number of votes possessed by the other 3,582 ratepayers. Moreover the eighteen vestrymen appointed to manage the parish affairs might be overruled by the ex officio vestrymen (1) amounting to nearly 40 under the Act.

It is not surprising, in these circumstances, to find that the Paddington vestry refused to co-operate with other more democratic vestries (such as St. Marylebone) and opposed any schemes that might detract from the social standing of the districts which they managed. Until 1855 the vestry resolutely opposed every Bill projected by new railway companies with ambitions for connecting Paddington with the City. They also resisted any suggestions that vestry finance might be used for providing lodging houses (2) or public baths for working men.

1. Select Committee on Local Government and Taxation of the Metropolis, Parl. Papers, 1861 (211), viii.

2. Paddington Vestry Minutes, 7 November, 1837, 2 January, 1846, 3 February, 1854, 4 April, 1851, 4 January, 1853.
The ease with which the property interests of Paddington acquired a monopoly of local government was due to the absence of a strong commercial class in the parish before 1850. In Kensington and in Hammersmith the tradesmen and small farmers controlled the parish business. In Kensington the aristocratic and gentry landowners and first suburban residents were not interested in parish business and left these affairs mainly in the hands of the High Street shopkeepers and publicans who turned the vestry into a petty oligarchy. These tradesmen regarded with suspicion the attempts by landowners to improve their estates and to promote new turnpike trusts. They also turned down the request of the inhabitants of the Ladbroke estate that the vestry should take over and repair the estate roads. But the new owners of building estates gradually infiltrated into the Kensington parish councils and committees and helped to persuade particularly the vestry, the works committee, to think about acquiring an Improvement Act and getting rid of

1. The composition and activities of the vestry (or lack of them) in the first half of the nineteenth century are discussed by G. Laurance, The Kensington Vestry, ms. (1961) (Kensington Central Library).

numerous lighting districts and separate rates that existed in the parish. When the motion was debated, however, it was opposed by the representatives of the suburban inhabitants led by the railway journalist, Herapath, because it was thought to be just a ruse by the tradesmen to improve their position. Herapath claimed that the Improvement Act was a device for destroying the 'open' vestry and for relieving the rates on favoured areas, such as the High Street, and spreading them over less developed districts. This was a typical attitude on the part of suburban residents who preferred to get the vestry to provide services from the finance arising from the rateable values of developed districts and commercial and industrial (including railway property).

During the first half of the century the Kensington vestry repeatedly opposed changes being discussed and carried out in other places. The Burial Board and the Board of Guardians were the only two institutions to incur any capital.

1. Kensington Vestry Minutes, 6 May, 1850. However the J.P.s in a special session on highways thought that the estate roads were of utility to the parish.

expenditure. In Paddington, on the other hand, the apparatus of parish government was used to provide funds for amenities thought necessary for the welfare of the district and suited to the social standing of its chief inhabitants. The most important of these were the churches to be erected on sites provided by the ground landlords of the Paddington estate. Between 1842 and 1852 over £20,000 was voted towards church building funds, and the money used either to start off a building fund or to make up any deficits when a church was built. This money was borrowed from insurance societies and repaid with the finance raised from levying a church rate. The rest of the money was expected to come from private donations and some of the government’s £1 million grant. The vestry started out by contributing £5,276 towards the building of All Saints, Cambridge Place, completed in 1842 at a cost of £7,011. Thereafter they contributed sums of £2,000 to £4,000 towards the building of

1. A Church rate was also levied to extend and repair the parish church.

six more churches. Christ Church, Lancaster Gate built in
1853 at a cost of £14,500 was, perhaps a typical example.
The land was provided by J. Pink, the developer of the
Craven estate on which it stood, and the bulk of the money
raised from the residents of the estate supplemented by a
parish grant. St. Saviour, Warwick Avenue, Paddington was
built with the aid of £2,000 from the vestry and another
donation of £2,000 from a local benefactor; the rest of the
money (over £8,000) was raised from the smaller subscriptions
provided over several years by the congregation. St. Stephen's,
Westbourne Grove, Paddington was erected in 1853 at a cost of
£10,200. In this case the money was raised with the help of
a building fund supported amongst others by the substantial
builders of the Paddington estate. The ground landlords of
the Westbourne estate, namely the Dean and Chapter of
Westminster and J. Phillips, who afterwards built St. Stephen's
Crescent, donated the site. The church was built in relation
to the design of the estate and for this reason the chancel
faced west instead of east. Only one of these churches, that

1. Church Commissioners, Endowments and Sites, File no. 17806.
2. Ibid., File nos. 17806 and 33401.
   Borough Library).
of St. Stephen, was properly a parish church.

The last church grant made in 1852 was carried through in the teeth of strong opposition from the rate-payers, who for some years previously had been growing increasingly discontented with the policies of the vestry. The spearhead of the opposition was the Paddington Parochial Association formed in 1833 in an attempt to reduce the cost of maintaining the poor of the parish. In 1849 the Association was reformed and the first of two unsuccessful attempts made to persuade the vestry to adopt Hobhouse's Act. Despite these setbacks the Association did manage to draft their secretary and chief spokesman onto the local council. This was W. Robins who used the vestry meetings as a platform for a series of

1. Paddington Vestry Minutes, 8 August, 1833; Minutes, Fulham Select Vestry, 1829-1832. There is evidence here of pressure to introduce some of the 'tests' later included in the Poor Law Amendment Act. For discussion on local pressures and schemes see J.D. Marshall, 'The Nottinghamshire Reformers and their Contribution to the New Poor Law', Economic History Review, xiii, no.3 (1961).

2. The Hobhouse Act was a culmination of many years opposition to select vestries. Among the various parishes that co-operated in bringing about a general reform, the most notable appear to have been Marylebone and St. Martin's. In 1842 Hobhouse's Act was adopted by five parishes in the Metropolis. In Marylebone and St. Pancras the elections of new vestrymen were influenced greatly by parochial committees. For this agitation see 'The Local Government of the Metropolis', Westminster Review (April, 1836), Parl. Papers, Select Committee on Select Vestries, 1830 (25), iv, Parish Vestries-Returns, Parl. Papers, 1842 (564), xxxiii. S and B. Webb, The Parish and the County (1921), pp.80-90. B. Keith-Lucas, The English Local Government Franchise, A Short History (1952) chapter 11 and F.H.W. Sheppard, Local Government in St. Marylebone, 1768-1835 (1958).
attacks on the Bishop of London, the Grand Junction Canal Company and the management of local government in London.

He carried on a personal vendetta against the Bishop of London, attacking him on three counts: first, that he had filched the lands of the poor in Paddington; secondly, that he had cheated the parish by giving them the largest hole he could find as a site for Holy Trinity Church, which, in consequence, cost the large sum of £18,457 to build; and, thirdly, that he had put up houses on the Paddington estate which were all show and no substance. In sum, Robins claimed,

"The transition state from an agricultural village to the fashionable Tyburnia was no very agreeable time for the majority of those who lived in Paddington. When the cottages were swept away, and the heavy poor rates which they had entailed were diminished, new burdens sprang up, scarcely less grievous. Rents became enormous; the Highway, Watching and Lighting Rates were excessive; and these were rendered more oppressive on account of those who received the greatest benefit from the causes which necessitated the greatest expenditure not bearing their just share of this local taxation". (1)

1. W. Robins, Paddington Past and Present (1853), p.211, Paddington Vestry Minutes, March–June, 1853. Also see 'Cantab', Paddington as it was and as it is. A Sketch (1877).
Robins is mentioned because he was typical of the urban and suburban radicalism of the 1840s and 1850s that had an important and lasting influence on the finances and management of parish affairs and on the capital expenditure of the local vestries and boards. Local radical groups were made up from professional men in alliance with drapers (1) and other substantial men of commerce. They received support from suburban inhabitants concerned about the efficiency of local government and the expense of local services. The leader and chief spokesman of urban radicalism in London was the Piccadilly austineer, and member for St. James, Westminster, James Beal, who attempted to organise popular discontent behind the Municipal Reform Association founded in 1866. Urban radicalism in London was, however, less a movement than an attitude of mind. As such it had affinities with the attitudes towards government shown by the 'economical reformers' in the local radical traditions of other mid-Victorian cities. The attitudes of

1. It was this combination of interests, as we have seen earlier, that supported the Freehold Land and Building Society Movement in London.

urban radicals harmonised with the ideals of suburbians
about local government: that it should be cheap, efficient,
and limited to the provision of essential services and estate
amenities.

The influence of the 'economical reformers'

The influence of the 'economical reformers' was being
felt in all the parishes of West London in the 1840s and 1850s,
not just in Paddington. Three items of business regularly
appeared on the agenda of vestry meetings: the level of the
rates, the sanitary condition of the new suburban districts,
and the cost and inefficient supply of water and gas. The
level of the rates was of more than usual concern in suburban
parishes that hoped to attract newcomers. Since the 1840s
the rates had been rising though only by relatively small
amounts. The chief cause in Paddington was the increase in
the Church rate and outlays on a burial ground and new vestry
(1) premises. The chief cause in Kensington and Hammersmith
was the increase in the poor rates.

In Kensington the poor rate rose a shilling to 3/-
in the £ during the early 1840s, resulting in the first of

many attacks on the Board of Guardians led by T. Perceval and J. Hanson, the latter a builder and property owner in Kensington. They succeeded in taking Kensington out of the Poor Law Union and for a short time managed to cut the poor rate. In 1846 the Board of Guardians decided to build a new workhouse, a move that created a domestic battle in Kensington that at one time brought some of the vestrymen to blows. Despite great opposition the workhouse project went through and the poor rate rose to 3/4 in the £ in 1846. It was not until 1852 that the anti-Workhouse faction managed to bring it down to 1/6 in the £. This was a low rate compared with the rate of 6/6-7/- in the £ approved, under protest by the Hammersmith vestry in the 1840s. In Hammersmith the poor law 'reformers' could do little to relieve the burden on the resources of the parish imposed by a growing number of poor, especially Irish poor at Brook Green, and labourers displaced by the street and

1. Kensington Vestry Minutes, 11 September, 1846, 23 June 1848, 6 March, 1851 and 5 March, 1852; Kensington Workhouse Committee Minutes, 22 June, 1846, 11 December, 1846 including letters and resolutions; also West London Observer, 5 December, 1868.
and railway improvements in Central London. As one inhabitant remarked to the West London Observer, what Hammersmith needed was an enterprising class of landowners who would carry out improvements for them. How else were they to afford the necessary outlays in a "parish of shopkeepers, cut about with taxes".

In the late 1840s the London vestries made a renewed attempt to do something about the supply of gas and water. The Kensington vestry passed a motion in 1849 claiming that the water supplied to the parish was "insufficient for cleanliness and health, costly in price and unsatisfactory in quality and that the system of intermittent supply was objectionable and pressed heavily upon the poorer people of the parish". Later in the year the special committee set up to investigate the water supply

1. As early as 1837 the Hammersmith vestry were becoming concerned at the number of "poor Irish" that "literally besieged the workhouse" (built in 1729 at a cost of £1,400). In that year they received the support of Feargus O'Connor, a temporary resident, in protesting at the amalgamation with the combined Union of Paddington, Chelsea, Fulham and Kensington. Hammersmith Minutes, 1836-37, passim.

2. West London Observer, 31 August, 1861.

made approaches to new projected concerns, such as the Henley Water Works Company and the Metropolitan Anti Water Monopoly Association. The latter was instituted to reorganise the entire water service of London and suburban districts into self-supporting institutions after an initial outlay raised from charges on the rates. The Hammersmith vestry also sent representatives to the Parochial Water Association. In that parish only a quarter of the two thousand houses or so had piped water laid on. The public pumps and wells of Hammersmith were of little depth and full of impurities: when a medical officer was appointed in 1856 he found evidence of direct percolation from neighbouring cesspools and stressed the dangers likely to arise from the heavy manurings of market gardens. Only Paddington of the London vestries kept aloof from this agitation. They were content with renewing their agreement with the Grand Junction Water Company which included a lower charge for water to the inhabitants of the Paddington estate than to the inhabitants of other districts.


The Kensington vestry was less to the fore in attacking the gas companies probably because they had negotiated a good bargain with the Western Gas Company in 1848 by which the Company agreed to pay a penalty of £10,000 if they amalgamated and after a reasonable time to pay 5/- a yard per day for every day in which they delayed laying pipes. Other London vestries went much further than this. For example, the Chelsea Improvement Bill of 1845 sought inter alia to permit the Commissioners of that district establishing a municipal supply of gas as had been proposed at Lambeth some years before, but the power was withdrawn largely because of the strong views held by Lord Shaftesbury upon the impropriety of granting trading powers to parochial boards.

Sanitary matters were also debated with a new sense of urgency. In the late 1840s the vestrymen of Hammersmith spent most of their time debating the reports of the inspectors on the "filthy and unwholesome state" of the


sewers. The prominence of sanitary questions was due to two causes. First, the vestrymen were becoming apprehensive about the possibility of cholera epidemics in the parishes. So far they had managed to escape any major epidemics and the reputation that the suburbs had for healthy living was still supported by the average mortality statistics. During the 1850s the average mortality rate in West London, at 19 to 22 per thousand compared favourably with the rest of London. Yet suburban 'rookeries' represented a threat to health. For example, Kensal Town, though 50 feet higher up

1. A Board of Health was set up in Hammersmith in 1831 to take precautions against cholera epidemic; Hammersmith Vestry Summary Minutes, 1828-1835. For the 1840s see Hammersmith Vestry Minutes, 1848-1852. In the Kensington Vestry the owner of a building estate at Notting Hill, W. Roy, proposed a motion applauding the recent interest in sanitary matters and calling for measures of a more "decided and comprehensive character". Kensington Vestry Minutes, 22 February, 1850.


than Chelsea, by which it was partly governed, had a higher mortality rate than some of the neglected courts and alleys of that parish. The 'potteries' in Notting Hill and Jennings buildings in the High Street were other black spots. In the former place the death rate in 1849 was 30 per cent in excess of that for London and the infant mortality rate was 80 per cent of all deaths in 1856 compared with 43 per cent for the rest of Kensington. One result of this concern was that the London vestries helped to support the passage of the Metropolitan Building Act in 1855 which was intended in part to prevent builders creating these suburban slums.

Secondly, the London suburban districts had attracted the attention of the Health of Towns Association. The publicity which they gave to the lack of sewers in the outer suburbs and the possibility that Chadwick's proposals for the reform of London government might be adopted, combined to move some of the sewer commissions to action. In the late 1840s


2. For example, Select Committee on Health of Towns, Parl. Papers, 1840 (384), xi, Q.535, 536, evidence of Dr. Neil Arnott, and the Reports of the Health of Towns Commission.

3. For the background to this, and the sanitary improvements of the Commission of Sewers of the City, see the relevant parts of S.E. Finer, The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick (1952), R.A. Lewis, Edwin Chadwick and the Public Health Movement, 1832-1854 (1952), Royston Lambert, Sir John Simon 1816-1904 (1963) especially part II.
the Westminster Commission began to overhaul their organisation but too late to save them from being replaced by the Metropolitan Commission of Sewers. Between 1845 and 1851, 34 miles of new sewers were laid at a total cost of £115,697 just under half of which was private work. In the next five years the Metropolitan Commission laid out another £59,263 and then unloaded their outstanding debts on the vestries and boards. Many of the new sewers were badly constructed: the Medical Officer for Paddington claimed that the principles of good town drainage had been ignored in the development of West London and that sewers had been constructed in a variety of shapes and sizes. In fact some of them laid down in Paddington had fallen in by 1866 and others were choked with filth. Most of the outer suburbs were still undrained in 1856: Kensington was described as still being in the age of open ditches and cesspools, and Hammersmith, which had not been assessed to a sewers rate, as having large


areas of flooded and swampy land.

The major outlay on improving the sanitary condition of the London suburban districts was made after 1855 by the Metropolitan Board of Works and the district boards. In 1856 those vestrymen who believed in 'improvements' had two problems to meet. First they had the job of keeping the rates steady; but secondly, they had to find the finance for new capital outlays. The way in which they managed this will be discussed in a later section.

Building the Churches: the role of voluntary effort

West London had a better record in the maintenance of social than sanitary conditions to 1856 due largely to the wealth and social aspirations of the new migrants. In this sort of expenditure local inhabitants could see to their own affairs and were not dependent on local government or risk capital. In most fashionable areas they set up square and garden committees and levied their own private rates: Kensington had eight of these committees in 1856. Their


2. The vestry inherited a debt of £5,000 from the Norland Square Committee and smaller debts from other committees, First Annual Report, Kensington Vestry (1856).
ability to pay high fees for the education of sons and daughters was reflected in a spate of school building from the 1840s when a range of private schools and academies, day and boarding, were provided by enterprising schoolmasters to supplement the existing endowed schools. Kensington was known as the region of preparatory schools and was also supplied with at least 15 schools for middle class girls and boys, providing a mainly classical education.

West London was also fairly well provided with churches. The religious tables constructed after the census of 1851 placed the division of Kensington thirteenth and the division of West London sixteenth in the list of divisions requiring more church accommodation. This was rather better than the division of Marylebone but worse than the position in Camberwell or Islington. The fact was, of course, that both schools and churches had not kept pace with the growth of population in poor or lower middle class districts. Kensington was said to be well provided with Churches by

1. Compiled from local trade directories, newspapers and F.S. de Carteret-Brown, Our Schools and Colleges (1872).

the local vicar but in some growing districts in Hammersmith (1) no churches had yet been built. In Paddington the distribution of churches was also uneven: the St. Mary district in 1852 had less than one place for every ten people, but in the district of St. John the ratio was one to six. The lower middle class, particularly the tradesmen, seem to have been particularly short of both church and school facilities. These people were above sending their children to the national schools, three of which were built during the 1840s providing 450 new places, or the parochial schools. At the same time the middle class schools were too expensive and provided unsuitable courses. The growth of commercial education in West London did not really get underway until the 1870s.

There were then many calls on the pockets of suburban residents besides that of the rates. They came from the

2. Paddington Vestry Minutes, 3 February, 1852.
promoters of voluntary organisations founded to raise money for charity and for building hospitals, churches, chapels, mission halls, schools and dispensaries.\(^{(1)}\)

The scale of contributions increased after 1850 especially those donated to church and chapel building organisations, and by 1901 no less than 260 religious buildings had been provided in West London at a cost which must have been somewhere about £2 million to £3 million\(^{(2)}\). The suburban residents also maintained the churches and chapels and the schools and missions which often went with them. It was said, for example, that the maintenance of religion at Notting Hill cost the residents something like £15,000 a year for their own ministry and the societies and other organisations connected with the various denominations.\(^{(3)}\) This effort of the Victorians to extend and

1. The census reports contain lists of these institutions.
2. It is not possible to calculate the precise cost.
### TABLE 10

The Provision of Churches and Chapels (1891)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Paddington Numbers</th>
<th>Paddington Attendance</th>
<th>Kensington Numbers</th>
<th>Kensington Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16,871</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconformist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8,164</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Hammersmith Numbers</th>
<th>Hammersmith Attendance</th>
<th>Fulham Numbers</th>
<th>Fulham Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7,446</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconformist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,536</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL West London**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconformist</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7,772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: A. Shanwell, Life in West London (1897) and R. Medc. Smith (ed.), The Religious Life of London (1904).*
and maintain the religious fabric of West London was a considerable building achievement which is not only interesting in itself but illustrates the role of voluntary contributions in the finance of suburban amenities. For this reason it is worth taking some time over. How did the founders of these churches raise the money that was required? And in what ways can this money be regarded as an investment?

Some indication of the scale of the operation is given in Table 10.

The finance for church and chapel building came from four main sources: the endowments of private persons and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; the grants made by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Church Building Societies; the loans made by Church Building Societies and other financial institutions such as the Insurance Societies; and individual donations and contributions.

The methods of financing individual churches and chapels varied greatly. At one extreme were those churches and chapels which were paid for at the time they were built or as they were being built. Some churches were built by private individuals or started out with a substantial endowment.

Other churches were built, piece by piece, as the money from local contributors came in. This was one reason why the Church of St. Mary Magdalene erected in a slum area on the banks of the Grand Junction Canal took ten years to build, from 1868-1878. At the other extreme were churches and chapels built mainly or entirely with loans. In these cases the procedure was for the promoters to raise funds on the security of land or pew rents and to recover the debts through a building fund. The loan might be repaid almost at once with the aid of contributions from private individuals or Church building societies; but when the money from these sources was insufficient to pay off the debts the incumbent and his building committee would be involved in a variety of money raising enterprises: church collections, subscription lists, door to door collections, bazaars, outings and special services. A good many churches and chapels combined all these various techniques.

The way in which money raising techniques were manipulated can be illustrated by giving a brief account of the building operation in West London to the 1870s. The size and financing of chapels and churches built between 1850 and 1871 depended on the wealth of the districts in which
they were situated and the internal condition of the various denominations. Until the 1870s the majority of Anglican churches were provided for wealthy districts. For example, during the 1850s twelve Anglican Churches were built of which five cost £75,000 or three quarters of the total expenditure. Some of these Churches were built like the houses in anticipation of the demand for them and in at least one case - that of St. Paul, Onslow Square - at the sole expense of the chief developer, Sir Charles James Freake. The Church of All Saints, Columb Road was also provided by a developer, in this case a clergyman, but was not such a successful 'speculation' and remained in carcass for eight years.

Whereas 'estate' churches built in wealthy districts were mainly financed by the contributions of builders, landowners and residents, the founders of churches built in the less wealthy or poor undeveloped districts relied either on the local clergy or outside organisations for funds. The point was made by a member of the building committee of St. John the Evangelist, Bradmore, Hammersmith, when he was explaining why it was the

1. Some of these Churches are referred to above pp. 335-7.
2. Church Commissioners, Endowments and Sites, File No. 23744.
Church had neither a spire nor a tower:

"On account of the poverty of the parish and the absence of any wealthy resident proprietors, it is impossible to obtain this (money) from local sources — the committee have, therefore, been constrained to appeal to the Church at large". (1)

The appeals which these Churches made were met in the main by clergymen until the 1860s. When a church at Shepherds Bush was mooted, for instance, in 1856 the entire cost (£6,500) was donated by the Bishop of London. Again when St. Philips, Earls Court was built in a poor and undeveloped part of Earls Court in 1850, the finance was practically raised by two clergymen, which moved the West London Observer to comment:

"The site has cost a large sum and though the contributions of many parties has been liberal, they have not given as generously as might be expected". (3)

This pattern was repeated in the 1860s, when the Church of St. Michael (1861, £1408), St. George, Aubrey Walk (1864, £8203) and St. Mark (1864) were all endowed by private individuals living in the new parts of Kensington. St. Stephen, Gloucester Road (1865) was another Church built with

1. Anon. A Short Account of the New District Church of St. John the Evangelist at Hammersmith (1858).
2. Church Commissioners, Endowments and Sites, File no.17589.
3. Cited in N. Forster, The Early Years of St. Philips Church, Earls Court, n.d.
substantial financial assistance from the developer of the 
(1) 
estate, H.B. Alexander. By this time, however, the growth 
of nonconformity and the state of poor districts in the City 
and suburbs was beginning to raise doubts in the minds of 
some Anglicans about the whole programme of Church extension. 
Critics wrote about the commercialism of the suburbs and the 
(2) 
inequality in the distribution of Churches. One result of 
this was the founding of Christian Missions, supported by the 
Bishop of London's Fund, but intended to be financed mainly 
from local people. The first Mission Church in West London 
was built at Walham Green in 1863 where it was alleged the 
religious accommodation was worse than the average of one 
place in seven common in other districts in Hammersmith. 

During the 1870s founders of the Churches built in 
poor districts were still having to go to some lengths in 
order to raise funds. The Church of St. Godolphin, built at 
Shepherds Bush in 1878 was originally an iron mission church. 
It was financed almost entirely without help from the wealthy 
people in neighbouring districts but from the small sums

1. Church Commissioners, Endowments and Sites, File no.33401.
2. For example, A.C. Tait, The Spiritual Wants of the Metropolis 
and its suburbs (1863), and A London Clergyman, Letters to 
the Bishop of London (1864).
accumulated over a long time by the warehousemen and poor clerks that lived in the district. St. Lukes, Uxbridge Road (1872) was built in a district which according to the West London Observer could not afford a new church. It had to appeal for support to people outside of the parish.

St. Lukes Church, Camberly Road, Kilburn (1877, £5,500) was also financed mainly from contributions outside of the parish in the form of donations from the Church Building Societies and Church Building Funds. Evidently, the wealthy inhabitants of West London were more willing to spend money on their own 'estate' churches than in providing new churches for poor districts at least until the 1880s.

In the building of large expensive churches the Anglicans had the advantage of being the approved church as well as financial advantage arising from the system of endowments. They had also been assisted by government money up to the mid century. In contrast the Catholic Church was in a poor position financially and legally for advancing into suburban districts. In fact no Catholic Churches were

---

1. Church Commissioners, Endowments and Sites, File no.17589.
3. Ibid., 13 January, 1877.
built until after the establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in 1851 when Brook Green in Hammersmith became an important centre for Catholic activity with a church, schools and Training College. Thereafter the Catholics had the advantage of imported funds in the shape of the religious orders invited into the country by Cardinal Newman, but the home Church continued to suffer from a shortage of finance, except in those districts fortunate enough to attract wealthy Catholic residents such as Countess Tasker who contributed £4,000 to the building of Holy Trinity Church, Brook Green, and other sums to a hospital and a convent. But the Church of Our Lady of Victories, the headquarters from 1869 of the Catholics in the west, still carried building debts in 1901.

The suburban movement was observed by Nonconformists as damaging to their chapels in that it brought both a flight away from well endowed City chapels and a flight to the Church of England. The social attractions of Anglicanism and the internal disputes and inadequate financial organisation of nonconformity accounts for the predominance of Anglican church

1. It cost £10,150. This section is based on Anon., Our Lady of Victories (n.d.), especially, pp.11-14, F.C. Durrant, The Story of St. Mathias’s Church (1943) and A. White, History of Holy Trinity Church, Hammersmith (1903), especially pp.38-9.
building until well into the 1860s. Thus the reform movement of 1849-1852 in the Methodist denomination caused a splintering of the Churches in West London which, in the case of the Hinde Street circuit, resulted in the loss of members. Denbigh Chapel in Notting Hill, built in 1856, was the first Methodist chapel to be erected in West London for many years and only the thirteenth in London which was capable of holding 1,000 people. The struggle to build this imposing chapel was made more so by the determination of the founders to avoid the common practice of building chapels and leaving posterity to pay for them. The experience of chapel building at Notting Hill was the major reason for the creation of the Metropolitan Chapel Building Fund, the first of the Nonconformist Building Societies which was launched with a gift of £50,000 from Sir Francis Lycett. Denbigh Chapel became the head of the Bayswater circuit and assisted in establishing new chapels at Warwick Gardens and Lancaster Road.


2. For a short account of Methodism in West London see, Anon Denbigh Road Methodist Church, 1858-1957 (1957).

3. No debts were incurred and shortly after the chapel opened the building fund showed a balance.
Paddington and Bassein Park, Fulham. The building of this chapel marks the beginning of the age of mahogany and pew rents in suburban methodism.

The advance of nonconformity into the suburbs was related to the bursts of evangelical enthusiasm which quickened the building energies of the sects and also to the changing character of residential settlement. The Baptists and Congregationalists made a major advance into suburban territory during the 1860s when the latter provided five chapels in Hammersmith and Kensington, costing between £30,000 and £40,000. In this revival decade the nonconformist churches made most headway in Hammersmith. At Shepherds Bush the Congregationalists erected a conspicuous building on the Uxbridge Road on a site, part of the Oaklands estate, donated by Peter Broad a City auctioneer, who did much to develop the district and to provide houses which rented from £100 to £250. In contrast, the Baptists and Presbyterians founded chapels at Leyfield Road and Starch Green, both districts which contained small houses renting from £28 to £30 towards Starch.

1. For the revival movements and chapel building societies see E.A. Payne, The Baptist Union, a short history (1959), R. Tudor Jones, Congregationalism in England, 1662-1962 (1962) pp.295-7, and for a local account, J. Stoughton, Congregationalism in the Old Court Suburb (1933), especially p.125. The five chapels were: Horbury Chapel (£1,700, 1849), Allen Street (£8,748, 1854-5) and the five other chapels were: Kensington, Oaklands, Shepherds Bush, Edith Grove and Craven Hill.
Green and £30 to £50 nearer London. In the following two decades both these denominations and the Methodists built substantial chapels for the new housing estates in Fulham. Some of the biggest were built at West Kensington Park; a Wesleyan chapel was started here in an iron building in 1875 before the area was developed, and the permanent building, erected ten years later, cost £8,000 to £9,000. The most expensive chapel was the West Kensington Congregational Chapel built in 1882 at a cost of £12,084. It received support from local residents with business interests in the suburb; the members of the building committee included two builders, a local J.P., a shopkeeper, doctor and clergyman. Only one meeting was required to launch the building fund and to accept an offer of £2,600 from a chapel building society. At this meeting held in the Vestry Hall, with J. Spicer, a leading builder in the district as chairman, the rest of the money for the chapel was subscribed or promised.

How can the financing of Churches and Chapels be regarded? The provision of money for this was, in part, an

expression of Victorian piety and evangelical enthusiasm.
The leaders of church building enterprise were the professionals in religion, the Bishop of London and the parish clergy, such as Dr. Sinclair of the Kensington Parish Church, a notable founder of new churches, and the many local and poor suburban clergy who depended on pew rents for their (1) incomes. They were supported by suburban residents who contributed money through the collection boxes and in other, more substantial ways. The help which they gave was more than a matter of religious conviction. The number and size of Churches in wealthy districts and the ease with which the funds were supplied indicates that these donations can be regarded as much an investment in maintaining property values and in keeping up appearances, as the money spent on buying a house in a fashionable district, paying school fees, and garden and square rates. Moreover, builders, landowners and traders who supported the building of churches and chapels were looking for a more tangible return. As Hobhouse remarked in relation to proprietary chapels, a Church in a genteel district was a

1. J.D.G. Scott, The Story of St. Mary Abbots, Kensington (1942), pp.151-2. For the enterprise of another clergyman in Acton who founded two churches at an early stage in its growth see, Percival Jolliffe, Acton and Its History (1910) p.81.
lucrative speculation. One of the earliest to realise this was George Scott, a landowner in Hammersmith and the builder of St. Peter's Square. After donating land and money to the Church of St. Peter he wrote to a friend in 1827:

"Thanks to my generosity and piety the new Church is begun at last, but the parsons will have it named after that papistical Saint Peter, because, not seeing it in the proper light, as you have done, they had the politeness to tell me they think George is such an atheistic Saint. However, piety is its own reward, and I have let between £400 and £500 per annum on building leases, and am petering away in squares, crescents and terraces and I hope to finish with St. George and the Dragon, and we shall then see which Saint gets the most custom". (2)

Yet it was not only economic interest that induced landowners and builders to finance churches and chapels because they also contributed to Churches unconnected with their own building estates and to other social institutions. They had several roles to uphold. The great landowners such as the Marquis of Westminster and the Duke of Bedford contributed quite large sums to the Metropolitan Church Building Societies and the Associations set up to improve the housing of workmen in their role as social leaders. In suburban parishes land-


2. Letter from George Scott, 11 April, 1827, in a copy of Faulkner's History of Hammersmith (1839), Hammersmith Borough Library.

owners such as the trustees of the Paddington Estate and (1) Lord Kensington were acting in the same way. But in parishes such as Hammersmith, without a resident class of wealthy landowners and unable to attract many wealthy developers, the leaders in the local communities were the (2) lesser landowners, builders and traders. They were the sort of people to be found taking an active part in the affairs of the parish during mid Victorian years along with Sir James Philipart, the Chairman of the Vestry. For example, Thomas Chamberlain was a builder in Hammersmith who was also a leader of local dissent, provided a site for a chapel on his own Rivercourt Estate in Hammersmith and also built and helped (3) to provide mission halls and schools elsewhere. James Gomme was an estate agent and landowner who donated two sites for churches on his own lands and also worked for other Church building committees. His grandson, Laurence Gomme, eventually

1. Sir Morton Peto who had an interest in a building estate at Kensington also contributed to Church building and provided workmen, dwellings, the Peto Improved Dwellings.

2. With the exception of the Bishop of London.

3. Anon. Note on Waterloo Street Church, n.d.
became the leading public man in Hammersmith as clerk to the Fulham Board of Works and ultimately the London County Council. W. Ainsworth, a tradesman, E. Bird, a member of the building firm established in Hammersmith for most of the century, and W. Crookes, another local builder, were members of the building committees of three churches in the 1850s, the promoters of unsuccessful railway to Hammersmith, governors of the local savings bank, members of the parochial and charity schools committee, and members of the vestry. A complexity of motives must have induced local people like these to dip into their pockets and to give up their time in order to persuade others to part with their money for new social and religious institutions.

**Capital expenditure on physical improvements after 1856**

After 1856 the agencies of metropolitan government began to put the physical condition of the urban and suburban districts of London in order. The programme of improvements

1. Details of his career will be found in the Gomme papers, London County Record Office.

2. One Church, Masboro' Road North, was in a working class district built by them. Information about Bird is from the Miscellaneous Parish Papers, Hammersmith Borough Library.
which they carried out was the main reason for the long term
increase in the parish and metropolitan rates in West London.
In 1901 the rates were over twice as high in Paddington and
Kensington than in 1857. The increase was not quite so large in
Hammersmith where the level was higher than in the other two
parishes at the start. These are relative terms, of course,
and during the seventy years since 1891 the rates in these
parishes have trebled.

(1)

**TABLE 11**

Parish Rates and Rate Income in West London, 1857-1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate in the £</th>
<th>Rateable Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>2s 1d</td>
<td>518570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>2s 11d</td>
<td>665674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>4s 10½d</td>
<td>1,276101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>1857 (2)</td>
<td>2s 9d</td>
<td>287655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>3s 3d</td>
<td>605711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>5s 1d</td>
<td>1,913523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>5s 5d</td>
<td>61200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>1871 (3)</td>
<td>4s 4½d</td>
<td>118200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>6s 2d</td>
<td>385407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Values and yields are given in the Parliamentary Returns on the Local Taxation of the Metropolis and the Annual Reports, Vestries and District Boards. The actual Rate in the £ was returned for the years 1859-1868 and after 1884. The parishes also keep rate books.

2. The rate in 1857 was actually higher than this (6s 0½d) but special local rates for garden and square debts accounted for 3s 3d.

3. Fulham and Hammersmith were separated after 1871.
A programme of capital works intended to improve the physical condition of the metropolitan parishes was carried out between 1856 and 1871. Over £800,000 was laid out on this kind of improvement in West London. The Metropolitan Board of Works provided about half of this mainly on the great drainage scheme: outfall works, main sewers to form the Western and Middle Level drainage systems and the covering over of the old open sewers of Ranelagh, Counters Creek and Stanford Brook, of which the last ran through the middle of a densely populated part of Hammersmith.

The Board also carried out or supported improvements in the main roads in order to relieve congestion at various points. The most important of these were the Kensington High Street scheme which cost £160,469, considerably more than the original estimate and the Edgware Road and Harrow Road widening scheme which cost a further £100,495.

1. Calculated from the annual reports of the Metropolitan Board of Works.

2. By 1867-8 the western drainage scheme was nearly finished. The main, or Chiswick line, started from that parish and ended at Cremorne Gardens with a branch into Fulham. The Acton line went along the Uxbridge Road from Stanford Brook at Wormwood Scrubbs to the Counters Creek sewer at Royal Crescent. Part of the middle level sewer to Kensal Green was also in operation. These new sewers ran from East to West intercepting the old sewers running from North to South. See Reports, Metropolitan Board of Works, Parl. Papers, 1867-8 (45), lviii, Report, Royal Commission on Metropolitan Sewer Discharge, Parl. Papers, 1884 (c.3842-1), xii.

The rest of the money was contributed by the vestries and districts boards: about half of it (£200,000) went on the paving of estate roads, and the rest on the building and upkeep of sewers, small bridges and minor roads, most of this work (1) being assisted with grants from the Metropolitan Board. The vestries and boards were not much concerned with re-development and carried out very few clearances of property under the Torrens Act of 1868 but in Kensington the street improvements rid the parish of one or two slum districts, such as Jennings (2) Buildings in the High Street.

The arrangements which the parish governments made for keeping the streets clean and lit by gas involved them in capital expenditures on wharves, depots, and over 10,000 lamp posts. These outlays were really improvements as they were aimed at maintaining the fixed capital of the parishes intact. The same can be said of outlays on fire engines and stations supplied after 1865 by the Metropolitan Board and maintained by

1. Details up to 1871 are given in the replies of the vestries and district boards to a circular letter in Report, Metropolitan Board of Works, Parl. Papers, 1871 (431), Ivii. The total expended by Paddington was £104,257, Kensington, £206,469 and the Fulham Board, £78,572.

2. One clearance was Virginia Place or Devils Alley in Kensington.
Most of the parish maintenance work was contracted to tradesmen, builders and dealers in materials. From the 1870s, however, the vestries and boards started to take some of this business over. They installed a meter system to regulate the supply of gas and experimented in oil burning and electric lighting. They went properly into the business of street cleaning and refuse disposal and despite the expense of equipment and wharves managed it more cheaply than before. 

The argument of economy was also used to justify expenditure on wood blocks which appeared on the main roads in Kensington from 1871 and on a few roads in the other parishes from the early 1880s. The surveyor of the Hammersmith Board of Works admitted that deal and creosoted blocks were more expensive than macadam but saved on cleaning and lessened the wear and tear on horses and carriages. All these outlays could be regarded from one point of view as means of improving public

1. Metropolitan Fire Brigade Act, 28 & 29 Vict., c.90, 1865. Prior to this the parish engines were not properly maintained and not used for fires in other parishes: see the report of the tragedy of Gilbert Street, Parl. Papers, 1857-8 (515), xlviii.

2. Annual Reports, Kensington Vestry, 1874-5, 1877-8, Fulham District Board, 1876-7 and Fulham Vestry, 1900. The cost was high at first in Kensington where £26,957 was laid out in 1878 on 33 vans and 83 horses.

3. Ibid., Hammersmith 1884-5.
health or as an investment of money in making the western parishes more desirable as places of residence.

How were these outlays financed? The Metropolitan Board of Works financed capital outlays by raising mortgage loans on the security of the rates and by floating metropolitan stock. The Board levied a sewer rate on the districts and also an additional rate to pay for other expenditure. This system bore particularly hard on parishes such as Fulham and Hammersmith where the Board's rates represented a fixed cost on parish resources already stretched in other ways.

The way in which the local governments financed their expenditure depended on how much they could raise from the rates without increasing the rate in the £. The vestries of Paddington and Kensington (until 1868) financed paving and sewer works out of the rates, recouping the whole or part of this from builders and inhabitants, and the sale of old materials. These parishes were run by substantial tradesmen, gentlemen and professional people who carried out their duties efficiently on the whole. They were strong enough to increase


2. The inhabitants of these parishes claimed they were being charged much more in tax than they received in benefits.

3. The vestry comprised 29 gentlemen, 15 professional people and 43 tradesmen, Select Committee on Metropolitan Local Government, Parl. Papers, 1866 (449), xiii. Qs. 34, 36-9.
the yield of the rates by revaluations of property and they had less calls on the parish resources from the Guardians than Hammersmith or Fulham which two parishes were still receiving the poor displaced by improvements. The Fulham District Board financed their capital outlays with money borrowed from insurance societies and the Metropolitan Board of Works. By 1871 only a quarter of these mortgage loans were paid off.

In the Fulham District and to a lesser extent in Kensington the demand for finance kept exceeding the increases in the rateable value of property. Increases in the local rate in the £ caused the formation of ratepayers or parochial associations who set themselves up as the watch dog of local government. One of the tactics which they used was to campaign against the local representatives in office accusing them of mismanagement, extravagance and whenever it could be scented, jobbery in the placing of contracts and the purchase of land for street and other improvements. For example, in 1878 letters were sent to the Metropolitan Board of Works on behalf of the local ratepayers, complaining of the excessive sums spent on the Scrubbs Lane sewer and from one of the members of the Fulham Board claiming that the sewer was made for the benefit of the building owners who were the contractors for
the work. On other occasions it was the local representatives who were accused of making money out of their public duties.

The parochial associations in the outer parishes also petitioned the House of Lords, through Lord Ravenscourt, to equalise the metropolitan poor rate and supported the activities of an organisation set up to campaign for this. Finally, the associations attempted to control the elections to the vestries and district boards (and later the school boards). They were, in some parishes, the real centres of political power, operating to return members who were pledged to the maintenance of economy in parish finances.

The vestrymen who were to the forefront in obstructing the work of improvement usually had property interests in the parishes. This was most noticeable where local government (as in Hammersmith and Fulham) was run by shopkeepers, publicans and the like. During the public health enquiries of the 1840s and 1850s claims were frequently made that shopkeepers were the main investors in house property especially working class

1. Minute of the Metropolitan Board of Works, 12 March, 1880. Payments for the work done were in fact higher than the estimate of their own engineer.

2. For example, West London Observer, 27 January, 1877, when the chairman of the Kensington Committee of Works was accused of jobbery in appointing a superintendent of scavenging and dust collection. This is just one of many similar cases.
cottages and houses which could be made to pay a return of
12 to 14 per cent on the money invested. One well known
builder held that the houses of poor people seldom belonged
to any "but those who are glad to get any money they can;
ye belon to a little shopkeeping class of persons, who
have saved a little money in business". James Beal and
J.C. Buckmaster repeated these charges to the Select Committee
on Metropolitan Local Government in 1866. The latter claimed
that the London vestries were made up of men "whose only
notion was that of keeping down the rates, and getting
facilities for the building of compound houses, which became
great nuisances in the parish". James Beal claimed that
there was "a large number of small house property owners in
the vestries who regard with great disfavour any increase in
the rates, however beneficial this might be to the health of
the district". Similar allegations were made in the late
nineteenth century.

1. Select Committee on Health of Towns, Parl. Papers, 1840
   (384) xi, Q.3108, Report, Health of Towns Commission, Parl.
   Papers, 1844 (572), xvii, Q.2042, Dwellings of the Industrial
   Classes (1851), pp.8.
2. Select Committee on Metropolitan Local Government, Parl.Papers,
   1866 (449), xiii, Q.Q.5855-6, 5865-9, 6063-6. He was referring
to the small Tenements Act which allowed builders to compound
with the vestry for a lower amount of rates by giving security
for rate payments on tenanted houses.
3. For comments on those made to the housing enquiries, see Dilke
   and Chamberlain in the Quarterly Review, December and March
   (1884).
The *West London Observer*, an advocate of improvements, seemed to think that Fulham deserved better representatives than 'pot house orators' and 'men of straw'. But for their part the owners of house property claimed that the expenditure of the Board improved the property of landowners who contributed less to the rates than they did as owners of commercial premises and houses. They argued, in fact, that the rating system was not only oppressive but also unjust.

During the late 1860s local pressure affected the capital expenditure of the Fulham District Board and the Kensington Board of Guardians. At first the Fulham Board had support for a ten year programme of parish improvements of which the provision of new sewers was the chief item. The ultimate cost of this was £110,000 (up to 1871) more than three times the original estimate. The building of sewers went forward rapidly at first, so rapidly in fact that proceedings on the Bradmore sewer were held up whilst the Metropolitan Board of Works completed the deep level sewer at Acton. Speed was important in a parish where builders kept on erecting houses in districts without sewage arrangements.

1. For example, *West London Observer*, editorials, 1877-8 especially 5 May, 1877.
2. This account is based on the annual reports and minute books of the Fulham District Board, 1856–1870.
By 1868 the medical officer of health had a number of problems to meet. The parish was threatened with what he described as a "monster nuisance all but in our very teeth": this was the proposal to bring the sewage of Chelsea and Kensington, with that of Fulham and Hammersmith, to a deodorising works at Sands End Fulham. At the same time and despite temporary reductions the rate in the £ was steadily increasing. In 1867 when the rates touched 9s 2d in the £ the medical officer was still exhorting the Board to fresh efforts and congratulating them on the work so far accomplished:

"Large tracts of land adapted for building purposes lie within (the parishes) and the sound of the bricklayer's trowel may almost everywhere be heard; the main sewers run through the leading thoroughfares from one end to the other; of their tributaries, many have been for some time in active operation, and many others are yet in contemplation. Houses of almost every class may find a suitable locale. The Gentleman and the Artisan may each have his pleasant dwellings, and that without the drawbacks which in former times have been our stigma. Our swamps and open ditches have under your rule been gradually banished from our sight".(1)

By this time the parochial associations were starting to stir up trouble for the Board. In 1868, E. Bailey, who claimed to represent the new inhabitants of the northern district accused the old Parochial Association led by Colonel Haley, of betraying their trust. The new Association was only one of such organisations.

---

formed between 1868 and 1872, whose combined influence eventually brought down the rates but at the cost of slowing up the programme of drainage which was by no means complete. Between 1868 and 1879 the capital expenditure of the District Board was less than half of what it had been in the years since 1856, and rigorous economies were made in the administration of poor relief.

The chief effect of the economy campaign in Kensington was to force the Board of Guardians to curtail its capital outlays. The expenditure of both the vestry and the Board started to rise from the mid 1860s for a number of reasons. First, the parish became responsible for the maintenance of all its main roads with the abolition of the last few turnpike gates. Secondly, from 1863, the medical officer was pressing for better sanitation: "There are still", he claimed, "a great many localities of the parish most imperfectly, or not at all drained and consequently very unhealthy, which cannot be much improved until new sewers are provided for them". The fear of a renewed cholera epidemic in 1866 helped to stimulate local sanitary activity in the

---

2. Details in this paragraph from the *Annual Reports, Kensington Vestry*, 1856-1870.
in the London parishes and the Sanitary Act of that year facilitated the building of new sewers and other action. A series of emergency measures were brought in to combat the epidemic in Kensington which included the building and cleaning of sewers and the provision of a medical dispensary. Thirdly, the number of poor in the parish began to increase and the Guardians started to build new premises for them. They erected a new infirmary attached to the workhouse, two casual wards, and a new workhouse for imbeciles; they also contributed to the building of a district school for pauper children, and a district hospital and even talked of providing a local hospital. The Guardians were responding to the agitation occurring in London at this time about the treatment of the sick poor who made up a large, perhaps a third, of the clientele of the workhouses. They were sensitive to the scandals being published in the local and national press and to the investigations being carried out into various infirmaries and workhouses, including the Paddington workhouse.

The increase in the rates in Kensington is shown in the following table:

1. For this and the Metropolitan Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, see J.E. O'Neill, 'Finding a Policy for the Sick Poor', Victorian Studies, vii, no.3 (1964), pp.265-284.
TABLE 12
Parish Rates in Kensington 1863-1870

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Vestry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>1s 5½d</td>
<td>2s 11½d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>1s 6½d</td>
<td>3s 0¼d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1s 7d</td>
<td>1s 5½d</td>
<td>3s 0¼d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1s 4½d</td>
<td>1s 10d</td>
<td>3s 2½d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1s 10d</td>
<td>1s 10d</td>
<td>3s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>2s 0d</td>
<td>1s 10d</td>
<td>3s 10d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 1868 a series of special vestry meetings were held in Kensington and a public meeting of protest against the "mania of parochial extravagance" in the administration of the poor law. This gave an opportunity for the old 'economical' reformers to come out of retirement and proclaim that Kensington wanted responsible not irresponsible government and they should endeavour to "keep the fingers of the Poor Law Board out of the pockets of the ratepayers".

1. The South Kensington representatives turned out in force: with Lord W. Pitt Lennox taking the chair. West London Observer, 6 June, 1868, 29 August, 28 November and 5 December, 1868.
One long term result of this agitation was the forming of a strong parochial association, the St. Mary Abbot Association, which virtually controlled the elections to the Board of Guardians in the 1870s; any candidate not on their list had little chance of being returned. The short term effect was to curtail spending in certain directions: the scheme for a new hospital was abandoned, the cost of the new infirmary cut and the provision of a public baths put off (in fact until 1885). A capital loan of £10,000 was raised in 1870 for street improvements but no further mortgages were negotiated until 1876-7 when a loan was raised to build the new town hall which the urban ambitions of this vestry demanded.

The political and financial conditions affecting the activities of London government in mid-Victorian years were to be found in other cities as well, but they had a particularly potent influence in London, damping down many attempts at municipal enterprise. Moreover, what improvements were made, at least in suburban parishes,

1. Ibid., editions on the Association, 1878.

concerned the physical condition of the parishes. As the medical officer of the Fulham Board pointed out:

"Engineering skill was the rock on which Public Health was made to stand. The disposal of sewage was pre-eminent, the necessity for medical supervision was not recognised". (1)

Government in West London was still being carried on after 1856 in the spirit of the old 'Improvement' Acts, and a real effort to improve social conditions, especially in poorer districts was not made until the late nineteenth century. (2)

The improvement of social conditions from the 1870s

From the 1870s London government was beginning to grapple with some of the social problems of urban life. The most important changes came with the setting up of the London County Council. The twin doctrines of efficiency and economy which had obstructed the work of government, though still invoked, were no longer so effective and the doctrine of efficiency was transformed by the Fabians whose

1. Annual Report, Fulham Board of Works, 1876.

2. C. Jephson, The Sanitary Evolution of London (1907), condemns the vestries and district boards for widespread neglect of the regulatory clauses of public health legislation. But his examples of this were very selective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Object of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
<th>Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856-1900</td>
<td>Sewers</td>
<td>165,567</td>
<td>24,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Masons and Paviors Work</td>
<td>313,567</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Street Improvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-1900</td>
<td>Wood Paving</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>116,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-1881</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1901</td>
<td>2 Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1901</td>
<td>Wharves, Depots, Stables, Vans etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1901</td>
<td>Infirmary, Wards, Dispensary, Mortuary</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1892</td>
<td>Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-1889</td>
<td>Baths and Washhouses</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1892</td>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Annual Report, Kensington Vestry.*
energy and ideas revived local government in London during the 1880s and 1890s. At the same time local politics became merged in the wider issues of urban land reform and party politics. The school board elections from 1872 created more interest than the vestry elections. They registered local grievances, especially that the Board was financing higher grade as well as elementary education, but they were also pointers to the national elections.

First, the structure and the incidence of local taxation came in for a lot of criticism from the 1870s. Much of this carried on the arguments put earlier by the economical reformers. Quinquennial valuations had been introduced to improve the efficiency of the tax raising machinery in London in 1869 and this meant that rateable values increased suddenly every five years to a greater extent than the normal annual increase on account of new houses and improvements. Those who attacked the system


2. For these elections see E.J.R. Eaglesham, From School Board to Local Authority (1956).
were not only claiming that this was an excessive burden to bear but that the small occupier rather than the landlord was the person who chiefly had to bear it.

By the 1880s the political climate in London was favourable to a revision in the whole basis of local taxation so as to relieve the burden on the poorer districts and increase the amount of taxation falling on the landowner. At the same time Webb and others argued that the tax system was the chief obstacle to capital expenditure on metropolitan improvements.

The making of improvements to the system turned out to be a long and difficult operation. The first of many attempts to equalise the rates in London had been made with the creation of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund and this was followed by the county grants and the Equalisation of Rates Act. But even in 1908 it was calculated that of the

1. Discussed in many publications such as J.F.B. Firth, The Reform of London Government (1888), W.M. Torrens, The Government of London (1884) and W. Woodward, London as it is and as it might be (1886). The tax structure was investigated several times in these years: see Goschen’s Report, Parl. Papers, 1870 (170), iv and Report on Local Taxation, Parl. Papers, 1893-4 (1168), lxxvii.

2. The Select Committee on Town Holdings, especially Parl. Papers 1890 (341), xviii also collected a lot of evidence on the taxation of ground rents, the rating of vacant land, the capital expenditure and rates of London government and the 'unearned increment'. Much of this came from Sydney Webb,
whole sum raised in rates by all authorities (central and local) £15 million, or nearly three quarters of the total were raised uniformly over all London. New proposals to tax the ground rents of landowners to levy charges on the rise in site values caused by road and other improvements, and to lessen the cost of compulsory purchase, all came to very little before 1900. The Commissioners set up to investigate these subjects found they had opened up extremely technical and complicated questions which were political as much as economic matters. In fact the parliamentary investigations into these subjects became a battleground for the leading supporters and opponents of urban landlords. Though modifications were made in the tax structure these did not turn the system into the sort

continued from previous page:

Charles Harrison (a leading member of the Leasehold Enfranchisement Association) and Sir T.E. Farrer, (chairman of the Council's Housing and Taxation Committee). For one aspect of urban land reform see my article 'The Politics of Urban Leaseholds in Late Victorian England', International Review of Social History, vi, part 3 (1961).


2. In addition to those already cited was the Select Committee House of Lords, Town Improvements (Betterment), Earl. Papers 1894 (292), xv. The building of Cromwell Road Bridge to West London was an important case discussed in this.
of collective taxation in proportion to wealth which Beatrice Webb desired. And by wealth the Fabians meant mainly the unearned increment which ground landlords were said to receive from the increase in the value of land in London and the improvements made by local government. (1)

Secondly, both the capital expenditure of government and the flow of voluntary donations were directed more than in earlier years to the provision of new social institutions for the inhabitants of lower middle class suburbs and the improvement of social conditions in poor districts. The most important additions to the physical equipment of West London were the board schools, fever hospitals (in Fulham) technical institutes and schools, new churches and missions, the public baths, public libraries and recreation grounds.

The most notable achievement in municipal enterprise and finance in the late nineteenth century was the school building programme. By 1877 the number of children in attendance at the Board Schools of West London was 18,968 (one in six of the proportion of children at school).

Colleges and Public Elementary Schools in West London
(London Technical Education Board, 1889)

Fig 26

4. WESTERN DISTRICT.

Legend:
- University Colleges or Polytechnics
- Technical Institute
- School of Art
- Secondary School, T.C. Training College
- Public Elementary Schools with Evening Classes
- Public Elementary Schools without Evening Classes
- P.T. Pupil Teacher Centre
Public Educational Institutions in West London, 1903

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Technical College (Polytechnic)</td>
<td>South Kensington</td>
<td>City and Guilds of London Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal College of Science (Polytechnic)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Campden Charity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings College, Women's Dept. (University College)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art School, Saltram Crescent</td>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>Private Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Park College, Technical Institute</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Artisans General Dwellings Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne Park Institute Technical Institute</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Westbourne Park Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal College of Art</td>
<td>South Kensington</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal School of Art</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Art, Woodcarving</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith School of Art</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington High School (Girls)</td>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>Public Day School Company Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's College</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Public Day School Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill High School (Girls)</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latymer Upper School</td>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
<td>Endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul's School</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington High School (Girls)</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>Public Day School Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Park High School (Girls)</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>Church Schools Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. of E. High School (Girls)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's R. C. Training College for Women</td>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1901 just over 100 schools were provided, financed by loans on the security of the rates (partly from the Public Works Loan Board) and at a cost of about £11 per child. The largest school, on the Portobello Road, housed 1059 children, but a more typical school was the Queens Park School built for £8,938 and housing 854 children. The provision of these schools affected the lives of the people of West London in many ways besides the opportunity they gave for a better education. In the words of G.M. Young, "Those solid, large windowed blocks, which still rise everywhere above the slate roofs of mean suburbs ——— meant for hundreds of thousands, their first glimpse of a life of cleanliness, order, light and air".

Since 1856 South Kensington had provided sites for the London institutes of the arts and crafts. The City companies who provided most of the finance for the building

2. West London Observer, 29 December, 1877.
of technical institutes in London before 1889 would have preferred to keep them within the City. But the availability of land at South Kensington was the factor which overcame their resistance and the City moved out to South Kensington when the Central Technical College and the Royal School of Mines was established there. The provision of other local institutions of a similar kind was due more to voluntary initiative than municipal finance (except for the South Western Polytechnic in Chelsea) and voluntary donations and local charitable funds financed the building of four colleges of art and four technical institutes. Eventually they received grants from the London Technical Education Board in its efforts to revitalise both secondary and technical education in London.

During the 1870s Paddington, of the local vestries in West London, led the way in the provision of new social institutions. It acquired a reputation for progressive policies carried out by local representatives whom the *Saturday Review* scornfully described as the shopocracy of London.


2. This paper consistently attacked the London vestries.
They were led by James Flood, a local auctioneer, who became known as the 'Lord Beaconsfield of Paddington'.
The most expensive monument of their activities was the public baths, laundry and gymnastics room, originally intended to be provided by the Notting Hill and Bayswater Baths Company but finally built by the vestry for £48,500. Flood and his supporters boasted that Paddington was a model vestry which set an example to all London in introducing improvements such as the wood paving in Westbourne Grove and other street improvements, but the increase in the rates which this expenditure caused brought the inevitable rate-payers' association into being supported by Whiteley. In fact Flood had succeeded in securing the support of a faction on the vestry in commercial opposition to Whiteley who raised the assessments on the Bayswater aristocracy - Whiteleys best customers-proportionately higher than the assessments on their own shops and offices. By 1883 Flood was out of favour and his failing health and the defeat of some of his supporters in the vestry elections of 1879 led to

1. The following account is based on R.S. Lambert, The Universal Provider (1938), pp.79-83, 100-1, 110-111, the Paddington Times for 1879, 1883 and the Annual Reports, Paddington Vestry, 1873-1878.
his withdrawal from public life. Although Paddington
spent cautiously in the last two decades of the century it
did display another piece of municipal enterprise in
negotiating for the purchase of a piece of land from the
Trustees of the Paddington estate for a recreation ground
and contributing half of the cost. The rest of the money
(1) came from a fund organised by Lord Randolph Churchill.

The increasing expenditure on capital works by the
vestries of West London is reflected in the increase in
mortgage indebtedness (except in Kensington):

| TABLE 14(3) |
|---|---|---|
| Mortgages on the security of the Rates: Vestries and Boards in West London |
| Parish | 1833-1856 | 1856-1888 | 1889-1901 |
| Paddington | £30,900 | £48,500 | £118,223 |
| Kensington | 32,900 | 337,469 | 161,400 |
| Hammersmith | - | 238,476 | - |
| /Fulham | - | - | - |
| Hammersmith | - | - | 406,666 |

By 1901 Hammersmith had a much higher proportion of outstanding
debts to the total rateable value of the parish (just under 50
per cent) than either Paddington (8.5 per cent) or Kensington
(2) (1.6 per cent).

2. London Statistics (1900) and First Report, Paddington Borough Council, 1901.
3. Annual Reports provide details.
The late nineteenth century was also characterised by the building of mission churches, chapels, and tabernacles, housed in all sorts of buildings, and costing from a few hundred pounds to three or four thousand pounds.

Missions were just one of the ways in which the residents in wealthy districts in West London were putting money into providing facilities in poor or undeveloped districts. One of the areas in which this sort of expenditure had been made for many years was the Potteries in Notting Hill. In the early 1840s it was already a centre for missionary work (including the London City Mission). A small school was opened there through the exertions of Lady Mary Fox (the St. James National School) the little mission room was also started by members of the Silver Street Baptist and Hornton Street Congregational Chapels. Lord Shaftesbury opened the Norland and Potteries Ragged School in 1858 and a few years later in 1861 a workman's Hall was opened. During the decade of the 1860s three medical dispensaries were added to the amenities of the district. This charitable expenditure increased in the late nineteenth century with the building of new missions, halls and coffee palaces, and the setting up of some boys' clubs and an infant nursery. Finally the vestry began to take a more positive interest in the district than
previously when it had concentrated mainly on restraining the activities of the pig keepers. The vestry bought 4 1/2 acres of land and laid out Avondale Park in 1892 and provided a public baths and wash-houses in 1896.

The provision of social institutions of this kind was intended in part to help the inhabitants of working class districts acquire some self esteem and pride in the hope that they might do more to help themselves and keep their surroundings in a better state. The increase in this sort of provision in the late nineteenth century suggests that suburban inhabitants were becoming increasingly sensitive to the possibility of these working class districts becoming potential sources of class hatred and social instability. Charitable and missionary activity was an opportunity to make religious and social contacts with the people living in districts which suburban development had increasingly isolated. And social contact might help to foster social discipline. It is possible to regard the building of missions, schools, and

1. This paragraph is based on the following accounts of welfare work in this part of Kensington: Mrs. Bayley and Miss E.B. Bayley, Ragged Homes and How to Mend Them (1859), and Home Weal and Home Woe (1892), F.M. Gladstone, Notting Hill in Bygone Days (1936), chap.vii., reports in the West London Observer.

2. For a discussion of the social climate of charitable effort in Victorian Britain see Kathleen Woodroofe, From Charity to Social Work in England and the United States (1962) part I.
other charitable installations as not only an expenditure in maintaining the social conditions in working class districts but also as an investment in civilising the poor and lessening the tensions of class conflict. And if this could be done by contributing money to organisations such as the Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Company, this was so much the better because the money earned in addition a rate of interest.
Conclusion

What we have been doing in this thesis is to examine the economic behaviour of the personnel and institutions engaged in meeting the demand for living space in Victorian London and in providing opportunities for the investment in transport, public utilities, housing and other forms of social capital.

We have seen that the conditions of metropolitan expansion were such as to yield substantial profits, especially to speculators in building land and the owners of urban estates. Much of this thesis has been concerned with the business operations of builders and developers, and their role as providers as well as users of capital. It cannot pretend to have done more than to open this subject up and to provide some information about it. Much more research is required on such matters as building finance, builders' profit margins, land values and the relations between transport and building development.

We have also been concerned with how builders and developers joined with others in organising new financial institutions, particularly building societies (including church

1. In particular research into whether the directors and promoters of railways had interests in land and building development in the districts through which their lines were projected.
building societies) and how they attempted to improve the efficiency of local government and to channel the wealth of suburbanians into these forms of social capital beyond the reach of commercial initiative. And we have observed some of the ways in which social and political aspirations influenced this.

In effect then we have been implicitly considering one element in a country's economic growth which has not been investigated before in quite this way, namely, the accumulation of social 'overhead' capital. It might be useful, therefore, to attempt just one or two generalisations about this rather than to summarise the content of the previous chapters.

The thesis has given a case study of the process of capital formation. Suburbs were akin to frontier districts in being under-subscribed with capital; but growth provided economies of scale and made for the intensive use of the capital provided. The wear and tear of physical equipment and a fairly rapid rate of obsolescence (through changing social conceptions as well as technical innovations) generated a demand for new capital to maintain the existing stock and to make up for the deficiencies in earlier provision, and to replace part of the equipment. There was no long run tendency for the marginal efficiency of capital to decline. The process of capital formation was self renewing and as the economy developed
the demand for social capital began to take up a larger share of the nation's resources.

How then were the savings accumulated? And what sort of savings were channelled into the formation of social capital? The answer to this depends on the sort of town being considered. In some frontier towns and industrial towns and regions in the north and the midlands, the savings made in manufacturing industry were employed in this sort of investment. But there is not much evidence of this coming into London or at least West London.

There is some evidence of a movement of capital from agriculture into investment in building. At least some landowners sacrificed agricultural rents for the time being and the savings made in rural districts were invested in mortgage loans to builders. On the other hand it is probable that agriculture benefited more from the profits made in urban development and it is possible that further studies of certain landowners with agricultural estates might throw some light on this.

In fact, suburban development was financed mainly from the savings accumulated in the commercial metropolis (in London and other cities). The chief sources of capital were the savings of professional people, small capitalists, including the
tradesmen-builders typical of the urban frontier, clerks and other lower income groups. They were the sort of people who were continually being encouraged to be thrifty and to practice self help. Suburban development (and hence the accumulation of social capital) was a result both of the desire to improve living accommodation and the frugality and capacity to make small savings by those who moved into suburban houses, or had business concerns in the suburbs.

London had the advantage of prior accumulations of savings. Even in the early nineteenth century it had landowners with substantial resources and the foresight not to squeeze their estates, and a developed commercial economy which extended into the suburbs. It was not only capable of financing its own expansion but had the wealth and the institutions to finance that of other towns as well. It would be interesting to know more about the migration of London capital into the building of other towns.

Moreover, the expansion of building production was itself a means of enlarging the commercial metropolis. Economists have stressed that the key factor in capital formation is the expansion of building capacity. This was achieved in Victorian London with hardly any technical innovations in the house building
industry. The rise of entrepreneurs who operated on a large scale and obtained economies through better organisation was an important innovation, but in the main building production expanded through the multiplication of small units. A ready supply of finance enabled builders to make capital outlays and helped migrants to buy or invest in houses. And the leasehold system in London permitted many builders to start operations with hardly any capital of their own. But the Victorian developers and builders do not appear to have spent their profits on expensive consumption. They were content to plough these back in repaying mortgage debts and in financing new outlays. Like many other small capitalists they also put savings into building societies.

Suburban development involved not only a demand for capital but in a sense helped to create its supply. The suburbs attracted wealthy residents who invested in improving their environment. They also provided opportunities for making profits to small traders, builders and members of the professions; and they developed means of transforming suburban wealth into new investment. Thus the process of investment does not appear to have depended much on external finance; in London at any rate suburban capital was its own chief progenitor.
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APPENDIX 'A'

Building Development in Paddington, 1805-1842

Estates

This appendix provides some brief notes on building development in Paddington before the start of the Victorian period of growth. The estates laid out for building purposes included the Bishop of London's estate, and the estate of the Grand Junction Canal Company. One of the small building speculations on the fringes of this land was that of Edward Orme, a London goldsmith, who developed a square of houses and built the first proprietary chapel in Paddington. (1)

The Bishop of London shared the ownership of the building estate with his ex tenants, whose interests were represented by trustees. The owners and managers laid out the estate with the aim of attracting wealthy house-holders. The Canal Company, originally the lessees of the Bishop

attempted to form a mixed estate of houses and industrial buildings. They appointed George Gutch, eventually the district surveyor, to prepare a scheme that would combine the building of wharves and small manufacturies with a market and residential property.\(^{(1)}\) The estate of the Bishop of London was laid out with wide roads and squares according to the design of the architect, S.P.Cockerell; but that of the Canal company was developed on a grid iron plan with straight narrow streets, in order to maximize the ground rents.

Building Development, 1805–1825

This period was mainly concerned with planning the two estates and in attempting to attract builders. The canal company was successful in letting land for wharves and in forming and letting Grand Junction Street, but many of the builders taking plots in 1817 failed.\(^{(2)}\) One of the most substantial was Thomas Finlay from St. Johns Wood, but despite loans from the Company his business ran into difficulties in the 1820s because of the failure of the builder

---

1. Minute Books, Grand Junction Canal Company, 20 March, 8 October, 1817. Pickford, the carrier, was an applicant.
2. Ibid., 1 July, 1819, 8 June, 1821, 26 March, 1827, 11 July, 1828, and 19 April, 1832.
that he employed. They also had difficulty in letting land near to the water and gas works and had to lower the ground rents which they charged. They accepted a tender from Coombe to build a gas works in order to promote the trade of the canal and because the place nearby was used for the collection of dust and ashes and was, therefore, suitable for inferior property only¹

The trustees of the Paddington estate began their operations during the Napoleonic Wars. In this period they raised all the grass rents, levied royalties on brick-makers, and advertised land as suitable for digging gravel². The main builder at this time was John Lewis, a local brickmaker, who subsequently failed. So too did the firm of Paterson and Michel who attempted to build an arboretum³. In these early days the trustees incurred two major expenses neither of which were recoverable from the builders. In 1811 they laid out £13,059 in building a tunnel drain through Hyde Park in order to take off the

1. Ibid., 27 March, 1820, 30 March, 1820.
2. Church Commissioners, Paddington Estate, Survey (1809-10).
flood waters. The other major expense was the purchase of the Bayswater Springs from the City of London for £2,651. This was necessary because the pipes which had carried water to Bond Street since the seventeenth century lay obliquely across the estate and the wells and cisterns placed at intervals near the surface interfered with building. The water supply was catered for in other ways: the springs were leased in 1811 to Samuel Hill, the projector of the Grand Junction Water Works Company, and an agreement was made which guaranteed the supply of piped water from the canal to the residents of the estate at reduced rates.¹ As the building slowly progressed the trustees and the canal company made roads and small sewers and formed squares. The sums involved varied from a few hundred to a few thousand pounds: Frederick Square cost, for instance, just £127 to form and plant but the Polygon and Crescent (the latter eventually called Stanhope Square) cost £5000.² This expenditure was financed from the brick and gravel receipts and eventually charged on the

¹ Minute Books, Paddington Estate, I 18 January, 1812, 24 November, 1812, 11 January, 1813, 7 June, 1814.
² Ibid., iii, 12 June, 1823, 22 September, 1825.
Capital expenditure was much less productive than the trustees had anticipated, a state of affairs which caused a lot of argument and charges of mismanagement. Details of the financial state of the business are shown in the following table:

### Paddington Estate Accounts, 1811-1819
(To the nearest £)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick, gravel, materials</td>
<td>7,799</td>
<td>Drains, sewers</td>
<td>16,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement charges</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>Rates, taxes</td>
<td>9,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>4,648</td>
<td>Agents salary</td>
<td>6,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land sold</td>
<td>8,572</td>
<td>Land tax</td>
<td>3,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>Bayswater springs</td>
<td>2,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Roads, gates etc.</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,186</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents</td>
<td>71,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was usual in developing a large building estate to allow for a preliminary period of slow progress during which the demand for land was building up. In this case, however, the initial period lasted twenty or thirty years, despite the fact that the houses were within walking distance of the City and that many of those for whom the houses were built would have their own carriages. So slow was the rate

---

1. Paddington Estate, Abstract Accounts (1810-1819) and Casual Receipts and Expenditure (1806-1819).
of progress that between 1810 and 1824 the rents from the estate improved by only £347. During this time 36 builders took up contacts for about 570 houses and of these about a tenth failed to complete. (1) Builders did not really come forward in any numbers until 1822-3, when a number of them agreed to build quite an amount of housing. For example, Rutty and Huddy agreed to build 87 houses valued at £30,000 and S. Gardiner agreed to build 45 third rate houses on the estate of the Canal company. J. Bark (a coal merchant) and H. A. Capps (a South London builder) agreed to build 96 and 70 km first and second class houses on the Paddington estate. (2)

One reason for the unfortunate start which some builders made on this estate was that during the Napoleonic Wars capital was scarce and some of the builders who did take plots were affected by the temporary diversion of funds capital to the Funds. Another reason was that they built built houses before the drainage was secured. (3)

3. Connaught Place built before the drains were laid, ruined the undertaker.
the drainage work of the trustees and the more tardy efforts of the Westminster Commission who built the Bayswater sewer in 1815, the estate continued to have a poor reputation for drainage and even in 1842 the houses in Westbourne Grove were still liable to flooding\(^{(1)}\) The continued reluctance of builders to venture their capital this far out of the town was due to the heavy obligations which they incurred for building drains and sewers and the unwillingness of the trustees to compensate for these expenses in reduced rents. In these circumstances the trustees succeeded in encouraging only a modest investment on the part of local builders, mainly bricklayers, carpenters, market gardeners and the like\(^{(2)}\).

During this phase the history of the estate centered more on the managers than on the builders; it was a history of border disputes, local conflicts, and internal disagreements. Much time was taken up defining the boundaries of the estate, negotiating terms for road building with adjoining owners, and attempting to resist the building of industrial

\begin{enumerate}
\item Bayswater Sewer Act, 4-5 Will. IV, c. 96 (Private, 1836): the cost was £3,500. Also *Kensington Chronicle*, 19 November, 1859.
\item Building contracts.
\end{enumerate}
works in the parish. The inhabitants had to rely on the local vestry for amenities such as paving and lighting but during this period relations were poor, and the vestry seemed, as a matter of general policy, always willing to take up cudgels against the Bishop of London. One particular sore point was the encroachments which the Bishop was said to be making on the waste and common lands. A further cause of dissension was the cottage property on the Bishop’s estate, nearly half of which were let for under £10 a year. These temporary dwellings were not finally swept away until 1824. Relations did begin to improve after 1824 when a Paving and Lighting Act was secured giving the property interests in the parish control over the affairs of the vestry.

The conflicts which most affected the progress of building development were those between the owners of the estate, who had different ideas on how best it should be managed. The chief critic was Sir John Morshead who at one point stayed away from the meetings and refused to ratify the contracts. His opposition came to a head in 1820 when he charged the surveyor, Cockerell, with mis handling affairs. The surveyor was

1. There are transcripts of the minutes of the open and closed vestries by J. Booth in the Paddington Library.

replaced by George Gutch in 1827 and Budd and Hayes, the
agents of Thomas Thistlethwaite another of the owners, took
over the management of the estate.

Building development, 1825-1843

In 1825 more acres of the Paddington estate were taken
in hand and £20,000 raised in order to pay legal expenses,
which were very heavy, and to form new roads and sewers.
Building started to go forward more rapidly than before,
especially towards the end of the 1830s. Between 1825 and
1835, ten lean years in the history of the London building
industry, less contracts were actually made than in the
previous ten years, but in 1838 the number of builders
coming forward suddenly increased and reached double figures
for the first time. In this year too the trustees made a
deal with the Great Western Company on the site for their
new terminal in Paddington which brought in a windfall
gain of £23,000 plus a rent of £7,000 per annum.\(^{(1)}\)

These events inaugurated a productive period. Between
1838 and 1843 (when building was starting to fall off temporarily)
fourty six builders agreed to pay £12,653 in ground rents for

---

1. Great Western Railway Act, 1 Vict., c. xcii(1838). The
station was a temporary one but lasted for sixteen years.
building plots. Moreover the estate was now inviting the attentions of builders who were able to borrow money from solicitors and insurance companies in order to finance the building of five story houses. They included W. Scantlebury (£790 in ground rents), W. Kingdom (£1,276 in ground rents) the architects G. and M. Wyatt and the contractors J. Ponsford (from Marylebone) and R. Batterbury.

Evidence for a building boom in Paddington after 1838 is also contained in the records of the fees charged for new buildings by the district surveyor. The details are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fees (£s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fees (£s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result was that the ground rents from the estate increased by over 200 per cent between 1833 and 1843. They were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ground rents</th>
<th>All rents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>5,797</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>18,637</td>
<td>20,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subsequent developments on this estate are discussed in the text.

---

1. Details from the London County Record Office and Parl. Papers, 1831-2(505),xlv,1833(22),xxxiv.
### APPENDIX 'B'

**Land and Building Development in West London, 1839–1900**

#### 1. Land Utilisation, 1839–1844

Based on the Tithe Redemption Surveys

**Paddington**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land subject to tithes</td>
<td>431 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land free from tithes</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>28 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, Squares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>81 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kensington (1844)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land subject to tithes</td>
<td>1,719 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land free from tithes</td>
<td>143 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>999 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery, Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>362 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawns, private gardens</td>
<td>172 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over
### Hammersmith (1844)

Land subject to tithes 2,278 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arable</td>
<td>231 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>988 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>357(\frac{1}{2}) acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchards</td>
<td>14(\frac{2}{3}) acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>145 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickfields</td>
<td>114 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, Waste, Water</td>
<td>415(\frac{1}{4}) acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,265 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fulham (1844)

Acreage of the parish 1,684 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pasture, Meadows</td>
<td>278(\frac{1}{2}) acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery, Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>914 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossier Grounds</td>
<td>24(\frac{1}{2}) acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gardens</td>
<td>290 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,597 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Structure of Landowning in West London, 1839-1844

Based on the Tithe Redemption Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paddington</th>
<th>Kensington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 plus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hammersmith</th>
<th>Fulham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 plus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Principal Building Estates in Paddington and Kensington

Note: This is not a complete list. A mark (1) indicates that the acreage of the estate has been estimated. The numbers in this list (and subsequent lists) correspond to the numbers on the map at the end which is intended to show the approximate location of the estates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Developers(s)</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>Bishop of London</td>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1805-1880s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Commissioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Thistlethwaite and others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peters Park</td>
<td>Dean and Chapter of Westminster</td>
<td>Church Commissioners E. Vigers</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1865-1880s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>The Neeld Family (Timber Merchant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Park</td>
<td>Artisans and Labourers General Dwellings Company Ltd.</td>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1876-1880s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canal</td>
<td>Grand Junction Canal Company (perpetual lease)</td>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Westbourne</td>
<td>T. Aldridge (Barrister?)</td>
<td>E. Vigers W. Buddle</td>
<td>30(1)</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>J. Phillips (Solicitor)</td>
<td>15(1)</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craven Hill</td>
<td>Lord Craven J. Pink</td>
<td>J. Pink (Builder)</td>
<td>15(1)</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orme</td>
<td>E. Orme (Goldsmith)</td>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>10(1)</td>
<td>1790s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### South Kensington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Developers</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Holland Park</td>
<td>Lady Holland</td>
<td>Piece meal development (part)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1820s-1880s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Brompton</td>
<td>C.J. Freake (Architect and Builder)</td>
<td>C.J. Freake Other Builders</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1850s-1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Exhibition</td>
<td>Commissioners Crown</td>
<td>T. Cubitt W. Jackson (part)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1850s-1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Kensington Park</td>
<td>Lord Kensington (2) Earl Harrington (2)</td>
<td>C.J. Freake W. Jackson C. Aldin</td>
<td>80(1)</td>
<td>1850s-1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Redcliffe Gardens</td>
<td>Smiths Charity (2) Gunter Family (Earls Court)</td>
<td>Corbett and Mc Clymond (Builders)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1860s-1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gunter Estate</td>
<td>Gunter Family</td>
<td>R. Gunter</td>
<td>40(1)</td>
<td>1790s-1840s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Valloten</td>
<td>H. B. Alexander (Solicitor)</td>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1830s-1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Phillimore</td>
<td>C. Phillimore (2) J. G. Davies (Builder)</td>
<td>J. G. Davies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1855-1870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The acreage of these estates in 1844 were:

- Lord Kensington: 160 acres
- Earl Harrington: 90 acres
- Robert Gunter: 168 acres
- C. Phillimore: 35 acres
- Smiths Charity: 52 acres

Note: 83 acres of land in Kensington went to the two Cemetery Companies.
## North Kensington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portobello</td>
<td>Misses Talbot(2)</td>
<td>See list, p.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1856-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Blake and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Parson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub divided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippodrome</td>
<td>G.W. Ladbroke(2)</td>
<td>Connop and Duncan 80(1)</td>
<td>1830s-</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or Ladbroke F. Ladbroke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne</td>
<td>W. Jenkins (Barrister)</td>
<td>Sub Divided</td>
<td>1840s-</td>
<td>1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Quintin</td>
<td>Col. St. Quintin(2)</td>
<td>C.H.Blake (part)</td>
<td>1870s-</td>
<td>1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>J. Whitchurch (Solicitor)</td>
<td>J. Whichurch</td>
<td>1840s-</td>
<td>1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norland</td>
<td>C.J.Richardson (Solicitor)</td>
<td>C.J.Richardson STewart (Barrister)</td>
<td>1840s-</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>C.H.Blake</td>
<td>C.H.Blake</td>
<td>1850s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Pits</td>
<td>Campden</td>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>(Re developed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodwin and White</td>
<td>1850s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The acreage of these estates in 1844 were:

- G. Talbot  170 acres
- W. St. Quintin  188 acres
- J.W.Ladbroke  179 acres

Many of these estates were sub divided for building purposes.

The next list attempts to indicate the extent of this.
5. The subdivision of building land in North Kensington

This list gives some indication of the number and sort of property developers investing in building land at North Kensington, 1840–1870.

**First owners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Talbot</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>(Gentry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. St. Quintin</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>(Gentry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W. Ladbroke</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>(Bankers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First purchasers for building purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Whitchurch</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(Solicitor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. and W. G. Roy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(Solicitor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. H. Blake</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(Barrister)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Walker</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(Clergyman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake, Kendall and Lake</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Solicitor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake and Parson</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(Solicitor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. S. Phillips</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(Solicitor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. K. Jenkins</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(Barrister)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. G. Tippett</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(Builder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frugality Investment Co.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other purchasers for building purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. J. Phillips</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Solicitor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pocock</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Builder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Vigers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Timber Merchant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falthouse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foskett</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Marchmont</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Clergyman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson, Clabon and Pearson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Solicitor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and House Investment Society</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Economic Investment Company</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freehold Securities Company</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Principal Landowners in Fulham and Hammersmith, 1844

**Fulham**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop of London</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. J. Powell</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Matyeer</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. H. Sampayo</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Moore</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Palmer</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hammersmith**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop of London</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Bridges</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. and W. Scott</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Hoof</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Souls College</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. and S. Gomme</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. and I. Askew</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillingham</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. W. R.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London Rail.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Simon Clarke</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. and W. Bird</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. E. Dibbin</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Essex</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Street</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Tubbs</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Bridge</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Some building estates in Fulham and Hammersmith

Note: It is not possible to give many details about building estates in these two parishes because there are very few records of property transactions in the nineteenth century. The other sources used usually give the name of an estate but very little else. The numbers in the list refer to the approximate location of the estates on the map. Unless otherwise stated they were developed in the 1700s and the 1880s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>(Lord Beaumont)</td>
<td>North End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mornington</td>
<td>Gibbs and Flew or the West Kensington Estates</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Barons Court</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Margravine Gardens</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Cedars</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>West Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Fulham Park</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Munster Park</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Salisbury</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Salisbury</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Beulah Lodge</td>
<td>United Land Company</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Moorfields (1860s)</td>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. College Park</td>
<td>Williamson and Wallington (Brickmakers)</td>
<td>North Hammersmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Scrubbs Lane etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Oaklands (1860s)</td>
<td>P. Brood (Auctioneer)</td>
<td>North Hammersmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oaklands Grove etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Askew (1850s,60s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North Hammersmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Albert Terrace,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Rd., etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Total land involved about 300 to 400 acres.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. St. Stephen (Westwick st.*, Netherwick Rd.)</td>
<td>British Land Company (52 acres) J. Goodwin (Builder)</td>
<td>Shepherds (Bradmore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Brook Green (1860s)</td>
<td>E. Bird W. Crookes (Builders and Brickmakers)</td>
<td>Shepherds (Brook Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Masboro' Road North</td>
<td>Freehold Land Company</td>
<td>Brook Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Bassein Park (Wendell Rd.,etc)</td>
<td>(G. Burgess, owner)</td>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Coningham (Uxbridge Rd)</td>
<td>(S. Fortesque, owner)</td>
<td>Shepherds (Bush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Spring Vale Stukeley Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Spring Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Poplars (Shepherds Bush Rd., Assylum St.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shepherds (Bush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Shepherds Bush (1850s)</td>
<td>London Assurance Freehold Land Society</td>
<td>Shepherds (Bush)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
APPENDIX 'C'

The Growth In Revenues from Urban Estates

1. Paddington Estate

Disposal of Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Let for building</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased to Grand Junction Canal Co.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold to Regents Canal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased to G.W.R.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites of Churches and Parsonages</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites for schools etc</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Workhouse and Burial Ground</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other pieces sold to the Metropolitan Railway Co. (for £14,422) and the Paddington Vestry for a recreation ground (£33,000).

Increase in Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1813 (£s)</th>
<th>1863 (£s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent Charges</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Rents</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>31,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rack Rents</td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Rents</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,705</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,181</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of which the Bishop of London drew one third and the beneficiaries the other two thirds.

Source: Bishop of London, Paddington Estate, MS.
2. The estates of C. H. Blake in North Kensington

Abstract A/C Kensington Park Estate, 18 May, 1857

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>£s</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>£s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Debts (from solicitors)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>52 Freehold houses valued at £2,000 each</td>
<td>104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums due to personal friends</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>when finished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums due on A/Cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Leasehold houses (surplus value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden, Blacksmith</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocock, Roads</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedall, House-fittings</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5 Leasehold houses (surplus value)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowland, Bricklayer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate Co.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Church mortgage</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allom (architect)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Own House and plate</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,052</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blake's financial position, 30 July, 1860

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incomings</th>
<th>£s</th>
<th>Outgoings</th>
<th>£s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on £4,650 invested in Consols</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Interest at 5% due on £19,000</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase money houses</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>&quot; £18,100 (Janson and Co)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth Rail Shares (200 12/6)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>&quot; £14,100 (Clark, Farebrother)</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth Rail Shares 1,000, interest say £3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>&quot; £20,500 (Lake and Kendall)</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross rental, £3,448, say net</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>Further sum to be raised, £3,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest due on Walker's security of £5,500 at 4%</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Ground rent, Kensington Pk. Gdns</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,760</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued next page:
### The growth in income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kensington Park Estate (£)</th>
<th>Portobello Estate (£)</th>
<th>Surplus (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>-125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>4,121</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The capital account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Value Kensington Park Estate (£)</th>
<th>Portobello Estate (1 £) (2 £) (3 £)</th>
<th>Capital Debts (£)</th>
<th>Surplus Capital (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>54,100</td>
<td>59,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>156,882</td>
<td>71,700</td>
<td>85,182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>76,285</td>
<td>30,930 19,688</td>
<td>79,555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>71,571</td>
<td>43,534 19,986</td>
<td>71,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>71,404</td>
<td>37,793 20,328</td>
<td>69,534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>52,553</td>
<td>28,236 34,256</td>
<td>55,227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>48,827</td>
<td>17,388 26,039 33,573</td>
<td>42,927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>46,860</td>
<td>- 22,883 24,033 13,542</td>
<td>80,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued next page
Value of estate, 22 March, 1872 (Will)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>(£)</th>
<th>Charges on Estate</th>
<th>(£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Property</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>Family Charges</td>
<td>36,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Park Estate</td>
<td>405,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Houses (Ladbroke Grove and Road)</td>
<td>20,465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freehold Ground Rents</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Land and Ground Rents, 2/3ds Portobello Estate</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Leasehold Land and Rents, 2/3ds St. Quintin Estate</td>
<td>8,134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>509,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Blake Estile, M.S.
## APPENDIX 'D

### House-Builders in Hammersmith, 1878-1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Business (Number houses under construction)</th>
<th>Hammersmith Number Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 - 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Firms</th>
<th>Number Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                 | 219          | 2,437         |

**Source:** Direct Surveyors' Fees.
APPENDIX 'E'

Insurance Companies and the Capital Market

The following notes are intended to give some examples of the changing distribution of insurance investments in the nineteenth century, particularly the place of mortgages as an outlet for the funds of the insurance companies.

Some examples of the distribution of investments, 1851-2

Equitable (31 December, 1852)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stocks in Funds</td>
<td>£3,855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash or Mortgages</td>
<td>£4,070,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funded Property</td>
<td>£1,834,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock (Amount)</td>
<td>£201,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; (Cost)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuities (Amount)</td>
<td>£13,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; (Cost)</td>
<td>£90,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchequer Bills (Amount)</td>
<td>£14,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; (Cost)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgages, rent charges etc</td>
<td>£322,329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Provident (20 November, 1852)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>£226,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Debt</td>
<td>£97,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgages</td>
<td>£482,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Loans</td>
<td>£63,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rock Life Assurance (30 June, 1851)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consols</td>
<td>£889,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Debs</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Guiana Debs</td>
<td>£65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgages and other Loans</td>
<td>£775,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued next page
The Investments of the London Assurance Corporation, 1870–1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mortgages U.K. (£)</th>
<th>Loans on Policies (£)</th>
<th>Loans on Rates and Rent Charges (£)</th>
<th>British Government Securities (£)</th>
<th>Indian and Colonial Securities (£)</th>
<th>Foreign Securities (£)</th>
<th>Rail and other Debentures (£)</th>
<th>Rail Shares and Stocks (£)</th>
<th>Reversions (£)</th>
<th>Annuities (£)</th>
<th>Life interests (£)</th>
<th>Municipal Corporation Stock (£)</th>
<th>Loans on other Securities (£)</th>
<th>Total (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,460,921</td>
<td>35,128</td>
<td>1,496,049</td>
<td>447,242</td>
<td>238,322</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>253,700</td>
<td>964,064</td>
<td>16,861</td>
<td>8,307</td>
<td>9,416</td>
<td>39,596</td>
<td>113,109</td>
<td>2,485,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1,048,353</td>
<td>43,205</td>
<td>2,138,029</td>
<td>334,038</td>
<td>208,182</td>
<td>244,211</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>83,168</td>
<td>51,131</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>9,416</td>
<td>58,937</td>
<td>845,186</td>
<td>2,200,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1,051,455</td>
<td>45,255</td>
<td>2,215,342</td>
<td>344,235</td>
<td>106,705</td>
<td>232,180</td>
<td>83,129</td>
<td>58,937</td>
<td>109,530</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>9,416</td>
<td>58,937</td>
<td>845,186</td>
<td>2,412,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>809,593</td>
<td>54,845</td>
<td>1,137,868</td>
<td>212,363</td>
<td>49,850</td>
<td>255,950</td>
<td>853,949</td>
<td>535,486</td>
<td>36,365</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>9,416</td>
<td>236,882</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,431,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

London Assurance Corporation: Mortgage Loans to Landowners and Public Bodies, 1857–1870

Loans made to builders are illustrated in the text of the thesis. The following are examples of other loans:

1857  Sir Robert Peel £20,000 at 4½%
"       Lord Wellesley £26,000 "
"       Earl Mornington £40,000 "
1858  Marquis of Anglesey and £70,000 "
"       Lord Uxbridge £40,000 "
1863  Preston Corporation £7,300 "
"       General Land Drainage Co. £5,000 "

Continued next page:
Mortgage Loans (continued)

1865
March. Londonderry's Trustees £65,000 at 4½% (Seaham Railway)
Sir John Ramsden £60,000 5%
1866
St. Leonards Improvement Comms. £8,000 " " (Drainage)
1868
Lewes Goal £12,500 4½%
Poplar Union £10,000 2 4½%
1870
West London School District £50,000 " "

Distribution of British Insurance Investments, 1892–1912

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security</th>
<th>% Total, 1892</th>
<th>% Total, 1912</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortgages</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans (Policies)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans (Rates)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India and Colonial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian and Colonial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Bonds</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debentures</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks/Shares</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, House Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Ground Rents</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Interests</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Loans</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sources for this appendix are:
Select Committee on Assurance, Parl. Papers 1852–3 (965), xxi
Annual Reports, London Assurance Corporation
Treasury Minute Books, " "
Board of Trade Returns
APPENDIX "F"

Building Society Promotions in West London and Middlesex (1840-1889)

1. Building Society Promotions in Middlesex, 1840-1869

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number Promoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840-1849</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1859</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1869</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Based on the lists of registrations in the Public Record Office.
2. It is not possible to distinguish between permanent and terminating.

2. Building Society Promotions in West London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number Promoted</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Terminating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1844-1849</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1859</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1869</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1879</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-1889</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. Information about terminating societies is difficult to find and the numbers promoted before 1870 were probably larger than this table suggests.
2. The main sources for the table are the Building Society Directories, Parliamentary Returns, the Statistical Abstract, and local newspapers.
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### The Permanent Land and Building Societies of West London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Capital (£)</th>
<th>Liab. (£)</th>
<th>Mbs.1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West London Economic</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>28,158(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London</td>
<td>34 Sloane Sq., Chelsea</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>108,989(1)</td>
<td>88,988</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western and General</td>
<td>Grove, Hammersmith</td>
<td>1851(?)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>High St., Kensington</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,055</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London Land</td>
<td>Sloane Sq., Chelsea</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington, Marylebone, and Pancras Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Building and Land</td>
<td>Edgeware Rd.</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill and West London Perpetual Building and Land Co. Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater and Kensington</td>
<td>Westbourne Hall</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>- (5)</td>
<td>5,833</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London and General</td>
<td>Tottenham Court Rd.</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater District</td>
<td>Mall Hall, Notting Hill</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington Land and Building</td>
<td>123 Edgeware Rd.</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet</td>
<td>Paddington Green</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>15,901(1)</td>
<td>22,789</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London and Suburban Ltd.</td>
<td>Warwick Rd., Kensington</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Capital (£)</td>
<td>Liab. (£)</td>
<td>Mbs 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne Park</td>
<td>Oliver Arms</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>(6) 297,497</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Brompton Labouring Classes Dwellings Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and West London</td>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Western Suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1874(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Suburban</td>
<td>Ladbroke Grove</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>23,205</td>
<td>22,789</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brompton and Kensington</td>
<td>Kensington High St.</td>
<td>1874(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldhawk</td>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>(1) 8,982</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London Temperance Investment</td>
<td>136, Uxbridge Rd.</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>(1) 3,305</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>242, Kings Rd.</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>6,175(1)</td>
<td>23,858</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea and South Kensington</td>
<td>147, Fulham Road.</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,176</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boatman's Institute</td>
<td>Sale St., Paddington</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,711</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>Paddington Chapel</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea &amp; Walham Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne Park</td>
<td>56, Porchester Rd.</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Paddington</td>
<td>Shirland Rd.</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>59,847</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Capital (£)</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Brompton and Western District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>2 Harwood Rd.</td>
<td>R.H. Aldridge</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. This may have been a branch. Another address was 114, Church Street, Paddington Green.
3. Probably evolved from the Hammersmith Grove Association (1848).
4. Probably started as the Kensington Hand-in-Hand, 1852-3. Ball, Norris and Hadley were a firm of estate agents.
5. Probably started at the Princess Royal, Hereford Rd.
6. This may have been a terminating society.
7. Probably started as St. James Square (1848?).
9. Started as the Goldhawk Mutual at the Devonshire Club and Institute in 1876.

SOURCES: New London Observer
Building Society Directors
Returns, Building Societies, Parl. Papers, 1873-1901
## APPENDIX 'G'

City and Suburban Railway and Tramway Promotions

Relating to West London, 1853-1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital (£)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater, Paddington and Holborn Bridge</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Metropolitan</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Station and South London Junction</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abandoned (1867)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Junction</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith, Paddington and City Junction</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>Re-named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan, City Extension</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and City</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith, Kew and Richmond</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington, Knightsbridge and Metropolitan</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Station and Mid London</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>740,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes, Hammersmith and Kensington</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham and Hammersmith</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimlico and Paddington</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London Extension</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan District</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and Wimbledon</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London and South Western</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Richmond</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A blank indicates that the Bill was either dropped, withdrawn or failed standing orders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital (£)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kew, Turnham Green and Hammersmith</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South London Junction</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing Cross Western</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Union</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Grand Union</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Suburban Extension</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>And in 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham, Hammersmith and City</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>And in 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan and South Western Junction</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kensington</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London Tramways</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southall, Shepherds Bush Tramways</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td>Started reformed West Metropolitan, 1883.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Western Suburban Tramways</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge, Southall, Ealing and Brentford Tramways</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and West End</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Extension</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton and Hammersmith</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing Acton and City</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>Ealing and Shepherds Bush, 1905.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth, Fulham and Metropolitan</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan District Extension to Kew &amp; Richmond</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Capital (£)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow and Metropolitan</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>First promoted 1846. Incorporated, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnham Green and Ealing</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds Bush and Priory Road Acton Tramway</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amalgamated Southall, Ealing Tramway to form West Metropolitan, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan District Ealing Extension</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham and Walham Green</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan District Extension</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater to Islington Tramways</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Reports, Metropolitan Railway Bills, Public Papers.
APPENDIX 'H'

Capitalisation of Gas and Water Companies

Increases in Share and Loan Capital to 1886

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Original Capital</th>
<th>Capital 1863</th>
<th>Capital 1886</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share (£) Loan</td>
<td>Share (£) Loan</td>
<td>Share (£) Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>40,000 20,000</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1,000,000 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>225,000 -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1,070,000 265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Middlesex</td>
<td>80,000 -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1,154,541 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>240,000 338,402</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1,137,500 32,269</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>548,843 -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>230,000 -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas, Light and Coke</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>8,103,000 2,186,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Report, Number and Condition of the Gas and Water Companies of the Metropolis, Pool Papers.
APPENDIX 'I'

Capital expenditure of Local Government in London, 1855-1886

1. Loans raised by Vestries and District Boards, 1855-1869

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sewage</th>
<th>Paving</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>244,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>1,583,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Loans made by the Metropolitan Board of Works, 1872-1886

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vestries</th>
<th>District Boards</th>
<th>Guardians</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>100,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>85,592</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>78,691</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>161,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>199,958</td>
<td>169,090</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>199,950</td>
<td>160,338</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>198,600</td>
<td>96,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>151,250</td>
<td>152,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>574,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>164,800</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>449,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>123,600</td>
<td>149,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>487,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>189,500</td>
<td>248,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>609,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>55,040</td>
<td>243,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>620,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>108,350</td>
<td>253,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,122,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>210,450</td>
<td>60,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>430,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Reports, Metropolitan Board of Works, Local Government, Loan Wks., Metropolitan Board of Works, Local County Record Office.
3. **Capital Loans, Metropolitan Board of Works, 1859-1867**

(Sinking Fund: 2% on loans)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Capital Account, Metropolitan Board of Works, 1886**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discharge of Loans (ex Commission of Sewers) 275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Drainage and Sewers 6,346,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embankments 2,157,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Street Improvements 11,930,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Minor Improvements 846,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges and Woolwich Ferry 2,118,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans' Dwellings 1,444,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Spaces 573,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Brigade 425,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Prevention 45,513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 'J'

A note on some approaches to English Urban History of the Nineteenth Century

Since 1945 there have been four main developments in the historiography of British towns. First, modern historical techniques have been used in writing the history of particular towns and cities. At one time local inhabitants and ardent topographers were almost the only writers of town history. Now trained historians produce biographies of cities and the work of local historians has become more sophisticated and less concerned with trivial detail. This reflects developments in historical study, notably the emergence of local history as a reputable field of study. At the same time general historians have turned from the history of national trends and aggregates to the study of local individuals, local situations and social groups. The local historians are not, however, agreed about their objects. Some see this pursuit as a necessary corrective to generalisations made about national trends and aggregates; but others see local history as the analysis of the progress and decline of a local community - such an analysis being carried out, as it were, for its own sake. As Professor Briggs has pointed out, the result of this divergence of approach is that the biographer of cities does not know "whether he is fitting local history into a stock national framework or whether he is helping to construct a new scaffolding".

The growth of historical writing on English towns has been quite remarkable and certain types of town - the English seaside town, for instance - have a considerable literature of books and articles (1) Some of these studies have produced, either directly or incidentally, the information about urban processes. They have also served to modify the generalisations frequently made about the conditions of town life, especially in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Secondly, many historians have written on urban themes. These necessarily cover a wide field: the economic activities of towns involving the analysis of specifically urban industries, such as retail trade; the metropolitan region, studied in terms of a complex of towns functioning either in harmony or in conflict with each other; the political and administrative aspects of town growth, in particular the operations, structure and finance of municipal

Continued from previous page: Approach to History (1940), and H. P. R. Finberg, 'Local History' in Approaches to History (ed., Finberg, 1962).

institutions; the pathology of town growth, notably public health, housing, labour conditions, urban crime and the maintenance of law and order. Some of this work touches on matters of central importance to the study of urban history, but, in many cases, the urban environment is incidental and a background to the main theme.

Thirdly, urban development is one important theme which has attracted the attention of historians. American writers such as Lewis Mumford, have written about urban growth on the large scale, as a part of cultural history. English writers have preferred to carry out limited studies of the growth of particular cities and their suburbs. Most of them have been concerned with physical growth. The principal concern of social historians has been the problems created by living in towns and the social costs of urban growth, rather than the social organisation and structure of towns. This is changing now and social historians are also beginning to contribute to the study of urbanisation as a social process.

1. The field is too wide for a bibliographical note. The following three books are, however, particularly relevant: W. Ashworth, The Genesis of Modern British Town Planning (1954), R.A. Lewis, Edwin Chadwick and the Public Health Movement, 1832-1854 (1952) and R. Lambert, Sir John Simon and English Social Administration (1963)

2. Lewis Mumford, The City in History (1961)

Naturally enough, London has figured prominently in recent studies and particularly the suburban expansion of Victorian London.

Dr. H.J. Dyos has examined the nature of the process of suburban expansion in Camberwell. Sir John Summerson has suggested the outlines of a typical piece of suburban development in Hampstead and Hugh C. Price has attempted to reconstruct the way in which building spread through the suburbs of North West London. In addition Professor Ashworth has identified some types of economic and social development in suburban Essex.

There is a need, however, for more specialist studies of particular aspects of urban development. Two obvious fields are demography, particularly the patterns of internal migration, and the development of urban transport. Some recent studies of urban transport have set out to do more than chart the domestic history of particular lines or companies. Dr. Barker's account of the development of the London transport system in the nineteenth century, for instance, was intended in part to show the inter-

---


Yet another specialist field is the finance of urban development. There are of course studies of the economic significance of towns at various times and of the economic activities going on within towns; but there are few studies of the economic, particularly financial, operations involved in building towns or renewing urban plant. Nor have the builders, with one or two exceptions, been rescued from obscurity. This thesis attempts to make a start on part of this field by studying the finance of suburban development in the western part of Victorian London.

Single-minded investigations carried out from the standpoint of a particular historical discipline can be regarded as an antidote to over much microscopic work in local history. They can help us to understand more about each particular component of urban growth. They are, however, necessarily limited in scope. Professor Checkland has argued that the next step in urban history should be an interdisciplinary approach to the study of cities.

and he suggests some techniques which, he thinks, should enable historians to study the relationships between components in a city's growth.

It will be evident from this brief note that urban history is a field which attracts many historians and which contains a variety of subjects and approaches. This diversity of content and method has given rise to a desire amongst those interested in the subject to define the scope and relevance of urban history. The attempt to do something about delineating the field of urban history is the fourth, and ultimately, perhaps, the most important development since 1945.

One facet of this development is the formation of urban history groups in Europe, America, and more recently in England. The English group publish a news letter which amongst other things has provided a list of research in progress and a bibliography of publications, 1961-1963.


2. In 1956 the sub-committee of the International Commission for the Historical Sciences created a sub-committee concerned with urban history: the Arbeitsgruppe fur Stadtgeschichte (Working Party on Urban History). For some years a group in the U.S.A. has been circulating news letters and arranging conferences. These activities were one inspiration for the start of the Urban History group in England in 1963.

3. Another bibliography planned is a list of British University Theses on Urban History, 1911-1961. Enquiries to H.J. Dyer, University of...
At the same time Glasgow University has started a journal called *Urban Studies* with the main object of providing for social and economic contributions dealing with urban matters. These new publications should help in overcoming the criticism of Professor Briggs that some practical and professional studies of cities remain "imperfectly grounded in more general urban studies". (1)

The main reason for the formation of the English urban history group was the concern of its members for a "more systematic approach to the problems of historical research in urban themes so that even the most general and particular studies could readily belong to the same canon". (2) This is, of course, to invite discussion on the scope and methodology of urban history. In fact two matters are involved. One of them is the need to clarify and possibly standardise the principal concepts and terms commonly used in urban history. This is an essential prerequisite to delineating the field of urban history and suggesting criteria which will determine whether or not particular studies can be


2. For an American discussion see O. Handlin, 'The Modern City as a Field of Historical Study' and E. Lampard, 'Urbanisation and Social Change' in *The City in History, loc.cit.* The latter is an outspoken critic of American City histories but, as his title indicates, he is evidently more interested in social change than in urban growth as such. See also his 'American Historians and the Study of Urbanisation,' *American Historical Review, Lxvii* (October, 1961), pp. 49-61
regarded as coming within this field. The second matter is rather different. It is the demand for a general theory of urban growth. Now this sort of enquiry might be claimed as one which goes beyond the province of an urban historian. It might be argued in fact that theorising about urban growth is properly the function of the social scientist.

A second facet of the new movement in urban history can be regarded as an offspring of the desire for discussions on method. It is the demand for a comparative study of towns. Comparative studies are necessarily late developers and when they do become established inevitably raise questions of methodology in order to determine what should be compared. Comparative urban studies of an economic or geographical kind are already established, but the study of comparative urban history is not yet underway. In view of this, it is not surprising that in a recent comment on Victorian Cities by Asa Briggs the reviewer, Dr. H.J. Dyos, concentrates on

1. The only general work in English is the comparative study by A.F. Weber, The Growth of Cities in the 19th century (1899)

methodology and praises the work as a pioneering attempt to introduce "sustained comparison into the study of urban history in this country not in order to produce a standardised life line of urban development but in order to explore common urban problems in terms of their local diversity".\(^1\) Clearly, the kind of approach adopted in this thesis, though necessary at this stage, may soon become outmoded. The thesis might serve, however, to indicate a neglected but important component of town growth which might form one element in any future comparative studies in urban history.
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SECTION I: LAND AND BUILDING DEVELOPMENT

1. Records

i Deeds and other estate records

Type: Minutes. Church estates only: valuable record of day
to-day business. No records of private offices
were found.

Accounts and Rentals. Used for calculating profits.
Ground rents cannot be used as an index of land values
because they varied so much (the ground rents of the
Paddington Estate are more reliable and Mr. Pennance
of the College of Estate Management, London is studying
these).

Deeds. Building agreements, mortgages and building
leases are the most valuable for names, covenants,
and capital outlays. They sometimes contain a
history of the legal and financial transactions of
a piece of land or property and usually a map.
Assignments and leases of houses are less valuable
for information on new building.

Trust Deeds and Wills. An important source of information
on the value and profits of particular estates.
Auction particulars. Useful for calculating increases in property values and type of property built. Often kept by estate agents.

Location: Church Commissioners, 1 Millbank, Westminster. This office has the property and other records of the Church Estates Commissioners and some records of Church estates prior to the 1850s. These are contained in minute books and files relating to particular estates. The files have the minutes of the Commissioners, letters, surveyors' reports, purchases of ground rents, and information relating to private bills and legal cases. They also list and number agreements and leases, some of the originals of which are kept in the office, and can be produced.

The main collections used were:

Paddington Estate (Bishop of London). Six vols. minute books of trustees, 1792 – 1860s. Account books (mainly pre 1840s). One vol. building contracts to 1900, several files, estate maps. Also one vol.

Short History of the Paddington Estate.

St. Peter's Park Estate (Dean and Chapter of Westminster). Mainly files (about ten sets).

Some estate maps.
Hammer smith and Fulham Manors (Bishop of London).
Mainly files: details (relating to farms, sewers, roads, boundaries, copyholds, new building) are listed at the Hammersmith Central Library.
London County Record Office, County Hall, Westminster.
Deeds. A large accumulation of deeds is kept in B 21. Others are listed in the office record guides. They are passed on by private individuals, the County Council (property purchased for clearance etc.), and the British Records Association. There are several hundreds of deeds but it is pure chance whether a document will be available for a particular district.
Estate Collections. The office does have small collections of deeds and other records for particular estates. Two of these were used:
Gunter Estate. A very small collection, mainly leases and mortgages.
Ladbroke Estate. More substantial: nine boxes of records for the Ladbroke, Kensington Park (Blake) and Portobello estates. They contain agreements, leases and mortgages; rental books; accounts; letters; wills; and, most valuable of all, statements of the solicitors who looked after Blake's affairs and the minutes of the estate trustees after 1872.
London Borough Archives.

Borough Libraries have small collections of deeds and other estate documents, including plans, similar to the county record office. They are listed on typescript and usually indexed. Most of the collections are in charge of the reference librarians except at Hammersmith where in 1955 the Borough Council appointed an archivist and a research assistant who began the task of finding and transcribing mediaeval documents.

The following list indicates some of the estates for which deeds are deposited in these borough archives. The initials in brackets indicate the libraries concerned.

Anderson Estate, 1825 to 1844 (P), (about 3 boxes)
Bishop of London, Paddington Estate (P)
Bishop of London, Hammersmith, mainly manorial (H)
Cedars Estate, Gibbs and Flew, (F)
Blake, Portobello and Kensington Park (K)
Chancellors Estate (F)
Charity Lands (K)
Hammersmith Bridge Estate (H)
Harrington Estate (K)
Kensington Estate and manorial records (K)
Ladbroke Estate (K)
Lloyd Estate (H)
Marriott Estate (K)
Phillimore Estate (K)
Scott Estate (H)
Whitchurch Estate (K)

**Middlesex Deeds Registry, County Hall, Westminster.**

A unique collection mainly of copy deeds, and an important supplement to local collections, though not a substitute for them. Only two local land registries were started in England before 1891 mainly because of the hostility of property owners to compulsory registration. One of these was in Yorkshire and the second was started on the order of the justices of Middlesex in 1708. The office functioned to 1891 when it was transferred to the Land Registry.

Subsequently the records were rescued from pulping by the archivist at County Hall. The Registry contains 10,848 volumes of copy memorials (or registers) and a few originals for 1709 to 1938. There are 253 volumes of indexes and 254 volumes of plans (Indexes also available on microfilm at the Hammersmith Central Library). The copies are summaries and after 1850 they are very much abbreviated. Moreover, they are bound in big volumes which are very heavy to carry.

Nevertheless, it is possible to use the Registry for uncovering the legal and financial transactions
involved in the development of a particular estate.
The index lists the names of landowners, leaseholders, parties to mortgages and districts in which transactions were made.

General Registry Office, Somerset House.
Useful for inspecting wills on payment of a search fee.


Useful information is contained in the minute books of those companies developing property. The most important for this study was the Grand Junction Canal Company, minute books (5 vols., 1792 - 1850s).

District Surveyors' Returns, London County Record Office, Westminster.

Returns of houses inspected and fees charged per year under the Metropolitan Building Acts. An important source for house building and house builders. The available returns cover the years, 1845 - 1852 and 1871 - 1900, with abstracts for the intervening years. They are in three parts: part 1 lists the fees charged in each district, part 2 lists the new housing and part 3 deals with complaints and inspections. Part 2 lists in four columns:

Landowner
Building Owner
Builder
Number and type of property erected
iii Records of Local and Private Estate and Railway Bills, House of Lords Record Office, Westminster.

Minutes of evidence of private estate bills (sometimes with maps). Also useful are the records of railway bills: subscription contracts, deposited plans, lists of owners assenting or dissenting to a line, lists of houses to be demolished, and minutes of the Commons' and Lords' committees. Reference books attached to the plans list owners, lessees, and tenants of property to be purchased. (Also available in Borough libraries). Reference books were rather disappointing because the amount of property involved was quite small.

iv Business Records

Records of Builders do exist but few have come into public hands. Most of the builders contacted for this study had either lost their records, or sent them for salvage during the War. Records of brickmaking firms are more plentiful: for instance, Bread and Sons, Paddington, have records of outputs going back to the 1870s. See also the section on Building Societies and Insurance Companies.

v Bankruptcy Proceedings, Public Record Office, Chancery Lane.

There are two sets of files relating to bankruptcies: the
v. Bankruptcy Proceedings, Public Record Office, Chancery Lane

There are two sets of files relating to bankruptcies: the File of the Commissions of Bankruptcy and the File of Proceedings under the Bankruptcy Acts, 1832-1902. The first class relates mainly to bankrupts for whom Commissions were issued before about 1845, although there are some of a later date. The files of many Commissions have not been preserved. The second class consists of a comparatively small selection only. Files in this class for cases after 1863 are not at present open for public inspection. Other records of the Court of Bankruptcy include order books and enrolment books. The files are not easy to use: the name and approximate date of a bankruptcy must be known and then it is not certain that the information will be available. Another reason why the files were disappointing was that builders were more commonly insolvent than bankrupt. A better source may be the Office of the Registrar of Bankruptcies and Insolvencies which have files from 1883, but a search fee is charged.
vi. Solicitors' Records (apart from deeds)

Solicitors' records, apart from deeds and statements, were not used much in this thesis. It was discovered too late that records of cases of arbitration and compensation that occurred when railway companies intended buying land do exist and are very informative. This was made clear by Dr. Kellett (see the Guide to Records) who points out that solicitors papers, especially valuation estimates, do contain information of importance to business and urban historians. One difficulty about this source is that solicitors papers rarely come into public hands.
## Guide to Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Public Libraries</td>
<td>Printed List of Maps of or including Hammersmith in the Reference Library, 1957, MS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Public Libraries</td>
<td>Index to Kensington Parish Records</td>
<td>n.p., n.d.ms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Maps

i. Tithe Rent-charge Apportionment Maps

Available at the offices of the Tithe Redemption Commission, Finsbury Square, the London County Record Office and (for some) the Borough Libraries.

These maps prepared at various dates between 1837-8 and 1845 are an indispensable source for any student of local history. They are scrupulously drawn up and on a large scale: for example, the maps for Hammersmith are more than 7 feet in width being on a scale of 1" to 1 chain or 22 yards. Their most obvious feature is the numbered plots of land which correspond with the numbers on the schedule. The schedule lists in eight columns:

- Landowners in alphabetical order
- Occupiers
- Number on the map
- Name and description of land or premises
- State of cultivation (and areas of waste, water etc.)
- Area of land in acres, roods and perches
- Amount of rent charge payable
  (a) to the Vicar
  (b) to the Impropriators

The first two and the fifth columns can be used for analysing landownership; the fourth column provides what is virtually land utilization survey. Land use figures are totalled at the end of the schedule.

ii. Other Maps

Maps are a basic 'record' of land and building development. The following were found to be the most useful:

- Tithe maps (above) 12"-1 mile, 1848-50; 25"-1 mile 1863-70.
- Ordnance Survey, /1056 or 5 feet to 1 mile, 1874-6. (based on surveys made in 1871).

contd./
Cruchley, G.K, 1830, London and West London, 6"-1 mile

Lucas, A.J., 1842, Paddington

Wyle, J., 1870?, London, West London, 3½"-1 mile

Stanford, 1886, Library Map of London and Suburbs, 4"-1 mile

There are many other maps, some of them re-printed by the London Local History Societies. For discussion and further information and location, see

4. Local and Private Acts of Parliament

Printed versions of most of these are available in the British Museum. They contain information about estates and management, leasing arrangements and estate debts.

4 and 5 Will. IV, c.96
56 Geo. III, c.9
8 Geo. IV
1 Vict., c.xcii
1 Geo. IV, c.34
17 and 18 Vict., c.25
51-2 Vict., cxlviii
1 and 2 Geo. IV, c.26
6 Vict., c.xxxiii
35 Geo. III, c.83
2 Geo. III, c.16
50 Geo. III, clxxix
16-17, Vict., c.23
54 Geo. III, cxxxix

Bayswater Sewer Act
Busby, W.H.
Bishop of London
Great Western Railway
Gunter Estate
Harrington Estate
Kensington Square
Ladbroke Estate
Norland Estate
Paddington Estate
Phillimore Estate
Scott, R.
Smiths Charity Estate
Talbot, C.H.
5. Published sources of statistical information

i. Bankruptcy

London Gazette
Ferrys' Bankrupts and Insolvent Gazette, 1860-1900
Annual Reports, Board of Trade (Bankruptcy), Parl. Papers, 1883 -
A return of the cost of administering the laws, the number, occupation and type of bankruptcy (with analysis), extracts and comments on particular cases.

ii. Builders and Building


Abstracts of the District Surveyors Returns, 1855

Available at the London County Record Office for 1855-1888, and thereafter in London Statistics, published by the London County Council.

Directories and Handbooks

The most useful source for the building trade are the commercial directories, builders price books, the London directories, and the local directories which list trades. The following is a selection of these:

Builders:
The London and Provincial Builders and Building Trades, 1851
Post Office Directory of the Building Trades, 1870

Commercial:
Pigots', London and Provincial, 1842
Watkins', Commercial and London, 1852
Robson's, London, 1853
Local:
Post Office, London and the Counties, 1842
Post Office, London and Suburban, 1860-
Dolling, J., Paddington Directory, 1863 (mainly trades)
Simpsons, Kensington and Hammersmith, 1863
Allens, West London Street, Court and Trades, 1869
" Kensington, Notting Hill
" Brompton and Knightsbridge, 1876-1886
Kellys, Kensington, Notting Hill, Brompton and
Knightsbridge, 1886-

iii. Population and Housing

Census of Great Britain, Parl. Papers, decennially, 1801-1851
Census of England and Wales, Parl. Papers, decennially,
1861-1901.
(Lists inhabited houses, houses building, uninhabited
houses).

iv. Owners of Land

The best source is the Tithe Redemption Survey (above).
The chief sources for County owners are:
Return of Owners of Land, 1872-3, Parl. Papers,
1874, lxxii (unreliable).
Sanford, J.L. and Townshend, M. The Great Governing
Families of England, 1865 (a few only).
Bateman, J., The Great Landowners of Great Britain and
Ireland, 1883. (Unreliable).

Other sources are:
Universal British Directories, Directory to the
Nobility, Gentry and Families of London, 1793.
Burke's Complete Peerage, especially 1882 ed.
" Landed Gentry " " ".

Also see:
Hanham, H.J., 'County Biographical Dictionaries,
1890-1937', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical
Research, xxxiv, 89, 1961.
Thompson, F.W.L., English Landed Society in the
Nineteenth Century, 1963.
6. Contemporary Newspapers and Periodicals

The following are the main periodicals consulted. They contain comments on the growth of London and on the property market, land sales, statistics, land tenure, building progress, bankrupts. They also contain (especially the Builder) sketches and descriptions of houses, churches and public buildings. The Builder is kept by three London Borough Libraries (e.g. Battersea) and the Patent Office Library. The Building Societies Gazette is available at the Building Societies Institute in London, Hanover Square, and the transactions of the Surveyors Institute at their headquarters in Westminster. The rest are available in the periodicals collection of the British Museum at Colindale.

i. Relating to the property market:

Builder, 1842 -
Building Societies Gazette, 1874 -
Estates Gazette, 1858
Freehold Land and Building News, 1850-1
Building News, 1852 -
Freeholders Circular, 1852-1906
Transactions, Institute of Surveyors, 1868-1880
Transactions, Surveyors' Institute, 1881-1900

ii. Local Newspapers:

These are listed in section 4. The West London Observer, 1855-1900 was found useful for reports on the physical state of the parishes and building progress.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1833 | 690  | Select Committee on Manufactures, Commerce and Shipping  
      |      | Especially evidence of T. Burton and J. Stewart on speculative building in London and Liverpool. |
| 1837 | 134  | Select Committee on Crown Lends  
      |      | Evidence on leases and management. |
| 1837 | 538  | Select Committee on Church Leases  
      | 692  | Evidence of effect of land tenure on building. |
| 1840 | 384  | Select Committee on the Health of Towns  
      |      | Reference to working class building and builders of cottage property. |
| 1845 | 372  | Select Committee on Building Regulations and Improvement of Boroughs  
      |      | Especially evidence of H. Biers, master carpenter on building trades. |
| 1851 | 589-1| Select Committee (House of Lords) on Episcopal and Capitular Estate Management Bill  
      |      | Evidence on the administration of church estates. |
| 1856 | 550  | Select Committee, Enfranchisement of Copyholds Bill  
      |      | Evidence of effect of copyhold tenure on building. |
| 1857 | 220  | Select Committee on the Bank Acts  
      |      | Especially evidence of E. Capps, south London builder, on speculative building. This is rather suspect. |
| 1862 | 470  | Royal Commission on Episcopal and Capitular Revenues. |
| 1867 | 3873 | Select Committee on Trade Unions  
      |      | Evidence on building employers and the London Master Builders' Society. |
Select Committee on Friendly and Benefit Building Societies.
Some discussion on the relations between builders and building societies.

Select Committee on the Artisans and Labourers Dwelling Acts.
Evidence on small builders of cottage property.

Royal Commission on the Depression in Trade
Evidence on the depression in house building.

Royal Commission on the Livery Companies of the City of London, especially the returns, Part II (Great Companies), III (Minor Companies), IV, V (Charities).
Information on the management of urban estates.

Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes.
Discussion on the effect of urban land tenure on housing conditions.

Select Committee on Town Holdings (General and Ireland).

Select Committee on Town Holdings (mainly London).

Select Committee on Town Holdings (mainly English provincial towns).

Select Committee on Town Holdings Report (Leaseholds), Index, Appendices (mainly on
The evidence in these five papers must be used carefully because many of the witnesses had axes to grind. Nevertheless there is much information on urban land tenure and management, house building, speculation and building operations, building societies.

contd/...
and housing conditions in London, Liverpool, Leeds and many other cities and towns. The evidence of Hyde (surveyor) and Yates (builder) is particularly interesting.

1890 (341), xviii Select Committee on Town Holdings.

1890-1 (325), xviii Select Committee on Town Holdings. Mainly Scotland. Appendices.

1892 (214), xviii Select Committee on Town Holdings. Report. Appendices.
These papers contain discussion and information on site values, rates and the taxation of ground rents. The appendices have analyses of local taxation returns, and one paper by Harold Rogers on the price and rentals of houses in the eighteenth century.

1894 (C283), xi Select Committee on Feus and Building Leases. Scotland.

1894 (292), xv Select Committee, House of Lords, Town Improvements (Betterment).
8. Books and Articles

Alonso, W.  

Anon.  
Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Company, Ltd., A Short Account, 1883. (Pamphlet).

Ashton, T.S.  

Ashworth, W.  
The Genesis of Modern British Town Planning, 1954 (Bibliography).

Ashworth, W.  
'Types of Economic and Social Development in Suburban Essex', London, Aspects of Change (ed. Centre for Urban Studies, Report, No. 3.).

Banfield, F.  
The Great Landlords of London, 1888 (political).

Bennett, T.B. and Lefevre, G.S.  
Trade Societies and Strikes, 1860 (building industry).

Blakiston, I.T.  

Browning Hall Conference, Report of Sub-Committee on Housing and Locomotion, 1902-7.

Cairncross, A.K.  
Home and Foreign Investment, 1953 (building cycle).


Colvin, H.M. Dictionary of Architects.


Cross, G. Suffolk Punch, 1939 (reference to estate development).

Cubitt, H. Building in London, 1911.


Davies, C.T. A Practical Treatise on the Manufacture of Bricks, etc., 1884.

Dictionary of National Biography.


Fabian Society 'The Unearned Increment', *Fabian Tracts*, 30, 1891.


Haig, R.M. 'Towards an Understanding of the Metropolis', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, x, 1, 1926.


Higbee, E. The Squeeze, Cities without Space, 1961 (Modern America).


Holland, G.C. The Vital Statistics of Sheffield, 1843 (‘Overbuilding’).

Hudson, K. Industrial Archaeology, 1963 (Section on Building materials).

Hughes, J.R.T. 'Problems of Industrial Change' in 1859: Entering an Age of Crisis, ed. P. Appleman, 1959 (Structure and organisation of house building).

Johnson, B.H. Berkeley Square to Bond Street, 1952.


Keye, B.L.B. The Development of the Architectural Profession in Great Britain, 1800-1945, 1951 (Bibliography; sociological treatment).


Land Enquiry Committee Urban Report, ii, 1914.

Leasehold Enfranchisement Association, Publications, 1883-1894 (mainly political).

Leser, C.E.V. Building Activity and Housing Demand, Yorkshire Bulletin of Economic and Social Research, iii, 1951.

Lewis, J.P. and Richards, M. House Building in the South Wales Coalfield, 1851-1913, Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies, xxiv, 1956.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little, B.D.C.</td>
<td>The Building of Bath, 1947 (Georgian Building development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London County Council</td>
<td>Survey of London (the later volumes contain examples of building development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland, F.</td>
<td>Building Estates, 1883.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews, R.C.C.</td>
<td>A Study in Trade Cycle History, 1954 (Building cycle).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mingay, G.E.</td>
<td>English Landed Society in the Eighteenth Century, 1963 (Bibliography; a few examples of urban estates).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumford, L.</td>
<td>The City in History, 1961 (a very broad).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson, V.S.</td>
<td>London's Overgrowth and the Causes of Swollen Towns, 1939 (Reasoned attack on Building Leases).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prest, J. The Industrial Revolution in Coventry, 1960 (Cottage factories).


Reddaway, T.F. The Rebuilding of London after the Great Fire, 1940.


Robbins, R.H. Middlesex, 1953 (Remarks on Twentieth Century building development).

Sargent, C.H. Ground Rents and Building Leases, 1886 (Elementary description).


Spring, D.


Spring, D.

'Earl Fitzwilliam and the Corn Laws', American Historical Review, lix, 2, 1954.

Spring, D.


Spring, D.

The English Landed Estate in the Nineteenth Century: Its Administration, Baltimore, 1963 (Based on the Bedford Estates).

Spring, D.


Stone, L.

The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641, 1965. (Refers to urban estates).

Summerson, J.


Summerson, J.

John Nash, Architect to King George IV, 1950.

Summerson, J.


Summerson, J.


Tallents, S.

Man and Boy, 1943 (Cubitt).

Tarn, A.W.

Thomas, B. Migration and Economic Growth, 1954 (Building cycles).

Thompson, G.S. The Russells in Bloomsbury, 1669-1771, 1940.


Thompson, F.M.L. English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century; 1963 (A few references to urban estates).

Turvey, R. The Economics of Real Property: an analysis of property values and patterns of use, 1957 (Economic analysis of the determinants of urban property values).

Verinder, F. The Great Problem of Our Great Towns, 1908.


NOTE: The preceding bibliography aimed at including most of the written material on urban land values, builders (not very much available) and building fluctuations in Great Britain. It also includes some of the work done on estate management (including urban estate management).
9. Theses and MS.

Dyos, H. J.

The Suburban Development of Greater London, South of the Thames, Ph.D., University of London, 1952.

Reeder, D. A.

SECTION II: FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (INCLUDING BUILDING SOCIETIES)

(This section includes material on these financial institutions connected with urban development.)

1. Records

i Insurance Companies

Royal Exchange Assurance Company, mainly policy registers, Hand in Hand Insurance Company, mainly minute books early nineteenth century, some ledgers and accounts. Papers of Walter Prideaux, solicitor to two insurance companies.

Most insurance companies keep records, especially minute books. Three companies were approached. The Scottish Union had records which showed that they made only occasional loans to builders. The Royal Exchange Assurance had lost records in various fires. Financial dealings were noted in the general minute books, but these were not made available for research. The London Assurance Corporation had a very full set of records going back to the seventeenth century. They included ledgers, surveys, general minute books and special minute books.

Records consulted were: Minute books of the Treasury
2. Contemporary Newspapers and Periodicals

Building Societies Gazette

Bankers Magazine

Journal, Institute of Actuaries
(especially vols. vii, xxix, xlii, xlvi)

Transactions, National Association for the Promotion of the Social Sciences.

(occasional discussions on the building society movement and home ownership).

3. Published Sources of statistical information

Returns, Building Societies incorporated under the Act of 1873, Parl. Papers, 1874 -

(Also in Statistical Abstracts. The returns give details of members, liabilities and assets, date founded and incorporated. Not all the societies give a full return).

Directories and Handbooks.

Banks: Hiltons' Handlist of London Bankers, 1890-;

Building Societies:

Building Societies Almanack and Provident Man's Directory, (2nd ed., 1847)
Building Societies Directory and Almanack, 1853, 1854.
Building Societies Gazette and Investment Advertiser, 1869.
Directory and Handbook of Building and Freehold Land Societies, 1874.
Directory of Building Societies with an analysis of balance sheets, 1884.

Insurance Companies:

Walford, C. Insurance Cyclopaedia, 1871-8
Committee, 1830-1885 (several volumes),
Balance Sheets, 1880-1900.

ii Building Societies

Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W. C. 2.
Has files of registrations of friendly and building
societies in England since 1836. A prospectus is
kept for each registration.

Private Records. No records of building societies
have come into public hands. It is important,
therefore, that their private records be preserved,
and Dr. H. J. Dyos of the University of Leicester
is at present engaged in surveying these.

All but one of the building societies had records
including minute books.

Chelsea Building Society, King's Road, Chelsea.
Annual reports, 1878
Minute Books, 2 vols., 1878-1892.
Prospectuses of other Societies.

Magnet Building Society, St. Marylebone.
Rough Minute book (North West Building Society),
1883-1891
Minute Books, 3 vols. 1860-1885
1 vol. Memorial History.

Paddington Building Society, Great Western Road,
Paddington.
Minute Books, 3 vols., 1879-1882 (St. Peters Park
Building Society)
Some ledgers - poor condition.
Prospectus.
Westbourne Park Building Society, Westbourne Grove, Paddington.

Collection of letters
Annual Reports, 1885-1900
Minute books, 2 vols, 1885-1893

West London Permanent Building Society, Sloane Street, Chelsea.

Annual Reports contained in
Minute Books, 1851- (several volumes to 1900)
Prospectus.
4. Reports and Minutes of Evidence, Parliamentary Committees and Commissions.

1837 (429), xviii Select Committee Railway Subscription Lists.
   An inquiry into the subscribers to the first railway promotion in West London.

1850 (508), xix Select Committee on the Savings of the Middle and Working Classes.

1867, x Select Committee on the Limited Liability Acts.

1871 (c.452), xxv Royal Commission on Friendly and Benefit Building Societies.

1887 (260), xiii Select Committee on Town Holdings.
   This particular volume contains evidence on the character of building societies.

1890-1 (c.6314), lxxxiii Select Committee on Advances on Real Property, 1890-1.
   With reports from Commissions on Land Banks and similar institutions in Europe.
5. Books and Articles

Contains those writings consulted for information on the institutions of the domestic money and capital markets.

Anon.                                       Building Societies and their Traducers, 1844.
Anon.                                       Do Building Societies benefit borrowers?, 1871.
Brookes, C.                                  The First Hundred Years of the Woolwich Equitable Building Society, 1947.
Dickson, P.G.M.                              The Sun Insurance Office, 1710-1960
Evans, D. M.                                 City Men and City Manners, 1852.
Evans, D. M.                                 Speculative Notes and Notes on Speculation, 1864.
Fletcher, B.                                 Houses and Building Societies, 1885.
The Hearts of Oak Benefit Society, Centenary History, 1942.

The Homes of the Working Classes, 1865.


The Surplus Funds of Life Assurance Offices, 1887.

The Stock Exchange, Its History and Functions, 1962. (Good Bibliography).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie, J. E.</td>
<td>Freehold Land Societies: their History, Present Position and Claims (1853)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayers, R. S.</td>
<td>Lloyds Bank in the History of Banking, 1958.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratchley, A.</td>
<td>Industrial Investment and Emigration, being a Treatise on Benefit Building Societies, ed. 2, 1851.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull, A. H.</td>
<td>'Life Office Investments, 1850-1900', Transactions, Actuarial Society of Edinburgh, iv, 1900.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, R. A.</td>
<td>A Treatise on Investments, 1852-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wats, J. S.</td>
<td>The Truth about the Liberator, 1839.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION III: GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC UTILITIES AND TRANSPORT

(This section includes material used to study the finance of local government in London.)

1. Records: Government

The minute books of some of the local government and municipal institutions in London were a main source for the study, although they sometimes proved to be disappointing because they merely recorded decisions taken. They were most interesting for the period before 1850. Minute books of the Gas and Water Companies do exist but only a few are kept in the Record offices. Only a small selection of the available material on government was consulted.

London County Record Office.

Minute books and Papers of the Westminster and Metropolitan Commissions of Sewers.

Occasional reference to:

Minute Books of the Metropolitan Board of Works (the last volume in 1888 contains a history of the Board. Professor David Owen is at present engaged in research on the Metropolitan Board of Works).

Western Gas Company, share register and a few balance sheets.

These records are listed fully in the office and described in the guides (see below).
London Borough Libraries.
The records of parish government are kept either in the central library or the town hall in each parish. Most of these have been preserved and listed. The main source for chapter 5 of this thesis was the minute books and financial documents of the vestries and district boards especially to 1860. These were readily available except at Paddington where they are kept in the Town Hall. The records are fully listed in the guides.

2. Records: Transport
The main concern in this thesis was the promotion of railways, the records for which are at the House of Lords Record Office. The minute books and other records of transport concerns are at the headquarters of the London Transport Commission in Paddington. The minute books of the Metropolitan Railway for selected years were consulted.
Transport records are discussed in several guides.
3. Guide to Records

Barker, T. C.  

Bond, M. F.  

Booth, J.  
The Paddington Town Hall Archives, Paddington, 1929.

Darlington, I.  

Darlington, I.  

Hammersmith Public Libraries  
Printed List of Records Relating to the Hamlet and Parish of Hammersmith, and of the Board of Works, Fulham District, which have been transferred to the Central Library, 1960, MS.

Kensington Public Libraries  
Index to Kensington Parish Records n.p., n.d.ms.

Paddington Public Libraries  
Paddington Parish Records, 1961, MS.

Ridge, A. D.  
4. Contemporary Newspapers and Periodicals

Transport

Heropaths Railway Magazine
(published the meetings of directors)

Government

Illustrated London News

Punch

Saturday Review
(for political comment on local government)

Times

Westminster Review

5. Published sources of statistical information

Local Authority Returns

These are kept at the Members Library, County Hall,
Westminster, and in some of the borough libraries.

Annual Reports, Vestries and District Boards, 1855–1900.
(contemporary reports of surveyor and medical officer:
mortality statistics, financial accounts, lists of
representatives).

London County Council Statistics, 1888 –

Financial and other statistics: gas and water,
public houses, music halls, etc.
Parliamentary Returns

Reports, Metropolitan Board of Works, annually 1855-1888
(Statistics of main drainage, and other improvements, financial accounts, gas and water companies, local taxation returns)

Local Taxation Returns for London, annually 1855-

Board of Trade Returns, Metropolitan Railway Bills 1862-

Tramway Returns, 1880-
(Capital, length of lines, number of miles opened, number of horses and cars.)

Directories and Handbooks


The London Omnibus Guide and Local Conveyance Directory, (various years)

Municipal Guide (various years)
6. **Reports and Minutes of Evidence, Parliamentary Committees and Commissions.**

1825 (355), Select Committee on the Supply of Water to the Metropolis.

1830 (215), iv Select Committee on Select Vestries.

1840 (384), xi Select Committee on Health of Towns.


1843 (486), xxi Report of the Poor Law Commissioners on Local Taxation.

1844 (572), xvii Health of Towns Commission

1845 (372), x Select Committee on Building Regulation and Improvement of Boroughs.

1846 (91), xvii Royal Commission on Metropolitan Terminals.

1846 (474), x Select Committee on the Metropolitan Sewage Manure Company.

1847 (686), lvi Sewers (Westminster)

1850 (59), vii Select Committee (Lords) Small Tenements Rating Act.

1852 (1471), xix Minutes of Information, Drainage of Land — including suburban lands.

1854–55 (419), x Select Committee on Metropolitan Communications.

1856–57 (333), xiv Metropolitan Turnpike Roads.

1860 (417), xxi Select Committee on the Gas (Metropolis) Bill.

1861 (211), vii Select Committee on Local Taxation, and Government (evidence).

1861 (372), viii "" ""

1861 (476), viii " (main index) "

1863 (500), viii Select Committee (Lords) on Metropolitan Communication.
1864 (87), xi  Joint Select Committee on Railway Schemes (Metropolis).
1866 (186), xiii  Select Committee Local Government and Local Taxation.
1866 (452), xiii  "  "  "  "  "
1867 (135), xii  "  "  "  "  "
1867 (268), xii  "  "  "  "  "
1867 (301), xii  "  "  "  "  "
1867 (520), xii  Select Committee on Metropolis Gas Bill.
1867-8 (489), lviii  Return Local Health Boards.
1870 (470), iv  Report on Local Taxation (Goschen).
1872 (252), xii  Joint Select Committee on Tramways (Metropolis).
  c.
1884 (3842-1), xli  Royal Commission on Metropolitan Sewage Discharge.
1884-5 (c.4402), xxx  Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes.
1893-94 (251), xii  Select Committee London Improvement Bill.
1893-4 1168, lxxv  Report on Local Taxation.
1894 (292), xv  Select Committee on Town Improvements (Betterment).
1899 (294), lxxx  Select Committee on Metropolis Gas Companies.
1906 Cd.2752 xli  Royal Commission on London Traffic. (Appendix)
1906 Cd.2987 xlii  "  "  "  "  "
1906 Cd.2751 xl  "  "  "  "  "
                  (Evidence)
1906 Cd.2798, xliii  "  "  "  "  "  "  (maps)
  2799, xli
2743, 4, xlv, xli
                  "  "  "  "  "  "  (reports)
7. Books and Articles

(Breansive bibliography).
Bates, J.                                   The Playgrounds of Paddington. How we
                                            created it and to whom we owe it, 1902.
Brennan, E. J. T.                            'Sydney Webb and the London Technical Education
                                            Board,' Vocational Aspect, xxiii, xxiv, 1959-60.
Briggs, A.                                  'Birmingham: the Making of a Civic Gospel',
Browning Hall Conference                    Report of Sub-Committee on Housing and
                                            Locomotion to London, (1902-7).
Calkins, W. N.                               'A Victorian Free Trade Lobby', Economic
                                            History Review, xliii.
Day, J. R.                                  The Story of London's Underground,
Douglas, H.                                 'The Founding of the Metropolitan Railway,'
Dover, R.                                   Metropolitan Board of Works, 1856.
Dyos, H. J.                                 'Some Social Costs of railway building in
                                            London', Journal of Transport History, iii,
                                            1957-8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyos, H. J.</td>
<td>'The Objects of Street Improvement in Regency and Early Victorian London', International Review of Social History, ii, 1957.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaglesham, E. J. R.</td>
<td>From School Board to Local Authority, 1956.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardes, P.</td>
<td>History of Street Improvements in London, 1898.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversley, Lord</td>
<td>Commons, Forests and Footpaths, 1892.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabian Society</td>
<td>Facts for Londoners, 1889.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabian Society</td>
<td>The London Programme, 1891.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay, S.</td>
<td>A Royal Road, 1883.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finer, S. E.</td>
<td>Municipal Trading: A Study in Public Administration, 1941.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finer, S. E.</td>
<td>The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick, 1952.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firth, J. E. B.</td>
<td>Municipal London, 1876.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin, C. G.</td>
<td>The Unhealthiness of London, 1847.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gomme, G. W. London In the Reign of Victoria, 1878.


Jones, C. Ealing from Village to Corporate Town, 1948.


Lee, J. M.  

Levien, D.  

Lewis, R. A.  

London County Council  
Return of Parks, Open Spaces, 1892 and 1899.

London County Council  

London County Council  

London County Council  

London County Council  
Synopsis of Reports before Royal Commissions and Parliamentary Committees referring to the Water Supply of London.

London Reform Union  

Lucas, B. K.  
The English Local Government Franchise, 1952.

Lucas, B. K.  

MacDermot, E. T.  
History of the Great Western Railway, 1927.

Marshall, J. B.  

Mathews, W.  

O'Neill, J. E.  

Parsons, C.  
Proposed London Railway, to afford Direct Communication between the City, Westminster, etc., 1853.


Richardson, R. W. C. Thirty-two years of Local Self Government, 1888.

Robbins, M. A Hundred Years of Public Transport, 1956.


Schooling, J. H. London County Council Finance .... made clear to ratepayers, 1907.


Stevens, V. Two Addresses to Ratepayers, n.d.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webb, J. B.</td>
<td>The Parish and the County, 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward, W.</td>
<td>London as it is and as it might be, 1886.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, J.</td>
<td>The Dolphin, 1828.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **Theses and M.S.**

Berry, G. Evolution of Water Supplies to the Royal Borough of Kensington, 1957.

Pfooks, E. J. Kensington Turnpike Trust, 1958 (Kensington).


Lawrence, G. Fifty Years of Vestry Government in Kensington, 1800–1850, 1960 (Kensington).
SECTION IV: CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS

1. Records:
Most of the records of churches and private schools are kept on the premises. The records of the churches of West London are listed in the London County Record Office. Another useful source for church building is the files of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Endowments and Sites. Many of these (especially those before 1860) contain questionnaires (date of founding, pew rents, building costs, name of builder, architect, incumbent) and details of property transactions, repairs, parsonage house and so on).

2. Published sources of statistical information:
Directories and Handbooks:
Crockford's Ecclesiastical Directory
De Carterer Brown, F. S., Our Schools and Colleges 1872, 1879, 1884.
Handbook to all the Places of Worship in London, 1848.
London Religious Census, 1888.
Metropolitan Ecclesiastical Directory, 1835.
Pepperell, W., Church Index

London County Council
Annual Report, Education Committee, 1901.
3. **Reports and Minutes of Evidence, Parliamentary Committees and Commissions.**

1865 (467), xliii
Return Endowed Schools

1852-3 1690, lxxxix

1857-8 (387), ix
Select Committee on the Deficiency of Spiritual Instruction in the Metropolis and other populous Districts, 1857-8 (387), ix.

1867-8 (3966 i-ix), xxviii
Reports, Endowed Schools Commission.

4. **Books and Articles: General**

**Armytage, W. H. G.**
Four Hundred Years of English Education, 1964.

**Best, G. F.**
Temporal Pillars: Queen Anne's Bounty, 1964.

**Burgess, H. J.**

**Burn, W. L.**

**Clarke, F. L.**

**Clarke, Jr G. Kilson**

**Eaglesham, E. J. R.**
From School Board to Local Authority, 1956.

**Inglis, K. S.**

**Jones, R. T.**

**Low, S. (Junior)**
The Charities of London, 1867 (*later edition*).

**Morgan, R. Streatly**
Sandford, Rev. J. The Mission and Extension of the Church at Home, Bampton Lectures, 1861 (1862).
Tait, A. C. The Spiritual Wants of the Metropolis and its suburbs, 1863.

5. Books and Articles: West London
(A small selection only)

Anon. Note on Waterloo Street Church, Hammersmith, n.d.
Anon. Denbigh Road, Methodist Church, 1858-1957, 1957.
Anon. A Short Account of the New District Church of St. John the Evangelist, Hammersmith, 1858.
Anon. Our Lady of Victories, n.d. (Kensington)
Durrant, F. C. The Story of St. Mathias's Church, Kensington, 1943.
Forster, N. The Early Years of St. Phillips Church, Earls Court, n.d. (Kensington).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philpott, H. B.</td>
<td>London and School, 1904.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, J. D. G.</td>
<td>The Story of St. Mary Abbots, Kensington, 1942.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton, J.</td>
<td>Congregationalism in the Old Court Suburb, 1933.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, A.</td>
<td>History of Holy Trinity Church, Hammersmith, 1903.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION V: LONDON, GROWTH AND TOPOGRAPHY

1. Local History Collections

The Guildhall Library, the Members Library, County Hall and the Borough Libraries have local history collections. The latter contain books, parish magazines, trade journals, press cuttings, handbills, and collections of prints and photographs.

For an introduction to this material see:


Many of the West London parishes also have local history groups.

2. Contemporary Local Newspapers (West London)

Before 1860 the following newspapers serving West London were in existence: West London Observer, Chelsea News, and the Paddington Times. By 1880 the total of newspapers in existence had increased to seven: 'West London' papers - 2, Bayswater - 1, Chelsea - 1, Paddington, - 1, Kensington and Hammersmith - 2. The following newspapers are still available:

- West London Observer, 1855-1900
  (mainly on microfilm, Hammersmith Central Library)

- Bayswater Chronicle, 1867, 1875 (British Museum)
- West Kensington Park Record, 1875 (British Museum)
- Paddington Times, 1880-1900 (British Museum)
- Kensington News and West London Times 1869-
  (1889- Kensington Central Library)
- Fulham Chronicle, 1889-1900 (Fulham Central Library)

The West London Observer was the most important local source for this thesis.
3. Books and Articles

(This section includes most of the material found useful for chapter 1 on the suburban development of West London. It also includes some books on London generally.)


Allen's Allen's West London Street Court and Traders Directory, 1869.


Anon. Royal Blue Book, or Fashionable Directory for 1829.


Anon. Bayswater Annual, 1885.


Bayley, E. B. Ragged Homes and How to mend them, 1859.

Bayley, E. B. Home Woe and Home Woe, 1892.

Bell, W. G. The Skirts of the Great City, 1907.

Bennett, A. R. London and Londoners in the Eighteen-fifties, 1924.

Besant, Sir W. London, North of the Thames, 1911.

Bingam, F. The Borough Guide to the Metropolitan Borough of Paddington, c.1900.

Booth, C. Life and Labour of the People of London, 1889–1903 (especially Ser. 1, Poverty and Special Districts in West London, and Ser. 3, the Inner West.

Brodbank, Sir J. G. History of the Port of London, 1921.
Bromhead, C. E. N.  

Centre for Urban Studies  

Chancellor, E. B.  
The History of the Squares of London, 1907.

Chesterton, G. K.  
Napoleon of Notting Hill, 1912.

Clarke, W. J.  
The Suburban Homes of London, 1881.

Clayton, R.  

Clunn, H. P.  

Coppock, J. T. and Prince, H. C. (ed.)  

Croker, C.  
A Walk from London to Fulham, 1860.

Cunningham, P.  
Handbook of London, 1850.

Dixon, R. C.  
Metropolitan Borough of Paddington, 1928.

Dolling, J.  
Paddington Directory for 1863.

Draper, W. H.  
Hammersmith: A Study in Town History, 1913.

Dyos, H. J.  

Faulkner, T.  
The History and Antiquities of Kensington, 1820.

Faulkner, T.  
The History and Antiquities of Brentford and Chiswick, 1845.

Faulkner, W.  
The History and Antiquities of Hammersmith, 1839.

Fennimore Cooper, J.  
England, with Sketches of Society in the Metropolis, 1837.

Ferguson, R.  
Passionate Kensington, 1939.

Fisher, F.J.  
'The Development of London as a Centre of Conspicuous Consumption in the 16th and 17th Centuries', Transactions Royal Hist. Soc. xxx, 1947.
Fitzgerald, P.  
Fulham  
Fulham Historical Society  
Russell, G. E.  
Gaunt, W.  
Gladstone, F. M.  
Green, B.  
Guizot, P. G.  
Hall, P. G.  
Hammersmith Local History Group  
Harrison, M.  
Holden, N. H.  
Hazzlitt, W. C.  
Holmes, E. J.  
Hogg, J.  
Howitt, W.  
Hucks, E. J.  
Ilchester, Lord  
Ilchester, Lord  
James, N. B.  
Jephcott, P.  
Jolliffe, P.  
Jones, A. H.  

London City Suburbs, 1893.  
North End Fulham, Occasional Paper, no.1.  
Kensington, 1958.  
Notting Hill in Bygone Days, 1936.  
Portrait of a London Borough, 1953  
An American at the Court of S. James, 1860.  
The Industries of London since 1851, 1962.  
They startled Grandfather, Gay Ladies and Merry Masners of Victorian Times, 1950.  
The Hazzlitts, 1912. 2vol.  
London as it is, 1837.  
The Northern Heights of London, 1869.  
Bayswater and its Old Associations, n.d.  
Henry Fox, first Lord Holland, 1920.  
Henry Fox, first Lord Holland, 1920.  
A Troubled Area; Notes on Notting Hill, 1964.  
Acton and Its History, 1910.  
Old Earls Court, 1935.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>Cyclopaedia of London, 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson, E.</td>
<td>A brief account of the Parish of Paddington, 1943?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Hunt</td>
<td>The Old Court Suburb. Memories of Kensington, Royal, Critical and Anecdotual (ed. A. Dobson, 1902).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loftie, W. J.</td>
<td>Kensington, Picturesque and Historical, 1888.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loftie, W. J.</td>
<td>London City, 1891.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysons, D.</td>
<td>The Environs of London, 4 vols., 1792-6.                               (especially 2, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott, C.</td>
<td>Now, 1910.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marson, M.</td>
<td>Edwina; the Biography of the Countess of Mountbatten, 1958.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton, C.</td>
<td>View of the Agriculture of Middlesex, 1798.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton, G. E.</td>
<td>Mayfair, Belgravia and Bayswater, 1903.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noel, B. | The State of the Metropolis, 1825.
Phillimore, Lord | Genealogy of the Family of Phillimore, 1922.
Rasmussen, J. E. | London: The Unique City, 1937.
Ridgeway, R. | A Short History of Campden Hill Square and its immediate surroundings, 1932.
Ridgeway, R. | A Short History of Kensington, 1935.
Ridgeway, R. | A Short History of Kensington and Past Noteabilities, 1931.
Richardson, J. | Recollections etc. of the last half-century, 1856.
Ritchie, J. E. | Here and there in London, 1859.
Robins, W. | Paddington, Past and Present, 1853.
Robbins, M. | Middlesex, 1953.
Sala, G. A. | Household Words: the Great Invasion and Looking at Life, 1852.
Sala, G. A. | London up to date, 1894.
Sherwell, A. | Life in West London, 1897.
Smith, C. M. | The Little World of London, 1851.
Recollections of Old Kensington, 1889.

Curiosities of London, 1855.

The Letters of Horace Walpole, 1905.


Old and New London, especially vols. v, vi, 1876.

The Pictorial Handbook of London, 1854.

London Exhibited, 1851.

The Intimate Charm of Kensington, 1948.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyos, H. J.</td>
<td>The Suburban Development of Greater London, South of the Thames</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of London</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees, M.</td>
<td>The Economic and Social Development of Extra-Metropolitan Middlesex</td>
<td>M.Sc.(Econ.)</td>
<td>University of London</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>during the Nineteenth Century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>