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Fig. 1 Sketch map of the town of Croydon, 1969
In an earlier dissertation an attempt was made, using Dr Dyos's pioneer work on Camberwell as a starting point, to study certain aspects of Croydon's urban development. An examination was made of two adjacent, but quite dissimilar, parts of the southern end of the parish; and answers were sought to such questions as when and how the land became available for building, who purchased the sites, who did the construction, what the factors were that determined the kind of locality that each was to become, the speed at which building took place, what affected that speed, what sort of districts resulted, and what their subsequent history has been. To avoid parochialism and to ensure that the study made some contribution, however modest, to the fuller understanding of nineteenth and twentieth century urban growth a wider, if less detailed, examination was also made of the physical environment and of the processes of land sale and estate development elsewhere in the town.

The study showed that Croydon was a place destined to expand rapidly in the nineteenth century by virtue of its geographical position. It was also a town in which

altitude and soil, the whim or the chance death of a substantial landowner, or even in one instance the redundancy of the training college of the Honourable East India Company following on the Indian Mutiny, all played a part in influencing the physical or social environment of the place. By contrast with Camberwell, Croydon was remarkably self-contained in its development. The land, which belonged mainly to Croydon men, appeared to be changed largely by Croydon men. It was they, and especially the tradesmen, who bought the building plots, financed house construction out of their profits, looked upon the rents from their houses as a secure investment and, as they grew in wealth, exercised considerable influence in the government of the town.

The present dissertation is a natural successor to the previous one. The first of its four parts takes a close look at another substantial area of the town, the Rectory Manor Estate, which first became available for building in the 1830's and which was developed slowly during the remainder of the century; remarkably slowly bearing in mind its proximity to the town centre. The investigation seeks to discover whether this area, situated as it was near the main shops and what was at first the principal railway station, developed along similar lines to the districts studied in the former dissertation or in a different manner.

By the nineteenth century Croydon was already a flourishing if small market town. A study of the place at
that time would be incomplete without an examination of the market centre. This district had deteriorated from a prosperous commercial and trading district to a notorious slum, described variously as a malignant sore, an upas tree, and as comparable only to Seven Dials. The second part of the dissertation therefore traces the struggle to improve the market area, and by a process of redevelopment to change it from an insanitary, lawless slum into an area of commercial prosperity and civic pride. Though Croydon is a vastly different town in origin, character, and size from Glasgow, the various stages of redevelopment parallel almost exactly those described by C.M. Allan in his briefer investigation of the latter town.¹

Much of the redevelopment of Croydon's market area is a story of human poverty and degradation, inefficiency and greed, philanthropy and public service. The third part of the dissertation therefore seeks to find out more about the people of the town, and especially the twenty thousand or so men, women, and children who lived in the parish in the middle of the nineteenth century. To this end, the 1851 census has been examined in detail in order to discover something about the pattern of migration into Croydon and its relationship to the social and occupational structure of the town.

Croydon's population in the middle of the nineteenth century was less than a tenth of the figure recorded in 1931, so that it seemed appropriate to conclude the dissertation with a study of a housing estate built between the Wars. The original intention was to choose an estate that was typical of the period, but further research has revealed many unexpected features in the area selected. Whether similar conditions obtained in other parts of the country, or at least in the south east, only further study would show.

Work on this fourth and final part of the dissertation dispelled the widely held belief that town planning was an important factor in estate development after World War I. The growth of the Ham Farm Estate in the 1920's and 1930's confirms only too clearly Ashworth's assertion of the almost total ineffectiveness of statutory town planning before World War II.¹ It has also become evident that the loss or absence of documents relating to estate development in Victorian times is more than matched by the loss and destruction of similar records of thirty or forty years ago. Builders of the inter-war period were better educated and more literate than their nineteenth century counterparts, and they probably at the time kept more detailed records of land transactions, wages, goods

purchased, and house sales; but practically none, relating to the Ham Farm Estate at least, have survived.

Much of the evidence for this part of the dissertation has been derived from interviews with those builders, or their relatives, who could be traced. Some of it is necessarily subjective and must be treated with care, but the outcome is the bringing together of a substantial body of knowledge about the way builders of thirty or so years ago thought, planned, and executed their work; about their background, their methods, and their success or failure. This is a kind of information which is recorded nowhere else and which would otherwise be lost as the people who remember it die off.

Very little work in detail appears to have been done as yet on suburban housing of the 1920's and 1930's, using the techniques developed by Dr Dyos in his study of an earlier period. It is hoped that the last part of the present dissertation will at least arouse interest in the possibilities of such work on twentieth century estates. The records that exist are almost daily being destroyed the people who undertook the building are rapidly diminishing in numbers.

R.C.W. COX

Sanderstead, Summer 1969
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NOTES ON THE TEXT

All streets are within the bounds of the ancient parish of Croydon, unless otherwise stated. For simplicity, the street names given are those currently in use.

Successive dwellings numbered say 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, are indicated as '2 to 6'; if numbered say 2, 4, 6, they are indicated as '2-6'.
INTRODUCTION

From Saxon times until the eighteenth century Croydon was one of the seats of successive Archbishops of Canterbury. One of them, Whitgift, endowed almshouses which still survive in the centre of the town; and, also, a school which after many vicissitudes now provides day education for about 1,500 boys. Others encouraged the growth of markets and fairs. By 1801, Croydon was an important trading centre and was also a stopping place for coaches. Its population was 5,743 and it was already much larger than any nearby town in East Surrey or West Kent; and within eight years a horse-drawn railway and a canal connected it with the River Thames. In 1837 West Croydon became one of the first places south of the River to be linked to London by steam railway; and within a year or two another line, east of the town, had been built and extended to Brighton and Dover.

Croydon was one of the first fifteen towns in the country to have a Local Board of Health, which commenced work in September 1849. Within a short time both water and gas were being supplied to many parts of the town, and steps were being taken to dispose more decently of the town's sewage.

Because of its market and its coaching traffic, Croydon was already providing considerable opportunity for employment, for trade, and for business. Yet it remained very much self-contained, and even inward-looking.
Reference has already been made to the fact that it was principally local men who changed the topography from a predominantly rural one to an urban one. But this was not the limit of their activities. The directors of the Croydon Gas and Coke Company in 1851, for instance, comprised a surgeon, a clock and watch maker, master plumber, boot and shoe manufacturer, stationer, coach proprietor, chemist, brewer, master wheelwright, two linen drapers, and a house proprietor. All of them lived and earned their living in the town; and all are named time and again as supporting this charity or financing that project, being elected to this board or invited to chair that meeting.

Thus, Honest John Close, the master plumber on the board of the Croydon Gas and Coke Company was also, later, a trustee of the Croydon Starr-Bowkett Benefit Building Society. When he attended meetings in his latter capacity, he sat alongside Joshua Allder, the founder of the town's largest departmental store, and the later managing director of the Croydon and Norwood Tramway Company. Allder was also a member of the Local Board of Health, at about the same time as John Pelton, a High Street grocer, who was also Chairman of the Croydon Land and Investment Company and an auditor of the Croydon Permanent Building Society. This Society's solicitor was George Hogan, who also acted for the

1. p.4, supra.
Croydon and Home Counties Permanent Building Society, and so was in contact with one of its directors, Thomas Goodwin, an attorney's clerk who was in turn on the board of the Croydon Starr-Bowkett Society. And so on.

The members of the Local Board of Health, the School Board and, later, the Town Council; the purchasers of building plots; the directors of local building societies, public utilities, and finance or investment companies; the patrons of local charities; the principal supporters or opposers of new town projects; the Justices of the Peace; and the men prominent in local church or chapel were all drawn from the same social groups of the town. The same names appear again and again in official minutes, local newspapers, company reports, and charity subscription lists. They were the names of people invariably resident in the town and usually, though less so by the end of the century, men who followed a business or trade in the town, often mingling time spent in earning a living with time spent on other activities, in a way that no commuter could ever do.

In the main, this is a study of events and buildings and of changes in the physical structure of a town that grew from five and a half thousand population in 1801 to a quarter of a million by the start of World War II. But it also describes the efforts of individual Croydonians to make themselves or other people richer, more secure, happier, or healthier.
I. RECTORY MANOR

1. Its Early History

In 1390 Archbishop Courtenay, lord of the manor of Croydon, granted the Rectory of Croydon to the convent of St Saviour, Bermondsey, in exchange for the manor of Waddon. Subsequently, the convent leased the estate to various tenants, who normally lived at the Parsonage which stood opposite the parish church, where St John's Grove is now. ¹

A survey dated 1493 shows that the Rectory manor then had privileges in respect of an area roughly triangular in shape and bounded by North End, London Road, Handcroft Road, Pitlake, and Church Street. Within that area stood Parson's Mead, of about thirty acres; and also a small triangular common of four acres, called Broad Green and situated at the junction of Handcroft Road and London Road. ²

2. Early Development on the Fringes

Much of the Church Street frontage of the land was developed early, for that road linked the site of the manor house, church and early settlement, with the market and the

¹ Clarence G. Paget, By-Ways in the History of Croydon, 1929, p.21.

² Because of its associations with Bermondsey, the land later bore the corrupted name of Barnaby's Hold; Paget, op. cit., p.17. CPL, S70(9), 4011, W. Corbet Anderson MS. notebooks, circa 1872, vol.1, pp.97,132, recorded the recollection of old inhabitants that people holding land within the Rectory manor were entitled to pasture cattle in Parson's Mead after Lammas Day.
The bounds of the former Rectory Manor Estate are represented approximately by North End, London Road, Handcroft Road, Pitlake, and Church Street.

North End runs northwards from the Civic Hall (now demolished) to West Croydon Railway Station, near the T.A. Centre. London Road continues northwards past the Hospital (formerly Oakfield House). Handcroft Road leaves London Road in a southerly direction at Broad Green, and joins Mitcham Road to become Pitlake, just north of the railway line; and Church Street and its continuation, Crown Hill, link Pitlake and North End.

The Market area, the subject of Part II of the dissertation is triangular in shape and has Crown Hill as its northern base, the other two sides being Surrey Street and High Street.

The Parish Church and what remains of the Old Palace (the latter marked as "Sch") are due west of Surrey Street.

The railway line on the eastern side of the map is the London to Brighton line and the large area west of it, marked "Car Park", is the former Fairfield and is now occupied by the Fairfield Halls and Croydon Technical College.
Fig. 2 6" to the mile O.S. map of the Rectory Manor area
newer part of the town to the east.

Indeed, Church Street and Crown Hill together constituted one of Croydon's two most important roads until the nineteenth century. But an examination of the 1851 census returns shows that by then North End, which earlier had been of comparatively little importance, contained the more affluent houses. Soon after that, too, North End became the site of two of Croydon's largest departmental stores, and generally the more important road for retail trading.

The changing value of these two roads can be ascribed to four main causes. Firstly, the Church Street properties, being older, were on more shallow plots and narrower frontages and so were less suited to the shop

1. It was described in 1858 as "one of the leading thoroughfares of the town," SPW, 271, 1 May, 1858. But by then North End, and also South End and George Street, were of ever-increasing significance. Church Street has so far been left untouched by Croydon's post-World War II commercial redevelopment, apart from the road widening allowed for in the Croydon Corporation Act, 1956, 4 & 5 Eliz., 2, Pt. III, 20, p. 11. Crown Hill is the easternmost part of Church Street.

2. A crude measurement of this is shown, for instance, in the fact that the households in North End in 1851 had, on average 1.0 servants each; those in Church Street only 0.25; Public Record Office, R.O.107, 1601, Enumeration Districts 4d, 4h, 41. Again, the four inns in North End had fifteen servants; the two inns in Church Street had only two: ibid.

expansion that has taken place in the last hundred years. Secondly, it is relevant to note the observation that "there is a marked tendency for the central shopping area to shift in the direction of the better-class residential districts."\(^1\) Church Street led down into the working-class part of the town, whereas North End led to the more affluent houses of London Road, Derby Road, and the Oakfield Estate. Thirdly, the north-south axis, which means the line of North End—High Street—South End became increasingly important with the development of the London-Brighton coaching traffic and, later, other forms of public transport.\(^2\) Fourthly, North End, from 1837, led from the town centre to what was Croydon's first main railway station.\(^3\)

Not only had much of the north side of Church Street been developed before the nineteenth century but a number of courts had come into existence as well, before any building took place on the back land.

One of these was Ann's Place, built about 1860.\(^4\)

---

2. Church Street did not provide ready access to any other town and was too narrow for trams or buses.
3. A station was proposed on the east side of the theatre on Crown Hill, in 1884, but neither it nor the line of which it was to form a part ever materialised: CPL, S70, 656.2 ORO, Preliminary Report by the Town Clerk to the Borough Council as to Bills in the Parliamentary Session 1884, p.4.
Within a quarter of a century, two of the houses had been condemned as being unfit for human habitation "by reason of dilapidation and unsuitableness of structure."\(^1\) Witnesses had described the dwellings as "eight two-roomed cottages, no upstairs, let at about two shillings a week, hardly habitable; should not like to live in them."\(^2\) Another observer was more specific. He said, "the second house on the left in Ann's Place, for which the late tenant paid four shillings a week, is the worst. There was a hole in the angle of the wall, through which I could put my arm into the open air. It was stuffed with frocks. The house is built of bricks and timber, and some of the bricks were out. The windows were broken and the tenant told me she could not burn a light because of the draught."\(^3\) The eight houses remained until 1937 or 1938.\(^4\)

One area that was of equal importance whether Church Street or North End was the more significant thoroughfare was the former site at the junction of those two roads. There stood, from medieval times, the Crown Inn. It formed part of the endowment of the chantry of St

\(^1\) CPL, Report of the Poor Dwellings Committee, presented to Croydon Town Council, 22 Sept., 1884, p. 16.
\(^2\) Evidence of P.Cs. Smith and McSweeney, ibid., p. 40.
\(^3\) Evidence of Robert Lacey, a School Board attendance officer and previously, for twenty-five years, a Croydon policeman, ibid., p. 43.
Nicholas, founded in 1443; and is named in a list of endowments of the time of Edward VI. The place became a focal point in the life of the town, as for instance in 1812 when it was the scene of the first meeting to establish by public subscription a school for the education of poor children irrespective of their religion.¹ In the middle of the nineteenth century, omnibuses called there on their way to and from the City.² It was later rebuilt and was finally demolished in 1955.³ A branch of Barclays Bank Ltd is now on the site.

Adjoining the Crown in later years was another building of importance. When offered for sale in 1911 the site was described as being ideal "for the erection of a picture palace or other place of entertainment, an emporium or stores, motor garage, public works or any other place of business requiring space."⁴ One can see from this description, incidentally, how little attention was paid fifty or so years ago to town planning and to regulation of land use, even on a most important central site. But in fact the North End Hall was built there.

¹. All these facts are from Ronald Bannerman, Forgotten Croydon, 1933, p.42.
². Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1851, p.154.
⁴. SPF, 145, 13 Jun., 1911.
The second side of the triangular Rectory Manor estate was formed by the roads now designated North End and, further north, London Road. One writer likened North End to the Path of Righteousness, being "very long and narrow, with the trifling exception that it is much more crowded." This is perhaps a local illustration of the general, and more recent, comment that "'ribbon-development'... is the most natural form of housing expansion— the building of houses with gardens along a main road. It has been a primary characteristic of town growth in all ages."

A good idea of the extent and nature of the development on the western side of North End in Regency times is contained in a typescript document housed in Croydon Public Library. It records, immediately north of the Crown, two or three cottages occupied by postboys and people employed at the Crown; then two coach builders' yards and a small paddock. Thereabouts was later built Croydon's police station from which, by the middle of the century, Inspector Shaw commanded about one hundred men of various ranks, horse and foot, who covered an area comprising the Croydon Poor Law Union, except Penge, plus also Carshalton,

1. See p.22, supra.
4. CPL, S70(9) PAG, Wm Page, My Recollections of Croydon Sixty Years Since, 1880, typescript.
Sutton, Streatham, and Warlingham. ¹

Nearby were large plumbing and painting shops with two small private houses attached. ² The shops would appear to have been the nucleus of the later works of Charles Lenny, a coach builder and maker of the Croydon Basket Carriage who by about 1862 was employing over two hundred men and had built up a very large export trade. ³

The next property to the north had since 1714 belonged to the Charity founded, in that year, by Archbishop Tenison for the education of ten poor boys and the same number of poor girls. In 1851 however the entire site was sold to Charles Lenny, the carriage manufacturer, the sale having been authorised by Parliament two years earlier.

---

1. Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1851. At the time of the 1851 census, there were nineteen constables in residence at the station, and also Inspector Shaw and his family, and one prisoner "confined in cell": Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4h, 65.

2. Page, op. cit. By 1851 there was, between the later sites of nos 31-33, a yard named after Thomas Hedgis, a carpenter: Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4h, 40. This yard contained about a score of cottages known variously as Grove Cottages, Vine Cottage, and Grove Place. Later the site was absorbed into the property of Messrs Kennards', but the yard entrance and name board still survive, and the direction of the yard's continuation westwards is probably indicated by the position of the store's arcade.

3. He was there by 1851: Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4h, 38. The originator of the carriage is said, however, to have been George Waters, a contemporary coach maker, of George Street: Benians, loc. cit.
earlier.\(^1\)

On the north side of the Archbishop Tenison property, in about 1820, was Lloyd's market garden and beyond that the Rising Sun which was used principally by coal heavers employed at the local wharves.\(^2\)

Adjoining that, there was the manor house which became, sometime between 1851 and 1855, a private school. But in 1856 the building was let on lease to John and William Drummond, prominent solicitors in the town. It had three floors, and eight bedrooms; and its land extended northwards for over forty yards, almost to Church Path. The lessor was Alexander Caldicleugh, the younger.

By the date of a later sale, in 1881, the agent's description anticipated a likely change of use, for it spoke of the site affording "facilities for the erection of business premises.....or for any public building or

\(^1\) On 3 Aug., 1849: SPHW, 978, 16 Aug., 1851. The ground floor included a girls' schoolroom, 16' 3" by 12' 3"; and there was a boys' schoolroom in the basement, 24' by 16'. There was, too, a wash-house with pump and sink and a small yard with a double privy: ibid. The school moved to Selwood Road, near the junction of Heathfield Road; and again, very recently, to new premises at Selborne Road, on the Church Estates Commissioners' Park Hill Estate. The school is now a voluntary-aided (Church of England) mixed secondary one.

\(^2\) Page, op. cit. The wharves were those at the canal basin where West Croydon Station is now. The Rising Sun was rebuilt at the end of the century, Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1902, p.xxxviii. The building is now occupied by Messrs Nevill Reed; it is numbered 89.
Beyond the manor house lay Parson's Mead enclosed by a low fence about waist high, with "a fine expanse of country to view, reaching to the downs of Epsom and overlooking...the barracks." This area, of thirty-two acres, fronted London Road all the way to just south of Broad Green House, so that at the beginning of the nineteenth century, North End did indeed, as its name suggests, mark the extremity of the town's growth in that direction.

Further north still, stood Broad Green House, just south of a hamlet that had grown up where Handcroft Road, the road to London from the old part of Croydon, joined London Road, which was a northerly extension of the High Street and North End. Much of Broad Green appears to have been enclosed by an Act of 1797; and when Alexander Caldecleugh bought the Rectory Manor in 1807 he built Broad

1. Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1902, p.xxii. It is possible that nos 109-115 constitute the original house, with later shop fronts added on the garden ground between the house and the present building line.

2. Page, op. cit.

Green House. But the land between it and the manor house in North End remained unenclosed until about 1824.

Thus, one frontage of the triangular Rectory estate, along Church Street, had been almost fully developed by the early nineteenth century; the second frontage, along North End and London Road, had by the same date been developed only as far north as the manor house in North End, beyond which it remained quite open as far as Broad Green House.

The third side of the triangle was formed by Handcroft Road, sometimes referred to as Barrack Lane, and Pitlake. This was the ancient way into the old quarter of the town from London, and probably had been in use more or less continuously since Roman times. But the land on the eastern side of Handcroft Road constituted a part of Parson's Mead and so had, like that fronting London Road, never been generally available for building. Only in the extreme south where Handcroft Road became Pitlake and where it curved round into Church Street was there any development.

1. CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents; Croydon Advertiser, 13 Jan., 1936. Alexander Caldecough died 18 Jan., 1809, aged 55, and was buried in Croydon Parish Church. He was succeeded by his son, also Alexander; Rev. D.W. Garrow, The History and Antiquities of Croydon, 1818, p. 51. The younger Caldecough died at Valparaiso, Chile, 11 Jan., 1858, Croydon Chronicle, 3 Apr., 1858, p. 1.
3. The Enclosure and Development of Parson's Mead

In 1823, the Parson's Mead Enclosure Act was passed, subsequent to the more general Enclosure Act for the town. London Road, a turnpike road, was widened at the same time; and allotments were made to the parties entitled previously to common rights. These allotments were between the manor house and the later West Croydon railway bridge, and this fact accounts for the minute division of property there.\(^1\) However most of the land passed into the freehold possession of the Caldcleugh family. It remained, for the moment, quite undeveloped and part of it was used for a time as a racecourse.\(^2\)

But after the death of Caldcleugh the elder his devisees offered for sale in May, 1835 his home, Broad Green House, and with it Parson's Mead "and a field called Horsecroft, now thrown together and representing 26 acres of most important and valuable sites for building."\(^3\)

The house and its grounds, bounded on the north by Sumner Road, on the west by Handcroft Road, and on the east

---


3. HWS, 1830-6, 23 May, 1835; SFW, 194, 23 May, 1835. The site of Broad Green House is now part of a large and recent development by the Land and House Property Corporation, Ltd.
by the turnpiked London Road, and covering six acres, were bought by an iron and brass founder, Jonathan Barrett of Streatham, for £4,150. The remaining land was offered in sixty-two lots and was described as "that most celebrated spot 'Parson's Mead' forming one of the most important and valuable sites for building ever offered to the public."

Further, would-be purchasers were assured that "the salubrity of the air, the purity of the water, the respectable and agreeable character of the society, the very superior quality of the tradesmen, the facility with which every article of comfort or luxury is brought to the very door, the opportunities of every description of field sports, one hour's drive from London and from the Sea has for some years past created a demand for good houses, which for want of a proper site for their erection, has notoriously exceeded the supply." It is quite apparent what social class it was hoped would be attracted; and to some very limited extent expectation was fulfilled. But not all the ground was bought at once. Further, building took place slowly, and the part farthest from London Road was occupied by a very different social class from that

---

1. SFWH, 788, 30 May, 1848; Public Record Office, H.O.107, 1601, Enumeration District 41, 116.

2. SFWH, 194, 23 May, 1835.

3. A mere thirteen signed contracts have been found and, of those, only nine bear the date of the original sale: ibid.
Two things are noticeable about this sale. First, every single one of the known purchasers was a Croydon man, not one of whom bought more than a very few of the available lots. Second, much of the land was not bought at all, for attached to the particulars of a later sale is a letter from a Joseph Reid of Sun Court, Cornhill, written to the auctioneer, John Blake, three days earlier. It is clear, from the letter, that Reid agreed with Blake's contention that the unsold lots in Parson's Mead should, if necessary, be sold off cheaply. Reid wished, as he said, to have the business finally closed and off his mind and, accordingly, authorised Blake to knock down the lots at a price "within one or two biddings" of their estimated value. It is impossible to say whether Reid, the solicitor for the estate, was acting in his client's best interests.

Blake noted on his copy of the particulars of sale, as a reminder to himself when he opened the bidding, "the nature of my instructions from Mr Reid and if I think fit read his letter or such part of it as I may judge proper.... The great advantages that all the supporters of Railroads calculate upon may fairly be called in aid here, as the Croydon Road will open at Michaelmas next. The

1. SPNW, 785, 21 Apr., 1838.

2. We have an example here of the quite fortuitous circumstances that could affect nineteenth century urban development.
Terminus being less than 5 mins. walk from the closest lot."¹ Unusually, Blake miscalculated the value of the land noting, "In 1835 the front land sold for £4. 10s. per rod or £720 per acre and the back land for £2 7s. or £376 per acre." From this he calculated that Lot 1 immediately south of the grounds of Broad Green House, front and half back land, would go for £320 but in fact, despite the added attraction of the new railway to London, Jonathan Barrett was able to add this acre and a half or so to the gardens of his house for £400.²

Indeed, all six lots sold in 1838 at or after the auction went for anything from about a half to a third of the value estimated by Blake. This indicates, it would seem, that there was as yet little demand for building land at this distance, say ten to fifteen minutes' walk, from the town centre; and too that what Blake had described as "the great advantages that all the supporters of Railroads calculate upon" were not yet a source of conviction to investors in land.

Shortly, Jonathan Barrett, the iron and brass founder of Broad Green House, permitted the leasehold development of the northernmost 258 feet of his London Road frontage, the area thus occupied being about three acres.³

---

¹ SFWH, 785, 21 Apr., 1838.
² Ibid.
³ SFWH, 788, 30 May, 1848.
Then, in 1848 he decided to sell out; and a memorandum survives, in the handwriting of William Blake the auctioneer, showing Barrett's income and expenditure during the time he had occupied Broad Green House. On 23 May, 1835, he had given £4,150 for Broad Green House and a further £159 2s. for the fixtures. Then, in April, 1938, he had purchased additional land for £400; thus, exclusive of auction fees and cost of conveyance, he had spent £4,709 2s. On the credit side, he had sold timber in December, 1835, which produced £163 8s. 8d.; and had received over the years £1,200 in ground rents. Thus, to avoid being out of pocket he needed to sell for £3,280 13s. 4d. In fact, he wrote a letter to Blake on the day before the sale authorising him to sell at £4,500; but, in spite of Blake's speech notes referring to "dry soil; fine water; excellent quality; best situation in Croydon, 5 minutes off the Rail; in hand," the auctioneer had to record afterwards, "put up and fully gone into but there was no bidder for the Estate."

1. SPHW, 788, 30 May, 1848.

2. He paid £14 19s. 2d. per annum window duty; and being rated at £135, paid about £20 per annum for Poor Rate (2s. 6d. in the £), Church Rate (2d.), and Highway Rate (4d.).

3. Probably on the site of his later house building.

4. SPHW, 788, 30 May, 1848. The lot was still subject to an annual quit rent payment of 1s. to the manor of Croydon Rectory.
It is indeed remarkable how little interest was being displayed at that time in any of the Rectory Manor land. It was served by a road that had been turnpiked. It was also within a few minutes' walk of the railway station and not much farther from the town centre; and it had no unpleasant industrial neighbours. Yet the land was selling very slowly; and even when sold, frequently remained undeveloped. This shows itself in the existence today of adjacent buildings of quite contrasting architectural styles and dates.

Not only was the development slow, it was also unusually varied as to quality, except in London Road. Residents there in 1851 included a victualler, the governess of a boarding school for fifteen young ladies, an umbrella and parasol maker employing fifty people, a hop factor, an iron merchant, an engineer, a stock broker, a land owner, an East India merchant, and a wholesale

---

1. One does wonder, though, what its condition was like bearing in mind a Coroner's Inquest, held on 26 Oct., 1869, into the death of a 38-year-old servant who "coming along the London Road....her foot slipped off the pavement into a hole about eighteen inches deep, caused by the sinking of the gravel," Croydon Advertiser, 30 Oct., 1869.

2. He kept the Fox and Hounds and had two house servants and two resident barmaids: Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 41, 96.

3. Thomas Morland. He is possibly the same T. Morland of Eastcheap, who was a director of the National Land Society in 1849: Sir Harold Bellman, Bricks and Mortals, 1949, p.205.
most of the houses had two or three resident servants. 2 Parson's Mead however, whilst it housed the Secretary of the Public Records, an importer of isinglass, a solicitor, and a tea dealer, was also lived in by a carman, a superannuated letter carrier, a laundress, and a widow on parish relief; on average, only one house in six had a resident servant and no house had more than one. 3

Handcroft Road, likewise, had among its residents an omnibus proprietor, a retired master of sappers and miners, and the foreman of the Surrey and Sussex roads; but also laundresses, gardeners and bricklayers, only about one house in twelve having a resident servant. 4

Thus, although the area began as a single unit, it did not develop as an homogeneous whole. Perhaps there were two reasons for this: one, that absolutely no restrictive covenants were laid down as for example to minimum price of


2. Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 41, 96-116. Later, in 1869, twenty of twenty-nine houses were occupied by people designated "Esq."; and other occupants included two solicitors, an M.R.C.P., a merchant, gentleman and estate agent: Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, pp.108-110.

3. Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 41, 1-50. Parson's Mead was listed among "better-class property" inspected by the Medical Officer of Health in 1877: S70(352) CR0, Croydon Board of Health Minutes, p.7.

houses; and secondly, it is doubtful whether the initial road lay-out was conducive to the maintenance of any unity of development. Parson's Mead, the only new road in the estate's early years, left London Road at the southern end and curved away in a north-westerly direction so that at its northern end it was about two hundred yards from London Road. This meant that it did not encroach on the grounds of Barrett's Broad Green House; but it also had the effect of leaving excessively long and wasteful plots on the east side of Parson's Mead, quite out of keeping with the kind of property built, and yet very shallow plots on the west side where the houses were packed together in very close proximity to those on the east side of Handcroft Road.\footnote{It also encouraged the use of the back land for miscellaneous purposes in more recent years.}

This then, was a completely unplanned development with considerable potential for either good or bad. It could, with a more positive arrangement of new roads, have become one of Croydon's high-class estates with all its houses similar to those in London Road. Equally it could have become one of Croydon's poorest areas, with housing akin to, or worse than, some of that at the rear of the west side of Handcroft Road, at its southern end, where the Mitcham Road barracks appear to have encouraged the
development of sub-standard property. But no single
master-mind had emerged to lead the zone into well-planned
affluence or into slum decadence, probably because the land
came on to the market too early for its large-scale purchase
to be an attractive proposition.

Apart from the building that took place in London
Road, Parson's Mead and Handcroft Road, a further
development took place in Derby Road, which led from
Parson's Mead, near West Croydon Station, to Handcroft Road,
near Pitlake. No record has been found of the first land
purchasers but in this instance there is a remarkable
contrast between one side and the other as to the date of
development, the quality and architectural interest of the
property, and its recent history.

At the time of the 1851 census, the road was there
but was un-named. There were only five houses; but ten
years later the north side of Derby Road was transformed,
largely by means of a fine group of houses, mostly
semi-detached, known as Derby Terrace 1 to 24 (now numbers
14-60). They are three-storey buildings with basement

1. Especially in Myrtle, Albion and Adelaide Streets: see,
for instance, Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601,
Enumeration District 4g, 161-261. Fragments remain,
empty and derelict, but much of the property has been
demolished in slum-clearance schemes.

2. It was described in the census returns as, "Barrack road
from Derby Arms to Fox and Hounds": Public Record Office,
H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4i, 91.
areas, the front doors being reached by flights of steps. When built, they each had four bedrooms, and two sitting rooms with marble chimney pieces; and also a breakfast room and kitchen in the basement.

In their day they must have been very attractive, their appearance as a group being enhanced by the gentle convex curve of the building line; but unfortunately they are now, in the main, very down-at-heel. No record has been found that has established the name of the ground landlord. But there is very little doubt that the builder was Charles Hyde, who occupied the detached house at the western end (now number 60), between 1854 and 1858.

The building activity in Derby Road in the 1850's was more intensive than usual for the area, the whole of the second half of the century showing generally a continual but slight amount of house construction. The failure to develop these available sites, despite their closeness to the town centre, suggests that the supply of

1. They were all on 90-year leases from 1851, the annual ground rents of nos 1 to 7, and 24, Derby Terrace (now nos 14-26, 60) being £5 each and those of nos 8 to 23, Derby Terrace (now nos 28-58) £1 each: SPHW, 419, 11 Apr., 1877.

2. Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim. The land immediately to the west, later occupied by Rose Cottage (later still no. 62; now no longer there) and also by the houses of Derby Grove, was described, in the directories, as "Hyde's Building Ground", as late as 1865/6.

3. See Table 1, p. 427, infra.
land considerably exceeded the demand. Since there was at no time a land shortage, it is worth looking to see whether the ebb and flow of building activity noted by Dr Dyos at Camberwell and apparent elsewhere in Croydon is confirmed in the Parson's Mead area. The peaks recorded by Dr Dyos were in 1868-1869, 1878-1880, and 1898; but it is clear that they did not apply in this locality at all, the only noticeable increase being in the earlier 1870's with the opening up of Clarendon Road, and in 1892-1895 when a sudden expansion in Handcroft Road was followed immediately by the first house building in Chatfield and Cavendish Roads. Of Dr Dyos's two lowest ebbs, in the years 1871-1872 and 1891, the first has no parallel locally, but no houses whatever were built in the Parson's Mead area in the years 1889, 1890 or 1891.

The building peak of 1892 to 1894 can be attributed, almost entirely, to the sale of land that had previously formed a part of the grounds of Broad Green House, and the way in which this particular land became available for development is a reminder both of the generally informal and haphazard way in which urbanisation was taking place and also of the extent to which it was the work of local men.

2. See Tables 2,3, pp.428-429, infra. Clarendon Road was at first called Handcroft Road East.
In 1891 Broad Green House and its grounds, amounting in all to over 5½ acres, were offered for sale. The house was described as being particularly suitable for some large public institution; and the property was offered in one lot so that, if acquired for occupation there would be no interference with the enjoyment of it as a residence or if purchased for building there would be no impediment to its development for that purpose. John Pelton bought the house and grounds by private contract on the day after the auction, for £9,000 and within twenty-four hours re-sold at a cash profit of £500. The grounds were rapidly built on but the house was sold privately when its demolition was imminent. It remained a private residence, though soon hemmed in on three sides by Victorian villas, until the late 1920's, when it came to be occupied by the Gregg Schools and, latterly, by Broad Green College.

By the end of the century, ninety-four per cent of all the building sites on the original Parson's Mead had

---

1. GPL, Shelf 16, Folio 11, Plan of Valuable Estate known as Broad Green House for sale by auction, 7th Dec., 1891.

2. SEPW, 0096, 7 Dec., 1891; GPL, qS70(92) EDR, Sydney Edridge's Memoirs, 1931. Pelton was almost certainly acting on behalf of the Croydon Land and Investment Co., see Cox, op. cit., pp.169,173. Edridge gives details of the negotiations, loc. cit.

3. It was bought by Levi Young, a wealthy local furnisher, who lived there until 1927: Ward's Commercial and General Directory, passim.

been developed, and the area then entered into a lengthy period of gentle change and decay. The extent of this has varied from road to road.

The greatest amount has been in London Road. As has been said already, the initial development was of a very high order. Towards the end of the century, estate agents were still seeking bankers, brewers, stockbrokers, "or any professional gentleman requiring a first-class Family Residence in secluded grounds" to take a lease of North End Lodge (later number 97) which, on an eighty-six foot frontage, had not only nine bedrooms, library, dining-, drawing-, and billiard rooms, but also electric light and "telephonic communication from the house to the gardens." But the house became a ladies' school.  

More frequently however, the houses had shops built over what had previously been the front gardens, a reminder of the comment by an architect, as early as 1849, that, "one by one each house casts a proboscis forth in the shape of a long, low, narrow shop, covering the dull patch that once was dignified as the front garden."

1. SPB, 277, 15 May, 1893.
2. It remained so until 1909. Later it became Clark's College, but the South Suburban Co-Operative store now occupies the frontage, with Clark's College at the rear: Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.
In recent years, the northern end of London Road has been transformed in yet another way. Numbers 189-201, between Chatfield Road and Sumner Road, were offered for sale in 1929 as one lot, the frontage being described as suitable for cinema, shops or garage. The properties were bought in at £25,000; but the following year, they were demolished and replaced by a cinema with shops built into part of its frontage.¹ More recently, immediately to the south, numbers 185-187 have also been demolished, and have been replaced by a post-World War II office block.

Since then, the remaining London Road properties as far south as Chatfield Road, together with the houses on the north side of Chatfield Road as far west as Cavendish Road, and the former properties on the east side of Cavendish Road have all been demolished.² The one and three quarter acres thus cleared has been redeveloped with a ballroom, flats, offices, petrol filling station, and shops, the builders being H. Fairweather & Co. Ltd, of North London.³

In the road named Parson's Mead the changes over

¹ HWS, 1379, 1 Oct., 1929.
² The London Road properties were nos 179-183 and included Broad Green House (no. 181). The houses in Chatfield Road were nos 2 to 8 which had been built between 1893 and 1895. The Cavendish Road properties were mainly stabling and engineering premises.
the years have been of a different kind. The houses built there were generally modest ones, typically erected by a substantial number of different builders, probably for an almost equally large number of different landlords. One group of early cottages is that represented by numbers 87-93. They were built on a total frontage of only fifty-five feet and the average depth of the plots was only eighty-five feet. As late as 1921 they were let at a mere 9s. 6d. each per week, and in that year were sold for a total of £590.

The same road, Parson's Mead, also had some rather more expensive property but the excessive distance between Parson's Mead and London Road gave them back land quite disproportionate in size to the quality of the houses themselves. As early as 1889, plots of land extending right through from the one road to the other were advertised as providing, "frontages....very valuable as sites for private houses and the interior for workshops or trade premises." Since then, Parson's Mead has become increasingly industrialised.

Derby Road, as was said previously, has gone down in the world very much. It has remained purely residential, but when the building land opposite the rather fine houses of Derby Terrace came on to the market, in 1879,

1. SPHW, 826, 13 Jun., 1889.
2. See p. 42, supra.
the plots did not attract a really comparable standard of building. As recently as 1937, however, the Derby Terrace houses were still largely in one-family occupation, number 40 for instance being let to a weekly tenant at a rental of 23s.¹

In Handcroft Road, the houses were mainly of the cottage type. The road was narrow and comparatively low-lying, and the development taking place immediately to the west, in Barrack Field, was of an inferior kind; it is noticeable too that where other roads joined the east side of Handcroft Road at an oblique angle, the properties built nearest the apex of the triangle, where the plots were too shallow for development on both frontages, were all sited with their backs to Handcroft Road.

To sum up, it will be seen that the Parson's Mead-Handcroft Road- London Road area was very slow to develop and showed none of the peaks of building activity found elsewhere. Further, although the quality of the early property in London Road was good, the road came to be important by the beginning of the twentieth century for retail trading purposes. Elsewhere, the great extent of back land between London Road and Parson's Mead, together with a complete absence of restrictions, made it possible for industry to intrude more and more into the latter road; and also, except on one side of Derby Road, no substantial

¹. SFW, 425, 11 May, 1937.
amount of land was developed at any one time by one builder so that the quality of the houses was generally neither consistent nor high. One example of the lack of consistency is the difficulty to be found in attempting to relate the rental value of the houses in the roads between London and Handcroft Roads either to their position or to their date of construction.

4. The Drayton Development

In the year 1801, the proprietors of the Croydon Canal were empowered, by Act of Parliament, to make a public carriage road from London Road, across Parson's Mead, which was common land, across Handcross Field, through an orchard, and into the lower end of Church Street. It was intended for track which would link the canal basin, on the site of the present West Croydon Station, with the Surrey Iron Railway which passed the lower end of Church Street on its way from Wandsworth to Merstham. When after a few years the railway went into disuse, the right of way presumably remained. This is the origin of the later Tamworth Road.

In 1835 the canal was purchased by the London and Croydon Railway Company; and on 1 June, 1839 the first train


2. The Surrey Iron Railway, which was opened on 26 Jul., 1803 between Wandsworth and Croydon, was the first railway in the world to provide a public service. It was extended to Merstham (Surrey) in 1805; W.G. Tharby, 'The World's First Public Railway,' Local History Records, Vol.VII, 1968, pp.26-28.
reached the West Croydon terminus.\footnote{1} Already plans had been deposited with Parliament for an extension of the line to Epsom and both possible alternative routes proposed following the site of the later Tamworth Road.\footnote{2} But when the line was finally built after about ten years, it followed a slightly more northerly course; and this resulted in the London, Brighton and South Coast Railway Company, which had bought out the London and Croydon Company, finding itself with land surplus to requirements between the tracks and Tamworth Road.\footnote{3} An auction followed on 15 June, 1849.

The available area, slightly more than ten acres in extent, was described as being admirably adapted for the erection of "respectable moderate residences" and attention was drawn to the contention that the demand for moderate-sized houses was in considerable excess of the supply. Would-be purchasers were also reminded that the railway company offered considerable reductions in season ticket rates at the intermediate stations between London, Croydon and Epsom.\footnote{4}


\footnotesize{2. Surrey Record Office, 202, Plan and Book of Reference of Intended Railway from Epsom to Croydon, Deposited 1st March, 1837; 211, \textit{ibid.}, Deposited 30th November 1837.}

\footnotesize{3. The line reached Epsom Town in 1847.}

\footnotesize{4. HWS, vol.VI, 1849-1850, cclxxii, 15 Jun.,1849.}
The sale particulars give details of the purchasers and how much they paid. If a close examination is made of the information and reference is made to the local directories and to the existing houses, a clear and comprehensive picture emerges of the resulting development.

To begin with, it can be seen that with only one additional road, Drayton Road, the existing street pattern remained; also that Upper Drayton Place, then a private road, and Lower Drayton Place, already a public footpath, were used to provide frontages for additional extremely shallow plots. One notices too that thirty lots were sold to no fewer than sixteen different people, all of them with one exception specifically described as Croydon men. In the main, development took place rapidly and, although there was a small adjustment of lots before it commenced, there is no difficulty in relating the various terraces of houses to the original land sale. Some of the buyers of land were men known to have had other building lots elsewhere in the town. Only five bought a substantial number of plots.

1. Even the other one, William Hunter, although he gave a City address, was living from at least 1850 until 1868, at North End House, North End: Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim; Public Record Office, E.0.107, 1801, Enumeration District 41, 77.

2. For example, Samuel Freeman, William Drummond, Henry Overton, William Gough, and Timothy Weller. For Overton, see pp.70-71, infra. For Weller, see pp.73-74, infra. Freeman lived at Selhurst Road from at least 1850 until 1863, dying on 25 Jan., in the latter year.
thus ensuring that they had a frontage on more than one road.\(^1\) The biggest single piece of development was at the junction of Tamworth and Waddon New Roads and was carried out by William Hunter, or his successor. It comprised 1 to 15, Tamworth Road, which were all alike, and 1 to 12, Waddon New Road, which also were all the same.\(^2\)

The best property in the locality was, without doubt, in Tamworth Road; and the best property in Tamworth Road was numbers 1 to 15.\(^3\) Except for one terrace of three, they were all semi-detached houses of three storeys, with steps up to the front door and with basement below.\(^4\) They had four bedrooms each, two parlours (both with marble chimney-pieces); and breakfast room and kitchen in the basement.\(^5\) The only property on the Waddon New Road frontage that was in any way comparable in quality to these Tamworth Road houses was West Place, numbers 55 to 57.

---

1. They were Drummond, Freeman, Hunter, Overton, and a man named F. Frith.

2. The former were built on six lots, of which Hunter, a City merchant, had bought four at the sale; the latter were built on four lots, of which Hunter had bought three at the sale: HWS, colxxxii, 15 Jun., 1849.

3. Although not as good, the second-best property in Waddon New Road was nos 1 to 12.

4. These are now all somewhat decayed; nos 1 and 2 have been changed into shops, and the first storey of no. 1 is hidden behind a large hoarding.

5. SPHW, 1424, 22, May, 1890.
Although not up to the standard of numbers 1 to 15, most of the houses on the Tamworth Road frontage were superior to those elsewhere in the locality.\(^1\) They were built largely between 1850 and 1858.\(^2\) Generally, they had basements with steps up to the front doors.

This feature has been referred to several times in this study. With narrow town houses it had never been easy to provide for access from the same facade both to the kitchen and to the main part of the building when the two entrances had to be kept apart. Hence it became the practice to build in front of the house steps down to the kitchen (which in a narrow house might best be kept in the basement) and other steps leading up to the main door.\(^3\)

Two other buildings on the west side of Tamworth Road are worth comment for other reasons.\(^4\) One is number 47. It was erected in 1872 and was at first a Christian mission hall. Later it was a Salvation Army barracks, before and during World War I it was the Star Picture Hall; and now, its exterior still almost unchanged, it is occupied

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] As is so often the case, these better houses are now by far the most neglected, nos 23 and 24 being semi-derelict and nos 38 and 40 quite so.
\item[2.] See Table 4, p.430, infra.
\item[3.] Steen Eiler Rasmussen, London: The Unique City, 1948, pp.298-300.
\item[4.] Both are outside the area covered by the 1849 sale described above.
\end{itemize}
by a car-repair firm, Tamworth Autos.¹

The second is that of Tavistock Secondary Girls' School, immediately south of the Drayton Road junction. The site was formerly occupied by a British School which had been founded in 1818 in another part of the town and which moved into Tamworth Road in 1837. Its headmaster for over fifty years was John Drage, one of Croydon's great but forgotten men.

The last point worth noting about Tamworth Road is its importance as a line of communication. It was the site of the branch track between the canal and the Surrey Iron Railway.² It was also, by 1840, on the route of a bus service between West Croydon and Mitcham. It does not later appear to have had a horse-tram service, but from October, 1906, it was on the route of an electric tramway that connected West Croydon and Tooting and, from the following month, West Croydon and Sutton.³

But perhaps the most interesting feature of this locality is the way in which the former private road, Upper Drayton Place, and the former public footpath, Lower Drayton

---

¹. Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.
². See p.49, supra.
³. SouthmeT, The Tramways of Croydon, 1960, p.87. On the Sutton route, trolley buses replaced trams from 8 Dec., 1935: ibid., p.116; and on the Tooting route from 12 Sept., 1937: ibid., p.120. These in turn were replaced by buses on 1 Mar., 1959. Other information supplied by Mr Clive C. Barlow.
Place, were used to provide frontages for additional cottages, though both were very narrow and Lower Drayton Place has never been wide enough to provide access for vehicles.

Seventeen of the eighteen houses in Upper Drayton Place were built between 1861 and 1864. But only in 1960 did electricity become available to the residents. Lower Drayton Place was equally lacking in amenities. It was unlit in 1864, by which time eight cottages had been built there. Yet until about 1870 the residents had to live in the immediate vicinity of a gas holder.

But the inconveniences of Lower Drayton Place were nothing as compared with those of nearby Bades Yard which in 1849 contained a privy belonging to adjacent premises and which discharged its contents onto the ground, whilst another privy was used by the inhabitants of nine houses standing in the yard. A well in the centre provided the only water supply and nearly every family living there had

1. The eighteenth, Rose Cottage, was built at the end of the century, Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim; Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim. See also Table 4, p.430, infra.


3. CPB, f570, Croydon Local Board of Health Reports, 1863-1866, 5 Apr., 1864; Table 4, p.430, infra.

4. Cf. Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1869, p.71; Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1874, p.42. The gas holder stood about where nos 10 to 15 were later built.
been chargeable to the parish on account of illness.¹

However, by 1879, Eades Yard, measuring about one hundred feet by fifty feet, had gone. It had been offered for sale in 1877, together with its cottages which, when all were occupied, produced £1 15s. gross.² Soon afterwards, in February, 1878, a builder named Brookes obtained approval for ten houses in what was by then referred to as The Triangle, or Triangle Yard, and the site was soon cleared of its existing property.³ Brookes then built numbers 6 to 10, on the building line of Cairo Road, with a gap between numbers 7 and 8 giving access to a further five new houses at the rear, in what came to be known as Cairo Place.⁴ This was very high-density development and the details are


2. Presumably part of the property is represented by four freehold cottages, "near the Volunteer fronting Cairo Road," which, when offered for sale in 1877, stood on a plot of ground which, in total, was 38 feet by 23 feet. No bid beyond £150 was made and the lot was withdrawn: SPHW, 205b, 21 Jun., 1877; HWS, 205c, 21 Jun., 1877.

3. Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes. The previous month, Brookes had had a plan for eleven houses on the same site approved and then, a fortnight later, rejected: CPL ST0(552) CR0, Croydon Local Board of Health, Report of General Purposes Committee of Local Board of Health, 17 Jan., 1878; ibid., 31 Jan., 1878.

4. These were Sopley Cottages 1 to 5, but no. 5 was bombed and has not been replaced.
mentioned here because it is surprising that these and the other houses in Cairo Road have not deteriorated considerably over the years, for none of them have forecourts, let alone front gardens, all are built on plots only about fifty feet deep, and all are face-to-face across the narrow road with a high embankment that takes the main road to Mitcham over the railway lines.

5. The Handcross Estate

It remains, as far as the Rectory Manor is concerned, to consider one other area. That is the Handcross Estate, occupying all the back land between North End, Tamworth Road and Church Street. Despite rapid redevelopment in the town centre in recent years, very little has happened to this down-at-heel area, even though it is immediately behind the town's principal shopping street, and within a few minutes' walk of the market and the business and administrative centre. The locality has always, within living memory, been shabby; and bombing and some site clearance have both added to its air of decay.¹

¹ Some of this clearance, as on the south side of Drummond Road (nos 19-27), and on the east side of Keeley Road (nos 7-13) took place as long ago as 1934 and 1938. When ground rents were offered for sale on 5-15, Tamworth Place, in 1935, it was said that the property "will be subject to the Croydon Corporation Act 1930, under which the Corporation have compulsory powers to acquire the property in connection with the new 40 ft street from Church Street to Tamworth Place," HMS, 1417, 16 Apr., 1935. The property remains standing, though semi-derelict; the road has not been built.
Much of the estate appears to have been owned by William Stephen Watton, who died in 1846.\(^1\) By that time, the only development on the back land had been in one or two courts or yards off North End, Crown Hill and Church Street.\(^2\)

In 1849, there were thirty-seven houses in the vicinity, of which almost all had poor and inadequate water supplies. In addition, a water course opposite the British Schools had open privies built over it.\(^3\)

By 1864, the number of houses had increased to fifty-three, the Local Board of Health's engineer noting that there were still only two street lamps.\(^4\) However, in 1883, some of the older cottages were demolished, an event which the Poor Dwellings Committee described as, "a conspicuous instance of the operation of private enterprise in effecting improvements.\(^5\)" But a somewhat similar group of tenements on the east side of Tamworth Road, known as Castledyne's Cottages, was not demolished until 1937 or

1. CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents; SPB, 28 May, 1896.
2. For example, Ann's Place, Hedgis's Yard: see pp. 25-26, 29n, supra.
4. CPL i570 CRO, Croydon Local Board of Health Reports, 1863-1866, 5 Apr., 1864.
5. CPL, Report of the Poor Dwellings Committee, presented to Croydon Town Council, 22 Sept., 1884, p. 15.
A substantial amount of the remaining land was put up for sale in 1852. That on Tamworth Road sold at £3 or a little more per foot frontage, at the southern end, increasing to upwards of £4 per foot frontage at the northern; the back land selling at between £2. 5s. and £2 15s., per foot, or £4 in the case of corner sites. All the ground was bought. Further, the purchasers were Croydon men, with the one exception of John Archer, a Peckham coal merchant. Only one of the purchasers obtained a substantial block. He was Thomas Berney, an attorney; yet his land was among the last to be developed.

In Tamworth Road considerable building took place soon after the sale. For example, the lot north of Keeley

2. SHW, 1422a, 26 Oct., 1852; ibid., 696, 31 Aug., 1876.
3. Cf., the situation in the Parson's Mead area, p. 38, supra.
4. One of the purchasers was William Purvis, of Dingwall Road, a man of many parts. The 1851 census described him as an attorney, clerk, and boot and shoe salesman: Public Record Office, H.C.107, 1601, Enumeration District 41, 68; and the directories as Assistant Clerk to the Commissioners of Property and Income Tax, 1850-1854, Clerk to Messrs Drummond and Co., Solicitors, 1854-1864, Secretary and Accountant of the Croydon Gas Company, 1864-1868: Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim; Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim. He lived, later, at 3, North End, near the Crown, and died on 23 May, 1873, aged 52: CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents.
5. It is also the site of part of the only post-World War II redevelopment in the area, to date.
Road, bought by William Gough, a Church Street grocer, was promised on a 99-year building lease to James Steer, the younger, a builder, in December 1853. Within three years he spent £400 in building dwelling houses at not less than £16 annual value each, the lease becoming operative when £200 had been expended. Steer started to build numbers 88 to 90, and rather more than a year later the work was sufficiently far advanced for the lease to become effective, the ground rent being £12 per annum. One of the three properties was a house and workshop, and this was sub-let in December 1864 to Thomas George Chapman, a carpenter, at an annual rental of £30. In 1869, Steer raised a mortgage of £600 on the entire property, borrowing at 5 per cent. interest from John Drummond, a local solicitor. When Steer died five years later, however, although he had paid the interest he had not commenced to re-pay the principal and his devisees sold the lease to William Tancock, a rate collector. The cost was £850, part of the property being

1. Gough paid £170 for the land which had a frontage of forty feet: HWS, ccxlvii, 26 Oct., 1852; SPHW, 1422a, 26 Oct., 1852. For Steer, see Cox, op. cit., p. 174.
2. Chapman and Sons (Ltd), 88, Tamworth Road, lease, 1 Jan., 1855, citing agreement between Gough and Steer dated 12 Dec., 1853.
3. Chapman and Sons (Ltd), lease, 10 Dec., 1864.
5. For Tancock, see Cox, op. cit., p. 175.
occupied still by Thomas Chapman. Later Eliza Jane Chapman, a building material merchant, had a sub-lease of both numbers 88 and 89. Subsequently, she sub-let numbers 88, 89, and 90 to Chapman and Sons Ltd, the family business, at an annual rental of £90.

A number of points emerge from this detailed analysis of the history of one group of properties. Because access was possible to the title deeds, confirmation is obtained that the man who bought the land when it was offered for building, that is Gough the grocer, was in fact responsible for its development, using the quite common process of the building lease to do so. Further, the name of the builder is revealed and so too is the fact that his later raising of a mortgage did not have a profitable outcome for himself or his devisees. We have an indication also of one source of income in Croydon for a builder who needed capital. Finally, we are able to watch the expansion of a carpenter's small workshop into a thriving limited company of builders' merchants.

Reverting now to the remaining part of the Handcross Estate, it would seem that the death in 1846 of

1. Chapman and Sons (Ltd), assignment of leasehold premium, 1 Oct., 1878. Steer died 2 Apr., 1874, and his will was proved 12 Sept., 1874: ibid.
2. Chapman and Sons (Ltd), counterpart lease, 7 Aug., 1883.
3. Chapman and Sons (Ltd), lease, 30 May, 1908.
William Stephen Watton made any development on much of the back land impossible, so that some of it continued to be used for market gardening. It appears that trustees were responsible for administering the estate and were prevented for some reason from selling the land for building.

However, in 1879 the land along Drummond Road, from Keeley Road to Frith Road, was offered for sale. The plots were only sixty-six feet deep and almost all a mere fifteen feet wide. This laid down the pattern of future development. All the lots, except one, were sold and were immediately built on. All the purchasers were again local men, and two of them, William Bush and William Hewlett Binskin, bought enough land to build terraces of houses.

The next sale of land in the area, in 1886, was concerned with the south-west side of an extended Frith Road. This time, the plots were, with one exception, sixty feet wide; but as they were only about eighty feet deep, obviously no improvement could be expected over the

---

1. See p. 58, supra.
3. This is again in contrast with the situation in the Parson's Mead area. The one lot that remained unsold was finally purchased in 1886, at the earliest: SFB, 155, 6 May, 1886.
4. The William Bush was probably either William Edwin Bush who was living in Osborne Road in 1867, or William Bush, a baker and confectioner who, at the same time, was at 3, Bedford Terrace, Sydenham Road: Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1869, pp. 132, 55.
kind of property that had been built in the neighbouring roads. As was so often the case in a Victorian suburb, the quality of a locality was dictated by the way the land had been divided up on sale.

Two other matters are of interest in connection with this part of the Rectory Manor Estate. One is the local specialisation in the meat trade; the second is the expansion of Kennard's departmental store.

Croydon's importance as a meat market was often stressed when railway projects were before the House of Commons in the nineteenth century, and evidence of the wholesale trade can still be seen today at the southern end of Tamworth Road and at the southern end of Frith Road. Indeed, at Croydon Valuation Court on 25 November, 1965, no fewer than five Croydon cold stores, four belonging to different meat importers and the other to a poultry depot, were the subject of appeals against rating assessments; and all of them were from this locality. The reason for their presence in this part of Croydon, right away from railway sidings, would appear to be the result of history rather than due to any economic advantage or necessity. The total rateable value of the cold stores, after successful appeal, was said to be £6,800; at least one other firm with similar

1. R.C.W. Cox, 'The Railways That Didn't Come,' Local History Records of the Bourne Society, III, p.34.
premises in the area did not appeal.¹

As regards Kennard's departmental store, this began when, in 1852 or 1853, William Kennard took over an existing shop in North End.² At first he employed only one assistant and the shop expanded very little before his death in 1888.³ Soon afterwards however the business began to grow considerably; and by 1910, Kennard's occupied the entire North End frontage from number 11 to number 31, as far north that is as Hedgis's Yard. Today, Kennard's extends still further to number 47.

What however is more significant in this study is the way in which the firm has expanded back into the streets at the rear of North End. After World War I, it took over 15-23, Keeley Road, and now its car park occupies the site of numbers 7-13 whilst the firm uses, too, the entire north frontage of Drummond Road from North End to Keeley Road and also a Keeley Road building bearing the words, "Young's Fire Proof Depositories. Est. 1864."

1. Croydon Advertiser, 3 Dec., 1965, p.19. The firms, and the stores' addresses, were Sansinema Co. Ltd., Drummond Road; Borthwick Thomas and Co., Frith Road; W. Weddal and Co., Ltd., Tamworth Road; Swift and Co., Ltd., Tamworth Road; and Ross Group Ltd, Tamworth Place. Messrs Armour and Co., Frith Road, are also meat importers.

2. Kennard's shop in its early days is illustrated in CPL, f370(9) CR0, Your Old Town, Diamond Jubilee Souvenir Number, 1861-1921.

3. He died on 12 Nov., at Birdhurst Road. He was 65: Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1902, p.xxxi.
6. The Estate in Retrospect

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the frontages on one of the three peripheral roads bounding the triangular-shaped Rectory Manor Estate had been fully developed; those on the second, which led northwards out of the town towards London, only had buildings at the southern end; and those on the third were largely untouched.

Enclosure had put the former open land of Parson's Mead into the private possession of Alexander Cadcleugh, the elder, in 1823. But only on his death in 1835 was the ground made available for building.

The situation and the time were both propitious. The market town was expanding; its road to London, alongside the Estate, had been turnpiked; one of the first railways south of London was at that moment being constructed to terminate within a few minutes' walk of the nearest part of the site; there were no neighbouring obnoxious industries; and the town centre was only a short distance away. Some of the earliest development was commensurate with these attractions; but land purchase and house building occurred slowly and, on the farther side of Parson's Mead, which was close to the working-class cottages along and off Mitcham Road, and where the plots were much smaller, a far poorer quality of property was built. Generally, the supply of land considerably exceeded the demand; and the ebb and flow of building activity noted elsewhere in Croydon, and also in Camberwell by Dr Dyos, did not apply at all in
the Parson's Mead area.

Any unity of development was inhibited by the absence of restrictive covenants; and by a complete lack of planning in the matter of the road lay-out, so that some plots were too cramped and yet had an abnormal length that encouraged later back-filling with buildings used for light industrial purposes. Even in one particular street, as for instance in Derby Road, the houses on one side might be of a far better type than those built, later, opposite.

In the present century, the big detached properties on the road to London have largely been converted into shops; and, in the part farthest from the town centre a cinema, and a million pound project comprising ballroom, shops, flats and offices, has replaced the earlier houses.

Many of the wealthier people of the Parson's Mead area in the nineteenth century were commuters from West Croydon station. By the end of Victoria's reign, however, most people of that social class had moved to other parts of the town that were managing to maintain their gentility more unsullied. In 1861, West Croydon Station had been described as the scene of constant ingress and egress—nearly the whole of the for-those-days immense traffic between the town and the metropolis being from that station.¹ In 1862, it was still the principal station for

¹. Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1861/2, p.xxiii.
passenger traffic with London. But by then about ten other stations and localities were attracting the attention of the Croydon middle-class commuter. West Croydon Station was in decline.

By that time too the Croydon Gas and Coke Company had opened its new works at Waddon Marsh Lane, outside but within sight of the estate. Closer still, there was an iron foundry of ever-increasing size, in Factory Lane, near the southern end of Handcroft Road.

Until the time comes when one can examine the census returns for years later than 1861, it is impossible to be specific about the occupation of most of the locally employed inhabitants of the Parson's Mead area, or to discover what changes there were in the employment and social pattern over the years. It is clear that some people living there were shabby-genteel; others were shabby. Some were self-employed craftsmen; many were journeymen. Some doubtless worked on the railway; some in the increasing number of shops. Few were destitute; but also, as time went on, fewer and fewer were affluent. Within those two extremes almost every standard of living and quality of labour was to be found in this heterogeneous locality.

London Road had fine detached houses; but it also had one of Croydon's largest pawnbroking establishments.

The other two parts of the Rectory Estate, the Drayton and Handcross areas, were more purely working-class. With the exception of the property in the road dividing the two localities, Tamworth Road, most of it there was terraced, much of it on plots only fifteen to twenty feet wide and often considerably less than one hundred feet deep. Further, what few buildings had stood there previously had been largely of a wretched insanitary kind.

Those two parts of the estate had, therefore, more in common with the low-lying Old Town around the Parish Church, than with the increasingly thriving shops of North End. The purchasers of land were as usual local men, particularly tradesmen, investing their profits in the expectation of a secure return on the rents of the cottages that were rapidly built there in the last three or four decades of the century. But the houses were not slums; and those built on the Handcross Estate, because they were erected later in time, were subject to the increasing quantity of building legislation. The house rents were of a level that suggests that most of the heads of household were probably journeymen or small masters.

Again, for details, one awaits the release of the census returns; but the probability is that the tenants were employed at such premises as those of Lenny, the North End coach builder;¹ of Dean, Clough & Co., also coach

¹. See p.29, supra.
builders, of Tamworth Road and Hedgis's Yard; of Joseph Moore, engineer, machinist, boiler maker and brass founder, of Overton's Yard, Surrey Street, who made agricultural and brewers' machinery, force and lift pumps and brass castings; of the Croydon Engineering Works, in Keeley Road, which produced steam engines and boilers, brick-making machinery, and sawing and brewing plant; and of Bloggs's zinc and iron works, in Church Street, where cisterns and rain water tanks were manufactured. Others doubtless worked in the various breweries and tanneries in the same area.

Considering the great physical change in the town's main commercial, and in many of its residential, areas in the last decade it is remarkable that so little has altered in the Drayton and Handcross districts, despite their proximity to the prosperous shopping centre.

7. The Developers

Almost every single one of the men who bought land for building in the Rectory Manor area was living in Croydon at the time. Some of them, such as Robert Brain and William Tancock, were active in other parts of the town as well. But many, such as William Hewlett Binskin, confined their purchases to this one estate and even to one


small part of the estate.

Two who bear names well known in the annals of the town are Henry Overton and Thomas Berney, yet in both instances as well as in the case of men less famous locally, it has been impossible to find out much about the part they played in building and renting and selling houses.

Henry Overton was born in the town in 1790.¹ He established a brewery business in Surrey Street where Overton's Yard still leads to the site of his works.² Later he supplied Croydon with gas, manufactured at the same place, until he was bought out by the Croydon Gas Company.³ He bought land in Parson's Mead and London Road in 1835, and more in Parson's Mead in 1838.⁴ By that time he owned more than two acres there.⁵ Except on the London Road frontage, he appears to have done nothing with this land for thirteen years but then, in 1851, he was responsible for the granting of a building lease to Henry Hyde, which resulted

1. Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4d, 32.

2. He later went into partnership with a Shirley brewer named Page. The firm of Page and Overton Ltd still exists but is now absorbed into a larger combine: information supplied by Mr Royd H. Matthews, who was born in a house in the brewery grounds.


4. His first purchase cost £370: HWS, 194, 23 May,1835; and his second £430: ibid.,785, 21 Apr.,1838.

5. CPL, £370(352), New Valuation of Croydon Parish, 1839.
in the construction of 1 to 4 Montague Place (now 10-16, Montague Road).\(^1\) Four years later, he granted a similar lease to Thomas Goddard for the erection of 65 to 68, Parson's Mead.\(^2\) In the meantime he had bought land costing £236 in Waddon New Road.\(^3\) He also bought some in Southbridge Road.\(^4\) The 1851 census returns name two sons but when he died on 11 January, 1864, he devised his estate to his daughter who in the following year married a Richard Paget.\(^5\) His property became the subject of a family dispute in Chancery.\(^6\)

Thomas Berney was a member of a distinguished Croydon family of solicitors, architects, and doctors, the best-known of whom was Sir Edward Berney, 1862-1953, a Whitgiftian who designed additions to his old school in

1. This was a terrace of rather grim-looking houses, built by Henry Hyde in 1853. They each had four bedrooms and the principal rooms were hung with "satin paper". They were frequently untenanted and attempts to sell them in both 1862 and 1868 were unsuccessful.

2. They have now been demolished and the site is occupied by W. Shirley and Sons, motor agents.

3. This was on a 150-foot frontage and gave him also a frontage on Upper Drayton Place.

4. CPL, Shelf 16, Folio 11, Plan of the Freehold Estate of the late Thos. Keen, for sale by auction, 8 Jul., 1862.

5. Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes. The will was proved 20 Oct., 1862: SPB, 21 Apr., 1921.

6. CPL, Shelf 16, Folio 11, Copy of Plan Mentioned or Referred to in the Affidavit of John Berney, in Chancery Proceedings, Lambert v Overton, 11 May, 1864, before Commissioner R. Richards. Allen John Lambert was another son-in-law and also an executor of the will.
North End. Thomas Bemey was an attorney and, in 1852, bought land in Drummond, Keeley and Tamworth Roads. He was born in 1791 or 1792 and died on 25 August, 1862.

A man of a different social class from Bemey but who also bought land in the locality was William Gough, a grocer and cheesemonger. He was born in 1812 or 1813. He had a shop at 91, Church Street until 1853 or 1854 and one in the High Street between 1852 and 1864. It was he who was responsible for the development, on a building lease, of 88 to 90, Tamworth Road. It seems probable that he paid his deposit for that land through the London and County Bank.

William Inkpen, a coachmaster, who was born in Croydon in about 1788, also bought land on the Rectory Estate. He lived for many years in Addiscombe Road.

2. He bought a substantial block of land but it was not developed in his lifetime; p. 59, supra.
3. Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4h, 163.
4. See pp. 60-61, supra.
5. HWS, 1851-3, ccxxvii, 26 Oct., 1852.
6. He was baptised 7 Feb., 1789, at the Parish Church; CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents. His age was given as 85 when he died: ibid. But the 1851 census returns give his age then as 60: Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4k, 23.
where, in 1851, he had five resident servants. He was a member of the Board of Guardians for a total of twenty-three years until he retired through ill-health. He was also chairman of the Vestry in 1829. He bought land in Parson's Mead where, by 1839, he owned nearly two acres. Previously too, he had purchased land on the south side of the present George Street, just east of Park Lane. He died on 28 October, 1873.

One developer who would probably be of considerable interest if more could be found out about him is Timothy Weller, another native of the town. He was born in 1797 or 1798. He owned rather less than an acre of land in Parson's Mead in 1839. Ten years later, he

1. Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim; Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim; Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District, 4k, 25.
3. CPL, f870(352), New Valuation of Croydon Parish, 1839.
4. CPL, f870(728), SHU, Particulars of Valuable Copyhold Estates.....Comprising the Fair Field.....Fair Field Lodge (and).....the Cherry Orchard.....(to be) sold by Auction.....on Tue. 4th, March, 1828, in 29 lots.
5. Described by one local historian as an "eccentric developer", he lived for many years on the Estate, firstly in Mead Grove, where he probably built eight of the ten houses, and then at 42 (now 83), Parson's Mead.
6. Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 41, 85.
7. CPL, f870(352), New Valuation of Croydon Parish, 1839.
bought three lots on the west side of Tamworth Road.¹

It is clear from what has been said that the developers of the estate were almost all resident in the town. Some seem only to have bought land in that part of Croydon; but others certainly had wider business interests not only in land but also in other trades or professions.

8. The Builders

The builder in this area about whom one would like to know far more is Charles Hyde; but unfortunately all efforts to discover descendants or anyone else who can provide much information about him have failed. Yet, not only did he build a considerable number of houses in the Parson's Mead part of the estate, he also built houses of a quality that compare favourably with many of the others in the locality.

He was born in 1813 or 1814 in Dorset and, at the time of the 1851 census, was a master carpenter living at 87, Parson's Mead, one of the group of cottages near the Harp public house with back gardens on to Handcroft Road.² A John Hyde, also from Dorset and probably an elder brother, was a wheelwright living in Handcroft Road.³ There was too a builder named Henry Hyde who was granted the 99-year

¹. This land cost him £284: HWS, ccxxii, 15 Jun., 1849.
². Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4i, 32.
³. Ibid., 69.
building lease which resulted in the construction of the ambitious Montague Place (10-16, Montague Road).¹

Charles Hyde's major work was the erection of the fine Derby Terrace in Derby Road (numbers 14-60). Hyde himself moved into the end house (number 60), a detached one, when it was finished and alongside he had his yard. One of his earlier ventures was probably Fulham Terrace, Handcroft Road (now numbers 12-20), where he appears to have erected five shops and houses and to have been the first occupant of the corner shop. This Terrace was very slow in construction for two of the group, started in 1852, were still unoccupied two years later when the other three were still being erected.²

This slowness was a feature of his work on the Derby Terrace project as well. Between 1852 and 1854 his own house, number 24 (now number 60) was completed, and by 1854, two others were being built. Four years later a further eleven were occupied but four more were still under construction. Two years after that, two more had still not been commenced. Thus, although finally alike in design, the terrace of twenty-four houses took Hyde ten or even fifteen years to complete.³ There appears generally to

¹ See pp. 70-71, supra.
² Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim.
³ Ibid. It is possible that the last two houses were not commenced until 1867: Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
have been little difficulty in finding tenants once the houses were completed, and Hyde had sufficient surplus labour available to enable him, in November, 1860, to seek and obtain a contract for alterations and improvements to Whitgift Hospital which work included another monument to him that survives in the form of the grass plots laid out in the quadrangle. Since there was apparently no lack of tenants to occupy the houses and no lack of labour to build them, the most likely reason for the slowness of construction was a typical shortage of capital. This may account too for the fact that Hyde soon moved out of his new house in Derby Terrace into one of those he had built in Fulham Terrace, Handcroft Road, the rent income from the Derby Road property being more than he would obtain if he let that in Fulham Terrace. At this time, too, Mrs Hyde was able to use the shop part of the Fulham Terrace premises as a corn chandlery. Later, perhaps because of an ever-increasing return from the Derby Terrace property Mrs Hyde was able, in 1864, to give up the shop; and the family moved back into Derby Road, to 30, Waterloo Place, adjacent to Hyde's Terrace, where they remained for some years. 1

Two further building operations can be attributed

to Charles Hyde with some reasonable degree of certainty. In 1887, there was a sale of his property, probably after his death; and one lot represented five three-storey shop premises then numbered 148 to 152, St James's Road, which were bought in at £1,500, whilst another lot, Wellington Terrace, 140 to 147, St James's Road, all two-storey three-bedroom houses renting at between £28 and £35 per annum each, were bought in at £2,000. Also sold, at the same time, were the four cottages of Derby Grove. So, too, was a two-floor workshop with about 150 square yards of floor space, situated at the end of Derby Grove. Both the cottages and the workshop were bought by Thomas Hyde Ebbutt for £1,350.

There were two further Henry Hydes active in the building trade in this part of Croydon towards the end of the century. One of them was living at 41, Derby Road, in

1. The second lot probably represented the eight houses of Hyde's, the building of which had been approved on 29 Aug., 1867: CPL, Index to List of Building Permissions, 1867-1868, 11. Both lots had been conveyed to William Tancock on 11 May, 1867, so that there again Hyde was probably in possession of a building lease: HWS, 24 Feb., 1887. Hyde occupied one of the houses in 1873: Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1874, p.174.

2. See p.42n, supra.

3. From 1885, the workshops had been described as White's building yard so, presumably, Hyde had retired: Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim. Ebbutt's continued to use the site of the workshops as stables and then garages for many years, and may do so still. The 'Hyde' in Thomas Hyde Ebbutt's name was purely coincidence; they were not related: information supplied by Mr T. Hands Ebbutt.
1893; and he presumably built Muriel Terrace, 1-17, Summer Road in 1894 when he moved into number 13 as its first occupant.¹ He is not to be confused with another Henry Hyde who was the first occupant of 148, Handcroft Road, very close to Muriel Terrace, and who was described in 1890 as a painter and house decorator and, from 1891 to 1898, as a plumber and gas fitter.²

A carpenter-turned-builder who certainly had financial trouble was John Shirley, senior. He had been born in Buckinghamshire in 1808 and, in 1851, was living in the grounds of the Old Palace.³ Soon after that however, he took a 99-year lease from James Spurrier Wright, a printer, of at least some of the land that Wright had bought in the 1849 sale.⁴ There Shirley erected, with a nostalgic touch in the name, Buckingham Place, 62 and 63, Waddon New Road; and he and his son, John, junior, continued to live in the latter house until after the start of the present century.⁵ At the rear he had a workshop, on the site of which 1 and 2, Mission Cottages, Lower Drayton Place were later built, the remaining land being occupied by the

2. Ibid.
3. Public Record Office, M.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4d, 132.
4. HWS, cclxxii, 15 Jun., 1849.
5. Ward’s Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.
London City Mission Hall. All this land, Shirley rented from Wright at £10 per annum. It is probable too that Shirley built the neighbouring houses to the north, Bridge Place, 58 to 51, Waddon New Road; they were completed in 1852.

Five years later, what were described as "Shirley's Freeholds and Leaseholds" were sold by order of Carew Saunders Robinson, the solicitor. The freeholds consisted of the four houses of Bridge Place, on which there was a reserve of £500, each one having two chambers, parlour and living room, yard, fore-court and washhouse with sink but, apparently, no kitchen: they had been built on a fifty-foot frontage, on land only ninety feet deep, and were let at a total of £53 19s. per annum. Obviously, by that time Shirley was indebted, probably to Wright and, indeed, lot 2 was to be sold at any bidding. This second lot, the leasehold part of the estate, was in Lower Drayton Place, behind Shirley's own cottage and comprised three newly-erected houses each with two chambers, parlour, living room, and washhouse, forecourt and garden ground, but again with no kitchen. These were let to weekly tenants at a total of £37 5s. 4d. per annum; and were held on a 99-year building lease granted to Shirley from March 1853, under which he had agreed to expend at lease £600 before 29 September, 1856. However, by October, 1857, he had only laid out a

1. SPHW, 1476, 28 Jul., 1890.
part of that sum in any building. Besides the three
cottages in Lower Drayton Place that Shirley had completed,
there were also two brick and timber houses in Cairo Place,
and "vacant building ground, on which is a cottage tenement
and other buildings and the foundations of five more houses
part laid, of the estimated annual value of £12 14s. 1" It
is impossible to identify each of these sites with
certainty; but Shirley's failure and the consequent break in
building continuity may explain why a plaque bearing the
name "Westman Cottages" is placed centrally between numbers
2 and 3 in a group of five, implying that all five are of a
kind, yet numbers 1 and 2 are apart from the other three and
are quite different in appearance. 2

Both before and after the business failure of John
Shirley, senior, his wife appears to have supplemented the
family income as a milliner and dressmaker. 3 He died in
December, 1889, aged 81. 4 His son continued to live in the
same house until 1910. 5 But he did little or no building,

1857. Neither lot was sold. When offered again on 1
May, 1858, lot 1 was withdrawn at £495; and bidding began
for the second lot, the three cottages, at £40(!) and it
was withdrawn at £45.

2. Nos 1 and 2 are now derelict.

3. See, for instance, Commercial and General Directory of
the Town of Croydon, 1861/2, p. 43.

4. CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents.

5. Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.
his advertisement in the 1889 directory reading, "For Funerals go to J. Shirley, Undertaker, 63, Waddon New Road. Every description of repairs done."  

Of the remaining builders, little is known. They can sometimes be identified as probable builders of certain groups of houses by being among the first occupants, but little other information about them may come to light. One such is William Tidy, who was the first occupant of 1, Cavendish Place, now 154, Handcroft Road. He was the builder of all eight of the houses bearing that name (numbers 140-154), occupying the frontage between Sumner and Cavendish Roads; and probably too of the further fifteen houses (numbers 110-138), each named after a place in the Isle of Wight, extending along the Handcroft Road frontage from Cavendish to Chatfield Roads. About 1885, he was a bricklayer living in Handcroft Road. Soon afterwards at the same address he was being described as a bricklayer and oven builder.

Then there was a man named Allbright, who had

2. Nos 110-138 are different in detail from nos 140-154, but are basically of the same design, an unusual feature in both instances being the position of the main chimney stack half-way down the forward slope of the roof.
4. Ibid., passim.
some building leases in Derby Road. But except that he might be related to a W.J. Allbright who over forty years later bought a plot of land for £620 on the corner of Leicester and Stretton Roads on the Morland Estate at Addiscombe, nothing is known about him. This is not perhaps surprising for even a substantial builder like Henry Bance has left few tangible traces.

We know that Bance was born in Croydon in 1790 or 1791 and was latterly in a very successful way of business in the High Street where, in 1851, he was employing thirty-seven men together with one assistant, his son Henry. He bought land in London Road in 1839. But when he died in 1854, it was still only partly built on. A subsequent sale included his partly-erected semi-detached villas, "carried up to the 2nd floor and fitted with sashes and

1. CPL, dS70, lease, 10 Jun., 1852.

2. Public Record Office, H.O.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4A, 52. Other possible members of the family at that time included: William Bance, a grocer and cheesemonger, George Bance, a cabinet maker who was still in business in 1882, Benjamin Bance, a master butcher, all of the High Street; and Ann Bance, a widowed proprietor of houses, who lived at Bance's Court, Duppas Hill Lane: loc. cit., passim; Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim.

3. SHW, 785, 21 Apr., 1838.

4. Surrey Gazette, 9 May, 1854, p. 7; CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents. His will was dated 18 Oct., 1852; information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes.
outdoor frames, joists, etc." It would seem highly probable that Bance was a builder, in the contractual sense, in a considerable way of business but that his amount of house construction was slight.²

The fragmentary information that we have about the builders on the Rectory Manor Estate suggests that most of them, like Henry Hyde and John Shirley, were concerned mainly with building leases obtained from a ground landlord who was, most commonly, a Croydon tradesman or professional man. One pair of builders though who certainly bought their own land for building was Joseph and William Hallett. The latter purchased three lots on the east side of Tamworth Road in 1852, on which subsequently were built numbers 71 to 74, 82 to 85 and the Sir Robert Peel public house; and also 1-5, Frith Road and 2-4, Keeley Road.³ All these properties have now been demolished to make way for the new bowling alley and car park. At the time of the sale, William Hallett was described as a builder, of Lavinia Villa, West Street; the land cost him £544. The 1853 directory names both William and Joseph Hallett of 42, West Street, as

1. HWS, 1857-1858, cxxxix, 3 Sept., 1857. Later these partly-built houses probably became 111-113, London Road.

2. It seems that in the 1850's there were, anyway, very few specialist house builders: D.A. Reeder, Investment in the Western Suburbs of Victorian London (unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Leicester, 1965), pp.119-120.

3. HWS, ccxxxvii, 26 Oct., 1852; SPHW, 1422a, 26 Oct., 1852.
being builders. By 1854, Joseph Hallett was living in a new house that he had built on one of their Tamworth Road plots. But four years later he was described as a timber merchant. Then by 1868 he was styled Joseph Hallett, Esq., at which time he was living at Sunningdale House, Bensham Manor Road. William in the meantime had also turned to alternative activities that were doubtless more secure than building and, by 1858, he was a corn, coal and flour merchant in the High Street.

Another family that made some small contribution to the house building in the area was the Leggs. Henry Legg was born in 1834 or 1835 and died at Bridge House, Pitlake, on 27 August, 1884, at the age of 49, after a long and painful illness. On his death, his brother Albert, 

1. Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1853, p.95. They are not named at all in the 1851 directory nor, apparently, in the 1851 census returns for Croydon. They may even have been unknown to the local auctioneer who, in respect of their plots, wrote "Hallett or Elliott" on his copy of the sale particulars; HWS, 1851-1853, ccxlvii, 26 Oct., 1852.

2. 2, Myrtle Cottages, 84, Tamworth Road, Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1855, p.103.


4. Ibid., 1869, p.260.

5. Ibid., 1859, p.116. He remained there until the clearance of the area at the end of the century and then, apparently, retired to 28, Northcote Road, where he died on 12 Jun., 1901. His widow continued living in the town until she died on 19 Jan., 1927, at 6, Croham Road.

who had been in partnership with him for sixteen years, moved to 1, Kemble Road and there set up in business on his own.\(^1\) An earlier partner had been John Mare, of Waddon New Road.\(^2\) Legg and Mare had advertised that they were undertakers and house decorators, as well as builders, and they were also agents to the Whittington Life Office and to the Railway Accident Mutual Insurance Company.\(^3\) They were obviously engaged largely on maintenance work; but they presumably built, in 1882 and 1883, Cairo Cottages 1 to 6 (14 to 19, Cairo Road) on land which they had bought in 1873 and used as a yard.\(^4\) Earlier, between 1869 and 1871, Henry Legg had been a director of the Starr-Bowkett Benefit Building Society.\(^5\)

A further builder in the area was Thomas White. Between 1858 and 1869, he was a bricklayer living in Bell Yard, Duppas Hill Lane.\(^6\) Then he moved to Alfred Road, as a builder.\(^7\) In 1879, when living at Oval Road, he bought

2. Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1869, p.278.
4. SPHW, 205b, 21 Jun., 1877.
5. CPL, Annual Reports of the Society, 1866-1871.
7. Ibid., 1869, p.216.
three plots of land in Derby Road, for £286.\(^1\) Much later, in 1896, T. White and Son had a yard between 72 and 76, Clarendon Road, adjoining the newly-built Whitehouse Villas, presumably a pun on the family name.\(^2\)

Another builder of whom practically nothing is known is Frederick Filbeam. He was born at Godstone, Surrey, and by the early 1850's was living in Croydon as a master carpenter. In the middle of that decade he built 9 to 12, Upper Drayton Place for William Berrington, their total cost being £450.\(^3\) Others, who are little more than names, include Ellis Brown Staples who probably erected Muriel Terrace, Sumner Road, on a building lease obtained from Jacob Bayliss;\(^4\) and John Mutton, a builder who was the first occupant of 5, Clyde Villas, 61, Clarendon Road, almost certain proof that he built all ten Clyde Villas in that part of the road.\(^5\) O.J. Mutton, possibly his son,

1. SPHW, 421, 26 Feb., 1879.

2. Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1897, p.49. The yard was later occupied by the Clarendon Film Company, and the 1908 directory reported the death on 17 Apr., 1907, of W. Zeitz, who sustained fatal injuries whilst "obtaining a railway scene for the cinematograph:" ibid., 1908, p.xxi. The factory of Gillett and Johnston (Croydon) Ltd, clockmakers, and formerly bellfounders, is now on the site.

3. Abstract of title of 11, Upper Drayton Place, in the private possession of Mrs M. Barlow.

4. SPB, 483, 16 Nov., 1922.

5. Then called Handcroft Road East: Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1874, p.40.
was still living there in the 1880's. Either father or son built 11-13, Ainsworth Road in 1883; and at least six houses in Derby Road, between 1875 and 1883.

Ten buildings can be attributed to Charles E. Pay. As a carpenter and decorator, he was living at 4, Alma Place, Pitlake from about 1883; and by 1888 he was the first occupant of Hollycombe, a single house alongside the Market Terrace shops on the bridge. He was by that time described as a builder and continued to live there until 1896. He built five cottages in Tamworth Place and four houses in Tamworth Road, all in the middle 1880's.

Two other names remain to be mentioned. David Waller moved into 4, Waddon New Road, as a builder, when it was new and so he presumably built numbers 1 to 12 since they are all alike; and possibly also the nearby 1 to 15, Tamworth Road. The other is J. Pescud, born at Titsey, Surrey, in 1797 or 1798, and almost certainly the builder of 10-16, Drayton Road, where the Misses Pescud were still living as recently as 1965.

2. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
3. Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1884-1897, passim; Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
4. See p. 52, supra.
5. Information supplied by Mr Clive C. Barlow.
It will be seen from this that despite the most exhaustive search, only a few of the houses in the area can be ascribed to particular builders; and that the picture that emerges is of building craftsmen, often chronically under-capitalised and sometimes on the verge of bankruptcy, erecting perhaps just one terrace or small group of houses. Even Henry Bance, in a bigger way of business than most, has left very little proof of his work in the area.¹

But even more surprising, is a total absence of evidence regarding work in the middle of the century by William Harris who seems to have been, at that time, easily the most substantial builder in the town. In 1851, he was employing five clerks, nineteen carpenters, five carpenters' apprentices, fifteen bricklayers, six masons, three plasterers, three plasterers' apprentices, two sawyers, seventy-nine labourers, four carmen, a gardener, and six boys, a total staff of 148, an unusual number for that period.² He was living at Waddon, then a hamlet just outside the town, but where or what he was building is, at the moment, a complete mystery. It is possible that Mead Cottages 1 to 6, Handcroft Road (now numbers 84-94) were built by him for they bear the inscription "W.H.1847"; but no mention of his name has yet been discovered in connection

¹. See pp.82-83, supra.
with house building in this area, or indeed anywhere else in Croydon.

2. Conclusions

The investigation of the Rectory Manor Estate had the aim, as has been said, of discovering to what extent the conclusions reached earlier about the development of one of Croydon's Victorian suburbs are relevant when related to a locality of the same date but within a few minutes' walk of the town's main shops and close to what was at first the principal railway station.¹

The earlier findings had shown that in South Croydon, the physical geography, and the presence or absence of earlier slum tenements and of obnoxious industries, had a very considerable effect for good or bad upon the quality of the Victorian and twentieth century urban development.² Flat ground, a liability to flooding, already-existing slum tenements, and a most objectionable linoleum factory, in the Bynes Road and Napier Road areas, resulted in a district vastly different from that which arose on the healthy, sloping, wooded downland across the valley.³

¹ See p.4, supra.
³ The Bynes Road area was also isolated by the railway; but the West Croydon line had no similar effect because there was ready access across it at West Croydon Station and at Pitlake, and by a footbridge in between.
On the Rectory Manor Estate, the same principles are found to apply. The quality of development worsened generally as one went down the slope from London Road to Handcroft Road. 1 Down there too one was in close proximity to the slum area of Barrack Town. 2 Waddon Marsh was also not far away. 3 In the early days there was no industrial activity to affect the locality, but the later intrusion of light industry into Parson's Mead assisted the decay of that road.

The conclusions reached earlier, about this comparably better quality of development on the higher ground, cannot be said to apply particularly to the slope of the Handcross Estate. There are however several good reasons for this. This estate was not on the market until the last two decades of the century, by which time there was increasing commercial activity on the adjoining land on the North End frontage, and effective housing legislation; and the whole area had, anyway, gone out of fashion.

In addition the Handcross Estate plots were sold with only fourteen- or fifteen-foot frontages; and this had a result analogous with what happened in parts of South

1. The same applied to Tamworth Road.
2. The part of Mitcham Road opposite the barracks, together with some very indifferent housing on the back land.
3. The older houses in that part of Mitcham Road all have one or two steps up to their front doors although the ground does not slope. This suggests that the houses were liable to be flooded.
Croydon. Frequently, though not always one suspects, a vendor would judge or be advised in advance as to what kind of purchaser his land would attract, the factors being especially the ones already discussed. He would then sell his plots at a particular size accordingly. To a large extent in offering, say, fifteen-foot plots he was merely reflecting the known or supposed potential of the land. But he was certainly ensuring too that the land when developed would in fact carry the kind of small terraced house that he had been led to believe was its destiny. Often a purchaser would buy adjoining lots so that he could erect a terrace of houses, but no cases have been discovered of such narrow plots being united and then used for a development substantially superior to that envisaged by implication in the sale.

As on Haling Down, so at Rectory Manor, the process of development was slow and gradual.\(^1\) But there was not even the same response to external economic stimuli as in South Croydon; and the peaks of building activity recorded for Camberwell by Dr Dyos, and noted in South Croydon, have no parallel on the Rectory Manor Estate.\(^2\) As in Brighton Road, most of the shops that came into existence were converted from former houses rather than purpose-built.

---

1. See Table 5, p.431, infra.

2. Reeder noted varying peaks of activity in different parts of West London and postulated over-supply rather than variation of demand: op. cit., pp.298-303,310.
Likewise the chance events that brought land on to the market in South Croydon were repeated on the Rectory Manor Estate; and the purchasers were again almost entirely Croydon tradesmen who seldom found themselves bound by any important restrictive covenants.

There were some building leases there, and most of the remainder of the houses were built under contract. The Croydon Land and Investment Company appears to have played no part although it was its Chairman, John Felton, who in 1891 bought (and held for twenty-four hours) the Chatfield Estate, comprising Broad Green House and its gardens.¹

The Rectory Manor Estate builders appear to have been if anything in an even smaller way of business than those of the Bynes Road area. Not only were they all resident in Croydon, they largely lived in this particular part of the town. They had mostly been employed in the various building trades, and were severely under-capitalised, their wives sometimes helping to eke out a living with, say, dressmaking or corn chandlery.

Thus in almost every respect, the urban development on the Rectory Manor Estate, near the town centre, was analogous with that on the urban fringes. The demand towards the end of the century for a large number of inexpensive cottages meant that, at that time, land suitable for such dwellings was quickly snapped up. But for better-

1. See p.44, supra.
class housing, the market was weak, and land sales languished. Further, the bigger houses, once erected, were not regarded as a particularly sound investment, were difficult to dispose of, and were later influenced adversely by poorer quality development elsewhere. In the twentieth century, such houses have been turned into shops and apartments, or have fallen into a state of considerable disrepair hastened by multi-family occupation.
II THE MARKET AREA

A. Decay

1. The Growth and Decline of the Market

Professor Hoskins has pointed out that the marketplace was the focal point of most medieval towns; and further, that it was often triangular in shape, "starting with a broad base, narrowing steadily as one goes away from it for a quarter to half a mile, until one reaches the outlet in a main road of the normal width."¹ He cited as an example of this, the "perfectly rational" case of St Albans, with its market stalls clustering at one end, under the abbey wall, and thinning out quickly as one went away towards the open country, with all its dangers for the peaceful trader.²

The market site in Croydon provides an analogy on a smaller scale. There was, it is true, no abbey; but the market lay immediately outside the bounds of the demesne of the Archbishop's manor, the base of the triangle being formed in this instance by Crown Hill, a part of the main thoroughfare linking the Saxon and later settlements.³ The site was ideal in every respect bar one; the downward slope from the east to west sides of the triangle. The ground


³ See pp.22-24, supra.
Fig. 3 Plan of central Croydon, showing the proposed improvement, 1890
Fig. 4 50" to the mile O.S. map of the Market area.
was so steep on the eastern side that no inn yards off the High Street were feasible there. But on the western side it was comparatively level.

The market existed before, probably long before, its first official recognition in a grant to Archbishop Kilwardby of a Wednesday market, and also of a nine-day fair commencing on the eve of St Botolph (17 June). A second grant, to Archbishop Reynolds, dated 1314, referred to a Thursday market and also to a three-day fair at the feast of St Matthew (21 September). Later Archbishop Stratford received, in 1343, permission to hold a Saturday market and also a fair on St John the Baptist's Day (29 August). The Town Clerk reported in 1883 that of these various markets and fairs, only the Saturday market and the August and September fairs had survived to comparatively recent times.


2. Some slope was desirable in a market place, especially for corn, for drainage purposes.

3. Clarence G. Paget, By-Ways in the History of Croydon, 1929, p.11; C.M. Elborough, Croydon a Borough....The First Election....with a copy of the Charter and.....the Report of the Enquiry.....1883, p.8. The grants were made in 1273 and 1276, respectively.

4. Paget, loc. cit.; Elborough, loc. cit.

At first, the market would have been an open-air one; and one writer has suggested that the goods being laid out in rows would account for the names of two of the later streets on the site, Middle Row and Butcher's Row, the latter being subsequently renamed Surrey Street.

As Professor Hoskins has pointed out, "such a market-place was covered with booths and stalls for different types of traders. The next stage developed when the stalls were covered over and became permanent. The last stage was reached when the permanent stalls became houses or shops. At this point it might well happen that a block of shops and houses would be built down one side of the market-place, taking the place of a number of stalls, and so creating a plan which is frequently seen today—that is, where the original open space is reduced to a broad main street, with a detached block of buildings down one side, behind which is a narrow back street."  

The process has been noted widely. Professor Beresford has referred to its happening at Higham Ferrers (Northamptonshire). It occurred, too, at Chichester.

1. Hoskins, op. cit., pp.224-225, describes what this would have been like.


3. Hoskins, op. cit., p.227

(Sussex) where Celia Fiennes referred to it in the 1690’s; at East Grinstead (Sussex), where by 1564 at least half a dozen cottages, a stable, and two shops formed a "Middle Row"; at the Carfax, Horsham (Sussex) where, as at Croydon, a town hall and market house were built; and at Midhurst (Sussex), where a map of 1632 shows a far larger island of houses in the middle of the road than survives at present, most of them being removed in the eighteenth century.¹

Sometimes, successful attempts were made to stop the market area being built over in this way. At Brighton (Sussex), for instance, two townsfolk were indicted in 1659 for building shops on it; and at Petworth (Sussex), in the mid-seventeenth century, the owner of a shop opposite the market hall was presented for encroaching on the square and building a structure harmful to the people merchandizing in the market and obscuring the light.²

Croydon’s market area was also built over. But as elsewhere it is frequently impossible to date precisely the first appearance of permanent buildings. Professor Hoskins attributes it generally to the great expansion of trade and population in the boom of the thirteenth century.³

² Ibid., pp.25,126.
However, Professor Everitt has pointed out that frequently such a market-place was not built over extensively until the sixteenth century.¹

There are references to market houses in Croydon in 1561 and in 1609 and at that time, as later, corn seems to have been the most important single commodity.² It was the subject of an Exchequer case in 1690 when the farmer of the profits of the market brought an action against seven maltsters to recover toll on barley purchased outside the town and delivered within it. He claimed that any grain delivered within the verge of the town and market of Croydon was liable for toll: the defendants, however, contended that toll was only due when the grain had been pitched in the market.³ According to Clarence G. Paget, "it appears that the farmers from 'below hill' (the south side of the Downs) often brought their grain into Croydon on other days of the week besides Saturday, the market day, storing it in rooms hired for the purpose in the inns round the market, and then sold it to their customers,

---


2. In the late eighteenth century the market was chiefly for oats and oatmeal for London though there was a good sale too for wheat and barley: Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1902, p.xv, quoting Universal British Directory, vol.11, 1795 or earlier.

either in or outside the market, by samples carried in their pockets. Even in such cases it was not unusual to pay the toll, which was one quart in every sack of four bushels of grain, but when the grain was purchased at the farmers' barn doors and delivered direct to the customers' premises, it became an open question as to whether any toll was due.

Much, we are told, escaped toll through being brought into town by the back way without being 'espied' by those whom the farmer of the toll employed to watch for it. The oatmeal men, we are given to understand, were especial offenders in this respect.

The defendants gained the day, the plaintiff's case being dismissed with costs.\(^1\)

Later, there was a separate butter market house; and there was also a fish market. This, according to Ronald Bannerman, was served by carriers on their way from the coast to London, whose arrival was announced by a bellman.\(^2\) The fish market was in a part of Middle Row known variously as Fishmarket Street, Old Fish Street, or, simply, the Fishmarket.\(^3\) Its precise locale, according to John Ollis Pelton, is uncertain but it was most probably near the junction of Middle Row and Market Street, behind

\(^1\) Paget, op. cit., p.13. The process of forestalling, i.e., circumventing the open market by purchasing direct from the local farmers, was said to be the main reason for the decay in the 18th century of the market at Horsham (Sussex), Cowley, op. cit., p.166.

\(^2\) Ronald Bannerman, Forgotten Croydon, 1933, p.22.

\(^3\) Paget, op. cit., p.12.
the Butter Market. An 1885 lease of property in King Street, which was in the same immediate vicinity, described the land as being near where the Irish fishmarket stood.

Latterly the fish were marketed particularly at the rear of the Town Hall, the principal fish sold being mackerel.

However in two instances in 1878, where fish was being offered that was unfit for human food, the offences took place in Surrey Street and Market Street, and concerned haddocks.

A much more important market commodity at Croydon however was meat. Surrey Street had been known variously as Butcher Row, the Shambles, the Butchery, the Flesh Market, etc., from at least the beginning of the fifteenth century until 1840. John Ollis Pelton describes how the Croydon butchers bought their livestock at Smithfield Market

2. Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes.
3. Pelton, loc. cit.
4. CPL, Local Board of Health Sanitary Committee minutes, 1870-1878: 20 Jun.,1878; 24 Oct.,1878.
5. Pelton, op. cit., p.44. Bannerman, op. cit., p.41 gives the date 1843. It was, in fact, on 5 Feb.,1834, that some of the inhabitants of the Row petitioned the Improvement Commissioners that the name might be changed to East Surrey Street. The Commissioners agreed to an alteration to Surrey Street but "the inhabitants of the street must be at the expense of the Boards," CPL, Croydon Improvement Act, Commissioners' Minute Book, 1829, 18 Apr.,1831. One can discount Pelton's suggestion, Memorials of Croydon Within the Crosses, 1926, p.30, that the name Butcher Row originated from the fifteenth century Archbishop Bouchier.
on Mondays and the beasts were then brought by drovers to Surrey Street where they were collected by their owners who had branded them at the time of purchase. What Butcher Row must have been like can be seen from the illustration of the Coventry street of the same name in Dr Martin's *The Town*, a nineteenth century picture of a sixteenth century street, "houses and shops undifferentiated and irregularly built; the roadway unpaved. The butcher's shop, with its open shutters, trestled counters and fugitive livestock.... a simple medieval survival."  

By the beginning of the nineteenth century the Butter Market House was "ruinous and decayed"; and the main market house, which had come to be used as a court house as well, was "extremely incommodious and much out of repair and not fit for H.M's Judges of Assize." The local Waste Land Commissioners decided to use money obtained from the sale of land at Norwood apportioned to the town by the Enclosure Act, to rebuild both the Market House, or Town Hall as it then came to be referred to, and the butter market.  

2. Martin, *op. cit.*, fig.44.  
Act of Parliament was accordingly obtained in 1806.\(^1\) It
was proposed to erect a new court house, corn market house
and butter market house under one roof, on the site of the
existing court house, "if the King's Head and Houses
adjoining can be purchased to give sufficient room."\(^2\) It
was decided also to advertise in the *Times*, the *Morning
Chronicle* and the *Oracle* offering fifty guineas "to the
Architect whose plan may be approved and adopted."\(^3\)

A Mr Cockerell was asked to judge the resulting
plans.\(^4\) Having minutely examined them he suggested that
while several had much merit, the best thing would be to
incorporate the good points of them all in a new plan that
he would himself be willing to make. Eventually, a £6,000
tender from Messrs Jollife, of Merstham, was accepted;
but then the trustees changed their minds and fresh plans
were prepared. It is possible that they had been unable
to obtain all the required additional property, for a butter
market was not included in the new building.

A fresh contract was signed the following year for
£4,938 14s. 10d., this amount being increased to £5,000 "to

\(^1\) 46 Geo.III, cap.108.

\(^2\) CPL, Rough Minutes of the Trustees of the Waste Land,
1801-1807, 19 Jul., 1806.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Possibly S.P. Cockerell, the well-known architect who
died in 1827.
compensate the builder for his disappointment with the last
tender.‖ He does not however appear to have demonstrated
his appreciation, for there were soon complaints that the
stone was green from the quarry and so was likely to be
much damaged by frost, there were too few workmen employed,
"and those were not disposed to do any work." Soon after
completion, too, the building was "found to be defective and
continual surveys and repairs had to be made." It was
also at once declared inadequate.

The Butter Market House had been rebuilt the year
before the new Town Hall was constructed, at a cost of
£1,219; and it continued in use for almost seventy years.
This building had two floors: the lower one used for the
sale of meat, bacon, cheese, and sundries; the upper one, on

1. Croydon and County Pictorial, vol. I, no. 7, May, 1904,
p. 214; there are illustrations of the front and rear of
the resulting building. As regards the cost, cf.,
Pelton, who estimated it at "upwards of £8,000", Relics
p. 9.

2. Croydon and County Pictorial, vol. I, no. 7, May, 1904,
p. 214. The stone was carted from Merstham on the Iron
Railway; Pelton, Relics, p. 9; so was obviously Reigate
stone from the Upper Greensand formation which has the
reputation of weathering badly. The building is also
illustrated; ibid., p. 8.

3. Croydon and County Pictorial, loc. cit.


5. Pelton, Memorials, p. 13. The Butter Market House later
became the works and office of the Croydon Chronicle;
ibid., p. 15, whose proprietor, F. Baldiston, was
responsible for the building's later "ornamental
character"; Pelton, Relics, p. 11; illustrated, ibid.,
opposite p. 16.
a level with the High Street, containing the butter market itself, and also displaying eggs, chickens, and other farm produce brought by higglers from such places as Godstone, Reigate, East Grinstead, and Horley.\footnote{1} Corn meanwhile was offered for sale on the ground floor of the new Town Hall.\footnote{2}

There survives a detailed description of the scene at the Saturday markets soon after the Town Hall and Butter Market House had been rebuilt. Apart from the butter market there was a small cattle market held opposite the Three Tuns, Surrey Street, chiefly for pigs, cows and horses, pens for the sheep and pigs being pitched in the neighbourhood near where the Stocks and Pillory stood. The corn market also was of "great importance, and held at the Town Hall in the Criminal Court, attended by a large number of merchants, farmers, millers, etc.

"The town on Saturdays was indeed a lively one .....a continuous stream of peasants flocking in to make their weekly purchases, in clay-covered thick boots..... returning in the evening laden with baskets as much as could be carried. The farmers and others driving into the town in their light carts, gigs, etc., accompanied by their wives and daughters principally to make purchases at the drapers, etc.....the tradespeople doing the best portion of their

\footnote{1}{Bannerman, \textit{op. cit.}, p.22.}
\footnote{2}{Pelton, \textit{Relics}, p.9.}
business in that day."¹

The reference to the site of the stocks and pillory is a reminder that these had been set up in 1811 at the rear of the new Town Hall, with a whipping post also nearby.² At the time of the July fair, the same locality was the scene of rope dancing, theatrical performances, swings and roundabouts.³ Stalls were set up for the selling of cherries, gingerbread, toys and sweetstuffs, whilst in the upper part of the Town Hall a small bazaar was organised where "the more superior articles might be bought."⁴ On the same day, a small horse and cattle fair took place in the High Street, the animals being tethered to iron railings which were not removed finally until 1862. In the early


² Pelton, Relics, p.9. He quoted an old inhabitant who claimed he recollected seeing "a man placed in the stocks as a punishment for begging; he was in an almost nude state, and had his hat placed at his side into which lookers-on threw coppers, while others brought him beer from a public house close by," ibid.

³ Pelton, Memorials, p.13. The July fair is referred to by some writers as the Town or Cherry Fair, and took place on 5 Jul., at the beginning of the cherry season: Bannerman, op. cit., p.25. This date does not coincide with the dates of the fairs granted by medieval charter: see p.97, supra.

⁴ Bannerman, loc. cit., quoting Page, op. cit.
1840's, agitation arose against the continuation of the fair and, after a fatal accident when a small girl was killed by a swing in Market Street, the event was suppressed by the magistrates.¹

The open space at the rear of the Town Hall had been the scene in 1842 of a meeting in favour of the Anti-Corn Law League, addressed by Richard Cobden.² But there is no evidence that the site became a traditional place for public speeches and rallies; indeed there is little evidence of mass, open-air political activity anywhere in the town.

Croydon perhaps was in something of a backwater politically. It was also capable of improvement economically, if there is justification in the criticisms of one resident who produced a pamphlet in 1829 suggesting various ways by which the town might be bettered.³ He pointed out how little Croydon had benefited from the presence of an Archiépiscopal palace and suggested that the Archbishops' neglect of the town was due "to their attention being so busily engaged in the affairs of the world that .......when they come here [it is] .......to rest and to be absorbed in the beauties of the surrounding scenery.....

The great want of Croydon is a market which shall induce

¹ Bannerman, loc. cit.; Belton, Relics, p.37.
² Bannerman, op. cit., p.10.
all country people to bring their stock here. It should be held on Wednesdays so as not to interfere with the London markets. Half the tolls received could go towards the upkeep of the market and the other half....for further much needed improvements in the town." The writer went on to outline ways of encouraging dealers to reduce "the exorbitant price of provisions," and of keeping the town popular by encouraging and advertising the fair. "As it is essential," he said, "to keep the town compact, and not to have so many straggling buildings on its outskirts, a 'local' market should be built in the space at the rear of the Town Hall, and for the sake of the convenience of the inhabitants a large tavern might be built on one side of the Town Hall, and a jail on the other."

Another local inhabitant, describing Croydon in about 1820, recollected that "there was little communication with the metropolis.....so much did the tradesmen confine their dealings to the town that I remember hearing an old shopkeeper assert that, owing to the predominance of credit transactions, you might go from one end of the High Street to the other, and fail to get change for a sovereign."  

By the 1870's things had altered substantially from the picture drawn of the 1820's; and a local newspaper

1. The author apparently regarded the existing market as being insufficiently attractive.

editorial of the latter decade illustrates particularly well the changed scene. It suggested that the market gave little appearance of belonging to a prosperous town. It yielded to the Local Board a mere £100 per annum, most of that, apparently, being derived from vendors of luxuries rather than of necessities. Even a sum as small as this was sufficient to convince some members of the Local Board that the building should be retained in its existing form and probably for its existing purpose. But there was, suggested the newspaper, a need to make a fresh appraisal of the situation; and perhaps to erect a new market incorporating a block of buildings which could be used for other activities.

If, continued the editorial, the law did not necessitate the retention of a public market and if too the requirements of the inhabitants were supplied by other means, the time had come when consideration should be given to the fact that the space taken up by the market might more profitably be set aside for other purposes. Evidently the day had gone when farmers' wives went willingly to market; and, suggested the editorial, servants had a preference for conversation with the grocer's man in the comparative privacy of the shop. "So far," continued the article, "as the poorer part of our population is concerned, their

1. In 1861, the amount was actually £107; Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1901, p.xxvi.
market is supplied on Saturday night by the shops and the stalls, all capable of doing the duty of a public market. It seems, therefore, almost ridiculous to retain a useless edifice while our parochial business needs suitable premises."\(^1\)

Certainly by 1868, trade in the butter market had declined to such an extent that the Local Board resolved to convert the house into a fire station. The Waste Land Trustees however refused to agree to the proposal.\(^2\) But a few years later, the lease was offered by auction; and after that the building became the offices of the *Croydon Chronicle*.\(^3\)

The sale of stock, by comparison, appears still to have been flourishing. But it was presenting problems of a different kind, as a member of the Local Board of Health pointed out when he drew attention to "a circumstance which by many is considered a great nuisance, inconvenient and dangerous to the public and preventing that free and unobstructed use of the Highways which they have a right to, and which nuisance has arisen within the last few years,

---


3. *Croydon Advertiser*, 14 Feb., 1874, p. 2; Pelton, *Relics*, p. 11; p. 105n, *supra*. At the auction, the Board asked a rental of £100 per annum, but the auctioneer noted, "last bidding was that of Mr Tancock, £75. I then bid £80 and there being no other buyers it was withdrawn": *SHW*, 692, 12 Mar., 1874.
namely the practice of selling horses on a Saturday in the Public Highway at the back of the Town Hall, and the shewing and trotting out of such horses up and down the street, which on such days is generally crowded with people." He reminded the Board of the Act imposing a penalty for such offence, "unless the same was done at a fair or legally established Market for such a purpose."

The matter was adjourned.¹

With corn, as with butter, trade was obviously contracting, for in the same year as the fire station project (1868) a Vestry meeting was held to consider amalgamating the Thursday and Saturday corn markets. It was resolved that in future only a Saturday corn market should be held.² Well might one writer lament, when comparing conditions in the 1820's with those in the 1880's, that, "Then all the...marketfolk dined at the various inns where substantial dinners or ordinaries were prepared. Now the few that attend the markets come by rail in the middle of the day and return home...to tea."³

When therefore the Royal Commission on Market

1. CPL, Local Board of Health, Croydon, Minutes, vol.1, 1849-1852, 17 Sept., 1850.


Rights and Tolls sent a representative to Croydon in July 1888, his enquiry was something of a post-mortem. It is not perhaps surprising to read that although "The Town Clerk was in attendance, and Mr J. Corbet Anderson [an] local historian and Mr H. Still [owner of the existing cattle market] were also present...no other member of the public put in an appearance." ¹

The Commissioner began by explaining that his object was "to inquire into the existing markets and fairs held in the town, and whether they were in the hands of proper individuals, or vested in the local authorities; the accommodation of the existing markets, and the desirability of establishing public ones." ²

The Town Clerk pointed out that the Corporation had not seriously considered the question of establishing a public market. In the Croydon Corporation Act of 1884, he went on, "the Corporation introduced a clause which should enable them to establish a market, but Mr Still, the proprietor of the existing cattle market, obtained the insertion of clauses for his protection, providing that his market should be purchased by agreement or arbitration."

The Town Clerk later referred to the space at the rear of the Town Hall which was let to stall-keepers on Saturday nights, receipts from these lettings being, in

---

2. Ibid.
1883, £39 8s.; in 1884, £27 9s. 6d.; in 1885, £32; in 1886, £61 8s.; in 1887, £71 6s. 6d.; and in 1888, so far, £19 14s. 6d. The large amounts were caused, he said, "by a great American meat 'boom'.....in those years." He pointed out, finally, that the corn market was likewise a private market.¹

Daniel Taylor, the Town Hall keeper, gave evidence that there was room for about eleven stalls at the rear of the Town Hall and said he believed five were let. He attributed the cause of the falling off of receipts in recent years, other than in the 'boom' years, to the fact that "costermongers and cheap Jacks" were allowed to stand exactly opposite the stalls, "without paying anything."²

The Commissioner later pointed out "the advantages .....in some large towns through the establishment of public markets." The Town Clerk replied, evasively, that in Croydon there were practically four great centres, and that "there would be difficulty in finding a suitable centre for a public market."³

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. Earlier, in 1871, "Scrutator", in the Croydon Chronicle, had advocated a "well ventilated market" on the site of the then disused Central Station; Pelton, Relics, p.52; and Alderman Allder, a year before the Commission's enquiry, had proposed a fish, meat, vegetable and fruit market, with room for 60 or 70 shops; Croydon Advertiser, 22 Oct.,1887, p.2. This idea was, naturally, unpopular with existing shop-keepers. Allder was himself a shop-keeper; but in linen drapery.
It is true that so far as the corn market was concerned, the frequent debates on the proposed demolition of the Town Hall, in the 1880's and 1890's, were accompanied by demands that provision should be made for accommodation for a corn market in any new civic building. But generally the Corporation did nothing to arrest the decline of the markets and by the start of World War I the only survival was a Saturday market in Surrey Street. However, perhaps because of a demand resulting from increased food prices in the shops, the street market there had, by 1922, become a daily one. An attempt to move it, at least in part, to Katharine Street was a failure. It remains in Surrey Street at the present time, there having been until recently a small covered market in addition, and further stalls in Firth Road and Old Palace Road.

Thus, after a period of medieval growth, and despite the building of new commercial premises in the early nineteenth century, the years after the middle of that same century showed a marked diminution in Croydon's market.

1. Felton, Relics, p.58, reporting a Council meeting of 13 Jul., 1885; HSIS, 1 Jul., 1890, p.19; ibid., 25 Nov., 1890, p.43. See also p.277, infra.
2. CPL, x370(9) GRO, This Is Up Your Street, 1954.
4. Bannerman, op. cit., p.24; Croydon Advertiser, 10 Jun., 1922, p.4; ibid., 17 Jun., 1922, p.9. The former covered market is now a supermarket.
trade, and the complete disappearance of many of the activities that formerly took place there. But the shops and houses that, in earlier times, had been built over the Market area still remained.

2. The Heyday and Decline of the Market Area Properties

By the time the Market area was fully built over, the road pattern was such that the original base of the triangle, on the north, was represented by Crown Hill; the eastern side by High Street; and, down the slope, the western side by Surrey Street.\(^1\) Two other roads, within the area, led away from Crown Hill in the direction of the triangle's southern apex; they were Market Street, approximately parallel with High Street, and Middle Row, roughly parallel with Surrey Street, and they converged just short of the apex.\(^2\)

Across the triangle, and down the slope, from east to west, there were a number of parallel alleys linking High Street and Surrey Street. These, from north to south, from base to apex of the triangle were Bell Hill, Streeter's Hill, Oak Alley and King Street. Many of the roads were very narrow, King Street for example, being only twelve feet from wall to wall; and the High Street, in one part, only

---

1. See p.94, supra.

2. Middle Row was called, alternatively, Middle Street. It will be referred to consistently in this work by the former name, and this will serve as a reminder that it coincided only very approximately in position with the Middle Street of the present day.
twenty five feet wide. The alleys were, of course, narrower still.

John Ollis Felton, who lived at the end of the nineteenth century and who chronicled the area minutely, described how, before his time, the locality had been occupied by prosperous tradesmen but in more recent times the property had been much neglected. He pointed out, for instance, that the Prince of Wales beerhouse, in Market Street, represented very good eighteenth century work, that it had character and had at one time appeared to greater advantage. At first floor level, he said, "a classic frieze" could be seen and, too, a curved cornice which added considerably to the overall effect.

His description of the decline, both structurally and socially, of the properties in the Market area was based on his own observations over a long period for his father's

1. John Ruskin, Praeterita, 1949, p.79; Benians, op. cit., p.82.
2. Relics, pp.ix, 3, 31-33, illustration opposite p.32; Memorials, p.12.
3. Pelton, Relics, p.26. This property was 8 and 9, Market Street, owned latterly by Messrs Nalder and Collyer. It had frontages on Market Street, Streeter's Hill and Middle Row: ibid., p.86. It is well illustrated, ibid., opposite p.37. Pelton made a similar reference to the King's Head, on the corner of King Street: ibid., p.35. That building is illustrated, ibid., opposite p.44. One landlady there was John Ruskin's maternal grandmother: ibid., p.35. Ruskin used to visit his aunt and uncle, who had a baker's shop in Market Street: Croydon, The Official Guide, 10th edn, p.51; Ruskin, op. cit., pp.109-110.
grocer's shop backed on to the area. He wrote that many of the best businesses in Croydon had been adequately located in the streets and alleys of Middle Row until the coming of the railways but that the narrowness and slope of the streets had ultimately proved unsuitable for the businesses to expand and so, one by one, the traders had moved elsewhere. ¹

There can be no doubt then that the Market area had become decayed. The narrowness and steepness of the streets, the age of the property, the smallness of each plot of ground, the changing pattern of retail trading, the effects of the railway, the constant and rapid growth of Croydon, all contributed to its decline. Precisely when this decline began, it is impossible to say; but it seems to have gone on throughout the nineteenth century. It was noted by a substantial number of observers, some of whose comments are quoted in this dissertation; yet the precise degree and speed of deterioration are very difficult to assess. The descriptions of the houses and the inhabitants are often emotive; and numerous of the commentators had personal axes to grind. Some people wished to stress the drunkenness, others the improvement stemming from philanthropy; some were concerned with estate values; and

¹ Pelton, Memorials, p.29; Pelton, Relics, pp.ix,3.
one lodging-house keeper make a xenophobic attack on the occupants of another lodging-house because they were Italians. The picture is confused further by allied questions such as the possible widening of the High Street, which was vigorously opposed by shopkeepers in North End and George Street; or by the removal elsewhere of the Town Hall, which was equally vigorously opposed by shopkeepers in the High Street. Those who demanded wholesale clearance of the area on the grounds of the appallingly insanitary state of the houses found that some of their most ardent supporters for demolition, happening to be members of the Local Board of Health's Sanitary Committee, were claiming that although for other reasons the locality should certainly be redeveloped, the state of health there (thanks to the efficiency of the Board) was quite exceptionally good.

Only in one limited way can the condition of the area, and its deterioration, be measured: that is, by a careful examination and comparison of the 1851 and 1861 census returns; though even those records tell us nothing, except by implication, about the drains, or the drunks, or the despair. They do show however that social decline in the inner part of the area was already under way before 1851, and that it was in full swing during the next decade. Despite the well-known limitations of the returns, they are of unique value in the actual and the comparative picture that they give of the area in 1851 and 1861.
3. The Market Area in 1851 and 1861

One thing that is soon apparent from a study of the 1851 and 1861 census returns is that the economic and physical deterioration of the Market area did not extend outwards to the roads that constituted its boundaries: High Street, Surrey Street and Crown Hill. It is true that those roads were very narrow and congested and that the properties there were mainly small ones; but it is also a fact that they continued in use as shops even after 1861, and on through the century, and attracted a considerable part of their clientele from other parts of the town.

In 1851, the shopkeepers of the High Street comprised four grocers, three china dealers, two butchers, two chemists, a clothier, draper, confectioner, baker, tobacconist, boot and shoe maker, dyer and finisher, hairdresser, bookseller, corn dealer, corn merchant, oilman, cabinet maker, and an eating house keeper; the postmaster had his office there, and the remaining building was the Horse Shoe Inn.¹

In Surrey Street, there were three butchers, three shoemakers, two tailors, dealers in furniture, china and general goods, a leather cutter, glover, tin plate worker, basket maker, and grocer. There was also the Britannia

¹. Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4c, 46-73. In the roads where the properties on only one side were affected by the later redevelopment (i.e., the roads forming the outside bounds of the triangle), premises on the other side have not been considered.
Inn, and the now recently-demolished Royal Oak.¹

The Crown Hill frontage was the site of a further three tailors' shops and of the premises of a straw plait dealer.² Bell Hill, just inside the Market area, was occupied by three butchers, a baker, fruiterer, tallow chandler, presser and a journeyman stonemason.³

When however one examines the 1851 returns for Market Street, one notices a difference. The baker's shop, kept earlier by Ruskin's aunt, was still there.⁴ There was also a grocer, pastry cook, clothier, hatter, whitesmith, and general dealer. But other tenants, such as a charwoman, coachman, Chelsea out-pensioner, gravel digger, and gardener were not directly involved in the local trade and commerce; and, more ominously, two buildings, the Prince of Wales beershop and the Rose beershop, were occupied by thirty casual lodgers, most of them labourers.⁵

In King Street, the situation was similar. Shop properties there were occupied by a pawnbroker, a baker, a cheesemonger, two hairdressers, a basket maker, tinman, and

¹. Public Record Office, H.O.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4c, 74-90.
². Ibid., 94-97.
³. Ibid., 109-115.
⁴. See p.117n, supra.
⁵. Public Record Office, H.O.107, Enumeration District 4c, 116-130. For the Prince of Wales, see p.117n, supra.
blacksmith; but there was also a widowed mangle woman, a rail porter, carman, and painter. People of similar occupation lived in Nichols Court, which led off King Street. Elsewhere in the same road, there were two eating houses, one of them with five casual lodgers, and there was also the King's Head which gave shelter to a further twelve itinerants.¹

But it was in Middle Row and its adjacent alleys and courts that the transition from trade to working-class poverty, and from shop to casual lodging house, had gone farthest by 1831. Of the 97 men of employable age in Middle Row and its courts on the night of the census, 54 were labourers; of the 206 inhabitants, 19 were Irish. There was a confectioner, a fishmonger, a fruiterer, and a grocer-beer seller; but the courts were occupied mainly by laundresses, charwomen, hawkers and paupers, and the rest of the locality was given over to further lodging houses. Of these, the most notable were one kept by an Irishman, Timothy Nolan, whose inmates were mainly fellow countrymen, one whose landlord was an Italian travelling musician, and another that housed a total of thirty people.²

The state to which at least the worst part of the

¹. Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4c, 131-150. The King's Head is referred to at p.117n, supra.
². Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4c, 151-179.
area had deteriorated by this time, can be seen elsewhere, in a government report of 1849. Eleven houses shared one broken-down privy and had no water supply, whilst the nearby lodging houses had "disgusting wretchedness of filth, open dunghills and cesspools, dilapidated privies, with water deficient in quantity and bad in quality." More specifically, an inspection of Hansom’s (i.e., Huson's) Court revealed, in one of the eight houses, a man with his wife and seven children occupying two rooms, the parents with a boy 3½ years old sleeping in one, the remainder of the family consisting of four sons, the eldest 27 years of age, the youngest 10, with two girls, 25 and 15 years old, sleeping in the second room. In another case, a man and four children, all of whom had had fever, were found in one small room. In a third instance, a man, wife, and five children occupied two rooms each measuring 8 feet 6 inches by 9 feet, the level of the floor being below that of the ground, with three filthy privies within about 18 feet of the door and windows.²

Tables 6 to 10 provide a statistical analysis, for 1851 and 1861, of the "twilight zone", that is the interior

2. Ibid., p.13.
of the Market area, comprising Bell Hill, King Street, Market Street and Middle Row. The first noticeable point is that in this decade the number of people living in those four streets increased from 449 to 590, even though there was a decrease in the number of occupied properties. Further, that although the increased crowding was common to all the streets, it was proportionately greater in the two which already had the greater population density; that is Market Street and Middle Row. In both those streets there were on average more than eleven people to a house.

The greatly increased overcrowding was due almost entirely to a proliferation of lodging houses. Bell Hill, which had none in 1851, had three very small ones by 1861; King Street's five had increased to eleven, though these again were individually small. By contrast, although Market Street and Middle Row had not seen a remarkable increase in the number of lodging houses, the already substantial number of inmates in each one had increased startlingly, so that by 1861 each lodging house in those two streets provided accommodation, on average, for between 22 and 26 wayfarers each night. Thus in one decade the number of lodging houses had increased from under a quarter to nearly one half of the available property; whilst the

1. For Tables 6 to 10, see pp. 432-437, infra. Oak Alley and Streeter's Hill had no separate properties on their frontages.

2. Table 7, p. 435, infra.
lodger population, already more than a quarter of the total for the four streets in 1851, was more than a half of the total ten years later.¹

Who were these lodgers? The census returns do not indicate whether they were resident in the area for any length of time or were merely passing vagrants; but other evidence that will be quoted later suggests that there was a remarkably high daily turn-over of lodging-house inmates.² They were moreover of all ages: indeed in 1861, nineteen of them were infants; and children up to the age of fifteen constituted no less than 15 per cent. of the total, a higher proportion than there were of people over fifty. In fact, only 9 per cent. in 1851 and 12 per cent. in 1861 were over that age, though it is not clear whether this was because the older people stayed away from Croydon, or became established more permanently somewhere, perhaps in the workhouse; or whether there was a tendency for their premature death, brought about by evil living conditions. A typical lodger group appears to have comprised husband, and legal or common law wife, with one or more young children; about half the lodgers were unmarried but this figure diminishes to roughly one-third if one excludes those too young to marry.³ Also noticeable is a substantial increase

¹ Table 8, p.434, infra.
² See, for example, p.184, infra.
³ Table 9, pp.435-436, infra.
in the percentage of female lodgers by 1861. This, and other evidence quoted elsewhere, suggests that the occupational pattern was changing from a preponderance of unemployed craftsmen and unskilled labourers (55 per cent. in 1851; only 34 per cent. in 1861), to a very mixed occupational pattern with a greatly increased proportion of women (25 per cent. in 1851; 39 per cent. in 1861) including field workers, hawkers and, from other evidence quoted elsewhere, prostitutes.¹ No prostitutes are specifically named in the returns; but contemporary police court cases show that a number of the women listed as having other occupations were plying that trade, either regularly or spasmodically. As an area degenerated so probably the divergence between stated and real occupation became greater.

Despite the evidence that these people were drifting homelessly, between 13 per cent. and 15 per cent. of the lodgers were natives of the town, and about half the total were born within thirty miles of the town. A further 12 per cent. of the lodgers in 1851 were, it is true, Irish,

¹ For example see pp.170-173, infra. Of one of the field workers, at a much later date, Argus Letters to the Croydon Advertiser said, "A garden woman.....was before the Borough Magistrates on Monday for being drunk. I am glad they let her off. All I wonder is that these kinds of women are ever sober, and I don't suppose they would be if they had money. They have no home, and no anything that makes life enjoyable. Who should expect they could keep sober for long together? Drinking is their only pleasure", Croydon Advertiser, 14 Aug., 1886, p.5.
but even this figure had fallen to 9 per cent. ten years later. Irish heads of household had, in the same period, increased from two to five, all in Middle Row.

A final Table attempts to show the degree of personal and family mobility. It may be inferred from it that there was quite considerable movement of population into and out of the area, particularly of lodgers; but comparison is difficult with other similar-sized localities that may not themselves be typical. To make a comparison with the town as a whole would be a monumental task without the aid of a computer.

4. The Lodging Houses

(a) Their Condition and Control

The outstanding feature of the inner part of the Market area was then, by 1861, its large number of common lodging houses. That these were partly the cause and partly the result of the decaying physical environment there can be no doubt.

Two problems were water supply and drainage. In 1831 a new public pump had been provided in Middle Row by the Improvement Commissioners at a cost of £16, the work being done by a plumber named Mann. A few days later a

1. Table 10, p.437, infra.

2. CPL, Croydon Improvement Act, Commissioners' Minute Book, 1829, 18 Apr., 1831. It stood at the junction of Market Street and Middle Row: J. Corbet Anderson, A Descriptive and Historical Guide to Croydon, Surrey, 1887, p.114.
Commissioner reported that he had conferred with Mann over the well in Middle Row and they were of the opinion that it ought to be domed, which would cost about £1 or £2. This was agreed. Only seven years later the Commissioners received a complaint about the "inefficient state" of the pump, and it was authorised that it be repaired.

After that date, the picture is confused. In 1852 the Local Board of Health's surveyor reported that six houses in Market Street, and the houses in Huson's Court, were without house drains and sufficient water closets; and that they had cesspools. Further they were without a proper supply of water, though this could be provided at a rate not exceeding 2d. per week each. Likewise, it was stated that the Robinson Crusoe beerhouse was without a satisfactory water supply, even though it had only just been built; and also that the drainage at 12, 13 and 14, King Street was very bad.

On the other hand, the house to house enquiry following on the fever epidemic of the winter of 1852-1853 suggests that the recently completed works of the new Local

1. CPL, Croydon Improvement Act, Commissioners' Minute Book, 1829, 25 May (almost certainly should be April), 1831.
2. Ibid., 29 Aug., 1838.
Board of Health had effected a great improvement. Comment was offered at one house in Middle Row, for instance, where there had been a scarlatina victim, "no smells at all- great smells from privies before but not now....very good work indeed....I think disease in the air." In King Street, too, considerable betterment was recorded. At one house, for example, where there had been no outbreak of fever, the tenant reported, "no obstruction or smells- smells from privy very bad previously- good water- well worth the rates." The only complaint there, as with several houses in the street, was about the parish drain which was "often stopped up" and "when full has a strong smell." Of another nearby household it was said, "No obstruction- no smells- good water- have no fault to find with anything- think stoppages when existing arise from carelessness from throwing down dust, rags, etc. Likes the works much- notwithstanding the rate. Smells dreadful before." The comments of a neighbour are set down as, "No obstruction- no smell- beautiful water- very wicked to say it is the water that has caused the fever. Well worth the rate. Don't grudge the money. Hope to gracious they won't take it away. Very bad smells before the works." One reporter made the general comment, "More has been said about the fever at Croydon than should have been. If anyone has a cold it
is the fever directly."

It might be thought from these quotations that conditions in the area had been bad up to 1852 but that they were, by the end of that year, improving dramatically as a result of the undoubted efforts of the new Local Board. But subsequent information about the inner part of the Market area does make one wonder whether the Report just quoted was not something of a whitewashing exercise; this is a possibility that one should perhaps bear in mind with all official documents of this kind.

In any event, any improvements cannot have been effective for long if there often arose the kind of complaint made in a further Report of 1853, when it was said that, at leasehold property in Middle Row, a stoppage was found in the main drain, caused by an old shirt. The area certainly continued to give the Local Board of Health anxiety. In May 1860, Dr Carpenter and another member, Benjamin Bean, made a report to the Board on the insanitary condition of Middle Row. Two years later, a leading

1. CPL, Return of Deaths from Fever in Croydon from 7 Nov. 1852 to 2 March 1853, with Results of Inquiries as to Causes in each Case and the General Prevalence of Disease

2. CPL, Report on an Inquiry Ordered by the Secretary of State, Relative to the Presence of Disease at Croydon, 1853, p.57.

article in a local newspaper described Middle Row as, "a small edition of the lowest part of Whitechapel; or, to speak more correctly, a cross between Rosemary Lane and Seven Dials."¹

The inhabitants did little to co-operate in any attempted improvements. The Inspector of Nuisances was reported as having told the Board in 1864 that "when the dustcart went round, many of the residents of Middle Row did not think proper to have their house refuse removed. Consequently they afterwards watched their opportunity, and threw it into the street." He said he had been unable to detect the offenders; and was instructed to employ a person to watch, "and the first person detected would be summoned and made an example of."²

Conditions were not helped by the unfulfilled need for a public urinal. Complaint was made, in 1865, of the state of a passage leading from Crown Hill to Middle Row. One member of the Local Board said that it was always a nuisance and would continue to be so while a beershop stood at the opposite corner, whilst another complained that he lived opposite and found it a great nuisance since he was obliged to draw down the blinds in his house to avoid the

2. CPL, f570(CRO), Croydon Local Board of Health Report, 1863-1866, 10 May, 1864.
frequent scenes of indecency.¹

Worse insanitary conditions were described ten years later, when the Local Board of Health discussed a proposal that the roads and passages between High Street and Surrey Street should be repaired with something less pervious than wall gravel. Dr Carpenter said that "if any members of the Board would visit the courts and alleys...... they would find a deal of ordure lying about, and it was impossible to scavenge the places properly while gravel was laid down.....Although the courts were scavenged every day, immediately after the scavenging cart had left they became choked with ordure."²

Conditions were made worse by the fact that some of the houses were derelict. For instance, the Local Board heard in 1666 of a dilapidated house in Middle Row which was described as a receptacle for filth of every description. One member said he could compare it to nothing less than a large open cesspool, of the worst kind, in the most crowded part of the town. It was resolved that the owners should be ordered to board up the front of the house, an act which, it was said, "would be the most effectual remedy."³

---

¹. Ibid., 11 Apr., 1865; 2 May, 1865.
². Croydon Advertiser, 30 Jan., 1875, p.3.
³. CPL, f570 (CRO), Croydon Local Board of Health Report, 1865-1866, 8 May, 1866.
But whatever individuals might say, one can
detect a distinct air of complacency in official comments
about the area. This is to be seen especially in a
report of the Poor Dwellings Committee presented in 1884.
It said:

"There are no unhealthy areas in Croydon. Sir
Richard Cross's Acts, 1875, 1879, and 1882, providing for
the compulsory purchase and destruction of such areas.....
are....inapplicable.
'The neighbourhood of Middle Row.....perhaps
affords the nearest approach to an exception from
this conclusion.....but the most dilapidated tenements
there having been shut up, unoccupied, and many of the
others used as common lodging houses which are well looked
after and described by the police as a credit to the town,
comparatively little is left of which the Sanitary
Authorities are entitled to complain.
'A conspicuous instance of the operation of private
enterprise in effecting improvements by.....closing
dilapidated poor dwellings was that of four tenements in
Middle Row, in front of Nelson Square, closed by the
landlord in 1880, and have changed hands in prospect of
further improvements." (1)

For such a committee in the 1880's to claim of any
town that it possessed no unhealthy areas, and that Cross's
Acts were nowhere applicable, must have represented an
extreme of optimism or of folly. When one comes to examine
the lengthy process by which the Croydon Market area was
finally cleared and the tangled and conflicting interests
that were involved in that process, one sees clearly that no
description of the area, however condemnatory or laudatory,
however melodramatic or complacent, can be taken at its face

1. CPL, Report of the Poor Dwellings Committee, Presented to
Croydon Town Council at its meeting, 22 Sept., 1884, pp. 9,
10,19.
An examination of the descriptions of the individual lodging houses gives little support for the praise offered by P.Gs. Smith and McSweeny in the just-quoted report, in which they are recorded as saying, "The common lodging houses here are well kept....the worst have been closed, and the remainder generally done up."¹ When one reads, below, evidence that conflicts startlingly with those comments, one wonders why the police constables, who made highly condemnatory remarks of other parts of the town, chose to praise Middle Row.² Were they on the defensive because of criticisms that the police were insufficiently vigilant in that part of the town? In that case surely they would have tended to exaggerate, rather than play down, the evil insanitary conditions for which they could not, anyway, be held responsible and the existence of which would strengthen any argument they might have about the difficulties of adequate police supervision of the area? It is much more likely, that the evidence was put into their mouths by a committee whose members, perhaps through civic pride, perhaps to diminish criticism of a new (and in the minds of many, extravagant) Corporation, perhaps because they personally and individually hoped to benefit from "the operation of private enterprise in effecting

¹ Ibid., p.41
² See for instance, Cox, op. cit., p.44n.
improvements," wanted to minimise growing public concern about conditions in the area. A Committee at that date that could state dogmatically, "there are no unhealthy areas in Croydon," would not find it difficult to extract evidence from two conscientious and probably rather overawed and complaisant, policemen to prove the contention.

It is true however that the lodging houses were subject to at least some degree of control and inspection. From 1848, the Public Health Act required the Local Board of Health to

"cause a register to be kept in which shall be entered the name of every person applying to register a common lodging house kept by him, the situation of every such house, and also from time to time to make byelaws for fixing the number of lodgers who may be received into each house so registered, for promoting cleanliness and ventilation therein and with respect to the inspection thereof, etc. Any person keeping a common lodging house without having registered the same, and refusing to admit therein between the hours of eleven in the forenoon and four in the afternoon any person authorised by the Local Board of Health is for every such offence liable to a fine of forty shillings."

These provisions were re-enacted and extended by the Common Lodging Houses Acts, 1851 and 1853, the statutory conditions remaining in many respects identical throughout the period under consideration. A Common Lodging House was defined, in the Public Health Act, 1936, as "a house..... provided for the purpose of accommodating by night poor persons, not being members of the same family, who resort thereto and are allowed to occupy one common room for the
The purpose of sleeping or eating.\textsuperscript{1}

At its very first meeting, in 1849, the newly-constituted Local Board of Health decided that a notice should be penned by the Chairman and printed and posted throughout the parish to all owners and occupiers of lodging houses warning them that the establishments must be registered and that the Board would meet shortly to receive applications.\textsuperscript{2} Later, in the 1870's, the Local Board found it necessary to reinforce its administration of the lodging houses, and drew up various regulations for their management, and these were sanctioned by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. E. Mitchell, the Sanitary Inspector, was at the same time appointed to carry out the various duties under the Common Lodging Houses Acts.\textsuperscript{3} A most valuable list of what these comprised was drawn up shortly afterwards. Among many other tasks, he had to visit eighteen common lodging houses weekly or twice per week.\textsuperscript{4}

But registration and inspection did not result in anything approaching perfection in the conduct of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{2} CPL, Local Board of Health, Croydon, Minutes, vol.1, 1849-1852, 3 Sept.,1849.
\item \textsuperscript{3} CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1870-1878: 28 Feb.,1873; 30 May,1875.
\item \textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 18 Mar.,1875.
\end{itemize}
lodging houses in, for instance, the matter of sanitation. For example, at a meeting of the Board in 1875, Dr Carpenter described a visit he had made to a Middle Row lodging house after a complaint had been made that filth had been thrown from one of the windows into the yard of the house next door. There followed a discussion on the question of whether the Board were sufficiently active in taking proceedings against lodging house keepers who failed to observe the bye-laws and during it Dr Carpenter pointed out that Mitchell, the Sanitary Inspector, had so many duties that he was only able to make the most cursory examination of the premises.¹

A very detailed description of the houses was written by 'Diogenes', a contributor to the Croydon Advertiser, in 1888.² His article bore the title, 'A Night in Middle Row', though he claimed that he had in fact spent from 11.30 a.m. on a Saturday until the Sunday night there, except for an interval for refreshment at midday on Sunday.

He referred to the utterly inadequate accommodation provided and said it was an open secret that one owner was making £7 per night.³ Yet only Christmas Day and Boxing Day were free, whereas it was the general rule in

---

¹ Croydon Advertiser, 30 Jan., 1875, p.3. The offenders were Huggett and Bucknell, of whom more is said, infra, pp.155-158, 149-151, respectively.
² Croydon Advertiser, 30 Jun., 1888, p.8.
³ This must have referred to Charles Day, see pp.158-165, infra.
London for seven nights' lodgings to be provided for the cost of six all the year round. The usual daily charge, he said, was 4d. which besides providing shelter for the night, gave access to a filthy stone-floored kitchen, overcrowded and often underground and badly ventilated. The charge also gave the use of fire and teapot. The kitchen in which 'Diogenes' found himself was capable of accommodating a dozen people; but there were forty in it, at least half of whom were roasting, boiling or baking at the fire or on a little gas stove. Late at night, he and his fellow inmates were turned out of the kitchen and he made his way to bed where his sleep was disturbed by two drunken soldiers who blundered in, in search of a bed, waking in the process an old lady, though it was not clear to 'Diogenes' why she was sleeping in the men's part of the house.

Later in the article, he condemned the fact that young and old, saints and sinners, were all herded together indiscriminately. The influence that people of bad character might have on other lodgers was referred to in a court case in 1881 when a lad named Alfred Adams and Henry Bettle, a tailor, of Bennett's lodging house, were charged with stealing horsehair from an outhouse. Hearing that Adams had not long been released from a reformatory where he had spent five years, the chairman of the bench commented that a number of boys of that sort were staying at the house; and a police inspector said he believed there were
"'swarms' of these kind of characters" in Middle Row. 1

When, the following week, another inmate of the same house was brought up on remand for stealing firewood and for assault, Mrs Bennett was told by Edridge, the presiding magistrate, that it was unfortunate that she kept a house where such young men were allowed to congregate. 2

A similar case was made against the lodging houses only one month later when Eliza Cuthbert, "a woman of ill-fame at Day's lodging house", was given seven days' hard labour for indecent conduct. The chairman of the Bench, again Edridge, who was never averse to using his position to make public pronouncements, remarked "that of course unfortunate persons like the prisoner must have lodgings the same as other people but it was a pity that they congregated together especially in common lodging houses. A number of people were travelling about the country, many of them respectable though poor, and it was very undesirable they should be associated in these lodging houses with disreputable persons." 3

Reverting to the article by 'Diogenes', he concluded it as follows: "Common closets are neither desirable nor should they be tolerated in the houses. The

2. Ibid., 5 Nov., 1881, p.7.
The stench permeating the immediate vicinity of such dens of infamy is too well known to need description. Besides this the drainage of Middle Row is not of the best kind, neither is the supply of water sufficient for the proper flushing of the drains.¹

Another description of the interior of one of the lodging houses comes unexpectedly from Alderman Joshua Allder, the prosperous linen-draper. He told the town Council on one occasion how he discovered a poor woman, evidently very ill, pleading with a cabman to take her home, which he was refusing to do as she had no money. Allder had, therefore, paid the fare, "and the next day called with my wife in Middle Row to see how she was. After some difficulty I found her.... It was a large room, with at least twenty or thirty people in it. Some were drinking, some were cooking their evening meal, others were cursing and swearing. Another lot were playing cards, and the poor creature was too evidently dying in one corner of the room, with no one but her little daughter to do anything for her.... I did the best I could at the time, but on calling the next day I found she had died in the night."²

The worst houses of all, certainly in terms of standards of sanitation, were those of Huson, or Nelson,

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid., 22 Oct., 1887, p.2.
Square. These had belonged at the beginning of the century to Deborah Huson, who also owned the Lord Nelson beerhouse in Market Street. Reference has already been made to their condition in 1849 and 1852. Complaints about the state of the closets there were reiterated in 1875; and in 1878. In the latter year it was the Board of Guardians who drew the attention of the Local Board of Health to the condition of the houses in the court, and the Medical Officer formally reported the existence of a nuisance in all seven of the occupied houses. Mitchell, the Sanitary Inspector, served notice on the lessee Mrs Sarah Huggett, a name that features prominently in the annals of the area, and because of her non-compliance she was summoned to appear in the magistrates' court.

The case was heard on 31 May, 1879, the Sanitary Inspector in his evidence stating that the property was in a very dilapidated condition, the stairs being old and the windows small. There was defective closet accommodation, insufficient ventilation and other defects. The pavement of the yard was so old that water remained there in puddles and became stagnant. In fact the place was altogether unfit

1. HWS, 885, 28 Jun., 1866.
2. See pp. 123, 128, supra.
3. CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1870-1878: 21 Jan., 1875.
4. Ibid., 7 Nov., 1878.
for human habitation.

Mrs Huggett, in evidence, said that the Board required so much done to the premises that they might just as well shut up the square, to which the chairman, Edridge, said, "perhaps it would be as well if that course were adopted." She asserted that she was "constantly receiving notices from the Board;" and that she had complied with them with the exception of building water closets and placing fresh windows in the houses, and this she could not do. "Although the places were old, they were thoroughly clean. In fact she had had them whitewashed quite recently."

Dr Philpot, the Medical Officer of Health, described the cottages as being "generally in a dilapidated condition. Throughout there was an absence of ventilation. There were no windows or doors at the back of the houses, the only entrance being in the front facing the square."

Mrs Huggett then expressed her regret that Dr Philpot or Mitchell had not called on her as she "would have been glad to accompany them.....There were no cleaner houses in Croydon than her's (sic) were, and.....they were more fit to live in than some recently erected. There had never been a case of serious illness in her houses." Dr Philpot agreed this was true but Edridge, from the Bench, said, "that is no reason why there should not be."

The other two magistrates then made an inspection of the premises and on their return one of them, a Dr Hetley, said he could quite bear out all that Dr Philpot had
There was, he said, no flooring to the lower rooms of the houses, but only an admixture of mud and filth. The places were not fit for human habitation, and the best thing that could be done with them would be to burn them down. He was certain that Mrs Huggett, do what she might with a view to keeping the houses clean, would be unable to make them decently habitable.

The clerk of the court then read a clause in the Act under which the proceedings had been taken, from which it appeared that the magistrates had power to order the premises to be pulled down if they were not repaired within a reasonable time.

Edridge, in the Chair, then expressed his satisfaction that the Board of Health had shown their determination to deal with such places, and his surprise that they had not been dealt with before. The houses would be closed within fourteen days until properly repaired, and the defendant would have to pay £4 costs. Mrs Huggett was allowed a fortnight to pay. She apparently did not rehabilitate the premises and subsequently the property together with four houses in Middle Row, was offered for sale, being described as "eligible for the erection of a large pile of warehouses or trade premises." It was

1. *Croydon Advertiser*, 7 Jun., 1879, p.2; CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1878-1885: 5 Jun., 1879.

2. HWS, 902, 17 May, 1883.
conveyed to John Mann Taylor, of Hampstead. But it continued untenanted and derelict until the whole area was finally cleared in 1892. Taylor's motive in purchasing is not clear unless he saw it as a speculation that might yield a good dividend at the time of re-development.

If one examines the local directories for the early 1890's, one notices that the names of the householders in Middle Row included Francesco De Lefiera, John Luigi, Luigi Cozzi, and Agostino Carraro. One expects to find Irish people living in the area, but it is surprising to discover what are obviously Italian names. The reason is interesting; and an article published in a local newspaper in 1888 gives considerable detail of the activities of what may well be a little-known group of immigrants. It was titled, 'Italian Organ Grinders and How They Live' and was by the keeper of one of the common lodging houses in Middle Row.

It explained that nearly all the "pianos and organs" being played in Croydon and elsewhere, were manufactured in London by large Italian firms, some of which let out as many as one hundred at a time. The instruments

1. Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes.
2. Pelton, Relics, p.88; Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim; HSSC, 10 Oct., 1892.
3. Presumably Steer, Duncan, or Woodcock, since Charles Day was illiterate; see p.165, infra. Or, of course, Day may have related it to a reporter. Such Italians were not new to the area: see p.122, supra; p.150, infra.
were hired by other Italians at between 7s. 6d. and 10s. per
week, the rent generally being taken to London monthly on a
Sunday. About every six months the instruments were
changed for others that had "the popular new tunes" and, if
in need of repair, "an intelligent Italian" came from
London, usually on a Sunday so that the hirer lost no
working time. The person renting the instrument had, in
such an event, to provide the other's board.

The writer went on to describe the frugality of
the organ grinders' meals; and listed their overheads but
unfortunately the arithmetic is faulty. It is obvious
though that these Italians earned far more than they spent
and the article cited the case of one married couple who had
saved over £60 in two years and also had a good box of
clothing in their possession as well. Many, it seems, put
their surplus cash in the Post Office Savings Bank until
they had saved sufficient to send it back to Italy, or until
they themselves returned home, comparatively rich men.

The article continued by stating that several
lodging houses in Middle Row were kept by Italians and that
the inmates were largely organ grinders and ice-cream
sellers. It concluded by describing them as "spongers" who
were taking a living from poor crippled Englishmen and then
removing their savings from the country.1

was usually extremely liberal in its views.
(b) **The Keepers**

Table 11 shows how, during the 1870’s and 1880’s, the number of lodging houses increased considerably.\(^1\) The figure would perhaps have been greater in the later years if several of the Middle Row premises had not been closed down, an event followed by a substantial increase in the number of common lodging houses in the adjoining King Street; an example of the well-known result of Victorian slum clearance that those dispossessed merely created new slums in nearby premises.

The names are known of seventeen of the lodging house keepers, names that appear frequently in the records of the sanitary authorities and also in the newspaper accounts of magistrates’ court proceedings. It is clear that two of the people, William Huggett and Charles Day, gradually achieved a virtual monopoly of the houses in at least part of the area; the first-named in the 1870’s and the second in the last ten years or so of the properties’ existence.\(^2\)

Another name that appears, on a more modest scale, throughout much of the second half of the century is that of Porter. Thomas Porter, a native of Hoxton, Middlesex, kept the Prince of Wales beershop and lodging house, in Market Street, in the 1850’s and ’60’s and, on his death, his widow

---

1. See p.438, infra.
2. See pp.154-165, infra.
Rosetta, carried on. They had presumably moved into Market Street just before the 1851 census, for their daughter, Sarah Ann, then aged one, had been born at Locks Bottom, Kent.\(^1\) As a widow, Rosetta took over two additional properties, 9 and 10, Middle Row, and later all three establishments were looked after by Miss S. Porter, presumably either Sarah Ann or her younger sister, Selina. A Henry Porter, probably their brother, had additional lodging houses in Market Street.\(^2\)

The Prince of Wales beer shop was run by the family for nearly forty years. It appears to have given shelter mainly to labourers and may well have been better-conducted than some of the other houses; certainly no record has been found, in a fairly extensive search, of any member of the family or of any inhabitants of the Porter dwellings appearing before the magistrates.

The house conducted in King Street, by Henry and then Daniel Bennett, seems also to have been of a standard that satisfied the Local Board. It was inspected, for instance, by Dr Coles, the chairman of the Sanitary Committee, in 1873 and he reported it to be in a

---

1. Public Record Office, H.0.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4c, 125; Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim.

2. This information and much that follows in this section is from Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, passim; Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.
satisfactory state as to cleanliness and general arrangements; the Committee thereupon recommending that it be allowed to take eighteen lodgers. Likewise when, in 1875, Charles Bennett, presumably a relative, took over the Cock beerhouse in Market Street in respect of which previously J. Williams had been permitted twelve single and five double beds, the Sanitary Inspector reported the place to be well adapted with only one room needing additional ventilation. There was washing accommodation with fixed basins and a proper W.C. The largest room was 18 feet by 15 feet by 6 feet 2 inches, that is 1,665 cubic feet, and was licensed for five lodgers; the smallest, 9 feet by 5 feet 6 inches, 395 cubic feet, being licensed for one.

Only one instance has been found, in the local newspapers, of a serious misdemeanour taking place in a Bennett lodging house, though there is evidence of juvenile delinquents congregating there. Although it has only been possible to examine a random sample of such cases, some lodging house keepers by contrast had their premises

1. CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1870-1878: 19 Sept., 1873; 3 Oct., 1873.
2. Ibid., 25 Jul., 1873; 20 Mar., 1874.
3. Ibid., 4 Mar., 1875; 8 Jul., 1875.
4. See pp. 138-139, supra.
mentioned very frequently in this context.¹ The one instance noted at Bennett’s was when John Andrews was charged with assaulting his wife by throwing a knife at her and so cutting her forehead. She had been lodging at Bennett’s for about four months, but her husband, who was drunk at the time of the offence, was a deputy at one of Day’s lodging houses. Charles Day junior, gave him a good character for sobriety and trustworthiness, but he was sent to prison for a month with hard labour.²

A lodging house keeper who appears to have been less co-operative with the authorities was Daniel Bucknell. He was a native of Stepney, Middlesex, and in 1851, when twenty-four years of age, he was keeping the Cricketers, Stroud Green Lane.³ The following year he took over Robert Shepherd’s lodging house at 11, Middle Row, at which time it was known as the Home Brewery beershop. His eldest child,

1. A complete search was made of all magistrates’ court cases reported in the Croydon Advertiser in 1861 and 1871; others discovered by chance in the course of other research have also been noted.

2. Croydon Advertiser, 4 Jun., 1887, p.2. Charles Day, junior, was not, perhaps, a good judge of character, for at the very same court, at a time when he himself was lodging at Bennett’s, he was charged with being drunk and disorderly. He had gone to his father’s house and so injured him that he was unable to leave his house for some weeks, and had also become very violent when taken into custody. He refused to pay the fines imposed and was removed by the police, Croydon Advertiser, 4 Jun., 1887, p.2.

3. Public Record Office, H.O.107, 1601, Enumeration District 40, 22. Stroud Green Lane is now Shirley Road; the Cricketers, rebuilt, is still there.
Daniel Charles, was born about a year later, at about which period the family moved next door to no.12, a shop just vacated by a clothes dealer. There Bucknell sold marine stores.

By 1858 he was occupying both premises and, at the time of the 1861 census, he had twenty-eight lodgers and, besides, gave shelter to his wife, four young sons, and his in-laws. Both his wife and his father-in-law, who was a silk trimming manufacturer, had been born in a parish in Middlesex; all but two of his lodgers were males, and they included two Italian travelling organists.¹

In 1875 Bucknell was in trouble for, among other offences, failing to display at both 11 and 12, Middle Row a ticket supplied by the Local Board of Health setting out the regulations relating to lodging houses. He was fined a total of £5 8s., with a fortnight to pay, the alternative being seven days' imprisonment.² A further outcome was that the Local Board directed the Medical Officer of Health and the Sanitary Inspector to report on "the various sanitary requirements necessary" at Bucknell's houses, and to make a more general inspection of the common lodging houses in the district.³ They recommended detailed

---

¹ See pp.144-145, supra.

² Croydon Advertiser, 6 Feb., 1875, p.3.

³ GPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1870-1873; 2 Feb., 1875.
improvements to the ventilation and water closets, and in
respect of no.11 Bucknell was "to remove the pony from the
premises and to discontinue the use of the basement as a
stable."\(^1\) However, he did not pay his fines and closed
down the premises; the Sanitary Committee recommending that
the houses should be at once removed from the register, and
instructing the Medical Officer to ensure that no subsequent
overcrowding took place there.\(^2\)

Another lodging house keeper was George Duncan,
whose application for a common lodging house licence for 5,
Market Street, was considered by the Local Board in 1877.
The accommodation and sanitary arrangements, and also
Duncan's character, being found satisfactory, the Sanitary
Committee recommended the licensing of five rooms there for
fourteen lodgers.\(^3\)

Five years later however the Sanitary Inspector
reported that Duncan had "altered the number of beds in the
rooms... He has also altered the cards by placing a number
over the original. No.1 room is required to receive five
persons, and it is altered to receive two, a partition
having been placed across it, and a part of the room taken
away. No.2 room should be \(\frac{1}{4}\) for \(\frac{3}{4}\) people\(\), and

1. Ibid., 18 Feb.,1875.
2. Ibid., 4 Mar.,1875; 18 Mar.,1875.
3. Ibid., 26 Apr.,1877; 10 May,1877. Duncan was described
   by the Rev. A.W. Jephson, in his autobiography, see
   p.184, infra.
has been altered to two. No.3 room should be two and has been altered to four. No.4 room should be two and has been altered to four.¹

"I asked Mr Duncan," continued the Sanitary Inspector's report, "why he had altered the cards and he said there had been a mistake in the first instance. He also stated that he could not find his certificate. On visiting the house this morning I found five beds in a room in the basement, and they all appeared as though they had been slept in; one bed at that time being occupied by a foreigner. The room is quite underground, and is not licensed."

The Committee recommended that legal proceedings be taken against Duncan for a breach of the Board's bye-laws.² He had to pay penalties and costs amounting to £5 3s. 6d.³ Subsequently, at his request, there was a readjustment of the number of beds he was allowed. As a result of this, on a stated scale of 500 cubic feet per lodger, he was allowed three lodgers in each of three rooms, two in a fourth, and two adults and a child under ten years

¹. Since the total legal accommodation on this reckoning was twelve and the alterations seem to have provided for the same number, it is not clear what gain Duncan was achieving except, perhaps, in the other part of the original no.1 room.

². CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1878-1885: 9 Feb.,1882.

³. Ibid., 22 Feb.,1882.
Duncan appears later, either knowingly or unwittingly, to have run a brothel at 4, Market Street. This came to light in a case which, according to a local paper, caused a great amount of excitement in the vicinity of the Town Hall, and "disclosed a wretched state of affairs which called loudly for a sweeping remedy such as the abolition of Middle Row and the dens which abound therein."^2

Ann Duncan, the landlord's daughter, was charged with wounding Elizabeth Clements, a lodger, by stabbing her in the head with a knife, the incident happening when Clements, who had been given notice to quit, went to the back door to get her boxes. One witness was a Mrs Margaret Hopkins who said she had assisted, at the instigation it would seem of Mrs Duncan, in bringing some men out of the prosecutrix's room, where they were "hid" under the bed.\(^3\) Evidence was also given by another woman, who had lived at the house about six months. She admitted she walked the streets, sharing a room with a female friend, both paying 1s. per night.

Edridge, the chairman of the magistrates, told

---

1. Ibid., 23 Mar., 1882. The minimum cubic footage per lodger had earlier been three hundred; ibid., 18 Feb., 1875.

2. Croydon Advertiser, 5 Nov., 1881, p. 5.

3. Having given evidence, Mrs Hopkins immediately went out and became drunk and incapable and was herself in the dock next morning.
George Duncan that the fact that the girls had been paying 14s. per week for a room indicated how the house was used. Duncan denied that he ever allowed immoral conduct in the house, and it would seem from the evidence that it had possibly gone on without his connivance.

Duncan tried, sometimes at least, to maintain good order on his premises. When in 1888 a woman named Jane White, of Middle Row, was charged with assaulting another woman, Duncan gave evidence that the complainant had lodged at his house for four weeks, and that when two young men lodgers "took liberties with her" he had given them notice to leave. The men, he said, had then got Jane White to pay the woman back.

The only other information concerning Duncan is to be found in the report of the inquest on the infant daughter of Maria Pottinger. The woman was co-habiting with Duncan, and the child was his. He said in evidence that the child had been sickly from birth and the night before it died he had given it some rum because it had the "gripes". When the child died he was at Harpenden Races and had received news of the fact by telegram.

It remains to consider two other lodging house keepers, Huggett and Day, the ones who, at different

2. Ibid., 19 May, 1888, p.7.
3. Ibid., 26 May, 1883, p.6.
periods, achieved a near monopoly in at least part of the area.

William Huggett was over forty when he first seems to have made a living in this way. He was a native of East Grinstead, born in 1809; his wife, Sarah, came from the same place. They may however have come to Croydon independently for, living with them in 1851, were two unmarried sons-in-law and a spinster daughter-in-law, meaning perhaps step-sons and -daughter, all of them born in Croydon. There were also three young children and an infant grand-daughter, probably belonging to an absent daughter of Huggett’s; all were native to the town. At this time he was a labourer, and had no lodgers.¹ In the following year he was a marine store dealer.²

However by 1861, he was a lodging house keeper and bricklayer and occupied four neighbouring premises in which he had, on the night of the census, no fewer than seventy-eight occupants.³ These formed a heterogeneous collection; labourers, travellers, garden women, hawkers, a journeyman sail maker, a miner, a pugilist, a journeyman bellows maker, two sailors, a pensioner from the 55th Regiment of Foot; and seven German musicians, including two women and a boy

¹. Public Record Office, H.O.107, 1601, Enumeration District 4c, 167.
². Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1853, p.98.
of twelve.

In the 1870's, probably because of a more rigid application of the bye-laws rather than because of any sudden deterioration in Huggett's standards, he was in constant conflict with the Local Board of Health. For instance in 1875, no fewer than fifteen summonses were issued against him at one time. He was living at that period at 3, Middle Row, a former fishmonger's shop which, after becoming a lodging house in the 1850's, had been in various hands before Huggett took it over in about 1868.

On the occasion of the 1875 summonses he had, firstly, failed to display the list of lodging house regulations; he was also summoned for failing to keep the seat, floor and walls of the W.Cs. clean, failing to wash and sweep the floors and wash the walls of certain rooms and of the stairs, and failing to keep blankets and rugs clean. The offences were said to have taken place at 4, 6, 7, and 8, Middle Row, the Sanitary Inspector reporting that the W.Cs. required thoroughly cleansing and lime-whiting; and Dr Philpot, the Medical Officer of Health, asserting that the houses were "in a decidedly unwholesome condition."

Mrs Huggett, who represented her husband, said that the lodgers tore down the regulations, that she changed the beds as often as she could but had not got a second set of blankets, and that as regards the W.Cs., everything that could be, was done. Periodically the premises were
cleansed, but the time had not arrived for doing so. He was fined 10s. on each of three cases, and 5s. on each of twelve, plus costs of £5 11s., making a total of £10 1s., with three weeks to pay, the alternative being one week's imprisonment for each case.¹

The Local Board's Sanitary Committee at once followed this up by investigating in greater detail two of the offending, and offensive, premises, nos 4 and 6, and also the house in which Huggett lived, i.e., no. 3. They recommended to the Board that in all three establishments Huggett should ventilate the staircases by means of an open grating, provide an open space two feet square over each room door "to ventilate into the passage", make it possible to open all the windows in each room, provide covered accommodation with fixed basins for washing, lay on a water supply and, in the case of nos 3 and 4, repave the yard.²

At about this time, Huggett moved to the Jully Bleachers beerhouse and lodging house, Union Street, in an impoverished part of the lower town, and he died there on

¹. Croydon Advertiser, 6 Feb., 1875, p. 3.
². CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1870-1878: 18 Feb., 1875.
4 July, 1876, of general paralysis. Sarah Huggett, the widow and, as has already been seen, the apparent manager of the family's affairs, then took over complete control. She was granted registration of the Jolly Bleachers lodging house in her name. Doubtless she also registered the similar premises in Middle Row.

Very soon she fell foul of the Local Board in respect of the condition of Nelson Square; and despite her aggressive assertion that there were no cleaner houses in Croydon, she was fined, and being unwilling or unable to put the properties into good repair they were closed and remained derelict and untenanted until the entire locality was redeveloped in the closing years of the century. Soon afterwards she also vacated the remainder of her Middle Row houses.

As she passed from the scene another more nearly complete monopoly of the common lodging houses in the Market area was developing, in the hands of Charles Day. He had

1. General Register Office, Somerset House, Certified Copy of an Entry of Death, DX 058672, 9 Nov., 1866. Letters of Administration were granted to his widow, his effects being "under £100 leaseholds", Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, Admon/Act, 14 Aug., 1876.

2. CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1870-1878: 18 Feb., 1875.

3. The Huggetts never had lodging houses anywhere else in the market area.

4. See pp. 140-144, supra.
been born in 1839 or 1840. He was possibly related to Thomas Day who in 1864 was keeping the Volunteer public house, Pitlake. Thomas, in August, 1858, when living in North End, had married Anne, the daughter of Thomas West, a timber merchant of Barrack Field. This Thomas Day might well have been Charles's elder brother; and another possible relative is G. Day who in 1864 was keeping the Railway Bell, North End, and who when he died, aged 51, in 1877 was living at Claremont House, Addiscombe. A lease of 1885 described Charles as a "lodging house keeper and farmer"; but there is no other evidence of his connection with the land.

His earliest venture into the lodging house business in the market area appears to have been in 1879 when he wrote to the Local Board of Health informing them that he had taken over Bennett's premises at 14, King Street, and requesting that his name be placed on the lodging house register. He later submitted three letters of testimony as regards his respectability, and the application was approved.

2. CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents.
4. CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents.
5. The term may merely indicate that he farmed out lodgings.
6. CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1878-1885: 16 Jan., 1879; 30 Jan., 1879.
Almost exactly a year later, he applied to register 11, King Street in the same way; but in this instance the Medical Officer reported that it was altogether ill-adapted for the purpose of a common lodging house and the application was rejected, as was a similar one a few months later in respect of 7, and 8, King Street.\(^1\) In the latter case, the number of beds Day wanted was excessive and the ventilation was inadequate.\(^2\)

The following year, Day applied to have 3, Market Street registered. The Medical Officer reported that there was accommodation for thirteen beds at the standard of 500 cubic feet per bed, but that better ventilation was required before the house could be passed as satisfactory.\(^3\) A fortnight later the Sanitary Committee read a letter from George Duncan, who already had a lodging house next-door-but-one, objecting for various reasons to Day's registration.\(^4\) However the Sanitary Inspector reported that Day had provided the required ventilation and that the police were of the opinion that it was of importance that houses of that kind should be registered so as to bring them under continuous inspection and, accordingly, the Committee

---

1. Ibid., 12 Feb., 1880; 15 Jul., 1880.
2. Ibid., 15 Jul., 1880.
3. Ibid., 5 May, 1881.
4. For Duncan, see pp. 151-154, supra.
recommended that the house be registered. An application a few months later however, for an increased number of beds was turned down through there not being sufficient cubic space.

After 1834, Charles Day extended his activities considerably. In 1885, he had King Street registered for seventeen lodgers. In 1887, Middle Row was registered for twenty; and, in 1888, Middle Row for fourteen. In 1889, Market Street was similarly licensed. When he died, in 1892, he controlled twenty of the twenty-eight lodging houses in the market area; all twelve of those in King Street, which before the closure of some of the Middle Row properties and before Charles Day's advent had had practically no lodging houses at all, four of the six remaining in Middle Row, and four of the ten in

1. CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1878-1885: 5 May, 1881; 19 May, 1881.

2. Ibid., 26 Jan., 1882.

3. Ibid., 15 Sept., 1885. This building had been a hairdresser's shop in 1851, but it had been a lodging house at the time of the 1861 census.

4. Ibid., 1885-1893, 27 Sept., 1887. This had been a baker's and confectioner's premises in both 1851 and 1861.

5. Ibid., 7 Feb., 1888. This appears to have been a Day lodging house previously so it may have lost its licence; or there might have been a re-numbering of the properties.

6. Ibid., 12 Nov., 1889. It had been a butcher's shop in 1861.
Market Street. Three other lodging house keepers shared between them the remaining eight premises.¹

It is obviously Day therefore who was the unnamed person mentioned in a leading article in the Croydon Chronicle in 1888. "Within thirty feet of the principal hotel in the borough," it said, "there exists a human moral piggery that, for low depravity, either Newcastle or Manchester might match, but certainly could not surpass.....One gentleman, residing himself in a charming town on the banks of the Thames, is the happy owner of no less than fourteen 'residences' in Middle Row.....The tariff is 4d. per night, and the management of each house is placed by the proprietor under a man or woman.....deputy.....who was to account to the happy absentee landlord for the receipts."²

Other evidence indicates that Day had further lodging houses at Kingston upon Thames, and some photographs in Croydon Public Library of his properties show display boards reading, ".....and at Kingston." He is not named in contemporary directories there, but this may be because they were not as complete and comprehensive as Croydon's; the only possibly relevant entry, that of a

¹. See Table 11, p.438, infra.
². Croydon Chronicle, 2 Jun.,1888. The term Middle Row was often used by contemporary writers to describe, more generally, the inner part of the Market area.
Charles Day, 3, Merton Cottages, Bearfield Road, being three years after his death and relating, perhaps, to one of his sons who was also named Charles.\(^1\)

He died on 4 February, 1892, at 2, Market Street. The cause of death was syncope following gastric catarrh, and he was only 52 years old.\(^2\) The Croydon Chronicle reported that he had often commented that he might die suddenly and that he was insured with two companies for the sum of £45.\(^3\) His passing was referred to in detail by all the local papers. He was described as "Uncle" Day and the Croydon Advertiser asserted that he would be missed in Croydon "where he had been seen for many years walking or standing about with his hands in his pockets, and in a generally independent frame of mind." The newspaper went on to describe how Day had attached himself almost continuously to a local police officer, Detective-Sergeant Ward, and concluded with a mention of a rumour that Day had intended taking over the Labourers' Dwellings in Elis David Road, in the expectation of the demolition of Middle Row.\(^4\)

\(^1\) No contemporary rate books survive at the Library, or in the Town Clerk's or the Borough Treasurer's Departments; information supplied by Mr F. John Owen, Borough Librarian and Curator, Kingston upon Thames.


\(^3\) Croydon Chronicle, 13 Feb., 1892, p. 5.

\(^4\) Croydon Advertiser, 6 Feb., 1892, p. 5. For further information about the Labourers' Dwellings, see pp. 181-183, infra.
The following week the local papers devoted much space to reporting "Uncle" Day's funeral. The Croydon Advertiser, referring again to his companionship with Detective-Sergeant Ward, commented that he had had a similar propensity for associating with detectives at Kingston upon Thames. The Croydon Chronicle described the large but orderly crowd that assembled in Middle Row to see the cortège, and then continued, "'Uncle' Day was not without his admirers for many little kindnesses experienced at his hands." To this, the Croydon Times added, "he was a rather rough, unlettered old fellow of the old school, but was as genuine and honest a man as one could wish to meet in a day's march. He was very highly esteemed."

The executors of his will, dated 1888, and proved 15 October 1892, were Joseph Day of the White Hart, Surrey Street, beerhouse keeper, and James Wright of Brighton, an auctioneer and estate agent. To his wife he left his rents and profits; and to his son, Joseph, his real estates. The witnesses of the will, Frederick Wright and William Arnold, were both Kingston men. Charles Day was

3. Croydon Times, 6 Feb., 1892, p. 5.
4. Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes.
5. He had another son, Charles, who had presumably been cut out of the will because of his violence; see p. 149 n., supra.
unable to sign his name.¹

Mrs Day continued temporarily to manage the lodging houses but the following year the Town Council gave her notice to quit by 31 January, 1894, as a part of the redevelopment scheme described below.²

(c) Crime

There is plenty of evidence in the columns of the local newspapers of crime in the market area. There were for instance two attempts in 1859 by Mrs Charlotte Hodges and her daughter Mary Ellen to burn down their Crystal Palace beerhouse in Middle Row for the purpose, as the local paper put it, of "making a bit," the premises being insured by two companies.³ Less serious, perhaps, was the theft, in October, 1876, of the clock from the Police Station in North End, the article being recovered next day at a baker's shop in Middle Row.⁴

But it is impossible to substantiate the often-made claim that had it not been for Middle Row, the local

---

1. Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, Will 983/1892. He died worth £1,000.

2. HSSC, p.162.

3. At the Croydon Assizes on 9 Aug., 1859, they were both sentenced to 15 years' penal servitude: CPL, x870(9) CRO, Old and New Croydon Illustrated, 1894, p.16.

magistrates' bench would have been virtually unemployed. An analysis for the year 1871 of the place of residence of all criminals appearing in the local police courts certainly does nothing to prove the allegation, for of the 261 cases noted, only seventeen were prosecutions against people definitely living in the Market area. It is true that in some cases the defendant's address was not given; and that sometimes several minor cases of assault and drunkenness were not detailed separately. But even if allowance is made for those two facts, the lodging houses still appear to have had no monopoly of evil. There is some evidence too that the attention given to the area by the police depended, at any one time, on recent events there, and on the immediate pressure of public opinion. In 1881 for instance, there was only one recorded case of Market area delinquency in the first three months of the year; in the last three months there were sixteen; by comparison, lest this might be regarded as a seasonal peak, the year 1871 produced six in the first three months and only four in the last three.

A specific example of extra police vigilance

---

1. For instance, the statement of the Mayor to the Croydon Provident Dispensary, "that the amount of work arising out of the wrong-doing of the people of that locality, or who frequented the houses there, was excessively large in proportion to cases coming from other portions of the town, and were it not for the vigilance of the police it would be in a bad state indeed." Croydon Advertiser, 8 Feb., 1890, p.7.
occurred in 1888. After Margaret Heaseman had been remanded for striking William Baker on the head with a plate, and with being drunk, in the kitchen of Day's lodging house, there appeared in the courts the following day two other women charged with fighting in Middle Row; and the Inspector, in evidence, said that a constable on duty in Middle Row had been placed there on purpose, in consequence of disturbances there.

Other factors make a statistical comparison impossible, too; for instance after Incorporation, Argus Letters to the Croydon Advertiser commented on the marked diminution in the number of cases coming before the Croydon magistrates. It ascribed this fact to the promptitude with which cases were dealt with, and the increased severity of the sentences. The Borough Bench, the article concluded, was a great success.

The commonest criminal activities were drunkenness, theft, assault or prostitution, or a combination of these. As regards the prevalence of excessive drinking, Argus Letters to the Croydon Advertiser commented that, according to a return presented to the Poor Dwellings Committee of the Town Council, Middle Row had the unenviable distinction of being the abode in Croydon of the greatest number of persons convicted for drunkenness.

2. Ibid., 16 Jan.,1886, p.2.
during the last six months of the previous year. Eighteen of these people had lived in Middle Row for longer or shorter periods, mostly the latter. Wilford Road was next with three cases. In one day alone, the previous year, the record had read: William Turner and Patrick Leary, both of no fixed abode, found drunk in Middle Row and fined 2s. 6d., with 5s. costs, each; Clementina Skeats, a married woman living in Middle Row, fined 5s., with 7s. costs, for being drunk and using obscene language; Mary Sullivan, an old woman of Middle Row, summoned for begging but discharged; and Joseph Venables, of King Street, remanded on a count of assaulting his wife.

Sometimes, perhaps because the defendant lived in Middle Row, a rather rough justice seems to have been dispensed; as with the labourer at Day's lodging house who, found in possession of a pair of lady's side-spring boots which he claimed belonged to his wife, was locked up for two or three days whilst enquiries were made, and was then set free for lack of evidence.

Some of the court cases were more dramatic. For instance a hawker, living in Middle Row in 1871, was charged

1. Ibid., 22 Nov., 1884, p.5.
2. Ibid., 6 Oct., 1883, p.2.
3. Ibid., 26 Feb., 1881, p.2; 5 Mar., 1881, p.7.
with violently assaulting a police constable; and a tailor, with rescuing the hawker from custody. Subsequently they had both hidden on the top floor of one of Huggett's lodging houses. Huggett threatened to break down the door if they did not give themselves up; and they were frog-marched to the station, the hawker guarded by four constables and the tailor by another two. They received, respectively, three months' and two months' hard labour.¹

A more typical assault case was that involving William Curtis who was alleged to have attacked his wife at a Day lodging house in Middle Row. They had been separated for sixteen years and she had then lived with William Horrocks, a chair mender. A month previous to the charge, husband and wife had become reconciled, Horrocks at that moment being "away" for fourteen days; but he had then again deserted her and her two children and she had returned to Horrocks. She was in bed with him when her husband entered and attacked her with, so she said, a hammer, a knife, and two large carving forks, though he only admitted to knocking her head against the bedstead. The case was adjourned for a week, by the end of which time Mrs Curtis and Horrocks had disappeared, so the prisoner was discharged.²

Violence was sometimes offered to the deputies in charge of the lodging houses. William Clarke, for

¹ Croydon Advertiser, 15 Apr., 1871, p.2.
² Ibid., 12 May, 1888, p.6.
instance, a labourer of 8, King Street, was charged with striking a deputy, Harriet Winter, with an iron when she refused to cook him some dinner.¹

These deputies were expected to maintain order in the houses; and when John Andrews, employed in that capacity at a Day lodging house, was sent to gaol for assaulting his wife, the magistrates' bench suggested to the Corporation that it should consider how far the defendant was a proper person to be entrusted with the management of a lodging house.² The Sanitary Inspector reported that he was only temporarily in charge, the regular deputy having absconded, and that the owner of the house would submit the name of a new deputy for consideration.³

Prostitution also figures frequently in the police court records relating to the Market area; but, of course, no woman admitted that occupation to the 1851 or 1861 census enumerators or, if she did, they replaced the word with some appropriate euphemism. This is a reminder that, in any occupational analysis based on the returns, one may be misled by the job description provided either by the informant or by the enumerator.

As early as 1839, Superintendent Callingham

¹. Ibid., 8 May, 1886, p.5.
². See p.149, supra.
³. CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1885-1893, 7 Jun., 1887.
reported to the Improvement Commissioners "that the house in Middle [Row] .... formerly kept as a Retail Beerhouse by a man of the Name of David Howie and now converted into a common lodging house the resort of common thieves and prostitutes against which many informations had been laid and convictions taken place had lately become so great a nuisance to the Neighbourhood and the parish as to call for the interference of some measures which would put a stop to any recurrence of such proceedings." ¹

The machinery for dealing with such complaints was much more ponderous than it became later; and the Commissioners resolved "that a deputation be appointed to confer with the Churchwardens and the Bench of Justices with the view of ascertaining if any measures can be adopted to remedy the nuisance and punish the occupiers of the house." ²

At the Commissioners' next meeting Penfold, the attorney, "reported what the necessary steps were in order to proceed against David Howie for keeping a disorderly House.....and the reason why the party could not be prosecuted at the present sessions.....it appearing that it is more the duty of the parish officers to prosecute than this Board." ³ It was resolved "that the matter be

---

1. CPL, Croydon Improvement Act, Commissioners' Minute Book, 1838, 20 Jun., 1839.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 3 Jul., 1839.
represented to the parish officers with a recommendation from this Board that provided they can find evidence sufficient to convict the party they should adopt measures to prosecute and that Mr Penfold be requested to confer with them on the subject to ascertain if the evidence of Inspector Callingham and others of the police could be made available for the purpose as already given to the Board.¹

Buggett's houses, not unexpectedly, gave shelter to prostitutes; such as the woman who was assaulted in 1875 by William Sharman, "a labourer, but selling hot potatoes from a can in the street."² But the most sweeping allegations of prostitution were printed in a leading article in the Croydon Chronicle, in 1888.

This said, "On the occasion of our visit as many as sixteen ladies, whose sole method of livelihood is better imagined than expressed were said to be occupying one house. To be seen to advantage, Middle Row should be visited at midnight. It is then en fete.... As many as from forty to sixty WOMEN are housed nightly in the dens of Middle Row, belonging to one absentee landlord."³ Soliciting seems to

¹. Ibid.
². Croydon Advertiser, 27 Jan., 1875, p. 3.
³. Croydon Chronicle, 2 Jun., 1888, p. 4. The man concerned was, without doubt, Day.
have been especially common in Park Lane.\footnote{See, for instance, the case of Mary Ann Carter, a King Street prostitute, charged with "annoying foot passengers" there: \textit{Croydon Advertiser}, 31 May, 1879, p.3.}

B. Unsuccessful Remedies

5. Attempts at Amelioration

(a) \textit{Laissez-faire}

In the second half of the nineteenth century, then, the inner portions of the Market area were in a state of moral and physical decay. The buildings, some of them at least of substantial quality, were becoming increasingly dilapidated and even derelict. In some, there was much overcrowding. Local sanitary conditions and habits were a constant source of anxiety to health officials. There was drunkenness, crime, violence, and immorality. A high proportion of the population comprised casual visitors to the town. All this existed in the town centre, within a few yards of the Town Hall. There was, not surprisingly, general agreement that something should be done to remedy the situation. But what?

C.M. Allan, in his article on urban redevelopment in Glasgow, suggested that there were five successive ways in which British urban decay was tackled in the nineteenth century. There was, firstly, what he described as "the workings of the market"; secondly, it could be done through the medium of philanthropic bodies; thirdly, by a rigid enforcement of public health...
legislation; fourthly, by municipal purchase and demolition followed by private redevelopment; and, lastly, by the council undertaking all the processes including rebuilding. That order was largely followed with the Croydon Market area; though the work was completed at the fourth stage, so that municipal rebuilding never entered into consideration.

The earliest method, that of leaving redevelopment to the market forces was based, he suggested, on the fallacy that obsolete buildings would show decreasing returns until eventually demolition and rebuilding would be found profitable. But in fact, as the houses decayed the middle classes vacated them and let them at high rents to people who were prepared to put up with intense overcrowding to spread the real burden of cost. The landlord then had no incentive to rebuild for the poor could not afford to pay more than they were already being charged.

There was even less incentive in the workings of the market to redevelop central areas as a whole. Wider streets would have meant less land for remunerative buildings; and anyway fragmentation of ownership made such replanning quite out of the question.¹

Support for the principles of laissez-faire in Croydon came, from Councillor James Smith, as late as 1888, with his cry to the Council of, "save us from dealing in

But what happened in the Market area merely confirms Allan's findings in Glasgow, that redevelopment resulting from normal speculation in real estate never had any chance of success. The most conspicuous failure was in the case of Huson or Nelson Square. It will be remembered that, in 1879, Mrs Huggett had been unable or unwilling to bring the lodging houses there up to the minimum standard demanded by the Local Board of Health, and they had been closed down. They had then been offered for sale in 1883 for demolition and commercial redevelopment, and had been purchased for £850 by John Mann Taylor of Hampstead. This event had been described optimistically by the Poor Dwellings Committee as, "a conspicuous instance of the operation of private enterprise in effecting improvements," the property having "changed hands in prospect of further improvements."

It is not clear what Taylor had in mind when

2. See p.143, supra.
3. Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes. Taylor, a furniture dealer and linen draper, lived at 5, Fitzjohns Avenue, Hampstead, from about 1884 to 1925; he did not figure prominently there as a local resident. He died 19 Jul.,1923, aged 78, having retired from business over forty years previously; information supplied by Mr Wm R. Maidment, Borough Librarian, London Borough of Camden; General Register Office, Somerset House, Certified Copy of an Entry of Death, DX 505884, 31 Oct.,1966.
making the purchase, except that he already had connections with the locality, for one relative was Mann the butcher in Surrey Street and his aunt, Sarah Mann, of Church Street, had left property there to him in 1869 at which time he lived at York Gate, Regent's Park. But whatever his intentions, the property remained unoccupied and derelict until finally demolished as part of a much greater scheme. The "prospect of further improvements" had never materialised; and neither did it do so anywhere else in the district.

(b) Philanthropic Works

The second of the five possible nineteenth century methods of urban redevelopment described by C.M. Allan was through the medium of philanthropic bodies which might be "set up to renovate slums or to knock down old buildings and build substantial artisans' dwellings on a non-commercial basis." He suggested that these arose because as the nineteenth century wore on it became increasingly obvious that market forces were not bringing about the gradual increase in housing standards and urban layout that might have been expected. The middle-class conscience became worried, and it came to be thought that where the market

1. Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes.
2. Allan, op. cit., p.598.
was failing charity might succeed. In 1841 the Artisans' Dwellings movement started, with the foundation of the Metropolitan Association for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes; and during the next forty years or so many such bodies were set up. "As far as they went," says Allan, they "were a great success.....and usually managed to make modest profits." \(^1\)

But the one body of this kind that attempted to improve housing conditions in the Market area was short-lived and unprofitable. It was the Croydon Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Society Ltd, of which very little was known until its one edifice, Shaftesbury Buildings, Elis David Road, was demolished in June, 1962, when various documents relating to the Society were discovered buried in the foundations. \(^2\)

The Society's objects were to purchase, lease or acquire lands and buildings in Croydon and to erect "Improved Dwellings for the Working Classes." Its capital was to be £5,000, in five hundred shares of £10 each. The seven founder members were: John Grantham, of 3, Park Lane, an engineer, who had five shares; Thomas Richard Edridge, of The Elms, High Street, a shipowner, who had ten; Samuel Woods, of Bedford Park, a stockbroker, with five; George

\(^1\) Ibid., p.600.

\(^2\) Croydon Times, 22 Jun., 1962, p.6. The documents are now housed at CIL, d570. Unless otherwise stated, the information that follows is taken from them.
May, of Bramley Hill, a merchant, ten; Frederick Ditmas, of 3, Norland Road, a retired Royal Engineers major, two; Alfred Burton Cowdell, of 5, Bedford Villas, a solicitor, two; and Frederick West, of The Waldrons, a solicitor, ten. Edridge, a Conservative, was the only one who played a substantial part in local public life, although Grantham is known as the inventor of the first regularly-operated steam tramcar.¹

Woods however was, at the time of the foundation of the Improvement Society, hon. secretary of the Croydon Auxiliary to the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews; May and Ditmas were local superintendents of the Croydon Branch of the London City Mission; Cowdell, a Liberal, was treasurer of the Croydon Sunday School Union; and West was hon. secretary of the Paper Makers' Provident Society.²

The Improvement Society was registered in January, 1866, its first committee comprising the seven founder members (although Edridge soon resigned), together with William Aris, a draper, Alfred Cowley, a brewer, John Thomas Matthews, Gent, Frederick James Sargood, a merchant, and Francis Vigers, Esq. These men, also, were not prominent

---

¹. It was a rather crude affair having no self-regulating mechanism to control the steam pressure, no speed indicator, and the entrance and exit were not separated from the machinery: S.H. Pearce Higgins, *The Wantage Tramway, 1958*, passim; *Times*, 29 Mar., 1873; *Journal of the Society of Arts*, vol. 23 (1874-5), pp. 727-728.

². Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, 1865, passim.
in local affairs though Aris, a Congregationalist was, like Cowdell, a committee member of the Croydon Sunday School Union; and Sargood was known for his Liberal sympathies.¹

The Improvement Society's prospectus is worth quoting at some length, because it sets out clearly the philosophical background to this kind of venture.

"The painfully low condition," it said, "both physical and moral, of some districts of Croydon, has excited the warm interests of the friends of the poor. This state of things may be traced principally to the want of good dwellings at moderate rents, compelling the labouring-classes to mass together in crowded rooms, and in old and often dilapidated and unwholesome houses, to the disregard of decency and comfort. This evil tends largely to lower their moral tone, and counteracts all the efforts that are made to improve their condition, or to introduce amongst them the saving truths of religion."

The prospectus went on to point out that, whilst the houses of the "higher classes" were improving in comfort those of the "humbler classes" seemed to be deteriorating. Many people felt that this evil could be obviated by building "improved cottages" in less dense localities; but there were many difficulties, not least of which was the high cost of sites. In any event, it was suggested, such a remedy would leave the existing slums untouched or, if some of them were removed, those remaining would be in greater demand with a consequent increase in rents beyond the capacity of the decent poor. The new Society therefore aimed to place "in the midst of the most wretched (who will

¹ Ibid.
not move far from their accustomed locality) those sanitary and moral agencies which have done so much in other towns."

The prospectus then pointed out that, although in overcrowded areas the return on investment in cottage property amounted to ten or even fifteen per cent., the Society had more moderate aspirations. It was estimated that its first project would yield a minimum return of four per cent. on capital. This was to be the construction of a building consisting of lodgings to be let at moderate rents with all possible provision for light, cleanliness, ventilation and moral control. It was hoped that subsequently "Model Cottages" would be built elsewhere. The prospectus drew attention finally to the Articles of Association which stated that the committee "should have the discretion to set apart, without remuneration, a portion of the buildings for moral and Christian instruction, free from denominational distinctions."

The Society very shortly after, submitted a plan to the Local Board of Health's engineer, Baldwin Latham, for the erection of model lodging houses in Middle Row; but as there was not quite the area at the back of the buildings required by the bye-laws he adopted the usual course of submitting the matter to the Board. John Grantham, himself an engineer, pleaded that the Society had been especially attentive to matters of ventilation, light and cleanliness and that they had employed a most experienced architect from London in order that the most recent improvements might
be carried out. The application however was rejected.

Some months later, the Society found it necessary to abandon its intention of building inside the Market area and bought from the Trustees of the Elys Davy Charity a plot with an unexpired lease of 95 years. This was in Elis David Road and on it Messrs Colls and Son, of London, erected the Shaftesbury Buildings for £5,200.

By the time of the Society's first annual general meeting there had been changes on the committee and some further people had been induced to take out shares. Horatio Sydney Coulson, Gent, and Theodore Lloyd, a stockbroker, both of them Anglicans, had replaced Edridge and Francis Vigers as members of the committee. New shareholders by then included R.A. Heath, a merchant and one-time Vice-Consul in Sardinia, who had 20 shares; J. Wickham Flower, a solicitor and amateur natural historian, 10; Carew Saunders Robinson, also a solicitor, 10; W. Vaughan, a builder, 10; W.J. Blake, the auctioneer, 5; J. Sugden, a builder, 5; John Morland, Gent, 5; W.H. Horniman, a tea merchant, 5; and Samuel Lee Rymer, a dentist, 2. Heath, Flower, Robinson, Blake and Rymer were all Anglicans; Morland and Horniman were both active members of the local Society of Friends. All these men, except possibly Sugden, were well-known figures in the town; but only Rymer played any prominent part in local politics.

1. CPL, Groydon Local Board of Health Report, 1863-1866.
It is evident therefore that the main supporters of the Improvement Society, whilst well-known and in many cases active in the town's philanthropic life, were only exceptionally involved in local government and politics. Of the twenty-three known members of the Society at least ten were Anglicans, two were Quakers and one a Congregationalist. It has been impossible to discover the religious affiliations of the others but there is no reason whatever to believe that to do so would be to upset the apparent predominance of the Church of England in the work of the Society.

Despite the good intentions, in the long term the shareholders' expectations were not fulfilled and in 1884 the Poor Dwellings Committee informed the Town Council that although the Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Acts of 1851, 1866 and 1867 enabled the local authority to provide lodging houses for the labouring classes, this had been done for the poorer classes in Croydon through the medium of the Model Dwelling Houses in Elis David Road, "but they do not generally avail themselves of it." The rent for one room was 1s. 6d., for two 2s. 6d., and for sets of three or more 3s. 6d. The report continued by stating that the sanitary condition of the dwellings was excellent and that there was seldom need to refuse applications for tenancies on account of the accommodation being full. Often however it was necessary to turn away applicants because of their
character.¹

The Society, it seems, was in voluntary liquidation and efforts to sell the dwellings had not been successful. Over the past three years only one dividend (of four per cent.) had been paid. Its last report had suggested that the decline in income and the increasing number of rooms left untenanted—currently eighteen—were both due to the rapidly-increasing number of small cottages being built elsewhere in the town.²

Even where societies of this kind were more successful they could still, as C.M. Allan has said, only scratch the surface of the problem. The very poor, those earning below say £1 per week, could not afford to rent new buildings even though profit was kept to a minimum. Further, much of the building was done on virgin land so that, as at Croydon, the contribution to slum clearance was slight. The importance of the housing societies, he concluded, lay in the fact that they brought the problems of slums and of renewal into public attention.³

1. For instance when Ambrose Noble, a hawker, of the Labourers' Dwellings, was charged with being drunk and incapable Edridge, the magistrate, asked him how long he had lived there. He said, "a year and a half," whereupon Edridge replied, "Then tell the Superintendent from me that you must find fresh lodgings. We can't have drunken people there," Croydon Advertiser, 22 Mar., 1884, p.3.

2. CPL, Report of the Poor Dwellings Committee, Presented to Croydon Town Council at its meeting, 22 Sept., 1884, p.32.

3. Allan, op. cit., p.600.
Another aspect of philanthropy in relation to the Market area was the work performed there for a time by the Rev. Arthur W. Jephson when he was a curate at Croydon Parish Church. Fortunately he described in his autobiography which was published in 1910, both what he set out to do, and also the conditions in the lodging houses.¹

He came straight to Croydon from Cambridge and was given charge of the part of the town that included the Market area. He began, in 1876, with a night school and soon had "a horde of young ragamuffins" to deal with. Describing the difficulty he had in finding suitable accommodation, he wrote:

"At last an old man named Duncan let us hire a good sized room, where we had a school every night, games and boxing, and a Sunday School and Evening Service.² Duncan was a curiosity in his way, most Scotsmen are. I found he used to re-let our room after we left at 10.30 p.m. and allow wanderers to sleep there. This I had to stop, as contrary to agreement.

"Duncan always posed as a stern Evangelical, but his only claim to the title was that he had taken part in the St George's-in-the-East Riots many years before and had torn Mr Bryan King's surplice in the riots which disgraced that period."

Jephson went on to describe how he and his assistants regularly went to all the lodging houses, "but to no purpose, as most of the people were here today and gone tomorrow." However, the City Missionaries helped to

². He was a lodging house keeper; see pp.151-154, supra.
ensure that the whole area was visited systematically and thoroughly. There was apparently no difficulty in obtaining funds to further the work for, as he said, "the late Baron Heath, the Italian Consul, was always to the fore with money, and Sir Thomas Edridge and many others."¹

With such financial support he was soon able to open a lodging house, the Glowworm, though it was never popular for, as he confessed, "I had to suppress evil language—and that was more than most of the people could stand or understand. We always had our complement of lodgers, but they were of a slightly higher type than those in the surrounding houses."² Opened in 1878, it was the forerunner of the Welcome Hall Mission and had a free lending library.³

Continuing the description of his work in the Market area, Jephson mentioned that the evening services were well attended and that he used to allow smoking at them, sometimes even providing tobacco. When he found a reluctance to come he used to get permission to speak to the company in their own kitchens, large rooms lighted with

---

1. Heath and Edridge, it will be remembered, were both supporters of the Croydon Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Society, Ltd: see pp.177-178,181, supra.

2. The Glowworm was very small by local standards, and was registered for two rooms accommodating five people, four in one and one in the other: CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1870-1878, 14 Feb., 1878; Jephson, op. cit., pp.7-8.

3. Croydon Advertiser, 15 May, 1886, p.3.
naptha lamps or gas.

Jephson went on to describe the scene:

"It was a curious sight. Some were asleep on the benches, others were eating, usually haddocks, bloaters or kippers. Some were cooking these things or frying bacon. Some were drying clothes, and the smell and steam and the fumes of the huge coke fire, the cooking and the tobacco, were almost overwhelming. Still the people liked to see us and join in some well known hymns and listen to a short address."

Jephson then mentioned that the race meetings at Woodside attracted the "riff-raff" from London and other large towns and that, at such times, the lodging houses were crammed. From that, he turned to the problem of obtaining situations for any who were prepared to work regularly. Some local residents were, he said, prepared to give the young lads and girls a trial with such morning jobs as cleaning shoes and knives, fetching coals, and digging. But, he suggested, the big obstacle was not a hatred of work but of regular work, of having to do the same thing every day and all day.

Of the social attitudes of the lodging house inmates, he wrote that drink was the greatest enemy but that betting "was not the curse that it has since become." Nor, he contended, was immorality especially prevalent. "A beaten wife did not matter, but a beaten child always excited the keenest anger.... A man who deserted a woman and child must quit the neighbourhood [but] no amount of drunkenness was considered shameful. Theft from richer folk was regarded as cleverness, but theft from one another
was almost unknown."¹

Summarising the work that he did over a period of five years, at the end of which time Jephson had 120 people actively engaged in attempting to alleviate the poverty of the area, he wrote:

"It is not exaggerating to say, that the whole neighbourhood was improved, the people were not left alone, they came into contact with those of another grade and learnt from contact with them many things which they would not have otherwise acquired." (2)

Yet earlier he had written that "most of the people were here today and gone tomorrow." He appears to have been well-intentioned and certainly succeeded in getting an extraordinary number of people interested in helping him. But how effective their work was; and whether their assistance was in the right direction is very difficult to assess at this distance of time. He must at least have found his experience among the poor of Croydon invaluable when he was appointed from there to the living of St John's, Waterloo Road.

Before finally moving away from the subject of philanthropy in the Market area, it is worth noting the opening in 1879, the year after the Glowworm lodging house came into existence, of the Castle Coffee Tavern, in the High Street. The shareholders were temperance workers and

¹. This last comment is not entirely borne out by reports of proceedings in the local police court.

². Jephson, op. cit., passim.
it provided newspapers, games and non-alcoholic drinks.¹
But obviously, with the best will in the world, the coffee taverns and the work of the people like the Rev. Arthur Jephson could have no profound or lasting effect; and the efforts of the Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Society had been financially unsuccessful and anyway had failed to cater for the wayward and the really impoverished.

(c) The Enforcement of the Public Health Acts
C.M. Allan pointed out that a third possible stimulus to redevelopment might be through the intervention of the local authority in enforcing the Public Health Acts, forcing private landlords to improve or demolish their worst properties, and so ensuring that a higher standard of housing was introduced and that redevelopment was speeded up.²

He went on to describe how the 1851 Common Lodging Houses Act permitted the inspection and regulation of those places, and how the Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Act of the same year gave a local authority the power to build and maintain its own dwellings. There followed the 1868 Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act which empowered local authorities to order private landlords to improve or demolish insanitary property. Allan found, in Glasgow,

2. Allan, op. cit., p.598.
that, "Although some improvements were forced upon private landlords.....this was an insufficient answer.....The powers.....were purely permissive and were not taken advantage of on a large enough scale, and the economics of slum proprietorship were such that where action was taken ......landlords often preferred to undertake the minimum of repairs rather than demolition and rebuilding. This did a little to raise slum housing standards, but nothing to replan declining areas."¹ It was Thomas Cubitt who told a Select Committee, "poor people's houses seldom belong to any but those who are glad to get any money they can....a little shopkeeping class of persons."²

There is a lot of evidence that in Croydon the application of the 1848 Public Health Act, by one of the first Local Boards formed anywhere in the country, dramatically and rapidly improved the town's sanitation and water supply; but it has been seen already that some qualification must be made, in respect of the Market area, because of the negligence of the inhabitants there.³ There has also been noted a degree of complacency in the report made to the new Council by its Poor Dwellings

¹ Ibid., p.601.
³ See pp.131-132, supra.
Committee, in 1884; and the local tightening up of lodging house administration in the 1870's merely serves as a reminder that at any date more could have been done in that direction. It has been shown, too, that compulsory closure of especially bad property, as at Nelson Square, led to dereliction, but not to demolition and redevelopment, even though in that instance the landlord appears to have been quite wealthy.\(^1\)

In Croydon then, as in Glasgow, *laissez-faire*, the efforts of philanthropic bodies, and the enforcement of Public Health Acts, all failed because of their individual disadvantages. But, as Allan showed, they also have "one very important failing in common. They all imply a piecemeal approach to redevelopment.....For replanning a city, whole areas must be tackled at once. Neither the market nor public health enforcement will work because it is extremely unlikely that the whole of any area will become critical at once. The philanthropic bodies are unsuited to this task because they are not so much interested in the economic efficiency of the areas as in the standard of housing and because they are unlikely to be rich enough to tackle redevelopment on a comprehensive basis."

"For wholesale demolition, replanning and reconstruction, the municipal authorities must intervene."\(^2\)

\(^1\) See pp.133,144, 174-175, *supra*.

\(^2\) Allan, *op. cit.*, p.599.
6. Attempts at Local Government Intervention, 1829-1888

(a) Early References; and the Work of the Local Board of Health, 1849-1883

In 1829, an anonymous pamphlet was published in Croydon advocating improvements in the town.¹ "In all the great space," it said, "between the Town Hall and the old town, there are only a few dilapidated buildings which could easily be demolished. In their place there might be the erection of a terrace of good dwelling houses on the front of the Fairfield, and as there has been a good deal of trouble about the lodging of the judge of assize, a house might be built for him in the centre and this would give it an air of respectability, while there could not be a pleasanter spot for the erection of houses built on a genteel plan."²

This 1829 pamphlet appears to represent the first of many unsuccessful pleas over the next sixty years for the inner part of the Market area to be redeveloped. 1829 was also the date of Croydon's first Improvement Act which, among its eighty-nine clauses, made provision for the election of Commissioners and for them subsequently to have

---


2. It has not been possible to identify the author of the pamphlet. The ideas it contained were not particularly practical and no account was taken of cost. The document's importance lies in the fact that it is the earliest evidence that thought was being given to improving the Market area.
power to cause the High Street to be lighted with gas, oil or otherwise, at such times and seasons as might be judged proper.¹

Only one other reference has been found to improvement plans of about contemporary date, Pelton stating that some years before the creation of the Board of Health, an attorney named Penfold who held the office of Vestry Clerk and Town Surveyor, drew up plans, in which some sweeping measures were defined for widening High Street.²

A few months after the formation in 1849 of the Local Board of Health the first move, admittedly a singularly modest one, was made to improve the triangular Market area; or, at least, the entrance into it at its southern apex. This move resulted from an unanimous decision to purchase the premises of a Mr Wood, of Leicester, and of a James Battersbee, in order to widen the entrance into Surrey Street from High Street. Mr Battersbee received £300 and gave back £50 of it as a subscription towards the work of improvement, the materials from the demolition raising a further £109 lls.³ Both Battersbee's donation and also the unanimity with which the matter was agreed, were to be unique in the history of the

¹ Pelton, Relics, p.47.
² Ibid., p.48
Market area redevelopment.

Perhaps taking his cue from this incident, the Board received an application at the end of 1850 from a man named Gower who was about to pull down and rebuild some old houses in Bell Hill and to set the new houses back so as to widen the public passage there. He asked that the Board should contribute a sum of money in aid of the Improvement. However, the alteration did not in the opinion of the Board appear to be of sufficient public benefit to warrant the advancement of any sum of money. The inhabitants of Bell Hill and Surrey Street then petitioned the Board and on its being found that it was proposed to throw back the house to be built so as to widen the road an average of two feet the Board agreed to donate £15, Gower having asked for £25. However, he refused the £15; and this perhaps promising idea of combining private enterprise with municipal subsidy seems not to have been attempted again, in this part of Croydon at least.¹

So, although by the early 1860's, as has already been shown, the area was in decay little was said and nothing further was done through the agencies of local government to rid the locality of its worst dwellings.

But in 1861 another matter, which would eventually have a substantial effect on the Market area, was given a considerable public airing. This was the need

¹. Ibid., 3 Dec., 1850; 14 Jan., 1851; 21 Jan., 1851.
to widen the High Street. Dr Carpenter, addressing the Local Board of Health, said that the width was considered by many to be a great detriment to business, inasmuch as ladies frequently objected to visiting shops there on account of the narrowness of the street and of the consequent danger of their carriages being scratched or damaged by passing vehicles. If the street were widened, it would greatly enhance the value of the property in the neighbourhood by increasing the business that would be done. He suggested that the time had come for an Act of Parliament enabling the Board to widen the street, "a measure that will be self-paying from the increased value of the property."¹ The prophecy was true, but almost thirty years would elapse and very many hours of heated debate would take place before it came about.

Soon after Carpenter's speech, two railway companies almost forced the Board's hand. The South Eastern Railway Company applied to Parliament for power to construct its Mid-Kent Railway to terminate in the High Street, an action that caused one member of the Local Board to point out that among the great advantages accruing from this would be that some of the old houses in the narrow part of High Street would be cleared away.² The project was

¹ Pelton, Relics, p.48.
² Ibid., p.49
ultimately abandoned and the line terminated at Addiscombe; but soon after, the London, Brighton and South Coast Railway Company built a branch line from New, now East, Croydon to Central Croydon Station where the present Town Hall stands. Although some members of the Board believed that such a project would make the widening of High Street inevitable, in practice the line approached that road from the opposite direction to the Market area, it terminated some little distance short of High Street, and had no immediate effect on its width. But, many years later, the Station's site did become highly relevant to the redevelopment of the area.

In 1864, the Board was again urged by some of its members to act and Dr Carpenter gave notice of his intention of moving a resolution that application be made to Parliament for powers to widen the High Street and to improve the town. His aim was no less than to widen the road to fifty feet and sweep away Middle Row.

"There is," he said, "a place in the centre of the town, which is a kind of cancer- a malignant sore- and it acts as a check upon the Board's sanitary measures. It is important that Croydon should possess a central place of business. If the centre.....is increased in value .....it will also tend to increase the value of property in the more distant parts of the parish." (2)

This last comment is particularly interesting because it is an early indication that one source of

2. Pelton, Relics, p.50.
opposition to the redevelopment of the area would come from residents and especially shopkeepers, elsewhere in the town, who would claim that the cost of the improvements borne by all the ratepayers would only benefit the people, and especially the shopkeepers, in the immediate vicinity.

Carpenter also gave minute details of the probable expense of his scheme which, although it made no provision for the demolition of the Town Hall, was in many ways similar to the one finally adopted nearly thirty years later. He advocated that the project should be paid for out of the water profits which at that time amounted to about £1,000 per annum.

Honest John Close, in seconding the motion, said that he knew "from personal experience as a guardian of the poor, that from the very large number of persons who congregate in these middle streets, may be attributed the presence of small-pox in the town, the spread of a large amount of illness, and consequently a large increase in the poor rate."

After a long discussion, Carpenter's motion was carried with only one dissentient and a committee composed of the Chairman, Cuthbert W. Johnson; Dr Carpenter; and Messrs Close, Crowley, and Drummond, was appointed to take steps for obtaining the requisite powers. However, when the question of the expenditure of money to obtain

1. Ibid.
Parliamentary powers came before the Board, there was far less enthusiasm for the whole idea, and there was a favourable majority of only one, that being the Chairman's casting vote.

As a result of this volte face, Dr Carpenter withdrew his proposal, on the basis that it would be impossible to carry a Bill through Parliament with a majority of only one in its favour; and he said that reluctantly he would postpone any further action "until a more favourable public opinion could be secured."^1

During the next few years the matter was discussed hardly at all by the Local Board; and only occasionally in the columns of the local press, although the question was asked in the Croydon Chronicle, "Is there no Haussmann to widen High Street and erect a Market with a Maison de Ville on the top of it?"^2 The Builder, too, at about the same time published a letter by A.S.C.B. advocating a much more drastic scheme which would remove the entire area leaving an open space, a market place, or a site for a Town Hall and Head Post Office."^3

This, and a letter along similar lines in the

1. Ibid., pp.50,53.
3. The Builder, 23 Dec.,1871, p.1011. The letter also contained fifteen other suggestions for improving the town and its railway connections.
Croydon Chronicle, seem to have marked a revival of interest in the whole matter.\(^1\) In early 1872, during a long discussion by the Board of Health regarding a proposal to construct tramways in the town, one of the principal arguments in their favour was that they would help to relieve congestion in the High Street.\(^2\) Then in November of the same year John Pelton, father of John Ellis Pelton the later chronicler of the locality, asked if the Butter Market could not be set back, as it would be "the first instalment of a great public improvement."\(^3\)

This mention of the Butter Market is a reminder of another factor that was, by the 1870's, becoming important in the area under consideration; that is the decline of the various markets and the resultant redundancy of the market houses.\(^4\) The Board, in 1873, tried to face up to the problem with a plan for a new Market House in which the lower part, entered from the rear, would continue as a market, whilst the upper portion would be shops and offices, the front being set back so as to widen the

\(^1\): Quoted in Pelton, Relics, p.52.

\(^2\): Ibid. There was no intention of running trams through High Street; it was too narrow.

\(^3\): Ibid.

\(^4\): See pp.109-112, supra.
This revival of interest in the future of the High Street, of the market houses and of the Middle Row area coincided with a wider national recognition that more active municipal initiative was needed. Following on the 1875 Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, many towns started the systematic purchase of slum property using where necessary compulsory powers. They demolished extensively and remodelled entire areas with wide, well-paved streets and adequate drainage and sewerage, and then sold the land to private builders for redevelopment.  

In August, the Croydon Local Board of Health discussed the Bill and John Pelton asked how far it would enable the Board to deal with Middle Row. Dr Carpenter said in reply that he did not think the Act would be workable in a place like Croydon but, if it were, he was sure that there was sufficient public spirit "to take steps to get some of the abominations removed which exist not far from the Town Hall."  

However, no further progress was made and the

1. Pelton, Relics, p.52; Croydon Chronicle, 15 Nov.,1873.
   A further plan for widening the High Street was considered by the Local Board in 1874, Croydon Advertiser, 24 Oct.,1874, p.2.
   

Board's last years of existence were concerned with the limited question of bettering the High Street, rather than the much wider one of slum clearance. Even in this more restricted matter of the High Street, the Board appeared to have lost much of its original crusading enthusiasm for improvement, and by that time the local newspapers were becoming highly critical. Thus when Baldwin Latham, the Board's engineer, advocated in 1876 the extension of the Street's wood pavement and when, despite "an animated debate in which much stress was laid upon the general inconvenience of the Street" the motion was lost by one vote, the Croydon Chronicle was moved to comment, "It would be difficult, if, perhaps, we except Gravesend, to find the High Street of an important town so exceptionally disagreeable. Its narrowness necessitates the road being used for walking, and that fact alone should have been sufficient to secure for it exceptional treatment."¹ When, too, a portion of the tramway was inspected in 1879 and the Inspector, on seeing the narrowness of the High Street, remarked on the apparent absence of "public spirit" in the town, the Croydon Chronicle commented, "If the Inspector was astonished at the High Street, what would he have said to the streets that are behind it?"²

Again, when the Local Board debated the tramways,

---

¹. Croydon Chronicle, 2 Dec., 1876.
². Pelton, Relics, p. 53.
in 1880, one member proposed that the Board should agree to widen certain thoroughfares at the expense of the Tramways Company, if the Company were unable to do so themselves; whereupon the Croydon Chronicle remarked, "Why should not the High Street be widened? No doubt it will be some day. But why should we have to wait until it is agreed that a Tramway Company may lay their lines through it?.....We do not think the public improvement ought to wait for them. There is Middle Row, and its dirty channels, we do not anticipate that tram cars will run there, but it would be very much to the credit of the town if these rotten relics of antiquity were done away with."¹ But by that time, the Board was preparing for dissolution.

(b) The Fruitless Work of the Town Council, 1863-1888

By 1880, a movement for Incorporation was under way, a committee for its promotion was formed and public meetings were held. No mention was made in the document defining the movement of the widening the High Street and the removal of Middle Row. But it was generally expected that such an improvement would occupy a prominent place in the programme of a Corporation.² John Pelton, when returning thanks on being appointed treasurer of the committee said, "It will be apparent to any stranger, when

¹. Croydon Chronicle, 7 Feb., 1880.
². Pelton, Relics, p. 54.
he hears of the renown of Croydon, and sees its High Street, that the town must be wanting in public spirit to allow such a disgraceful thoroughfare to remain. There is no doubt that if a Charter of Incorporation is obtained, before long a very great change for the better will be made.  

Incorporation took place in March, 1883, and the High Street widening was mentioned a year later at a Council meeting when Councillor Hobbs, a builder and close associate of the swindler Jabez Spencer Balfour, during a discussion as to the cost of paving the High Street with wood, suggested that it would be as well to get an estimate for widening the street at the same time.

It looked at about that moment as though the Corporation might have much of the improvement work done for them. This was because the Central Croydon Railway Bill was seeking power to commence a line at West Croydon Station, which would pass along the back of Tamworth Road, sweep round across Church Street and Surrey Street to the site of the then existing Town Hall, and tunnel under the High Street into Croydon Central Station; provision being made for a new road right across the Market area from the Dog and Bull, Surrey Street, emerging into High Street, opposite Katharine

1. Ibid.
However the line, and the road, were never commenced.

The next move came in September 1884, when the Council listened to a proposal for the appointment of a High Street Improvement Committee consisting of Aldermen Bowyer, Cooper, Layton, Rymer, and Thrift, and Councillors Allen, Goodwin, Hinton, Hobbs, Miller, Morland, Pelton and Taylor. There were objections raised to Hinton, Miller, Pelton, and Thrift on the grounds of their being pecuniarily interested in the Improvement (they were all shopkeepers with premises in the immediate vicinity); but at the next Council meeting the suggested committee was appointed, with the addition of Councillors Gurney, Hopekirk, and Newberry.

Councillor Hinton, a wholesale provision merchant and a Strict and Particular Baptist, was elected chairman. In an early speech, he described Middle Row as a gigantic upas tree and a place where no reasonable man would put his cattle. The High Street, he suggested, was so narrow as to be dangerous to life and limb and it was not surprising

---

1. CPL, S70(656.2) CR0, Preliminary Report by the Town Clerk to the Borough Council as to Bills in Parliamentary Session, 1884, pp.4-5.

2. Appendix III, p.458, infra, contains a list of Council members especially concerned with the Improvement project, together with the names of the Wards they represented, their occupations, and religious and political affiliations.

3. Pelton, Relics, p.56.
that the Mayor, in his "state carriage", always avoided it on his way to the Town Hall. In places the road, including the footpaths, was only twenty-four or twenty-five feet wide. Advocating a wide avenue planted with trees, he expressed the hope that in due course, "instead of the fair Croydonians going across the water to see the Boulevards of Paris, the fair Parisians would come across the English Channel to see the Boulevards of Croydon." This last comment was greeted with both laughter and applause.

The local newspapers largely supported the setting up of the committee, the Croydon Chronicle commenting that the improvement should have been carried out twenty years previously. The same paper felt, though, that the state of Middle Row had been exaggerated to an absurd degree. It concluded its comments by expressing the belief that the ultimate cost would be nil; that a little money would have to be laid out in the early stages but that if the scheme was carried out fairly the ultimate return would exceed the expense. The Croydon Review also supported the project but introduced a new and later highly important factor into the argument by pointing out that whatever was done, a new Town Hall would have to be included in the scheme.

The Croydon Guardian took up a different position from the other local papers, and one that it was to hold with increasing fervour until the Improvement Scheme was finally carried out. It did not seek to deny that the removal of Middle Row and its surroundings would be a vast improvement and said that no exception could be taken in principle to the widening of the High Street. But it suggested that the scheme would tend to benefit only a few interested persons and urged that the taxpayers should not be taxed for an embellishment from which they could derive only a trifling advantage. Further, because of the nearness of London and intensive competition among traders in the town, no-one could afford the increased rentals that would be demanded for any new shop property. Only if the scheme could be carried out without increasing the rates, perhaps by purchasing the Croydon Gas Company and utilising its profits for the purpose, should it be accepted.¹

The Committee, under Councillor Hinton's chairmanship, soon faced a barrage of criticism. He himself had said that it was not a matter that could be done in a month, or even twelve months.² Yet only six weeks after the Committee had been finally appointed, its report was ready for presentation to the Council. There were three principal recommendations: one, that the new High

Street should be not less than fifty-four feet in width; two, that Messrs Blake, Haddock and Carpenter should be employed at a fee not exceeding one hundred guineas to ascertain on what terms the necessary property could be purchased and the value of the frontages which would be made available for lease or sale; and three, that in accordance, with a suggestion made to the Committee by means of a letter from an absent member, Councillor Pelton, the cleared sites should be put up for auction.¹

The Croydon Advertiser commented that Councillor Hinton had only brought ridicule on his Committee by his too precipitate report. The newspaper pointed out, furthermore, that the absent Councillor who had suggested that the sites be auctioned was chairman of a company "which has not been an unspeakable blessing to the Borough."² When, a fortnight later, the Council had a further look at the report, it accepted an amendment that plans and estimates be invited with prizes for the three best schemes.³

In the meantime, the highly-critical Croydon Guardian had put forward its own plan; a cheaper one. This was for a curving road leaving the High Street at the

¹. Pelton, Relics, p.57; Croydon Advertiser, 22 Nov., 1884 p.2.
². Croydon Land and Investment Co.: Cox, op. cit., p.169
³. Pelton, Relics, p.57.
corner of Crown Hill, i.e., in the north-eastern corner of the Market area, and emerging into the main road again just short of the Town Hall. The newspaper accepted that the scheme would not meet with the approval of the High Street traders because business would be diverted to the new thoroughfare; but it would save the ratepayers "a considerable amount of taxation."\(^1\)

The Council's competition attracted twenty-five entries.\(^2\) But, although the Croydon Chronicle assured its readers that the widening of High Street had at last come within what it called the range of practical politics, it also warned that the work would not be carried out unless a strong expression of public feeling was manifested. Norwood Councillors could be expected to offer almost automatic opposition, suggested the newspaper, and many others would advocate postponement until trade was better. Delay however would be unwise for the cost of such a scheme was rising all the time. It was unfortunate that the Town Hall was in the way of the proposed widening for, antiquated and inadequate as it was, it still had a useful life.\(^3\)

Since nearly all the competitors proposed demolishing all the buildings within the Market area the

---

2. Pelton, Relics, p.58.
Council decided, before awarding the prizes, to instruct Messrs Blake, Haddock and Carpenter to provide a rough estimate of the cost of acquiring the properties. This showed that, including compensation to occupiers, it would cost the Corporation £182,000 but that the land consisted, for the most part, of building frontages of very great value. Meanwhile, the Committee was reconstituted, close regard being paid to the need to exclude such members as Alderman Thrift, and Councillors Hinton, Miller, and Pelton, who had pecuniary interest in redevelopment.

The following month, the Council approved the competition awards. The first prize of £100 went to Fortuna, the pseudonym of J.M. Brydon, F.R.I.B.A., of Cambridge Place, Regent's Park, London, who was responsible for Chelsea Town Hall (1885-1887) and the so-called New Government Offices, on the corner of Great George Street and Parliament Street, which house the Department of Economic Affairs, most of the Treasury, and part of the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. The second

2. See p.203, supra.
prize, of £50, was awarded to J.D. Hayton and W.F. Potter and the third, £25, to F. Evitt. Brydon's scheme, in addition to the widening of High Street and the demolition of the whole area, required the construction of a new street west of North End, as a continuation of Surrey Street. The High Street was to be widened to fifty-five feet, Crown Hill to fifty feet, and Surrey Street and "New Surrey Street" were both to be fifty-five feet wide.¹

The London Echo announced, "The whole centre of the town is to be pulled down and re-arranged and the streets levelled afresh....When Croydon has thus been beautified it will be one of the handsomest towns around London."² But the reporter had obviously overlooked the warning of Alderman Cooper, a member of the Improvement Committee who, at the Council meeting when the awards were approved, had assured critics that it was an entirely erroneous impression for Councillors to think that, by commending certain plans for the prizes, the Committee intended suggesting that one of them be carried out.³ Messrs Blake, Haddock and Carpenter had estimated that the cost of demolishing all the property in the area and compensating the owners there would amount to £182,000.⁴

1. Pelton, Relics, p.59
4. See p.208, supra.
Brydon's plan, which included not only total demolition of the Market area but also the northward extension of Surrey Street, would obviously have cost even more.

However, when after a further three months the Improvement Committee produced another report, the scheme outlined was a vastly cheaper and more modest one. It was presented to the Council on 10 May, 1886, and recommended the widening of the High Street to fifty feet, and the demolition of the property on its west side, together with that on the back land including Middle How; but not including that in Surrey Street. A cul-de-sac road was to give back access to the new High Street and the old Surrey Street properties. The Town Hall was to be demolished, the ground let for building purposes, and a new Town Hall built on a site of less value; but no place was named specifically. The estimated cost of this modified scheme was only £62,865, the interest and sinking fund on this amounting to about £2,580 per annum. The Water Committee was to be requested to say whether the current charge for water, without any increase, might be relied on to produce that amount.¹

At the next Council meeting, chief opposition came from critics of the accuracy of the calculations, rather than from any who doubted the need for the project; though one Councillor thought that to move the Town Hall would be

¹ Pelton, Relics, p. 60.
a great mistake as it would take away business as well. Another Councillor, with, as will be seen later, considerable foresight pleaded that the whole Market area should be demolished, and that Middle Street should have an outlet into Surrey Street, the proposal for a blind road being a complete mistake.¹ He also favoured a High Street width of fifty-five or sixty feet.²

The Croydon Advertiser and the Croydon Chronicle not surprisingly; and also the Norwood News, finding that people in that part of the town would not have to contribute much, if anything, towards its fulfilment came out in favour of the scheme. "If," it said, "some gigantic plan had been proposed which would have burdened the whole of the borough with an enormous debt, we should have considered it the duty of the Norwood ratepayers to resist.....Upper Norwood has so little in common with the trade of Croydon that it would not be right for the property owners and ratepayers there to bear an equal share with their Croydon neighbours of the cost of improving the centre of the town." But, it suggested, the proposed scheme was moderate in dimension, did not involve heavy liabilities, and the method by which it was to be paid for, that is from the water profits, would cost the Upper Norwood ratepayers nothing and the South Norwood ratepayers little

¹. See pp.281-282, infra.
more.\textsuperscript{1}

The \textit{Croydon Guardian}, the overtly Conservative local paper was, as usual, out of step. It had, in the previous December, published a letter by a Chepstow Road solicitor, J. Davis Peard, who had raised the old cry of "pecuniary interest", despite the fact that the Council, the previous month, had apparently gone to considerable lengths to meet that formerly-justified criticism. The letter had continued:

"As to High Street being a disgrace to the Town, it has on the contrary something interesting and unique in its way and affords evidence of Croydon being as different from a London suburb as Brixton Hill is from the High Street itself. One of the charms to those residents who have to go to the City daily is the great distinction which exists between our Town and.....London itself.....I, for one, see nothing that Croydon need be ashamed of in its ancient High Street and I hope the ratepayers will ....protest against the expenditure of their money which can only result in benefiting a few interested parties."

\textsuperscript{2}

This letter is very important because it reveals clearly another previously unmentioned aspect of the opposition to Improvement; that of the wealthy commuter, especially on the Park Hill estate, who wanted Croydon to remain a kind of sylvan retreat and who would not gain personally and so was unenthusiastic about paying additional rates to benefit those who remained in the town all day.


\textsuperscript{2} Croydon Guardian, 5 Dec., 1885, p.6.
The growing influence of such people was referred to later by the Croydon Advertiser when it spoke wistfully of the earlier Liberal ascendancy in the town which had diminished as the place had become "a huge dormitory for the merchants and other City men whose votes as Conservatives in London have been repeated in Croydon."¹

However, the Croydon Guardian went farther than its correspondent J. Davis Bead had, and suggested that perhaps not even the High Street traders would benefit if the road were widened. North End it pointed out was full of good shops, George Street was to be widened, and those two roads linked the two principal railway stations. "High Street has remained in its present condition for years, and," continued the paper, "will probably, in its widened condition, remain for a thousand years more."² It suggested that all the Corporation had to do was to decide how wide the street should be and then, as each lease fell in, compel the owner to put back his building to the new line; a curious suggestion, particularly as not all the properties were leasehold.³

But even if the Croydon Guardian did not reflect a

². In fact, it remained "in its widened condition" for seventy years, at the end of which time the buildings on the east side began to be set back in readiness for further widening.
majority newspaper view on the Improvement, it was not the sole obstructionist body. It will be remembered that the Improvement Committee had recommended that its modified scheme should be financed by the profits of the water charge.\(^1\) But the Water Committee, at its next meeting, opposed the idea of its surplus being used in this way.\(^2\)

As a result, when the whole matter was discussed further by the full Council on 24 May, 1886, the Improvement Committee's report was referred back.\(^3\) The people of South Norwood and, even more so, Upper Norwood no doubt wondered whether any alternative method of financing the scheme would be as easy for them to bear as this one would have been.

When the Improvement Committee again reported to the Council in August, it remained adamant about the source of finance, but it had made substantial alterations to meet other criticisms.\(^4\) Feeling the force of the suggestion that the road at the back of the High Street properties should not be a cul-de-sac it recommended that after all the entire market area should be cleared. This volte face would, according to the report, involve a gross expenditure of £182,000 the figure originally estimated by Messrs Blake, Haddock and Carpenter at the beginning of the year, as

1. See pp.210-211, supra.
2. Pelton, Relics, p.61.
4. Ibid., 14 Aug., 1886, p.2.
against the estimated figure of £62,865 for the modified scheme considered in May.¹

After three hours the debate was adjourned and was resumed seven weeks later. Then, a Councillor Benson moved that the authorisation that the money be provided from the water rate should be deleted. This is, at first glance, unexpected. He favoured Improvement; and it was to Upper Norwood's advantage that the scheme should be financed from a source that would cost that part of the town nothing.

But Benson wished to use the surplus on the water rate for a quite different purpose; that of softening the town's water.

As the editorial of the Croydon Advertiser commented afterwards, "We do not suppose that in thus preparing the way for his pet project.....the learned Councillor [he was an LL.D] ....intended to secure the utter and entire discomforture of his friends the High Street Improvement Committee, with whom he had just voted, but such was the effect of his amendment."²

It was indeed, for after the debate on his amendment, it was put to the vote and it was carried by 23 to 15, "some of the members having in the meantime left."

The Mayor had then put the adoption of the Improvement Committee's report, as amended, and "not a hand was held up

¹ See pp.208,210, supra.
² Croydon Advertiser, 9 Oct.,1886, p.2.
in its favour."1 At that moment, to quote the Croydon Advertiser, "The High Street Improvement Committee..... practically ceased to exist, and unless exceptional circumstances arise.....the proposal to widen the High Street and sweep away those disgraceful slums which are known as Middle Row, is doomed to disappear from local practical politics."2

The same newspaper, with a bitterness that was quite uncharacteristic, analysed the opposition to the scheme. It included, the editor suggested, most of those Councillors who had unsuccessfully formulated plans of their own. He also noted, perhaps with more accuracy, that of the twenty-one Aldermen and Councillors who were "on the side of stagnation" only six or seven were Liberals, the remainder being "pronounced Conservatives" while, on the other side, Alderman Rymer and Councillor Miller, both Conservatives, found themselves in the company of no less than nineteen Liberals. "We are so heartily disgusted," continued the editorial, "that we find it difficult to argue the matter much further.....we cannot conceive how business men, of ordinary mental capacity, and of reasonable public spirit, could have brought about so disgraceful and depressing a decision."3

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p.5.
So, after twenty-five years of discussion, and the expenditure of some money and a lot of time, the project was back on square one. "Public opinion was very dissatisfied and at the ensuing Municipal Elections an emphatic verdict was given in favour of the Improvement. The defeat of the opposition was especially severe in the Central Ward," reported Pelton.¹ "Observer", in a letter to the Croydon Chronicle said, "An accident may prevent, and an opposition can hinder, but a work of such public benefit must sooner or later be done, if there is any public spirit in the town."²

It was to be many months before another serious effort was made. But that effort, when it finally came, was to be, at long last, a successful one. In the meantime, Councillors and residents who favoured the scheme could only look back on a quarter century of fruitless argument and successful obstruction.

In summary, this had begun with the anonymous pamphlet of 1829.³ At the same time Improvement Commissioners were appointed to light the High Street.⁴ There was also a vaguely defined plan, presumably by the

1. Pelton, Relics, p.61
3. See p.191, supra.
4. See pp.191-192, supra.
Vestry, to widen the same road.¹

Immediately after its formation in 1849, the Local Board of Health had successfully opened up the southern apex of the Market area, but the possible development of the idea of combining private enterprise and municipal subsidy had eventually come to nought.²

Next, in the early 1860's, Dr Carpenter had argued unsuccessfully for the widening of the High Street.³ But two railway company plans to alter the area, either directly or indirectly, had finally had no effect either on the High Street or on the slums at its rear.⁴ In 1864 Dr Carpenter had made his supreme effort to persuade the Board to seek Parliamentary powers to widen the High Street and sweep away Middle Row, and his proposal had been carried with only one dissentient.⁵ But when a committee formed for the purpose reported to the Board on the expenditure that would be incurred in obtaining powers, only the Chairman's casting vote saved the day, and Carpenter had then felt, doubtless rightly, that an application to Parliament would have no chance of success with such minimal support from the Board.⁶

¹ See p.192, supra.
² See pp.192-193, supra.
³ See p.194, supra.
⁴ See pp.194-195, supra.
⁵ See pp.195-196, supra.
⁶ See p.197, supra.
The withdrawal of his proposal had been followed by a period of eight years when the matter remained largely dormant.

In the 1870's, the market had declined and there had been discussion on the future of the market houses.\(^1\)

In 1875, the Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act became law.\(^2\) There was, too, mounting local newspaper criticism.\(^3\)

Yet despite all this, nothing had been done by the Local Board which was becoming, seemingly, increasingly inept and inactive. The main hope of those who wanted "improvement" seemed to lie in the Incorporation of the town as a Borough, an event which took place finally in 1883.\(^4\)

Another Railway Bill that might have changed the local landscape beyond all recognition had proved abortive.\(^5\)

But, in 1884, a High Street Improvement Committee had been set up which not only had the task of considering the High Street widening and the Middle Row slums, but also the future of the Town Hall which had become inadequate for its function and which would be an obstruction if its neighbouring buildings were thrown back.\(^6\)

---

1. See p.198, supra.
2. See p.199, supra.
3. See p.200, supra.
5. See pp.202-203, supra.
6. See p.204, supra.
The new Committee, which included members who had a vested interest in High Street property and trade, had produced a precipitate report which was referred back. On its being reconsidered by the Council a decision had been made to hold a competition for the best plans for the area. Almost all the competitors had proposed the drastic remedy of total demolition of the Market area; and so the Council had sought, and obtained, an estimate for the cost of that work, the Improvement Committee, in the meantime, having been reconstituted to exclude interested parties.

Early in 1886, the estimated cost of the project had been known to be £182,000; and the prizes had been awarded, the winner being J.M. Brydon, a well-known London architect. However it had been made quite clear that the Committee was not implying, in making the award, that Brydon's scheme should be undertaken and, shortly afterwards, it had produced an alternative more modest one estimated as costing only £62,865. It had recommended that the profits on the Water Rate should meet the cost, an idea that was attractive generally to the ratepayers, especially in Norwood, but not to the Water Committee.

1. See p.205, *supra*.
2. See p.206, *supra*.
5. See pp.210-211,214, *supra*.
This report too had been referred back and when it had reappeared before the Council it was found that the Improvement Committee remained adamant about using the Water profits but that, to meet other criticisms, had reverted to the earlier idea of demolishing all property within the Market area.\(^1\) After very lengthy debate, an amendment to the effect that the profit from the water charge should not be used had been carried substantially, whereupon a straight vote on the entire report and including that amendment had been defeated unanimously.\(^2\)

It was almost a year after that before the matter was raised again. Then on 17 October, 1887 Alderman Allder unsuccessfully proposed to the Council that Parliamentary powers should be obtained to acquire Middle Row. It was an isolated proposition from a member of the Council who had played no particularly active part either in favour of, or against, the idea of Improvement; and it possibly arose from a letter that the Medical Officer had reported receiving a few days earlier. This enclosed a plan and a request that the houses marked on it, since they were unfit for human habitation, should be inspected and reported upon in accordance with 31 and 32 Vict., c.130. The signatories were a barrister-at-law and three J.Ps., one of them the ageing Dr Alfred Carpenter.

---

1. See p.214, supra.
2. See pp.215-216, supra.
The Medical Officer had reported that he doubted whether this was representation within the meaning of the Act, but that he had inspected the premises. He did not however consider that they were unfit for human habitation.¹

Allder anyway emphasised the moral advantages of doing away with Middle Row; and advocated a market place 90 feet by 270 feet for sixty or seventy stalls or shops bringing in a net income of £1,500 per annum, which would permit a capital outlay of £40,000 or £45,000. He was supported by Councillor Morland who pointed out that the area was occupied largely by undesirable casual visitors to the town who would not come at all if Middle Row were demolished. But an amendment proposing the improvement of the High Street and Surrey Street frontages and also the original proposition, were both defeated, even the sympathetic members of the Council having become disillusioned about the possibility of any scheme ever being finally successful.²

However John Ollis Pelton claims that the municipal elections of that year were distinctly in favour of the High Street widening.³ Further, at the Civic

¹. CPL, Local Board of Health, Sanitary Committee minutes, 1885-1893, 11 Oct., 1887.
³. Pelton, Relics, p.64.
Service following on those elections the Vicar of Croydon, the Rev. J.M. Braithwaite, made it quite clear where he stood. Taking as his text, "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from Heaven," he said:

"If vagrancy is an evil which we cannot altogether get rid of, there is no occasion for any Borough to allow it to have a recognised centre of such magnitude, so that it constitutes almost a town by itself, with a public opinion of its own, and a basis of operations from which to spoil the whole neighbourhood." (1)

But nothing happened, and the Croydon Chronicle, in a leading article on 5 May, 1888, suggested that the Council had no sincere or determined intention of grappling with the problem and without pressure from the burgesses the work would be delayed until its cost was ruinous. 2

Soon after this comment appeared, although it would be greatly exaggerating the influence of the Croydon Chronicle to suggest that the timing was anything more than coincidental, there was a revival of interest in the Council Chamber and, this time, however tortuously, it was to lead to final success. Its leader was a Croydon hatter and tailor, Alderman Francis Coldwells, who had taken no particularly noticeable part in earlier debate. Although never honoured subsequently by the town, perhaps because of his marginal association with Jabez Spencer Balfour's Liberator enterprise, the final success of the Improvement

2. Croydon Chronicle, 5 May, 1888, p. 5.
Scheme was due in very large measure to his skill in debate and in manoeuvre, within the Council Chamber.

He had been born at Stoke Newington in 1832 and had been educated at the British School there. He became land steward for Col. Mosse Robinson of Bird Hurst, and then entered into partnership as a tailor with J.E. Arnold, in North End. When made an Alderman in 1884 the Croydon Guardian had commented, "To say that Alderman Coldwells is the Demosthenes of the Town Council is only to award what is due to him. Nobody has been more severely criticised; but that is the distinction which applies to your so-called self-made man. At the same time it probably heightens the value of the honours gained and nobody will grudge them to him whose natural gifts have comprised the sole basis on which his elevation has been constructed."

During his period as Chairman of the High Street Special Committee, after 1888, there was frequent reference to his negotiating skill and his ability as an orator; and in the 1892 Parliamentary Election, as a Home Rule candidate, he won Lambeth North from the Conservatives by a majority of 130, standing for reforms in respect of the London water supply and the metropolitan markets, and for

Then came the Liberator crash. At the first meeting of the creditors of The Building Securities Co. (Ltd), on 2 June, 1893, at Carey Street, London, W.C., Coldwells attended as a director. The Company, one of the Balfour group, had been formed in 1884 mainly to buy, develop and sell land and erect buildings; but its apparent raison d’être was to acquire and re-sell the business of Messrs J.W. Hobbs, a transaction carried out in April, 1885, at a paper profit of £5,000 but an actual loss of £28,000 in cash. Almost its entire subsequent business had consisted of speculation in stocks and shares and at the time of its crash there were liabilities of £138,893 and assets of £11,584. The insolvency was attributed by the Secretary to "the engagement in larger transactions than its subscribed capital warranted, and also to the payment of dividends which had not been earned."

Coldwells addressed the meeting rising, as he termed it, in self-defence. He said that £7,647 had been divided amongst the directors in fees, £2,000 of that going to Jabez Spencer Balfour. Personally he had received only £36, and for that small sum his character and prospects had been irretrievably ruined for life, besides which a writ had


2. The principal in this firm was Councillor Hobbs.
been issued against him for £10,000. He had, anyway, only joined the Board in October 1891, and was not therefore responsible for what had occurred previously to that date.\(^1\) The day after the meeting, he wrote to the Council resigning his aldermanic seat on health grounds.\(^2\) He did not contest his parliamentary seat at the next election and his opponent, H.M. Stanley, a Liberal Unionist, won it back by a majority of 401 from a Home Rule candidate, C.P. Trevelyan.\(^3\)

Coldwell's career in public life was finished; but this self-made man, as will be seen, had been largely responsible for the final success of the Improvement Scheme. The physical results of that project remain virtually unchanged to this day, long after the name of Coldwells has been quite forgotten.

C. The Final Cure

7. Successful Municipal Intervention, 1888-1890

On 25 June, 1888, Alderman Coldwells had submitted to the Council a proposal that a committee should report on the possibility of improving High Street, Surrey Street, and Crown Hill, and abolishing Middle Row, Market Street, and King Street, without having to buy all the properties affected and afterwards re-sell the sites. He stressed

---

1. Croydon Advertiser, 3 Jun., 1893, p.3.
2. Ibid., 17 Jun., 1893, p.5.
the "moral aspect" and suggested that if the tramps in Middle Row were dispersed they would be better controlled by the police and, indeed, probably many of them would never come to Croydon at all. The motion was carried by 26 votes to 13.

The attractiveness of Coldwells' proposal was undoubtedly that it opened up the possibility of a substantial scheme being carried out without either raiding the Water profits or incurring considerable, even if only temporary, indebtedness. It was an extension of a principle that had recently been used in connection with property called "Miller's Corner". This stood on the opposite side of High Street, where the estimated cost of purchase by the Corporation for road widening had been £20,000, but where an "equitable arrangement" with the new occupiers, the London and County Banking Company, had resulted in a cost of only £2,000, the sum paid to the Company to set back the frontage of their new premises.

As might be expected, the Croydon Guardian opposed the scheme, "on precisely the same grounds on which we oppose the establishment of Free Libraries, the utter

1. HSIS, p.1; Croydon Chronicle, 30 Jun., 1888, p.2.
2. Pelton, Relics, pp.64-65; Croydon Advertiser, 30 Jun., 1888, p.5.
3. Councillor Miller's drapery shop was there.
injustice in forcing the payment of these things on those who do not ask for them and do not participate in them."¹

However, progress was made towards forming the Committee, the constitution of which Coldwells had obviously considered most carefully. He favoured a small one with no ex-officio members, not even the Mayor, with no one interested in any property likely to be affected, nor even with any lawyer or solicitor who was likely to be employed by any owner of property in his own interest. Coldwells even went so far as to oppose the appointment to the Committee of anyone living outside the area but who was in the same business as anyone likely to be affected by the scheme.²

On 1 October, 1888, the High Street Special Committee, as it was called, presented its first report, which was unanimously adopted by the Council. It expressed the view, which it had to modify subsequently, that it would be possible to arrange with interested parties to improve High Street and abolish Middle Row, Market Street, and King Street, without first buying all the property. The Committee thought it would be unnecessary to deal with the Surrey Street and Crown Hill frontages, beyond the need to obtain entrance and exit for a roadway at the rear of the

². Croydon Advertiser, 21 Jul., 1888, p.3.
High Street properties.\(^1\)

The report, expectedly, was welcomed by the Croydon Advertiser, though it pointed out that the proposal as it stood would leave the Town Hall jutting out into the middle of the new road.\(^2\) The Croydon Guardian, opposing the report, suggested that the main reason for the work was said to be the necessity of dispersing the lodging houses and that the existing legislation was adequate to do that as the Corporation could refuse to licence lodging houses that were close to each other.\(^3\)

The Committee soon reported to the Council that negotiations were proving difficult because of uncertainty about the Town Hall, the shopkeepers not unnaturally objecting to having their frontages set back if that building were allowed to remain projecting nearly twenty feet into the road.\(^4\) But if the Town Hall were merely set back to the new frontage and accordingly extended on the other three sides it would occupy a valuable High Street frontage of one hundred and eighty feet. Further, it

\(^1\) It will be seen that this was a modification of Coldwells' original resolution: see p.226, supra.

\(^2\) Croydon Advertiser, 6 Oct., 1888, p.5.

\(^3\) Croydon Guardian, 6 Oct., 1888, p.5.

\(^4\) HSIS, pp.2-3; Croydon Advertiser, 3 Nov., 1888, pp.3,6. It was almost inconceivable that the Town Hall could remain where it was if the rest of the improvement were carried out. This fact probably prevented the existence, such as there was in Leicester, of two improving factions, one favouring economy and the other wanting associated new civic and recreational facilities as well: Asa Briggs, Victorian Cities, 1963, pp.385-386.
suggested that it was essential if negotiations were not to break down that owners and occupiers should be informed that the Council would not allow the Town Hall to extend beyond the building line.¹

By that time Argus Letters to the Croydon Advertiser were already referring to "the wonderful diplomacy" of Alderman Coldwells.² This he was exercising behind the scenes in discussions that were going on over the alternative site for the Town Hall which the Committee had reported might be obtained "at a less sacrifice of money." The negotiations were with the Brighton Railway Company which, it will be remembered, had built a branch line from New, now East, Croydon to a terminus called Central Croydon.³ Although the station had seemed to be ideally placed and Katharine Street had been opened up to give access to it, both the line and the building had been an embarrassment to the Company, and had been little-used by the travelling public; and providentially, both as to time and place, the Company wished to be rid of its white elephant at the moment when the Council was seeking a new Town Hall site.

But the agreement that emerged was more complex

¹ Pelton, Relics, pp.66-67; HSIS, pp.3-4.
² Croydon Advertiser, 8 Dec.,1888, p.5.
³ See p.195, supra.
than a straightforward purchase of the Station site. For one thing, that building occupied only a part of the land that was owned by the Company in the vicinity; thus the negotiations concerned in addition a skating rink, a frontage at 41 High Street, and indeed much of the ground bounded by Katharine Street, High Street, Mint Walk, and Park Lane. This the Committee pointed out would be "more than sufficient for . . . a Town Hall, Municipal Offices, Police Station, and Public Library, leaving a surplus of land which can easily be disposed of." The Company wanted £12,500, but eventually settled for £11,500.¹ There were however conditions, and one of these was distinctly unpopular in some quarters.

Between the Central Station and the main London-Brighton line, there lay the Fairfield, across which the branch line had been built. Legally or illegally, the Fairfield had been sold earlier to the Railway Company and had been fenced-in and its gravel extracted, leaving only a diagonal path running across it, in a south-easterly direction, from the Park Lane-George Street junction to a footbridge leading over the main railway line into Fairfield Road. In exchange for a strip of the Fairfield, parallel with Park Lane, which would enable Park Lane to be widened to forty feet, the Company wished to close the diagonal path; and completion of purchase of the Central Station site

¹ HSIS, p.5; Croydon Advertiser, 9 Feb., 1889, p.3.
was conditional upon the Fairfield exchange. This "package" deal was to stir anew opposition to the Improvement; and create a lot of trouble for those engaged in the work.

When the plan was debated Alderman Coldwells pointed out that the Council must not expect that all the advantages could be on their side. Some Councillors expressed fears that once the diagonal path was closed the Railway Company would use the hollow made by the gravel extraction for an engine shed and railway works, but others took the view that if it brought five hundred workmen to Croydon it would be a good thing for the town. Several members pointed out that the advantage lay with the Council because Croydon Central Station was a white elephant and a nuisance to the Company, which could not close the station without the Corporation's consent.

But generally any feeling within the Council that there would be a loss of amenity, or that the Railway Company was getting the better of the deal by being paid to rid itself of a financial embarrassment and to obtain more favourable access to land it already held, was swamped by jubilation that the problem of a Town Hall site, and therefore of the High Street widening, had been solved so unexpectedly. The report received almost unanimous support.

1. HSIS, p.8.
2. Croydon Advertiser, 9 Feb., 1889, p.3.
and its adoption took place amid cheers. But the following month, the Council had to receive a deputation which stated that it approved the purchase of the land from the Railway Company but opposed, as a condition, the surrender to the Company of the Fairfield footpath. A further memorial was sent to the Council in May. However by that time negotiations were complete and the petitioners were advised to contact the Railway Company. They did so; but the Company refused to re-open negotiations.

Coincident with this, Haddock was negotiating with property owners; and it was rapidly becoming obvious that although in many instances voluntary arrangements were possible, there were other cases where it would be necessary to obtain compulsory powers. This, as a report of the Committee pointed out, was because of the considerable doubt that existed in many people's minds as to whether the Council seriously intended carrying out the project.

The same report set out the details of the final proposals; and the next edition of the local newspapers bore a plan showing the alterations to street widths and

1. Ibid., p.5.
2. HSIS, p.8.
3. Ibid., pp.9-11.
4. Ibid., p.12.
alignments. 1 The High Street was to be widened to a minimum of fifty feet and was, at the southern end, to have a space nearly 130 feet wide where, suggested the Croydon Advertiser, there could be a fountain or statue erected in commemoration of the work. There was to be a new road linking Crown Hill with Surrey Street, 24 feet wide. There was no proposal to include in the scheme the frontages of Surrey Street northwards from the junction with the new street because, it was thought, to purchase them would be too costly to be profitable. Only that part of Crown Hill which it was necessary to take to make the new roadway was to be dealt with by the Corporation though, suggested the Croydon Advertiser, "as in Surrey Street private enterprise may see the advisability of doing that which does not at present seem likely to be sufficiently remunerative to tempt the Town Council." 2

In approving the plan, the same newspaper again paid tribute to Aldermen Coldwells.

"The Committee," it said, "have come to the Council on every possible occasion, pledging that body to every step they have taken, and feeling their difficult way with great ingenuity, grasp of detail, and vigour of purpose. They have been under skilful guidance, for Mr Alderman Coldwells has fairly surpassed himself in the methods he has adopted, both inside and outside the Committee..... [He] wholly deserves his success for the consummate

1. For instance, Croydon Advertiser, 5 Oct., 1889, p.5. This plan is reproduced on p.95, supra.
skill he has exhibited." (1)

Very soon the Special Committee produced a further report which gave details of the costing. It promised that compulsory acquisition would only be resorted to in the last extremity and it claimed that the occupiers of the largest business premises in High Street were quite ready to reach agreement on reasonable terms.

In the opinion of the firm of surveyors, the cost of purchasing the scheduled properties, including all interests, would amount to no more than £146,000 whilst the new building sites thrown open might be expected to let at rents which, when capitalized, would be equal to £66,000. There would therefore be a net expenditure of £80,000 which, by negotiation, might be reduced to £40,000, or at least to £50,000. If the net cost were £50,000, the charge for principal and interest would amount to about £2,000 per annum for 60 years. The rateable value of the property in High Street with which it was proposed to deal was £1,829 and the General District Rate on that value, at 2s. 5d. in the pound, was £221. The Committee felt that at a very moderate estimate the rateable value of that property would be at least trebled and that the new properties might therefore be expected to yield to the General District Rate additional revenue of £442. That, set against the £2,000 per annum, would leave £1,558 to be provided. Whether that

1. Ibid.
or some proportion of it should be taken from the water rate so as to alleviate to some extent the disadvantage which the Norwood ratepayers suffered from having to pay a much higher charge for water than their Croydon neighbours, or whether the whole of it should be borne by the General District Rate, or whether a special rate should be levied, or whether it should be made a charge on the financial relief that might be expected to flow from the Local Government Act, were questions which the Council, suggested the Committee, could not properly decide until the actual cost were known more accurately. Thus the controversy that had so afflicted previous schemes was averted. The report was adopted without a single dissentient, the *Croydon Review* noting that the scheme would do much for the commerce of the borough and would give almost limitless employment for all trades during the actual period of the work.

But it was still possible for the scheme to founder. On 23 November, 1889, the columns of the local press gave notice of the Corporation's intention to apply to Parliament for compulsory powers to purchase; and at its next meeting the Council voted with only one dissentient to do so. But, by a curious anomaly, the expense of promoting any Bill in Parliament could not be incurred until the

1. HSIS, pp.15-18.
burgesses had been consulted. This event would, of course, give opponents of the scheme, whatever their motives, the opportunity of bringing all the well-laid plans to a halt; for, by merely persuading the majority of the townspeople not to approve the expense of parliamentary procedure, they would make compulsory purchase impossible, this would in turn make the scheme no longer viable, and yet again the whole Improvement would have to be abandoned. Consultation of the burgesses would be by means of a public meeting, but anyone at that meeting could, if he wished, demand a subsequent poll of the ratepayers. This extraordinary procedure, more suited to an earlier day and age, was fraught with difficulties for supporters of the scheme since any local demagogue, however ill-informed, might be able to sway the meeting; and, however overwhelmingly the project was favoured there, any one individual could insist on a public poll with its attendant difficulty of presenting the voters with the reasoned arguments in support of the plan.

The public meeting was held at the Town Hall on 10 February, 1890. The Mayor opened the proceedings by reading a letter from John Cooper, a previous Mayor, who expressed the hope that the Improvement would be carried out since it was "one of the greatest benefits that could possibly be conferred upon Croydon." Alderman Coldwells

1. Ibid., 7 Dec., 1889, p.5.
then outlined the scheme which, he said, could be completed at very little cost to the ratepayers. He described its numerous and, by now familiar, advantages and, doubtless with an eye to the audience he was addressing, spoke of the work that would be provided over the next two or three years and the stimulus that this would give to trade. He continued, "Thanks to the cheap trains running into Croydon, not only the people of Central Croydon would benefit, but the inhabitants of the Borough generally. Many workmen would be required, and the men would be obliged to live in all parts of the Borough; so that the whole of the town would share in the benefit."¹ He obviously felt it necessary and wise to convince ratepayers outside the town centre that they would gain equally with those living in or near High Street; and, that part of his speech is of interest too because it shows the importance of short-distance railway travel within the bounds of the Borough in the days before the development of cross-town bus services.

Coldwells then continued by describing the financial implications of the scheme; and after the Vicar had spoken, the Mayor invited comments. There was then a "very animated discussion" chiefly revolving round the important, but only indirectly relevant fait accompli, the closure of the diagonal footpath across the Fairfield.²

¹. Pelton, Relics, pp.71-74.
². Ibid., pp.74-77.
The critical count was then taken. Only one person present voted against the Improvement and he went on to demand a poll. His name was Henry G. Bremner, a resident of the Park Hill estate and a writer of fierce letters to the local press alleging corruption among members of the Corporation. Uproar followed and the Deputy Mayor then moved a vote of thanks and urged all the working men present to do all they could, if necessary taking a half day off to vote. When the meeting finally closed Bremner had to be escorted to the cab stand by the Town Clerk and a magistrate, shadowed by half a dozen constables.

Accordingly, arrangements were made for the poll, as laid down by the provisions of the 1875 Public Health Act, the voting papers being delivered to the houses and later collected. But before the poll took place and, with an eye to its outcome, the Special Committee had presented a further report to the Council. The Norwood Review had previously commented that it thought Norwood should bear its share of the general burden and it had advised its readers in the Norwood Ward to support the Council. But the Special Committee recommended to the Council on 5 March,

2. Ibid., p.7. It is not clear why a half day's holiday was necessary as the voting papers were to be delivered to the houses.
that it was desirable to alleviate, as far as possible, the disadvantage that the Norwood ratepayers suffered by having to pay the Lambeth Company's higher charge for water, and that accordingly, the cost of the scheme should be borne, as far as practicable, out of the surplus of the Croydon Water Charge.¹ This was carried in Council by nineteen votes to three; and three days later, at a crucial meeting of the South Norwood Ratepayers' Association, its members agreed with only one dissentient to support the scheme.²

The poll resulted in a substantial majority in support of the Council, the voting being: IN FAVOUR 10,618; AGAINST 2,722; MAJORITY 7,896. Rather over ten thousand of the 14,787 burgesses had voted. The next edition of the Croydon Advertiser analysed the voting figures and stated that about 7,000 single votes— that is from people rated at under £50— had been in favour, and 2,000 against; and that of 4,300 votes by burgesses who had more than one vote, 3,600 were recorded for the scheme, and 700 against. This, it suggested, disproved the claim that voters who would only have to pay indirectly for the Improvement, in other words those paying least rates, formed the majority of its supporters. "We had hoped," it continued, "for a substantial majority, but never, in the most sanguine of our expectations, had we indulged in the wild hope of a majority

¹. HSIS, p.19.
². Pelton, Relics, p.76.
of nearly eight thousand on a total poll of just over thirteen thousand." It reported that the Council were supported by a substantial majority in every district of the borough, that even Upper Norwood and Thornton Heath supported the scheme, and that Park Hill, the affluent estate where the opposition to the loss of the Fairfield footpath had been strongest, was also found to be in favour of the project.  

The same newspaper then went on to review the events that had led up to the poll and suggested there was strong probability that if the question had been submitted to the public on a former occasion the improvements would have been approved even then by a substantial majority.  

The only sour note was sounded, not unexpectedly, by the Croydon Guardian:

"Local affairs appear to be so many shuttlecocks depending for their success on the agility and the expertness of the representative battledores, to whom the excitement and pleasure of the game become the first and apparently the only consideration. "There will be no more need for free dinners...nor will the Croydon Charity Society be called into activity, because every working man will be in constant employment...owing to the...improvement. Any working man failing to obtain work need only apply to any member of the Corporation who if not enabled to provide work, will refer him to the one or two individual members of the Council who promised that it should be given." (3)

2. Ibid.
At this distance of time, it is of course impossible to decide whether the declared motives of individual supporters and opponents of the various attempts at improvement were real, or pretended, or self-delusory. One can only record what they were stated to be; and it is important to do so, because they reveal the issues over which, publicly at least, the forty-year battle was fought. One thing that does emerge clearly is that, of the local newspapers the Croydon Advertiser and the Croydon Chronicle, both avowedly Liberal, supported the various schemes; whereas the Croydon Guardian, staunchly Conservative, invariably opposed them. Latterly, too, the same political division was largely, though not totally, apparent on the Council.¹

The Improvement stemmed, above all, from complaints about the sanitary and structural and moral conditions of the lodging houses in Middle Row. It was known too that the population was migratory, "varying as much as four hundred a night."² It was widely contended that it was the migrant population that was troublesome, and that demolition of the lodging houses would remedy the problem in the town. Opponents of the Improvement scheme, however, asserted that Middle Row and its adjacent streets

---

¹ See p.216, supra.
² Croydon Chronicle, 2 Jun., 1888.
had not been shown to be either pestilential or immoral.¹
Even some of the scheme's supporters agreed with Alderman Rymer when he said that he was "thoroughly well acquainted with those streets and houses, and his experience was that the dwellings there were fairly clean, perfectly healthy, and that there was no overcrowding."²

Professor Ashworth cites evidence that had been given before a Royal Commission that where newer residential areas were expected to attract people from overcrowded districts, the lack of communal facilities, together with the absence of the stimulus of familiar company proved at first a great handicap:

"For example, in 1884, the Vicar of St Mary, Charterhouse, remarked that people were packed together in his parish because of low rents, security from police interference, and the sociability of life there. The attractions of the society were strong enough to outweigh the physical discomforts, while the proximity of well-established markets, such as did not exist in the newer areas, meant a real saving of expenses. Consequently people declined to move out." (3)

3. Wm. Ashworth, The Genesis of Modern British Town Planning, 1954, p. 33, quoting Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, Report, vol. II, p. 130. Allan pointed out that, in Glasgow, strongest opposition to improvement came from the slum-dwellers themselves. "So unpopular were the Trustees that they were afraid to go into the clearance areas unless accompanied," op. cit., p. 610. This was not the case in Croydon because few of the slum dwellers were anything more than purely temporary residents.
Finally in this connection, among those who believed that there were slums in Middle Row were people who accepted the dictum that "as fast as slums are cleared, new ones arise. This is because of (i) the further decay of other old property and (ii) the fact that when the worst slums are removed the next worse properties become the worst." On this point the Croydon Guardian, commenting on what it called "The dispersion of Middle Row to other parts of the town" said, "There is no power possessed by the Council to refuse certificates to lodging houses properly registered and in all probability the one blot removed will result in blotches in various parts."  

Turning now to another aspect of the Improvement Scheme, it has been shown how it came to be closely linked with the need to widen the High Street which, as it stood, was too narrow and crowded even for a single tramway track. The road was often described as being extremely dangerous. But 'Janus', in a letter to the Croydon Guardian suggested that, "narrow as.....the pathway is, there is still room for foot passengers to pass one another, and if that pest of the High Street could (as it should) be got rid of- I mean the most objectionable perambulator, with its attendant

1. Allan, op. cit., p.598.
4. For instance, Croydon Advertiser, 15 May,1886, p.2.
impudent gaping nursemaid—there will be enough room for all reasonable requirements."¹ There was also however a school of thought that the street's narrowness was prejudicial to business.²

In any event, it was easy for opponents of the scheme to attack High Street shopkeepers who supported it, on the grounds that they were doing so for self-gain at the ratepayers' expense; and equally easy for supporters of the scheme to attack shopkeepers elsewhere in the town who opposed it, on the grounds that they were doing so out of jealousy.³ Perhaps the most sensible comment in this direction came in Argus Letters to the Croydon Advertiser: "The High Street people naturally want the improvement done because it will be the best thing in the world for them. The North End people don't want it done because the trade is going their way; the London Road people are actuated by a similar feeling on similar grounds; and of the George Street people the same may be said." But, went on the article, whatever might be the views of the contending factions, it was the Corporation's duty to provide proper trading

2. Croydon Advertiser, 15 May, 1886, p. 2. See also p. 194, supra.
3. For instance Councillor J.T. Hinton's attack on Alderman Allder's "feelings of jealousy for fear there should be a range of noble shops erected when the old ones are removed," Croydon Advertiser, 9 Oct., 1886, p. 2. As we have seen, Allder in fact himself proposed a plan the following year: pp. 221-222, supra.
facilities: "If the customers don't come there that is nothing to do with them. All they have to see is that the High Street is made convenient for business as the chief thoroughfare in the town. At present it is inconvenient and dangerous, and a disgrace to Croydon."¹

Some people asserted that the High Street widening was supported by those who desired the possible benefit of the Tramway Company at the ratepayers' expense.² Some made more general accusations of the few benefiting from the many.³ It is unfortunate that, until the formation of the last and successful committee, little or no effort had been made to exclude from the deliberations and the decision making, not only people who might benefit indirectly but even those whose property was involved.⁴

The state of trade, so often the reason for doing or for not doing things in Victorian times, was cited both by opponents and supporters of the Market area redevelopment.⁵ But supporters of the scheme pointed out

2. For example, J. Davis Peard, in a letter to the Croydon Guardian, 2 Dec., 1885.
3. See pp.205,212, supra. See also the editorial comment in the Croydon Guardian, 9 Oct., 1886, p.5.
4. See pp.203,208, supra.
5. For example, a speech to the Council by Councillor Gurney, Croydon Guardian, 11 Oct., 1886. See also pp. 205,213, supra, on the supposed lack of commercial future for the High Street, because of (a) London, and (b) North End and George Street.
that, locally, trade would be improved if the work were undertaken; improved both directly, in the building trade, and also more indirectly in other fields as well. It is interesting to find that when the Public Meeting was about to take place, a leaflet was published which read: "More Work!!! To the Working Men of Croydon. Attend in Your Hundreds at the Town Hall....And Support the Mayor and Corporation in their endeavour to widen the High Street and thus add to the attractions of our Town, and give Work for Hundreds of your fellow men. Much will depend upon your own efforts!! ONE OF YOUR NUMBER."

Turning again to the opposition to the scheme, additional reasons put forward or implicit for its not being desirable included the sacrificing to the Railway Company of the diagonal path across the Fairfield; jealousy that the opposer's own schemes had been rejected; and a desire to retain the rural charm of the town in contrast to the metropolis.

But the main opposition, otherwise, was concerned with an unwillingness to incur expenditure; an unwillingness to allow the Water Profits to be used for the purpose; a fear, above all, of a substantial burden being put upon the

1. See p.238, supra. See also a speech by Councillor Davies, Croydon Advertiser, 9 Oct., 1886, p.2.

rates. Linked with this, was a divergence of view as to whether improvements in one part of the Borough should be financed only by that part, or spread overall. ¹

Finally, let us consider one other motive that prompted support for the Improvement scheme. C.M. Allan has pointed out that philanthropy, although undoubtedly important in for example the Artisans' Dwellings Movement, was by no means the only motive behind redevelopment of blighted areas.

"A very important motive," he says, "was fear; fear of the reservoirs of disease, crime and vice which the worst slums tended to be. Further, many of the most decayed areas were the town centres which, having grown up with the narrow winding streets in pre-industrial times, had become quite unsuited to bearing the increased traffic of the nineteenth century. But perhaps the most important motive force behind improvement was the feeling that slum areas were an affront to civic dignity. The City Fathers were often made painfully aware of this problem because decay and the City Chambers tended to be side by side in the oldest part of the town." ²

In the case of Croydon, not only was the decay literally side by side with the Town Hall, the Town Hall itself was in serious need of removal or enlargement, and would in any event have to be drastically altered, or moved, when the High Street was widened.

So much for the motive of the individual; but Croydon in the second half of the nineteenth century was

¹  Croydon Advertiser, 16 Jan., 1886, p. 6.

²  Allan, op. cit., p. 598. See also pp. 200-202, 222-223, supra. It will have been noticed how frequently the term "public spirit" is used by both speakers and newspapers in this context.
acquiring a sense of collective responsibility as well. A Liberal ascendency had grown up in local affairs though it had subsequently, as has been noted already, been diminished by the growth of Croydon as a dormitory suburb for wealthy commuters. It has been shown too that it had been the Liberals, predominantly, who had favoured the Improvement and the Conservatives who had opposed it.¹ This is to be expected since the commuters saw less reason to incur expense in the town centre than did men who walked and traded there daily.

It is not possible, unfortunately, to discover the occupations and political persuasion of all the Aldermen and Councillors who took part in discussions on the scheme; and, further, as has been shown, they did not in every instance vote consistently. But certain trends certainly emerge from a study of the facts that are available.²

Seventeen members of the Council, actively interested in the redevelopment of the market area, are identifiable as having been, in the broadest sense of the word, tradesmen in the town. Eight of those are known to have been Liberals, and four Conservatives: of the eight Liberals, six generally favoured Improvement and none are known to have been against it; of the four Conservatives,

¹ See pp.213,216, supra.

² The information that follows is based on the facts set out in Appendix III, p.458, infra.
two were in favour and none are revealed as being contrary. Seven other active members of the Council are identifiable as being commuters. Three of them, all favouring Improvement, were Liberals; and of three known Conservatives two were against Improvement and the attitude of the other one is unknown. Of thirteen Aldermen and Councillors in the sample who can be identified as supporting the project, at least nine were Liberals and only two (both traders, in a broad sense) were certainly Conservatives. These figures, whilst not statistically reliable, give the general impression that a Liberal was likely to favour Improvement whether he traded in the town or commuted; a Conservative however was likely to be against Improvement unless he traded in the town. It has been observed already that the Liberal local newspapers favoured the successive schemes; the Conservative paper was bitterly opposed to them.1

It has also been noted that the Chairman of the ill-fated High Street Improvement Committee, Councillor Hinton, was a Strict and Particular Baptist.2 The Chairman of the successful High Street Special Committee, Alderman Coldwells, was a strong temperance advocate, but his religious persuasion is not known.3 There are altogether

1. See p.241, supra.
2. See p.203, supra.
3. He was educated at a British School: p.224, supra.
seventeen members of the Council who showed interest in the Improvement and whose religious connections can be identified. Four were Baptists, three of them at least (Allder, Thrift, and Barrow; all wealthy men) attending Spurgeon's Tabernacle at West Croydon; two others were Congregationalists; one was a Quaker; and one was a Methodist. Of these eight nonconformists, six at least favoured the Improvement, and the other two are not known to have been against it. The Methodist was a Conservative; Councillor Hinton, the Strict Baptist, would never reveal his politics; all the rest were Liberals. Of the nine known Anglicans, three commuters, two of whom were Conservatives and one a Liberal, attended churches that are known to have been Evangelical, though the Liberal played no active part in its work.¹ The Liberal favoured Improvement, and at least one of the other two was against it. One Liberal, who favoured the scheme, was connected with a Tractarian church.²

It would seem from this necessarily slight analysis that support for Improvement came, especially, from Liberal tradesmen, who might be nonconformists or at either

¹. Alderman Foss: information supplied by Mr W.R. Secker.

². This was Alderman Cooper who was treasurer of St Augustine's Church Building Fund. The Vicar of St Augustine's suggests that Cooper was Tractarian because Gladstone was, rather than through any deep personal conviction.
end of the Anglican spectrum; nonconformists were almost invariably Liberal anyway. Opposition, on the other hand, came especially from those Conservatives who were commuters; and such Conservatives were, almost inevitably, Anglicans.

It would be quite wrong to treat these as well-defined conclusions. The sample is small enough to do no more than indicate apparent trends; but it constitutes an important part of the pattern of support and opposition to a scheme that was, at long last, in sight of fulfilment. For, with the announcement of the result of the poll, the Council could go ahead and obtain the Parliamentary powers that it needed to carry out the redevelopment. It was of that moment in time that John Ollis Pelton wrote:

"It is difficult to foretell the effect of this, the greatest improvement that Croydon has ever contemplated .......When the ....narrow old thoroughfare .....is converted into a fine main street .....we shall often think of the ancient tenements which contain so many relics of a picturesque past .....Such Conservatism is .....commendable, if we are prepared .....to acknowledge the requirements of progress, and not endeavour .....to preserve anything that may tend to hinder the natural expansion of the .....town." (1)

9. The Implementation of the 1890 Croydon Improvement Act

The Croydon Improvement Act received the Royal Assent on 4 July, 1890. It provided for the street improvements; the demolition, and sale of the sites, of the Town Hall and Butter Market House; the extinguishment of rights of way over Bell Hill, Market Street, Middle Row,

1. Pelton, Relics, p. 28.
Streeters Hill, Oak Alley, and King Street; and the right to purchase land compulsorily and then to lease, sell or exchange it. It was enacted that no sum was to be awarded on account of good will or loss of trade profits except for temporary disturbance if, in the opinion of the arbitrator or jury, the claimant could have obtained premises suitable for his business in the immediate neighbourhood. The Council was not to acquire ten or more houses which on the previous 15th December has been occupied, even in part, by "the labouring class" as either tenants or lodgers, unless and until the approval had been obtained of the Local Government Board to a scheme for providing new dwellings for that number of people or for such a number as the Board deemed necessary. The Council was empowered to borrow £90,000, repayable over 60 years, for street improvements; and £35,000, repayable over 50 years, for the erection of a new Town Hall. The Council could if it wished issue Corporation Stock. The "labouring class" was defined in the Act as including all people, other than domestic servants, whose income did not exceed an average of thirty shillings per week.  

But implementation of the 1890 Croydon Improvement Act was to concern at least as much the tradesmen, whose business premises were doomed to be

demolished. The minutes of the Special Committee make possible a statistical analysis of the compensation claimed and paid to the leasehold and freehold property owners who were subject to the Act; they also show the various stages of negotiation that were possible.

The Corporation went to considerable lengths to be fair to those dispossessed; and, in many instances, agreement was reached as to compensation.¹ The Croydon Advertiser complimented the Town Clerk on his negotiating skill.² The paper added, "Without the least doubt..... the Borough is getting what it requires.....at a very much cheaper rate than had been expected."³

Where agreement was not reached informally, the Special Committee recommended that notice to treat should be served, the figure quoted usually being the same, or similar, to the Council's original offer. Often, this was accepted; but just occasionally recourse was had to arbitration. Thus in the case of the freehold of 1, Middle Street, a claim for £900 was not acceptable, the Council offering £700 under a notice to treat. A Mr Bousfield was appointed arbitrator on behalf of the Corporation and a Mr

¹ Allan pointed out that in Glasgow, too, only rarely did compulsory purchase have to be resorted to: op. cit., p.604.
² He was C.M. Elborough and was Croydon's first Town Clerk. Appointed in Jun., 1883, he died on 18 Nov., 1895, at the age of 49: CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents.
³ Croydon Advertiser, 2 Sept., 1893, p.5.
Blake, of 9, Dartmouth Terrace, Lewisham Hill, on the part of the claimant. The Town Clerk appeared to give evidence for the Corporation and Sir J. Whittaker Ellis spoke in support of Haddock's evidence. The umpire, R.C. Driver, awarded the claimant precisely the amount previously offered by the Council and the claimant therefore had to pay his own costs and half the arbitrators' fees.¹

There are only four other cases recorded of arbitration having to be carried out. As a result of one of them, Mrs Kemp of Parson's Mead, who had demanded £3,500 in respect of the freehold of 16, High Street but had only been offered £2,600, managed to increase her compensation a little, to £2,756.² In the second instance, Thomas Jell valued his lease at £1,500, exactly double the Council's estimate, and Bousfield, this time acting as sole arbitrator, finally awarded £862.³

The third case, concerning Mrs Humphreys' leasehold of 3, Church Street, was a rather curious one in that she initially made no claim, the Council offered her £50 and then, under notice to treat, first of all £100, and later £200, presumably feeling that the sum involved was not worth quibbling about. Mrs Humphreys then elected to go

1. HSSC, pp. 62, 78, 95; HSIS, pp. 111, 125.
3. HSSC, pp. 61, 95, 110, 125.
before a jury, and finished up with an award of only £160.¹

The final example of arbitration concerned 20, High Street, in respect of which the freeholders claimed £5,500. The Corporation offered an unacceptable £4,706, but the arbitrators found that even that was too much; and awarded £4,568. The indignant freeholders then threatened to take proceedings to recover their arbitration costs, as the offer of a sum by the Council previous to arbitration had not been made under the Corporate seal; however, this threat was not carried out.²

Thus, where arbitration was resorted to, the claimants finished up with, on average, £629 less than they had demanded, whereas the Council had to pay out an average of only £48 more than its initial offer and of only £18 more than its final offer.

These figures suggest that the Council's original offers were fair ones; and confirmation of this fact is implied on examination of the other cases where the relevant figures are known but which did not reach the arbitration stage. In those instances, the average discrepancy between the vendor’s claim and the finally agreed figure was £368; yet the average discrepancy between the original Council offer and the finally agreed figure was only £28. In only

¹. HSIS, pp.166-167; HSSC, pp.153,158,168-169.
two instances of settlement by compromise did the Council have to increase its offer by over £200; but in no fewer than six cases, vendors had to agree to drop £2,000 or more.

One problem that faced the Special Committee, on a small scale, but which could have been a serious one had it arisen more widely, was that of the dispossessed Charity. The Trustees of the Elis David Charity held the freehold titles to 4 and 6, High Street, and informed the Committee that they were "reluctant to sell....by reason of the probability that they will be required by the Charity Commissioners to invest the purchase money in funds which will produce but a low rate of interest and....a consequent serious depreciation in the income of the Charity." The Committee, therefore, negotiated with the Trustees for the conveyance to them of a site which would yield approximately the same income as they were already receiving. The land was, in fact, on about the site of their existing property, having a 30 foot frontage and a depth of 75 feet; and a lessee, S.G. Edridge, was soon found to occupy the new premises when completed.¹

In the case of 13 and 14, King Street, the freeholds of which were owned by the same Charity, the Trustees' demand for £1,375 was countered by a Council offer

¹. HSIS, pp.127,132,138-139; HSSC, pp.103,110,115.
of £1,150, and then £1,160 under notice to treat; but at that point the Charity Commissioners intervened on the grounds that the sum was insufficient. The Town Clerk then suggested to the Clerk to the Trustees that 13 and 14, King Street should be conveyed to the Corporation, and that the Trustees should take in exchange the freehold of 1, Crown Hill, which was alongside the plot already offered to them in lieu of their former High Street holding, the Trustees paying the Council £450 "for equality of exchange."¹

The Council's Special Committee showed an awareness of the need to cause as little inconvenience as possible to traders; and wherever possible deferred taking possession until the occupier's tenancy had expired and until he had found either permanent or temporary alternative premises.² It was this that contributed, doubtless, to a number of tradesmen moving eventually into new and more spacious premises on or about the site of their old ones. The Special Committee too let out on a weekly tenancy, the windows of vacated but not yet demolished shops, in order to avoid more shops than possible appearing to be unoccupied.³

Another problem was concerned with the lapsing of

1. HSSC, pp.177-179,184.
2. CPL, Corporation of Croydon, Report of the High Street Special Committee to be presented to the Council on Monday 25 Oct., 1897, a copy of which is affixed in HSSC.
3. HSSC, p.167.
licences, consequent upon the closure of public houses. It arose for example with the Old King's Head, the lease of which contained a provision that at the end of the tenancy the occupier should transfer the licence to someone appointed by the lessor. The Council was therefore asked by the Special Committee to consider whether it would be advisable where licensed houses were purchased to keep the licences alive with a view to transferring them to other premises so that their value might not be lost to the Corporation. But the Council decided that this and a similar licence elsewhere should be allowed to lapse.

The Committee, under the chairmanship until late 1892 of Coldwells, and thereafter of Frederick T. Edridge, kept a most efficient watch on the very wide range of problems that arose during the seven years between the passing of the Improvement Act and the Committee's final report in October, 1897. The Committee was, as has been said already, both fair and considerate. It was also business-like and expeditious.

Soon after the Act was passed, the Town Clerk was authorised to arrange with his London agent, E. Dean, for

1. HSSC, p.33.
2. Ibid., p.170.
3. Although, when Vincett, a King Street butcher, claimed compensation for damage and inconvenience to his business caused by the demolition of the Old Town Hall, the Committee, whilst regretting any inconvenience, said it could not admit any liability: HSSC, p.157.
the latter to carry out the very substantial amount of conveyancing work entailed in the transfer of the properties. A few months later a special sub-committee was set up to settle all questions arising on the titles of properties purchased, with power to order the acceptance or rejection of any titles, or reference to the courts or to a conveyancing Counsel." In only one instance though were there serious doubts about a title; that of Mrs Carter, who claimed the freehold of 10, High Street. In that instance the Council finally decided to treat her as a life tenant only, and to suggest the appointment of Trustees to enable the sale to be carried into effect.

Demolition of property began on 19 June, 1893, the first to go being the eight derelict houses in Nelson Square. They were sold by auction together with adjoining properties in Middle Row, for the purpose of demolition, for a total of £24 10s. By September demolition had taken place in the High Street too, for at the beginning of that month a local newspaper reported that the Coffee Tavern and Messrs Hooker and Webb's premises had gone. It added the comment, "Those who have to pass through the High Street

1. HSIS, p.44.
2. Ibid., p.56.
3. HSSC, pp.48,52,59,60,66,69,95.
4. HSSC, p.95.
will not be sorry that the work of demolition has been completed, for the dust and lime were by no means pleasant.\textsuperscript{1}

Meanwhile, a sub-committee of the Special Committee had been considering tenders for the purchase of the old Town Hall; and that of Thompson, a Walworth contractor, for £55 was eventually accepted. The low price was accounted for partly by the fact that most of the fittings had been removed to be used in the temporary premises in Park Street, and a considerable amount of labour would be needed to remove the building in the requisite six weeks.\textsuperscript{2} The clock had previously fetched eight shillings and was subsequently displayed at Louis Tussaud's exhibition in Birmingham.\textsuperscript{3} By October, 1893, Middle Row, too, was fast disappearing, one of the first dwellings to go being a Duncan lodging house.\textsuperscript{4}

Early in the following year, the Special Committee issued an interim report. This showed that to date the purchase of freehold and leasehold interests and the settlement of trade claims had cost £78,926 including £4,236 professional fees and dues; a further £56,404 had been agreed for purchases and compensation which, with an

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Ibid.}, 2 Sept., 1893, p.5.
  \item \textit{Ibid.}, p.8.
  \item \textit{Ibid.}, 28 Oct., 1893, p.8.
  \item \textit{Ibid.}, pp.5, 8.
\end{itemize}
estimated additional expenditure of £2,948, for further fees and dues, totalled £138,278. It was expected too that the purchase of the remaining property and the accompanying compensation would cost a further £146,000 together with £10,000 fees and dues. The Council was thus able to claim that all the necessary property would be acquired within the amount provided; and it already appeared that the building frontages, after deducting the value of the land to be conveyed by way of exchange, would probably realise a larger sum than was earlier anticipated.¹

A further achievement was the Committee’s handling of the Tramways Company. Foreseeing that when High Street was widened, an approach would be made to Parliament for permission to lay down lines linking the existing ones in North End and South End, the Committee advised the Council to retain that power in their own hands but without any pledge that such lines would be laid or as to what would be done with them, in the way of leasing, if they were laid. The Town Clerk was accordingly instructed to apply to the Board of Trade for a Provisional Order authorising the construction of a tramway between North End and South End.²

An approving editorial in the Croydon Advertiser commented that when the High Street widening had first been mooted some opponents of the scheme had alleged that the

¹. HSSC, pp.169-170.
². Ibid., p.159; HSIS, p.168.
work was to be done so that the Tramways Company might have a better opportunity of becoming a paying concern. Even if that had been true, which was not so, the retention of power in the Council's own hands would, suggested the newspaper, effectively prevent anything being done in the matter that was not in the public interest.¹

Later the Council opened negotiations with the Tramways Company for the lease of the lines when they were laid. They asked £150 per annum rent, a figure that was at first unacceptable to the Company.² Subsequently the directors had second thoughts and they accepted that rental for a period of 21 years, terminable at the option of the Corporation at the end of the first 7 or 14 years.³ The option though is only of academic interest as in June, 1899, the Council purchased the entire tramway system.⁴

10. The Fate of the Dispossessed

Table 12 shows, except for the High Street, the number and type of premises demolished under the Improvement

---

2. HSSC, 3 Jun., 1896; 21 Jul., 1896.
3. Ibid., 30 Jul., 1896.
4. Southmeat, The Tramways of Croydon, 1960, p.27. A condition of the lease was that the Company must run at least three cars per hour from Thornton Heath to South End between 8 and 10 a.m.; HSSC, 26 Nov., 1896. The new paving was laid by Messrs Mowlem & Co., for 3s. 3d. per lineal yard for a single road; and the rails came by freight train from Leeds Steel Works Ltd., at £6 per ton; HSSC, 25 Jan., 1897; 28 Jan., 1897; 22 Feb., 1897.
scheme; and also the number and the status of the people living there at that time.\textsuperscript{1} As has been amply demonstrated already, there was a preponderance of lodging houses, and a very high proportion of temporary inhabitants.

When Pelton compiled his book on the area, at about the time of the passing of the Improvement Act, 143 properties and pieces of land, including those in the High Street, were held freehold by as many as 80 different people, the most substantial owners being firstly, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, representing the lord of the manor, the Archbishop of Canterbury; secondly, the Corporation; and, thirdly, George Alexander Knott and William Melmoth Walters who possessed most of the property bounded by Market Street, Streeter's Hill, Middle Row and Bell Hill.\textsuperscript{2} By the time the Corporation came to treat, there had been still further fragmentation of ownership. As regards the leaseholds, the only lessee or tenant with a substantial stake in the area was Charles Day or, more correctly at the time of demolition, his widow.

Table 13 shows the movement of business about and out of the town as a direct result of the Scheme.\textsuperscript{3} Twenty-seven of the forty-five tenants of shops and similar

\textsuperscript{1} See p.439, infra.
\textsuperscript{2} Walters lived at Epsom Road, Ewell, Surrey: Kelly's Directory of Surrey, 1891, p.1740; \textit{ibid}., 1895, p.649.
\textsuperscript{3} See p.440, infra.
premises that were demolished are unrecorded thereafter anywhere in the local directories. Only seven then-existing traders subsequently occupied new premises in the clearance area, six of them in the High Street. Another three, one in High Street and two in Surrey Street, moved into existing buildings across the road; and eight others moved to premises nearby or in other parts of the town.

For twenty-seven out of forty-five businesses to cease to exist as a result of the demolition work seems a very high proportion. But a search of local directory entries for twenty-five places immediately adjacent to Croydon revealed the name of only one former Croydon trader who had gone to any of them. What happened to the remainder it is impossible to say; and unfortunately the advertisements connected with closing sales do little to help. Some concerned W.B. Newby & Co., silk mercers, of 20, High Street, with workrooms at 15 and 16, Market Street.

1. In this section, the standard source of information has been Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.

2. Two are still there today, i.e., Messrs Roffey & Clark, and Grant Bros Ltd, the former now absorbed by the latter in all but name.

3. He was R. Tandon, draper, of 16, High Street, who moved to Commerce House, Manor Road, Wallington, Surrey. Admittedly, many of the twenty-five places were rural villages rather than centres of trade.

4. It was W.B. Newby who had tried, by means of a letter to a local newspaper, to persuade his lady customers to support the Improvement scheme: Croydon Chronicle, 20 Feb., 1886.
They advertised a final sale in which everything must be sold "as W.B. Newby is leaving Croydon at the end of July, when his tenancy in the High Street terminates." But there is nothing to indicate whether the firm stayed in business and, if so, in what town.

We do know however that Messrs Tanner & Sons, who had a boot and shoe business at 34 and 36, High Street, moved to 57, 59 and 61, Whitehorse Road, away from the town centre. However, Messrs Stapleton & Sons, who were clothiers, hosiers, and hatters, and had a boot warehouse, at 46, High Street, next to the Town Hall, and who claimed that they had been established 120 years, moved into new premises slightly farther north. R. Landon, of 16, High Street, whose drapery business had been established in 1868, went farther afield, to Wallington.

Further reference to Table 12, shows that almost exactly three quarters of the inhabitants of the Market area, excluding High Street, were resident only temporarily; but this may have been a blessing for the centre of the town when redevelopment commenced. It made it possible for instance when Elizabeth Martin was charged with being drunk.

4. See p.265n, supra.
5. See p.439, infra.
and disorderly, and using obscene language, in Market Street, for the magistrates to adjourn the case for a week, "to give the Martin family a chance of going out of the borough." ¹

It meant, too, that the general dictum laid down by Professor Ashworth, that those who had been displaced crowded into the cheapest property near at hand and by the very fact of increased overcrowding tended to reduce its condition to that of the accommodation they had recently left, did not apply in this particular instance. ² There is indeed little or no evidence of subsequent overcrowding or of property deterioration, in the neighbouring locality.

Any possibility that this might have happened was avoided anyway by the building of Council cottages and a Municipal lodging house; both resulting directly from the Improvement scheme, but neither having been contemplated when the demolition of the Market area had first been planned.³

The earliest mention that has been found of them is in the 1890 Improvement Act itself, so perhaps they resulted from an amendment to the original proposal, without which the Bill would not have gained Parliamentary approval.

---

3. CPL, Corporation of Croydon, Report of the High Street Special Committee to be presented to the Council on Monday 25 Oct., 1897, a copy of which is affixed in HSSC.
The requirement that they should be provided by the Corporation was reiterated in the Special Committee's minutes in October, 1890, which stated that there were in the area seven houses tenanted by twenty-four people of the labouring classes, sixteen houses giving accommodation to 194 lodgers, and a further eleven registered common lodging houses providing beds for about 205 people each night. The Committee requested the Chief Sanitary Inspector to find out what vacant accommodation existed that was suitable for the labouring families that were not living in common lodging houses; and the Town Clerk to discover the duties and powers of the Council with regard to the abolition and replacement of the common lodging houses. The Town Clerk subsequently reported that there was a legal obligation to erect a common lodging house, and that the Council had absolute power to build such places under the Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890).1

The Chief Sanitary Inspector subsequently conducted a census of the people who would be homeless on account of the proposed demolition work.2 The final figures have been analysed and are set out in Table 12.3 The census revealed the existence in the area of two mechanics employed in the town; two bricklayers employed in

1. HSIS, pp.27-28.
2. Ibid., p.66.
the construction of Cane Hill Asylum, at Coulsdon, Surrey; and of some shopmen and domestic servants living-in. But the majority, almost exactly three-quarters, of the inhabitants were there only temporarily, and comprised particularly casual labourers, hawkers, tinkers, rag and bone men, laundry workers, female rag gatherers, flower sellers, musicians, mechanics, field workers, needlewomen, and people of no regular employment.

On receiving the Chief Sanitary Inspector's figures the Special Committee pointed out to the Council that there were 350 temporary and 122 permanent inhabitants, the former staying in the town no more than seven days at a time. The Committee went on to list the town's vacant houses and rooms let at weekly rents; these numbering 65 houses, 27 of them in Wilford Road, and 99 rooms, 22 of them at the Labourers' Dwellings. The Committee concluded its report by suggesting that the Council would probably agree that for the 'permanent' residents of Middle Row the vacant premises would provide sufficient accommodation; and that a submission should be made to the Local Government Board that no new dwellings were necessary.¹

The Local Government Board, however, took a different view, and informed the Special Committee that accommodation should be provided for at least 150 people in substitution for the houses to be demolished which had

¹ HSSC, p.21; HSIS, pp.67-68.
accommodated 472. They suggested that the most satisfactory solution would be the erection of a Municipal common lodging house to accommodate about 100 people, and cottages for about 50. The Special Committee consequently appointed a sub-committee of four to look further into the matter.¹

This Artisans Dwellings Sub-committee negotiated the purchase from Thomas Rigby for £1,150 of a 160-foot frontage on Mint Walk, west of the proposed extension of Fell Road.² Three weeks later they instructed G. Fritsch, A.R.I.B.A., to prepare plans for ten cottages on the land, each one to accommodate about five people and to cost about £250.³ The plans were soon approved by the Committee which then recommended acceptance of a tender submitted by Alfred Bullock.⁴ When the cottages were almost ready for occupation, the Special Committee directed that bills should be posted in the neighbourhood of Middle Row, Market Street, and King Street inviting applications for the tenancies. The Committee agreed that the rents should be 9s. 6d. for each cottage, except those at the ends of the terraces which

---

1. HSIS, p.99; HSSC, p.67.
2. HSSC, pp.74-75; HSIS, p.101.
3. HSSC, p.88; HSIS, p.102.
4. HSIS, pp.138, 147. For information on Bullock, see Cox, op. cit., p.168.
were to be rented at 10s. The Chairman, Edridge, and the Borough Accountant, were authorised to consider the applications and to let the cottages, priority being given to any former occupiers of houses affected by the Improvement. The 1894 directory listed the cottages, Croydon's first Council houses, as unoccupied. But by the following year tenants had been found for them all.

As regards the provision of a Municipal lodging house, the Special Committee had recorded its view, in October, 1891, that any necessary accommodation of this kind would be better provided by private enterprise. Further, in the previous year, when one Councillor had asked the Council if it would not be incumbent upon that body if it pulled down Middle Row to provide some place for the people to go to, his comment had been greeted with considerable laughter.

But there were two difficulties about leaving the

1. HSSC, pp. 176, 177.

2. Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, 1894, p. 120. The City of London had been empowered to build what would now be described as Council houses as early as 1851, Hole, op. cit., p. 165.

3. The houses were numbered 10 to 19, Mint Walk: ibid., 1895, p. 117. Only one tenant had been listed as a "principal resident or tradesman" anywhere in the town the previous year. He was Charles F. Niemeyer of 23, Wandle Road: ibid., 1894, p. 258. A Henry Niemeyer had, previously, lived in Market Street for many years: ibid., passim.

4. HSSC, p. 176.

provision of lodging houses to private enterprise. First of all, it would obviously be ridiculous to clear the Market area and then allow the land to be used again in the same way; so, not surprisingly, an application by Robert Brain to erect a common lodging house on the site of his existing ones was not approved, the Committee considering that the freehold should be purchased, and the land let "for some unobjectionable purpose." 1

Then, secondly, there were fears in the town about the spread of what had previously been a localised problem. This was well expressed by Argus Letters to the Croydon Advertiser, which pointed out that there was not likely to be strong competition among the residents in different parts of Croydon for the new Middle Row. Yet the people driven out of the area had to go somewhere.

"We cannot," the article continued, "abolish the Middle Rowites though we are destroying Middle Row. Our chief hope.....is that we may reap the advantages of distribution. 'Move on,' is a very good sanitary and moral as well as police direction. If the Council are prepared to build public lodging houses the whole of the difficulty will be removed, but in default of such action I expect the denizens of Middle Row will have to offend the eyes and ears and noses of many highly-respectable residents." 2

However, as has been said, the hand of the Council was being forced by the Local Government Board to provide a

1. HSSC, p.192. For information on Brain, see Cox, op. cit., p.167.
2. Croydon Advertiser, 22 Mar., 1890, p.5.
Municipal common lodging house; and in November, 1892, the High Street Special Committee recommended that the site most suitable for it would be the frontage of land occupied as the Highways Depot in Mitcham Road. Fritsch again had the task of preparing suitable plans, for a building to accommodate 66 men and 34 women, with separate kitchens and day rooms. Seven tenders, six by local firms, were received for the constructional work. They ranged from one of £7,960, submitted by W. Akers & Co., High Street, South Norwood, down to one of £6,494 by Alfred Bullock. But the amount of even the lowest was greater than the Committee had anticipated and so they appointed a sub-committee which revised the specifications and then obtained a new tender from Bullock for £6,000. This was accepted.

The Lodging House was formally opened on 21 July, 1894. But considerable difficulty was experienced in obtaining and keeping suitable staff a succession of Superintendents and Matrons having to be dismissed for a series of offences. The first Superintendent absconded after some eight months with the takings; the second,

1. HSIS, p.102.
2. Ibid., pp.102,122-123.
3. The Committee's "rough estimate", when instructing the architect, had been £4,500: Ibid., p.123.
4. Ibid., p.159.
5. HSSC, p.200.
together with his wife, was dismissed for drunkenness after only three months; the third was soon the subject of complaint.¹

Another problem in the administration of the Municipal Lodging House was its being designed for 66 men and 34 women. During the first three weeks that it was open the average number of beds occupied on the men's side was 56 per night (85 per cent.) and on the women's side only 9 (26 per cent.). For the next six weeks the men's beds were fully occupied every night with ten exceptions, whereas the average number of beds occupied on the women's side was only ten per night, that is about 30 per cent.² Later, in 1896, the sub-committee was informed that the beds on the men's side were fully occupied continuously and that many men were turned away nightly, whilst of the 34 beds available on the women's side the average number occupied during the previous two years had been under fifteen. On the basis of the nightly charge of 5d., the cost of the staff and the interest on the capital outlay could be covered if the House were filled, but there was a deficit of £159 3s. 6d. for the year 1895–96 because of the empty beds. The Local Government Board was eventually persuaded that the House should in future only accommodate men, the weekly lodgers being placed on one side of the

¹ See Ibid., pp.197, 217, 247, 260, 272, 277, 306.
² See Ibid., p.214.
building and the nightly lodgers on the other. ¹

The Municipal Lodging House, now known as the West Croydon Men’s Hostel, is currently in the news as it is soon to be demolished because of a ring-road scheme; and a special sub-committee of the Council has suggested that it should be run down during the next four years. The Hostel at present accommodates about seventy men, some permanent and some "casual"; and voluntary organisations are being asked whether they can offer alternative facilities when it is closed. ² So, after seventy years, the welfare wheel has turned full circle and private enterprise is now likely to task back a long-lost responsibility.

Other removals brought about by the Improvement scheme included the Town Hall, the Post Office, and the corn market. There had been opposition to the Town Hall’s removal on the grounds that unnecessary expense would be involved, or that serious loss would be caused to High Street and North End traders. ³ But even the most ingenious schemes for retaining the building, or for building a new one in situ, ⁴ were rejected when the site of the nearby

¹ Ibid., 30 Oct., 1896. The last few pages of these minutes are not numbered.
³ Ibid., 22 May, 1886, p.5.
⁴ See, for instance, ibid., 22 May, 1886, p.5; 29 May, 1886, p.5.
Central Station in Katharine Street became available. The land thus obtainable, although it involved the sacrifice of the diagonal Fairfield footpath, was cheaper than its equivalent acreage in High Street; it also gave more scope for the architect; it provided additionally a site for a new Police Station and the beautiful Town Hall Gardens; and it was not far enough removed from the previous site to be criticised as attracting away trade.

The new Town Hall was designed by Charles Henman, Junior.\(^1\) Its foundations and lower ground floor were constructed by Samuel Page, of Borough Hill, and the superstructure by W.H. Iascelles & Co., of Bunhill Row, London.\(^2\) It had been anticipated that the replacement Post Office would be sited alongside, but the Postmaster General decided that it should be rebuilt in High Street.\(^3\) He was, therefore, sold a 40-foot frontage on that road, for £5,480.\(^4\) The land that had been intended for the Post Office was bought instead by the Commissioner of the

2. The building included a Council Chamber, Police Court, and Public Library; and was opened by the Prince of Wales, 18 May, 1896. Inadequate now for many years, it was superseded, in 1968, by Taberner House, a multi-storey block nearby. The future of the Town Hall is uncertain. Page was a Councillor: p.286n, *infra*.
3. A new Head Post Office was opened alongside East Croydon Station in 1967.
4. HSIS, pp.65,77,87-88, 92.
Metropolitan Police for a new Police Station.¹

Despite the decline of the markets over the years, the Council, in July, 1885, had received a memorial from stall-holders and factors at the Croydon Corn Market drawing attention to the inadequate accommodation. The business was carried out in a room at the King's Arms, access being through the tap-room.² When, later, redevelopment of the area became a reality the Special Committee received a suggestion from "several gentlemen engaged in the corn trade" that accommodation should be provided in the new Town Hall where they might rent stands that could be removed on non-market days.³ The Committee recommended a building suitable both as a corn market and for small meetings, but that it should only be erected on a guarantee that for at least five years a minimum rental of £40 per annum would be realised by letting stalls.⁴ The resultant Corn Market, clearly so designated but virtually unknown to Croydonians, remains adjacent to the municipal buildings. It is now used by the Public Library.

11. Redevelopment and Reinstatement

Apart from such ancillary activities as the planning and erection of municipal cottages and the

¹. This is still in use but is inadequate.
². HSIS, p.24.
³. Croydon Advertiser, 18 Jul., 1885, p.3.
⁴. HSSC, pp.11-12.
Municipal Lodging House, the Special Committee, once it had completed negotiations for the purchase of the condemned property, had to attend particularly to the re-sale and re-development of the sites. Some shopkeepers wished to return; but many plots of land were available to newcomers. In either case, the Committee had the responsibility of negotiating the best prices it could; and for ensuring too that the buildings were an improvement on the old ones and that those on the High Street frontage would contribute to the town's new-found dignity.

But a serious set-back to the Council's long-term plans came in June, 1895, when the Town Clerk reported that Parliament had refused a Bill giving the Corporation power to retain the High Street ground rents in perpetuity, though it had agreed to the extension of the period for retention of the leased land to ten years from the dates of the various leases. The Special Committee reported that it felt certain that in a few years' time the ground rents would sell to much greater advantage and that therefore application should be made to the Local Government Board for a loan of £70,000, which would enable the Corporation to retain for the moment both the let and the unlet frontages. The ground rents that would be recoverable, it was said, would more than pay the interest on the loan.¹ The High Street ground rents were fixed at £6 per foot frontage, at

¹ Ibid., p. 268.
the southern end; £6 10s. in the centre; and £7 10s. at the northern, or Crown Hill, end. The lessees at the southern end had to spend a minimum of from £1,350 to £2,250 on their buildings, the amount depending on the depth of the plot.¹ No building anywhere in the area was permitted until the plans and elevations and proposed materials had been approved by the Corporation; and buildings to be used for the sale of intoxicating liquors or for "noisome or offensive" purposes were not to be permitted.²

The Committee had discussed whether all the High Street buildings should be of one uniform style and, having consulted Henman, Haddock and the Borough Engineer, had decided against the idea. Likewise, a uniform height for the buildings was considered impracticable because of the varying level of the street and because too of the different business purposes for which the buildings would be used. However, the height of the ground floor was to be not less than twelve feet. The Committee also decided that sky signs and projecting signs were not to be permitted; and that lessees were to be allowed a peppercorn rent for twelve months after taking possession of a site.³

The southern extremity of the High Street provided

---

¹. Ibid., pp.127-128,131.
². SPB, 484, 26 Nov.,1896.
³. HSIS, pp.103-106. For an example of a sale particular setting out, in full, the restrictive covenants, see HWS, 714, 13 Jun.,1895.
the Committee with a particular problem because Surrey Street left High Street at an angle of only about thirty degrees and fell away rapidly downhill. Originally, a gap of 135 feet had been proposed between the south end of High Street properties and the corner house of Scarbrook Hill; but this would have given a nine-foot drop from High Street to Surrey Street. It was therefore decided subsequently to extend the High Street premises farther south because, apart from all else, it was thought that it would be a good idea to hide from the High Street as much as possible of the Old Jail and the adjoining properties on the far side of Surrey Street. In addition, the wider gap would be wasteful of valuable frontages, and would entail unnecessary outlay for paving; and the Committee therefore recommended that the gap should be reduced by 45 feet. A public drinking fountain, erected on the site in 1896, to commemorate the Improvement Scheme is now totally neglected by the Council and ignored by passers-by.

The Council had little difficulty in disposing of the High Street land. The purchasers who showed the greatest foresight were Messrs Grant Bros who bought, in addition to their plot fronting the High Street, a piece

1. HSIS, p.130.
2. The materials from the demolished shops on the site were used in "making up the new corner," HSSC, p.204.
3. Ibid., p.139.
of land at the rear, in the new Middle Street, and the Council raised no objection to their covering the latter site with a building connected to the High Street premises by a bridge of approved design across Middle Street. This bridge was to be removed immediately prior to the expiration of Messrs Grant's lease of the High Street premises, or immediately before one or other of the premises ceased to belong to the same owner. The bridge is still there, unnoticed alike by the few pedestrians in Middle Street, and the many shoppers in Messrs Grant's who pass over it unknowingly on their way from one part of the store to another.

Generally however, whereas the High Street land and indeed the land in Crown Hill and Surrey Street sold fairly rapidly, that in the new Middle Street did not. Middle Street indeed was a planning error; its right-angled bend, designed to avoid shortening the depth of the valuable plots at the southern end of the High Street, prevented Crown Hill having an outlet to that part of High Street and failed, even more conclusively, to open up Surrey Street. It was simply a backwater and, in March, 1897, the Special Committee found it necessary to set up a Middle Street Vacant Land Sub-committee in an endeavour to dispose of the

1. Ibid., 27 Jul., 1896.
2. Crown Hill land was offered at £2 per foot frontage: HSSC, p.162.
road's remaining leases. Still, to this day, it is a little-used canyon-like street serving as nothing more than a parking place for lorries using the market in Surrey Street and as a service road for adjoining High Street and Surrey Street properties.

Three builders are named as being responsible for much of the redevelopment work. Some of the premises were constructed by Messrs Thomas Wawman & Sons, whose workmen were invited to dinner at the Greyhound in 1896 by Councillor Godson who was having built the five new shops in High Street adjacent to Messrs Grant's. Wawman also took a building lease on land at the corner of Crown Hill and Middle Street, undertaking to spend £2,000 on work there.

The Croydon Advertiser's new office was also built on High Street land; its printing works, replacing those in Katharine Street, being erected with frontages also to both Surrey Street and Middle Street. The opening of the premises was described, with pride, in the newspaper's own columns. The builders were Messrs E.P.

1. Ibid., 15 Mar., 1897.
2. One of them was Councillor Martin Taylor: see Appendix III, p.458, infra.
3. Croydon Advertiser, 15 Feb., 1896, p.8. For Thomas Wawman, see Cox, op. cit., p.175. The shops were nos. 26-28 and are now a part of the store of Grant Bros Ltd. Godson had bought the land at between £5 and £6 per foot frontage: HSSC, p.254. See also HSIS, p.201; HSSC, p.205.
Bulld & Co., of Strathmore Road; and the architect was R.W. Price, of Sutton, Surrey.\(^1\) Naim and Pevsner describe the building as having, "quite a good Jacobean front with four storeys of pilasters and a polychrome treatment of purple and buff terracotta."\(^2\)

The same authors mentioned briefly a nearly-adjoining feature now taken for granted by Croydon shoppers and yet the cause of much heart-searching when first mooted. It is what Naim and Pevsner described as, "an arcade leading to a steep drop, the best townscape effect in Croydon."\(^3\) Although one cannot but admire the execution of the Improvement scheme, the re-planning of the area had left a lot to be desired, doubtless through the need for financial stringency and also because of a lack of expertise. Not only, as has been said already, was the new Middle Street of little practical use; in addition, with the disappearance of all the alleyways leading down from High Street, Surrey Street was suddenly isolated. Its local customers had mostly been forced to move away; and it had no direct contact with any new customers in the improved

---

1. Ibid.

2. Ian Naim and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of England: Surrey*, 1962, p.164. In 1966 the premises were vacated, the newspaper company moving to much larger buildings at Advertiser House, Brighton Road. The High Street premises have been gutted and are now occupied by The Tavern in the Town, a public house designed in what is claimed to be Dickensian style.

3. Ibid.
High Street. \(^1\) These facts had been appreciated in advance neither by the Council nor by the Surrey Street traders. However, soon after demolition began, the Special Committee received a memorial advocating some means of communication between High Street and Surrey Street. \(^2\) But the steepness of the slope made the problem an especially baffling one to solve and the Committee decided that no action could be taken. \(^3\) A private enterprise project to build two shops in the High Street with an arcade of eight further shops running "towards" the new street was abandoned and further petitions to the Council were turned down. \(^4\) But it is clear from the discussions that rejection was based on an absence of ideas rather than on any firm principle. One Councillor pleaded that the residents of Surrey Street felt that they were being treated harshly by being shut out from High Street; and another that people trading in Surrey Street were not newcomers but were old-established tradesmen. A third feared that Surrey Street would become another Middle Row if it were not opened up; but a fourth thought that few people would go from High Street to Surrey Street by steps; and the proposal for a passage was lost by

---

1. Argus Letters to the Croydon Advertiser, 4 Jul., 1896, p. 5.
2. HSSC, p. 147.
3. HSSC, p. 182.
three votes.\(^1\) A newspaper editorial commented that the traders in Surrey Street, who were suffering considerable loss of trade from the demolition of much of the area, had made a great mistake in not resorting to some kind of opposition when the Bill for widening High Street and abolishing Middle Row had been considered. "We are afraid," it concluded, "many of the old traders will go to the wall."\(^2\)

But then the Committee and the Council made a remarkable volte face. Only seventeen days after the Council's rejection of the last proposal the Committee recommended to the Council that the High Street part of the land be let at a ground rent of £200 per annum for 99 years from June, 1893 with one year's peppercorn rent, and that the lessees be allowed to build an arcade and to erect a bridge across Middle Street with steps to Surrey Street. The Corporation was to maintain the footway, bridge, and steps, and to light them; and also to have control of both ends of the passage and of the steps. The Council accepted the Committee's recommendations.\(^3\)

The reason for the volte face is explained in the Croydon Advertiser's account of the official opening of the Arcade, on 13 October, 1897. Its existence was entirely

---

2. Ibid., p.5.
3. HSSC, 21 Jul., 1896.
due it said, "to the private enterprise of a few gentlemen who were determined that Surrey Street should not have such a thorough isolation from the High Street as the improvement scheme would have effected."¹ Two of them were Councillors and all three had business interests in Surrey Street.² The arcade, built on a High Street frontage of 41 feet, and situated by chance between the office of the Croydon Advertiser and that of the Croydon Chronicle, had three shops on either side and led to a light iron bridge spanning Middle Street with steps giving access to Surrey Street close to the junction of those two roads. The architect was Alfred Broad.³

Chronologically, the Arcade represented the last major part of a municipal improvement scheme that had been made necessary because of the failure of private enterprise; yet, ironically, the Arcade itself was a minor triumph of private enterprise made necessary because of the failure of municipal planning.

1. Croydon Advertiser, 16 Oct., 1897, p.3.

2. One was Coun. Page who lived at Borough Hill and later at Sydenham, London, S.E. He died 10 Feb., 1908, aged 71: CPL, Biographical Index of Croydon Residents. Another was Coun. Lillico, a corn merchant. His firm, now agricultural merchants, have premises in Cherry Orchard and Lansdowne Roads. The third was George Raymond, a butcher at 39, Surrey Street.

3. For further information on Broad, see Cox, op. cit., p.114. The builder of the Arcade was named Saunders.
12. Conclusions

Table 14 shows the movement of business about and into the town as a direct result of the scheme.\(^1\) Of forty-four shops and similar premises erected, twenty-six had tenants not recorded as having traded in the town previously.\(^2\) Seven businesses that were earlier in the clearance area occupied new premises, six of them in the High Street; another one moved from an existing building across the road; and six others moved into new premises from other parts of the town.\(^3\) A further four businesses opened additional branches in the new buildings whilst, at least temporarily, remaining as well in their existing ones. Several of the incoming firms bore names which, in one way or another, implied that they were part of bigger organisations.\(^4\) This contrasts with the picture that is given by the local directories of the earlier one-owner businesses.\(^5\)

---

1. See p.441, infra.

2. It is coincidence that the number erected was almost the same as the number demolished; the new premises were inevitably more commodious. It is also coincidence that the number of new tenants is almost exactly the same as the number of departing traders: Table 13, p.440, infra. None of the 26 new traders had previously had businesses in any of the places referred to on p.265, supra.

3. See p.265, supra.

4. For example, Bourne & Hollingsworth; Britannia Furnishing Co.; Invincible Tea Co.; Land and Provincial Meat Stores; Hudge-Whitworth Cycle Depot.

5. Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.
But Croydon had gained much else; the total disappearance of Middle Row, a wider High Street, a new Town Hall, a new Police Station, municipal cottages, a Municipal Lodging House, the Town Hall Gardens, a new townscape that survived almost untouched for the next sixty years, and, above all, a new civic dignity.

It now remains only to consider one further question that had given the Corporation and the ratepayers so much, indeed the greatest, anxiety. What had it all cost?

The answer is provided by the final statement of accounts of the Special Committee. This shows that the sites had cost just under £145,000 to purchase and that other expenses, including the cost of erecting the Municipal Lodging House and the Mint Walk cottages, less nearly £21,000 from the sale of sites to date, left a deficit of about £152,500. However the estimated value of the ground rents still in hand together with the capital value of the same Lodging House and cottages amounted to a little over £103,000. Thus the final cost to the ratepayers was likely to be just over £49,000 as against an estimate and expectation, when work had first begun, of £90,000.¹

The Committee had indeed done its work well. Despite the opponents of Improvement and despite the fears of some of the supporters of Improvement, the heart of the

¹. HSSC, 18 Oct., 1897.
town had been renewed. *Laissez-faire*, philanthropy, and the rigid enforcement of the Public Health Acts had failed; but the Corporation, once it had found the right leader, albeit a man of little education, had succeeded.
III. POPULATION MOVEMENT INTO CROYDON IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

1. Introduction

A recent study has suggested that any examination of the process of town growth "must be based on an investigation of the migration from which the growing towns drew their fresh supplies of labour; and in studying the process of townward migration, we are excavating the foundations of modern society at a point which has not often been laid bare."¹

The analysis that follows is of Croydon's census schedules for the year 1851, the aim being to discover something about the pattern of migration into the town in the years before that date.

This particular census was carried out on the night of Sunday 30th March. In the preceding week schedules had been issued to all householders and, on completion, were collected so that the information could be entered into books by paid enumerators.² A separate

---


2. Before 1841, the burden of form-filling had been carried out not by the householder but by the overseers of the poor. The revised system was more accurate, and made it possible to collate more detailed information: A.J. Taylor, 'The Taking of the Census, 1801-1951,' *British Medical Journal*, no.4709, 7 Apr.,1951, p.716.
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schedule was provided for each occupier; that is the resident owner or tenant of a whole house, or the lodger of a distinct floor or apartment.

Therefore, a person described in this account as being a "head of household" is the first-named "occupier" listed on every separate schedule; normally a head of family. Where an institution, for example a boarding school or lodging house, was large enough to require more than one schedule, only the first person named on the first schedule has been considered. In addition Selsdon, a detached and geographically separate part of the parish of Croydon, has not been included.

The analysis relates directly therefore to 3,773 persons; all of whom were adult, and most of whom were heads of families.

2. Migration into Croydon
(a) Birthplace of Heads of Household

For the purpose of the current investigation, the country has been divided up into a number of areas of differing distance from the centre of Croydon. It will suffice here to say that the areas represent respectively the ancient parish of Croydon; places outside Croydon but

1. See The Census of Great Britain in 1851, 1854, p.8, the official report on the census of that year.

2. Selsdon's population was 143. Most of the inhabitants were farm labourers.

3. For detailed definitions, see Appendix IV, pp.459-460, infra.
within five miles of the town centre; places in England at approximate distances of 5 to 10, 10 to 30, 30 to 75, 75 to 150, and over 150, miles respectively, from the town; Scotland and Wales; and Ireland.

Ninety-eight per cent. of all Croydon's heads of household were born in the British Isles. The very few born outside Europe seem without exception to have been British subjects born in British possessions. Not a single head of household had been born in Australasia, and only one in Africa.

Almost one quarter of Croydon's heads of household in 1851 were native to the town; over half had been born within ten miles of the town centre; and more than nine out of ten were living within 150 miles of their place of birth. The figures underline the comment in the official analysis of the census, that the people to the north of Nottingham and Leicester were less inclined to go to London.

It appears from the raw figures that a remarkably small proportion (8 per cent.) of Croydon heads of household had been born in parishes adjacent to the town. But it is necessary to appreciate that if such parishes had only small populations the number of migrants to Croydon

1. Table 15, p.442, infra.
3. Table 15, p.442, infra.
might be small yet the figure could well represent a significantly high proportion of the villages' total number of inhabitants.

A much more accurate figure is therefore obtained by relating the number of heads of household in 1851 born in each area to the 1821 population of that area. The significance lies in the fact that the low percentage of heads of household in Croydon in 1851 who had been born in the adjacent villages was due solely to their small total population; and that in fact the villages adjacent to Croydon contributed to the growth of the town at a rate thirteen times as great, for their size, as did the area which included London and suburban Surrey. This puts in better perspective the extent to which Londoners in the first half of the nineteenth century were moving out to places as far away as Croydon.

As has been noted elsewhere, by the middle of the

1. A random sample of 180 Croydon heads of household revealed that their average age, at the time of the 1851 census, was 44, giving a mean birthdate of 1807. The year 1821 seemed likely, therefore, to approximate as closely as any other census date to the average period at which they were leaving their native towns or villages. There is no reason to believe that the conclusions reached from Table 16, p.443, infra, would have been any different if the 1811 or 1831 figures had been used instead. The 1821 population figures are where possible from the various volumes of the Victoria County History.

2. Table 16, p.443, infra. This is a point not referred to by Dyos in his consideration of the apparently small proportion of migrants recruited from the countryside surrounding his area of study: Dyos, op. cit., pp.126-127.
century agricultural areas began to suffer a net loss of population to other parts of England and Wales in spite of the high rate of natural increase in the country as a whole. The official report on the 1851 census shows too that a substantial proportion of the native population had migrated from certain counties.

For example, Cumberland's 1851 population comprised 162,115 natives of the county together with 33,377 people born elsewhere, making a total of 195,492; but 201,795 people throughout the country are shown as having been born in Cumberland so that 39,680 Cumbrians must have migrated to places outside the county, 6,303 more than the number of immigrants. The report went on to list no fewer than nineteen counties, all of them predominantly rural, from which substantial numbers of natives had migrated.

Table 17 lists certain of the counties named in that way in the official report. It compares the number of Croydon heads of household in 1851 born there with the number from counties which are not named as having a considerable migrant native population, that is counties generally where industry was more prosperous. A necessary


3. To the 39,680 must be added any who had gone abroad.

4. See p. 444, infra.
criterion if any such comparison is to be valid is, of course, distance from Croydon since that has been shown to be a very important factor in migration to the town. One must, too, bear in mind the qualification that any statistical investigation of a county may be misleading if it is understood to imply a uniformity within that county.¹

Neither in a comparison between Cumberland and Durham, nor between Shropshire and Staffordshire, is there any perceptible difference in the amount of migration to Croydon even though, in both cases, the first-named was rural and had an excess of migration over immigration and the second-named was at least partly industrialised and did not. There is, however, some evidence of a higher migration rate to Croydon from Cornwall than from Lancashire; and a distinctly higher rate from Devonshire than from Lancashire.² The most notable of the comparisons, however, is that between Warwickshire and Wiltshire, in which instance there is a very considerable difference. It is apparent, too, that there was little correlation between a county's rate of migration to England generally

¹ Redford and Chaloner, op. cit., p.16.
² The difference in distance between Croydon and the county towns of, respectively, Cornwall and Devon, is insufficient to invalidate the findings.
and its rate of migration to Croydon.

Table 18 shows in detail the extent of the relationship between distance from Croydon and migration to that town. It indicates the order of the counties if distance is the only criterion. It also shows the comparable extent of migration to Croydon from the different counties in relation to each one's population at the time of the 1821 census. The calculations reveal that there is some, but only some, measure of positive correlation between distance and the amount of migration into the town from the nineteen counties lying between about 75 and 150 miles from Croydon. But there is absolutely no correlation between the extent of migration from the nineteen counties to anywhere in England and Wales and the extent of migration from the nineteen counties to Croydon.

Norfolk, Suffolk, Monmouthshire, and Lincolnshire tend to reveal a high rate of migration to Croydon by comparison with their national migration rates; and Rutland, Shropshire, Derbyshire, Huntingdonshire, Herefordshire, and Worcestershire tend to reveal a low rate of migration to Croydon by the same comparisons. The sample from Monmouthshire may be too small to be statistically reliable.


2. Distance is calculated from the county town. Hence the comment at n.2, p.296, supra.
Otherwise it would seem that the extent to which Croydon obtained its share of the total migrant population of those counties must have depended on the amount of attraction that other expanding areas held. What cannot be seen from the census returns is the extent to which the decision to migrate to a particular place may have been influenced by what success other members of the family - brothers, uncles, or even distant cousins - had already had there.

Migration to Croydon was also influenced by communications. The town stood on one of the two direct coaching roads to Brighton, via Cuckfield and Hurstpierpoint; and was also served by coaches that travelled by an older route, via East Grinstead and Uckfield, and thence on to Eastbourne, or to Brighton via Lewes. A comparison of the number of Croydon heads of household in 1851 born in the parishes served by these roads with those in equidistant parishes not on a direct coaching road, adjustment being made where necessary for any difference in population, shows most conclusively that


2. A fact observed also by Dyos in his broader study of South London, op. cit., p.111.

migrants tended to follow the main lines of communication. The figures for Merstham, Horley, Cuckfield, Hurstpierpoint, Godstone, and East Grinstead are individually large enough to show that those places contributed between twice and ten times as many migrants in proportion to their 1821 population as did other parishes which were at the same distance but were not on a main road to Croydon. Only in the instances of the expanding Brighton and nearby Lewes is the evidence to the contrary. Even including those two places, the total figures show that after allowing for population variations there was twice as much chance on average of Croydon heads of household in 1851 having been born in parishes along the main roads leading north to Croydon as in equidistant parishes not favoured with a direct link with the town.

We may conclude, therefore, that in Croydon in the middle of the nineteenth century about three quarters of the heads of household were either native or had been born

---

1. The principal railway south from Croydon, built in the late 1830's, followed very closely the line of the direct Brighton coaching road.

2. For example, thirteen Croydon heads of household had been born in Horley (population in 1821, 1,065) but only five in Eynsford (Kent) (population 1,077); eight in Cuckfield (Sussex) (2,385) but only three in the combined parishes of Frant (Sussex), Compton, and Ditton (Kent) (combined populations 2,342); four in Hurstpierpoint (Sussex) (1,321) but only one in Lamberhurst (Kent and Sussex) (1,325); twenty-two in Godstone (1,210) but only nine in Kingston (4,908); and 32 in East Grinstead (Sussex) (3,153) but only five in Chertsey (4,279). Unless otherwise stated, the places named were in Surrey.
within ten miles of the place. It is clear, too, that distance was an inhibiting factor in migration, but less so given a direct line of communication. One might judge from this that whilst migration was a conscious act the destination of the migrant was less a matter of thought or planning. Like the majority of present-day week-end and holiday motorists, migrants seem to have kept to the well-known main roads. Sooner or later, along such a main road, they found employment.

We may also conclude that although declining industry in certain counties stimulated migration to other parts of the country, whether its victims came or not to a place such as Croydon depended not only on the distance they had to travel but also on the counter-attraction of accessible employment elsewhere.

2. Migration into Croydon

(b) Probable Place of Residence Immediately Before Removal into the Town

Evidence of nineteenth century migration based on birthplace has one severe limitation: a man might, and indeed often did, have a number of different homes during his lifetime. It could be therefore that place of birth alone would provide a distorted reflection of the locality and direction from which families had come into Croydon during the first half of the century.

But there is a practical way, using the 1851
census returns, of ascertaining the probable whereabouts of people’s homes immediately before their arrival in Croydon; that is to note the birthplace of each household’s most recent child born outside the parish. Tables 19, 20, and 25 therefore are concerned only with, firstly, households having two children of any age, the elder having been born outside Croydon and the younger within the parish, the gap in their ages being less than six years; and with, secondly, those households having had their most recent child born outside the parish less than six years before the census.¹

Five hundred and ten households, referred to hereafter as "selected" households, were thus accountable, this number representing between one seventh and one eighth of the total number of householders in the town.² Of course, any generalisations about population movement based on this sample must be tempered by the fact that it relates only to the families that had, at the time of their arrival in Croydon, one or more young children; the people indeed who might well be the most inhibited, apart from the aged, from any long-distance migration. On the other hand, the sample is bound to be more accurate in its indication of the

---

1. A random sample of 100 such cases produced an average movement date of six years before the census, i.e., 1845, assuming, in the first case, that migration took place half way in date between the two births and, in the second, that it took place half way between the time of the birth and of the census. The Tables are on pp. 446, 447, 452, infra.

2. i.e., 3,773.
places from whence people had migrated directly to Croydon than the more comprehensive sample based on place of birth.

Of the selected heads of household born outside the town, about one-third had been born within ten miles; and more than half had lived within that radius of the parish before moving into it. By contrast, at a distance of more than thirty miles, the respective figures were thirty-nine per cent. and twenty per cent.¹ It has been shown, already, using place of birth of all heads of household, that distance from Croydon was a vital factor in influencing the extent of migration.² Here is confirmation that movement into the town, at least of households with young children, was generally over a short distance, even though the head of household might have been born in another, more distant, part of the country.³

Because of the considerable variation in population between one area and another, especially between the villages immediately adjacent to Croydon, and London and the Surrey suburbs, the extent of the immediate migration to Croydon from the neighbouring parishes becomes much more apparent once the figures are related to the 1821

1. Table 19, p.446, infra.

2. See p.293, supra.

3. Cf., Smith's theory that a little later, i.e., by 1861, a "good deal" of the population movement was "direct rather than a drift by stages," op. cit., p.209.
It has been observed that the small proportion of Croydon heads of household native to the villages adjacent to Croydon was due only to the fact that those villages were thinly populated and that in reality they contributed, in relation to their population, thirteen times as many heads of household to Croydon as did the territory including London and suburban Surrey. This puts into perspective the extent to which people born in London at the beginning of the century were moving out to places as far away as Croydon. One might expect, however, that an examination limited to the selected households would show a comparatively larger proportion of Londoners migrating to Croydon, since it is based on more recent and shorter-term population movement. But, in fact, it shows the villages adjacent to Croydon contributing, in relation to their population, fifteen times as many families as did London and suburban Surrey. This is evidence, once again, that as yet Croydon was still too far from London to be receiving many of its migrants.

Croydon would seem at that time to have been subject to the flow of population into the metropolis; and only later to have received a substantial number of migrants from inner

1. See pp.293-294, supra.

2. Ibid.

3. The two dates are, on average, 1807 and 1845: pp.294n, 301n.

4. Table 20, p.447, infra.
London as a part of the ebb tide. It is an oversimplification, too, to believe that households had necessarily moved to Croydon by a direct route. Only forty-two per cent. of the selected heads of household in Croydon in 1851 were probably living substantially nearer to Croydon immediately before their move into the town than they had been at birth; and, what is more significant, no fewer than twenty-one per cent. were living farther away. It is obvious that there must have been much movement to and fro within a ten-mile radius of Croydon; and it is noticeable that, of the 510 heads of household under consideration twenty-six, that is to say about five per cent., although natives of the town, had moved up to 75 miles away before returning to Croydon again in time for the 1851 census.

Even within the limited radius of five miles from the centre of Croydon there was a remarkable variation in the extent of migration to Croydon. The heads of household, whose probable place of residence immediately before removal to Croydon is known to have been in that area, constitute too small a number to provide reliable statistical information; though the contrasting migration

1. Dyos, op. cit., p.123.

2. See the 'wave' theory of migration as expounded in Redford and Chaloner, op. cit., pp.186-187; also the references to currents and counter-currents of migration, Havenstein, op. cit., pp.181-195,199. Cf., Dyos's strongly held view that migrants to Croydon from London generally made the move in one bound rather than by a succession of short migrations; op. cit., p.124.
rates for, on the one hand Beddington and Addington and on the other Mitcham, are probably based on a sufficiently large sample to be valid.\(^1\) Certainly when places of birth of all the Croydon heads of household in 1851 born outside, but within five miles of, Croydon are reckoned the results are both significant and of interest. Sanderstead is seen then to join Addington as a place with an exceptionally high migration rate to Croydon, followed by Farley (though again perhaps with too small a sample to be valid), Coulsdon, Beddington and Warlingham. All these were exclusively rural parishes; all except Beddington and, to some extent Addington, being isolated chalk downland settlements.\(^2\)

That this was a one-way population movement tends to be proved by the fact that whilst, in 1851, twenty-three natives of Sanderstead (1821 pop. 189) were living in Croydon, the figure representing 127 per 1,000 of the village's 1821 population, only two natives of Croydon (1821 pop. 9,254) were living in Sanderstead; that is 0.2 per 1,000 of the 1821 Croydon population.

Not one downland parish failed to provide a relatively large number of Croydon heads of household in

\(^1\) Beddington's rate is 27 "selected" heads of household per 1,000 of its population in 1821 and Addington's is 25; but Mitcham's is only 2.

\(^2\) Redford and Chaloner commented, "It is agreed that where the land after enclosure was used for corn-growing, depopulation was less likely to occur than where it was used for pasturage (especially for sheep pasturage)"; _op. cit._, p.70.
1851. The parishes within five miles of Croydon that did so fail, were on the London side, for example Tooting, Streatham and Mitcham; or had poor road links and no common boundary with Croydon, for example Hayes and Keston.¹

A clear-cut picture emerges then of the local pattern of migration to Croydon. There was a considerable migration off the chalk Downs immediately to the south of the town; the flow, it seems, being almost entirely one-way. This is a microcosmic reminder of the big nineteenth century population movement from countryside to town that reached its peak in the fifties, a movement coinciding not with the worst years of the agricultural depression but with the "Golden Age of Farming". It also coincided with railway expansion, and with the more economical use of labour forced upon farmers by foreign competition and rising wages.² By contrast there was considerably less migration to Croydon from the north, presumably because people there were more attracted London-wards. There was also very little migration from parishes east and west of Croydon which, although less than five miles away, had no obvious communication or trading links with the town.

The only inconsistent feature of this analysis is

---

1. Dyos has drawn attention to the comparison between the "all-round" catchment area of Wimbledon (Surrey) and the "elliptical" one of Croydon, suggesting strongly the over-riding influence of lines of communication and the catchment area's shape: op. cit., p.125.

2. Cairncross, op. cit., p.76.
the high incidence of migration from Beddington to Croydon. It was more than thirteen times as great as that from immediately adjacent Mitcham. Beddington was farther from London than was either Mitcham or Croydon; it was too the only parish in the area, other than Mitcham, that had a population increase of less than five per cent. in each decade between 1821 and 1851; and it was probably, like Mitcham, suffering from the decline of its former water-power industries.

Both places had equally direct road communication with Croydon but the road from Mitcham lay across a bleak, marshy common which may possibly have constituted a psychological, as well as physical, barrier. By contrast, the road from Beddington to Croydon was a simple one to negotiate; and access from there to London for many months of the year was probably easier eastwards via Croydon than north-eastwards across the marshes of the River Wandle, so that Beddington-born people destined ultimately for London were much more likely to pass through Croydon than were Mitcham-born people. At the moment of the census they would be recorded as residents of Croydon although their residence was only temporary and their ultimate destination London. There is here a reminder of the limitation of this process of analysis. It shows only the position at one particular moment of time; it does not indicate the relative

1. See p.305, supra.
stability or instability, mobility or immobility, of natives of the various separate parishes.

One other aspect of migration to Croydon based on the evidence of probable place of residence immediately before removal into the town is of interest. As in the examination of the sample relating to all Croydon heads of household in 1851, the statistics relating to the selected households show that there was twice as much chance of a migrant having moved into the town from a parish astride a main road or, since it is a mean year of 1845 that is here being considered the main London to Brighton railway line, as there was of his having come from a parish not so situated.\(^1\)

3. Social Class and Migration into Croydon

(a) Birthplace of Heads of Household

If the heads of household in Croydon in 1851 who had moved into the town from places more than ten miles away are analysed on the basis of social class, it can be seen that the proportions in each class are almost exactly the same as the proportions overall in the town at that date.\(^2\) But this situation does not apply when related to

1. See p.299n. It is notable that despite the recent opening of the railway the proportions remained unaltered.

2. Cf. the relevant lines of Table 22, p.449, infra, col.(n) and those of Table 22, cols.(e),(g),(i),(k).
the areas less than ten miles from the town.\textsuperscript{1}

Of the heads of household born in the town or within a ten mile radius of it, slightly more than half the working-class people were native to the town, whereas only nineteen per cent. of the middle- and upper-classes had been born there. By contrast, taking again the heads of household born in the town or within ten miles of it, one-third of the working-class people were born between five and ten miles away, in West Kent, London and much of East Surrey, whereas nearly three-quarters of all the upper- and middle-class heads of household had been born there. Perhaps the most significant consideration in this connection is that of the native heads of household, only eight per cent. were upper- and middle-class, the other ninety-two per cent. being working class; the comparative proportions for the area at a five to ten mile radius being, respectively, about one-third and two-thirds.\textsuperscript{2}

It can be seen from this, then, that although nearly a quarter of the town's heads of household had been born in the parish, a considerably higher proportion of working-class than of upper- and middle-class people had remained at their place of birth. Further, a much higher

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} For example, cf. the relevant lines of Table 22, p.449, \textit{infra}, col. (n) with those of cols. (e),(g),(k) of the same Table.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Table 23, p.450, \textit{infra}. The reasons why the poor, generally, were reluctant to move are considered in Lyos, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.151-156.
\end{itemize}
proportion of heads of household who had originated from London and other places between five and ten miles from Croydon were upper- and middle-, rather than working-class. At any distance beyond ten miles- or beyond London- extent of population movement appears to have been unrelated to social class.

The area between five and ten miles from Croydon was a particularly heterogeneous one including, as it did, such diverse places at the City of London, Southwark, Kingston, and isolated rural villages like Cudham (Kent) and Tandridge (Surrey). There was, therefore, a considerable variation within the area in the number of upper- and middle-class people who were born there and subsequently moved to Croydon. Indeed, 231 of the 798 upper- and middle-class heads of household living in Croydon in 1851, that is almost exactly thirty per cent., had been born in the small belt of land lying between places five miles north of Croydon and the far side of the City of London. By contrast, less than nine per cent. of the town's working-class heads of household hailed from the same area: a mere 247 out of 2,975.¹

There is, in all this, proof of the relative immobility of the working-classes; of the comparatively high rate of migration to Croydon of the upper- and middle-classes from London and its immediate environs; and, as one

¹ Tables 21,24, pp.448,451, infra.
would expect, the considerable effect of distance upon the limitation of population movement among all social classes.¹

3. Social Class and Migration into Croydon

(b) Probable Place of Residence Immediately Before Removal into the Town

It has already been noted that the proportion of migrants of each social class coming to Croydon from places more than ten miles away was similar to the proportion of each class resident in the town. This is confirmed by a study of the figures relating to the selected households.² Likewise, the figures for Croydon's adjacent parishes and the locality comprising West Kent, London, and that part of East Surrey between five and ten miles from Croydon, confirm most of the conclusions reached in the analysis based on place of birth. Especially from the latter area, there emanated a high proportion of middle- and lower middle-class residents, and a low proportion of unskilled workers.³ Then,

１. The means needed to migrate were considerable, especially for a whole family, and the immobility of the working classes has been noted by numerous writers. At East Grinstead (Sussex), in the eighteenth century, three quarters of the settlement cases were from places within 20 miles of the town: G.O. Cowley, Sussex Market Towns, 1550-1750, (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of London, 1964), p.96. Enquiries in 1909 showed that the majority of the poverty and distress in London was amongst the town-bred part of the population and that in a high proportion of cases country immigrants arrived to fill places definitely secured in advance: Dyos, op. cit., p.117. "The imagined picture of yokel to slum-dweller is clearly false despite the contemporary rural depopulation": ibid., p.113.

２. The raw figures are in Table 25, p.452, infra.

３. The figures are respectively 42%, 54%, 27%.
too a study of the selected heads of household confirms the earlier statement that within the area between five and ten miles from Croydon the social class of the migrants to Croydon depended very much upon the nature and position of the place of origin.¹

But despite these similarities in the pattern of migration to Croydon from places between five and ten miles away soon after 1807 and again in about 1845, there were also subtle differences.² By the latter date, less of the total upper- and middle-class migration was from the City and its immediate environs; and more was from the London suburbs.³ There had been, too, a substantial increase in working-class movement to Croydon from the latter districts.⁴ On the other hand, a marked decline can be seen as between the two dates in the extent of migration from the more rural parts of the area.⁵ All this is a reminder that between 1807 and 1845 London was expanding southwards so that Croydon, especially with its good railway links with

---

1. See p.310, supra.
2. The reasons for these two dates being quoted are given on pp.294n,301n, supra. 1807 represents the mean date of birth of all the heads of household; their overall mean date of migration cannot be calculated.
3. The comparative figures are 46% and 34% in about 1807 and 40% and 50% in about 1845, from City and suburbs respectively.
4. The comparative figures at the two dates are 32% and 55%. 5. The comparable figures for the working classes at the two dates are 50% and 27%.
the south bank of the Thames, was in contact, however modestly, with that increasingly populous area in a way that it had not been at the start of the century. The population tide was beginning to turn. At least among a class that could afford to support two or more resident domestic servants commuting, by 1845, was becoming almost commonplace.¹

4. Occupation and Migration into Croydon

(a) Birthplace of Heads of Household²

The official report on the 1851 census set out a complicated occupational grouping. A much simpler, and it is suggested more logical, classification has therefore been devised for the purpose of this study, on the basis of what might be termed "occupational function". This provides eight categories which can be described, briefly, as independent; professional and clerical; agricultural; craft and industrial; distributive; domestic; transport and sustenance; and miscellaneous.³

As with social class, the proportion of people of different occupations moving into Croydon from any distance beyond ten miles was very similar to the proportion already

¹. But the extent of the population movement was still small: pp.303-304, supra.
². The relevant figures are in Table 26, p.453, infra.
³. The occupational classification is dealt with in greater detail in Appendix VI, p.463, infra.
in the town. Likewise, at lesser distances than ten miles, the same distinctive features emerge as before, that a low proportion of independent and professional and clerical members of the community were native to Croydon, confirmation of the lower average social status of the resident natives; and that a particularly high proportion of independent and professional residents were from London.

Apart from the Irish, the number of people employed in agriculture tended to diminish rapidly as distance of birthplace from Croydon increased, for the obvious reason that they did not have to move far in search of work. As another study has pointed out, "There could be little attraction for an agricultural labourer in moving from one rural area of low wages and employment to another;" but we do not know, of course, how many people employed in non-agricultural occupations in Croydon had formerly worked on the land elsewhere in the country. Certainly, the highest proportion of agricultural workers in Croydon from any one area, apart from Ireland, was from the villages immediately adjacent to the town; a reminder that those

1. For example, 7% of the heads of household who moved into Croydon from places 10 to 30 miles away were independent and 8% of all the heads of household in the town were similarly placed; 16% of those from places 30 to 75 miles away were employed domestically and 13% of all the heads of household in the town were so employed; 32% of those from between 75 and 150 miles away were engaged in crafts and industries and 35% of all the heads of household in the town were so occupied.

places were almost exclusively rural at the time.\footnote{For instance Sanderstead, now a prosperous commuter suburb and a part of the London Borough of Croydon, had forty-two heads of household living there in 1851, twenty-nine of whom were engaged in agriculture. The remainder comprised four in domestic work, a banker, schoolmistress, Rector, three policemen, a baker and grocer, a bricklayer, and a wheelwright.}

Of the people employed in crafts and industries, natives of Croydon provided a higher than average proportion; but the proportion of workers connected with the distributive trades and in domestic employment was related closely, as to birthplace, to the total number of people so employed. Finally, in the transport and sustenance category a rather high proportion came from the villages immediately adjacent to Croydon, with a diminishing proportion from places more than seventy-five miles away.

One other point of interest, though not statistically significant, is the occasional example of what might be described as employer-loyalty. For instance, the head of the Crowley family, who owned a substantial brewery in High Street had been born at Alton (Hants), where the firm also brewed; and it is noticeable that among Croydon's heads of household in 1851 was a drayman born there, while two labourers and a carman from the same Hampshire parish might well have been Crowley employees too. Again, the manor house of Waddon was occupied by a farmer born at Cheddleworth (Berkshire) and of seven farm labourer heads of household living in the immediate vicinity at the time of
the 1851 census one had also been born at Cheddleworth and two others were from neighbouring Berkshire villages.

4. Occupation and Migration into Croydon

(b) Place of Residence Immediately Before Removal into the Town

As one would expect, from what has been said already, very few professional and clerical people had moved into Croydon from the parishes immediately adjacent. On the other hand, the same area provided a considerable supply of agricultural workers. The area nearer, and including, London was not surprisingly the previous home of only comparatively few people who were employed on the land; but it sent to Croydon a large proportion (forty per cent.) of all the selected professional and clerical workers. It was also the place from which a considerable number of craft and industrial workers and people employed in the distributive industries had come. It is interesting that many of the people employed in domestic work had moved into Croydon from places farther afield, this being the only occupational group where a higher percentage of the total had probably lived previously over ten (though under thirty) miles from Croydon rather than in the area between the five- and ten-mile radii of the town.

Generally, it appears that the birthplace of the Croydon head of household in 1851 tended often to be considerably farther away from the town than his most recent place of residence outside the town, though this
qualification applies rather less to clerical and professional people than to the remainder. It is noticeable, for instance, that of the heads of household in the distributive trade who had not been born in Croydon only twenty-six per cent. had been born within ten miles of it whereas no fewer than sixty per cent. had lived as close to it as that immediately before moving into the town.

5. General Conclusions

Croydon, in 1851, had upwards of four thousand heads of household. A quarter of these were native to the town, over half had been born within ten miles of it, and nine-tenths within 150 miles. Proportionate to their population, the town’s adjacent villages were contributing thirteen times as many heads of household as were London and suburban Surrey; a similar difference was found to exist when probable last place of residence was considered.

Croydon, even in 1845, was still too remote from London to be receiving many of its migrants; it was still in the direct line of the population movement into the capital and only much later, perhaps in the last two decades of the century, did it receive a substantial London-based population.

There was, certainly at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a considerable migration away from the
isolated villages on the chalk Downs south of the town, a flow into Croydon that was beyond doubt one-way. By contrast the parishes to the north sent few people to Croydon, presumably because they were attracted Londonwards. The villages east and west of Croydon that had poor communication, trading, and marketing links with Croydon likewise contributed few people to the growing numbers in the town. In relation to their population, twice as many Croydon heads of household originated in parishes on coaching roads leading into the town as in villages on byroads.

But the population movement was not simply a relentless one in a single direction. Twenty-one per cent. of migrants were probably living farther from Croydon when they moved into the town than they had done at birth; and about five per cent. of the incoming migrants were people born in Croydon who had, more recently, lived up to seventy-five miles from the town. Three influences can be detected that affected the extent of migration into the town: distance; decline or total absence of local industry at the migrant's place of origin; and the interplay of the alternative attractions of London and of other areas of industrial expansion elsewhere in the country.

Among the heads of household born more than ten miles from Croydon, or probably resident at that distance immediately before arrival in the town, the number of people
in each social class and each occupational group was almost exactly proportionate to the class and occupational structure of the town in 1851, except for a high proportion of domestic workers from distances between ten and thirty miles away, and the number of Irish farm labourers. However with places less than ten miles from Croydon the situation was quite different.

Thus, a considerably higher proportion of working-class than of upper- and middle-class people born in Croydon had remained there. By contrast, a much higher proportion of heads of household who had originated in London and other places between five and ten miles from the town were upper- and middle-, rather than working-, class. Indeed, over thirty per cent. of the town’s entire upper- and middle-class heads of household had been born in London and suburban Surrey.

The villages adjacent to Croydon, not surprisingly in view of their rural nature, provided a particularly high proportion of the town’s agricultural workers. It is safe to assume that these people, at least, had rarely changed their occupation on moving into the town though, of course, this is a matter not recorded by the census enumerators.

We are left, then, with a general picture of the considerable effect of distance upon the amount of population movement among all social classes; of relative immobility among the working-classes; and of a comparatively
high migration rate of the upper- and middle-classes from the London area to Croydon. There is clear evidence, if contrast is made between the 1807 and 1845 statistics, though they are not exactly comparable, that the movement of the more affluent from such places as the City and its environs was increasing between those dates, greatly accentuated no doubt by the building of the railway in the late 1830's. By 1845 commuting was a normal feature of life among the better-off sections of the community.

There is finally some slight evidence of employer-loyalty; that is, of people moving to Croydon to accompany an employer who also did so.1

6. Application of the General Conclusions to Particular Parts of the Town

Those, then, are the general conclusions regarding migration into Croydon that emerge from a detailed analysis of the census returns for the year 1851. But it is obviously necessary to see whether the conclusions apply equally to separate parts of the town.

Because of its distinguishable, if undistinguished, homogeneity the Market area merits special attention. A good starting point, therefore, is a comparison between that locality and the other working-class areas in Croydon.

1. At the end of the century there was a very substantial example of this in the other direction, out of the town: R.C.W. Cox, Some Aspects of the Urban Development of Croydon, 1870-1940 (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Leicester, 1966), pp.68-69.
From this study, it emerges that both the extent of the migration into the town of the heads of household, and the distances that they had travelled, were almost exactly the same both in the Market area and in the other working-class districts. But these findings are based on the place of birth of all heads of household who, it has been calculated, had a mean birthdate of 1807 and a probable mean date of arrival in Croydon of sometime in the 1820's. However, with the selected heads of household, that is those who if not native to the town had a mean arrival date of about 1845, the position is noticeably different. With those people there seems to have been much less disposition to move into the Market area; another cause and effect perhaps of its increasing decay. It is clear, too, that there was less inclination also for the new migrants to move into Old Town, the site of the ancient settlement close to the manor house and church. They seem, obviously, to have favoured the working-class areas elsewhere, for example off Mitcham Road to the north, St James's Road to the north-west, or Brighton Road to the south.

This might reflect the growing availability of suitable housing in the latter places; but equally it might merely represent the continuation of a long-standing tradition, of which otherwise nothing is known, for the newly-arrived to occupy initially and rather tentatively a

1. See pp.294n,301n, supra.
house on the outskirts of the town, only to move nearer the centre later on. Broadly, the findings that the working-class migrants with a mean settlement date in the 1820's were to be found equally in the Market area, in Old Town, and in the other working-class areas whereas the working-class migrants who had arrived within the past six years appeared to be shunning the older and more decayed localities holds good also for the agricultural hamlets at Waddon, Woodside and Shirley.¹

Although they are not statistically significant, an examination of the census returns for the various parts of the town does show the whereabouts of just one or two enclaves, mainly Irish. These migrants, not surprisingly, tended to live in close proximity to each other: for example in Leather Bottle Lane, near Broad Green, and in Hill Street, Old Town, where eight out of ten and nine out of sixteen adjacent households, respectively, were headed by men, mainly farm labourers, who had been born in Ireland. In Waddon hamlet, too, of the eleven people who had been born at places between 50 and 75 miles away, six were from Berkshire and neighbouring Oxfordshire and another three from Sussex.² There was no geographical concentration

---

1. These hamlets appear to have been slightly more attractive than the other areas to both earlier and more recent working-class migrants from the neighbouring villages and generally from places less than ten miles away.

2. See the comment on "employer-loyalty", pp. 315-316, supra.
anywhere in the town, however, of people from abroad: the twenty heads of household who had been born on the Continent, predominantly in France, were scattered about the parish, mainly in more affluent localities.

The absence of local directories dating before 1851 makes it impossible to use the census returns for that year to discover from whence the householders of the more recently erected cottages and villas had come. For that purpose therefore it is necessary to turn to the returns for 1861. There is, however, no reason to think that the general migratory pattern had changed substantially over the decade or, indeed, that it would do so in the next few decades either. It is unfortunate however that the 1861 returns were not compiled with quite the same standards of accuracy and the same attention to detail as those for 1851.

It is especially relevant in the context of this dissertation to study the 1861 returns for the properties that had been built on the Rectory Manor Estate in the previous ten years. When one does so, one finds that in many ways the situation there almost exactly resembled the situation appertaining to the town generally. Thus, in both cases, ninety-eight per cent. of all heads of household had been born in the British Isles and around nine out of ten were living within 150 miles of their place of birth. Then, too, of the heads of household born in the

town or within a ten-mile radius of it, about half the working-class people were native to the town whereas only nineteen per cent. of middle- and upper-class people had been born there; and, by contrast, only one-third of working-class householders had been born at places between five and ten miles away by comparison with nearly three quarters of those from the upper- and middle-classes.

Before considering ways in which, by contrast, the facts and figures for the new houses on the Rectory Manor Estate do not coincide with those for the town at large, one must ascertain what differences there were in social and occupational structure. Socially, thirty-eight per cent. of the new inhabitants of the Estate were middle- and upper-class in comparison with twenty-one per cent. throughout the town. Therefore one would expect, if the pattern of migration to the Estate were typical of the town as a whole, to find a proportionate weighting on account of this imbalance of the social class pattern.

After making such an adjustment, however, there remains a shortfall of some five per cent. of heads of household native to the town and of heads of household born within ten miles of the place. In other words, Rectory Manor was attracting a somewhat higher proportion of migrants of all social classes who had been born some considerable distance from Croydon than was the town generally. It is probable that the same can be said of new
Looking more closely, also, at the newly-arrived selected heads of household, that is those whose most recent place of residence can be identified with some certainty, thirty-one of the thirty-three who had moved onto the Estate from places between five and thirty miles away had come from the general direction of London, especially from areas around New Cross, Southwark, Hackney, and Islington. However as the Estate was on the north side of the town and was attracting a higher than average number of middle-class people it would be wrong to infer that the same would necessarily be found to apply to new houses throughout the town regardless of location or social exclusiveness.

The occupational pattern on the Estate was typical of that for the whole town, with one exception: only four heads of household were engaged in agriculture. The pattern does not therefore necessitate any further adjustment to the conclusions already reached.

To summarise then, it seems that more recent arrivals in Croydon, even those of the working-class, were steering clear of the older and decaying areas and were settling in cottages or villas nearer the edge of the built-up area. We do not know, however, whether that had always been the custom or whether it was something new. The Irish, by contrast, tended to concentrate in one or two limited parts of the old town; but the few migrants from the continent were scattered widely about the parish, mainly in
areas of some affluence.

A detailed examination of the 1861 census returns for Rectory Manor suggests that in many ways such a new district merely reflected the general pattern of migration to be found throughout the town. But it does seem possible that the Estate may have attracted a greater share than the town generally of people who had migrated over considerable distances. There is some evidence, too, that such estates as this one may have been proving especially attractive to middle-class migrants from the inner London suburbs.

7. Croydon's Population After 1851

The 1861 census returns were compiled too soon after those of 1851 to reveal any contradiction of the findings outlined above. But it would be a more fruitful exercise to examine in detail the returns for some later date, say 1901. This is, unfortunately, impossible. But we do know that during the period between 1851 and 1939 Croydon grew vastly in population. Its 1851 figure of 20,343 increased in the next decade by about fifty per cent.; between 1861 and 1871 the new total increased by a further eighty-four per cent.; after which the rate of increase per decade levelled out at between thirty and forty per cent. right up to the end of the century. In 1939, the population of Croydon was approximately a quarter of a million.

No detailed statistical analysis is possible of the birthplaces of the people of Croydon and their
relationship to either social class or occupational group in this period of rapid growth. Such factors as the agricultural depression of the 1870s which, according to H.A. Shannon, stepped up the inflow of population into London, doubtless affected the social and occupational structure of the migrant population.¹ So too did the increase of commuting from the earliest stations, such as East and West Croydon, and those built subsequently in various parts of the town.² But whether the trams had a similar effect is more open to question.³

There is conclusive evidence that Croydon, in the second half of the nineteenth century, was self-contained in its urbanisation: its land, which belonged mainly to Croydon men was changed largely by Croydon men.⁴ The ground landlords were local people, though not necessarily natives; so, too, were the builders. We know further that by 1881 a considerable number of Croydonians had been drawn from London and that at the time of the 1911 census 66.1 per cent. of the town’s total population had been born outside


2. See, for instance, Cox, op. cit., p.92.

3. See, ibid., pp.82-83, 91, 96.

4. Ibid., p.150.
its borders. Yet it still had a considerably higher proportion of native population than, say, Wimbledon (Surrey) simply because of its position as an independent town.\footnote{Dyos, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.123,125. Wimbledon is north-west of Croydon and is about two miles nearer London Bridge.}

However, a detailed examination of the social classes, the occupations, and the places of origin, of the occupants of the thousands of new houses that were erected in Croydon during the last third of the nineteenth century must await the release of the later census returns.
IV. THE HAM FARM ESTATE

1. Introduction: the Hamlet of Shirley

The hamlet of Shirley is in the eastern part of the parish of Croydon. Until the twentieth century it was separated from the town centre by almost two miles of countryside; and was somewhat isolated, except to the extent that the lower part of the settlement lay on the road, now the A232, linking Croydon with both West Wickham and Bromley (Kent).

In July, 1856, Shirley’s first permanent church, St John’s, was consecrated. The flint and stone building, designed by Sir Gilbert Scott, was "deliberately villagey, although not small," and had seating, more than half of it free, for 350 people. At the consecration ceremony, the substantial sum of £246 8s. 9d. was collected, compared with £130 donated at the consecration of St Andrew’s, in the working-class district of Old Town, Croydon, the following year. That Shirley Church rapidly became fashionable can be seen by an examination of the Art Nouveau tombstones and of their sugary, self-important inscriptions. The local directory described Shirley, towards the end of the same century, as a "quiet, straggling, little country place....The neighbourhood....pretty and beautifully


2. Ruskin’s parents are buried at the eastern end of the churchyard.
Key to Fig. 6

The Borough Boundary marked on the northern part of the map divides Croydon and Beckenham and, therefore, Surrey and Kent.

The railway line farther north is that between Eden Park and Elmers End; and the one in the north-western corner links Woodside and Elmers End. The London stations lie beyond Elmers End.

The Ashburton Playing Fields, on the west of the map, are on the site of the former golf course.

Long Lane, on the north-west of the map, and Wickham Road, on the extreme south of the map, are both main roads leading to Croydon town centre, which is farther west.
Fig. 6 6" to the mile O.S. map of the Ham Farm Estate, Monks Orchard
timbered....There are several noblemen's and gentlemen's residences around, which give a character to the locality."¹

One of them was Shirley House which in 1851 had been the home of the Earl of Eldon and his wife and seven children, who were attended by fourteen servants.² At the same time a house in Stroud Green Lane, now Shirley Road, had been occupied by a barrister-at-law who was one of the Committee Clerks of the House of Commons; Shirley Cottage, on the present Wickham Road, by an M.P.; and Coombe Farm, by a Captain in the East India Company's service. But otherwise almost all the inhabitants, throughout the century, were farm labourers or domestic servants; though on Shirley Hill there was both a brewery and a windmill.

One of the Shirley farms was Ham Farm which soon after World War I became available for building development. Its land was offered in the form of frontages to the few existing farm tracks irrespective of whether such roads constituted the ideal, or even a satisfactory, basis for the


2. The house later became Shirley Park Hotel. It has now been demolished, and its grounds form the site of the new Trinity School of John Whitgift.

creation of a housing estate.

During the 1920's an unplanned development of shacks, often home-made, and of more substantial but small buildings grew up along the old farm tracks, the exceptionally large gardens being used as smallholdings. The condition of the roads, at first unmetalled and increasingly rutted and muddy, served to underline the extreme isolation of residents from the shops of Croydon and from railway stations from which they could commute to London.

Attempts were made during the second half of the same decade to introduce the new and largely permissive town planning legislation, but these had only minimal effect. Then, in the 1930's, partly because of such legislation but due far more to the spread of London as far out as Croydon, a more usual type of inter-war suburban development was superimposed upon the existing semi-rural, chaotic growth of the previous decade. The result is an inter-war housing estate which superficially, but only superficially, is like so many others built at that time on the outskirts of London. Many of its characteristics raise the suspicion that just as the species, Suburb Victorian, is now known to have many mutations, so too may the species Suburb Inter-War.

2. The Earlier History of Ham Farm

Ham Farm, which stood about half a mile north-east of Shirley, and so farther still from the centre of Croydon,
was possibly of some local importance in medieval times.¹ Later it formed part of a much larger estate the boundaries of which were unrelated to those of the parish or even of the county and which, by 1820 enclosed some 3,202 acres.² In that year it was sold up in lots much of it, but not Ham Farm, being bought by Samuel Jones Loyd, M.P., a banker who subsequently became Lord Overstone.³ He was succeeded, some thirty years later by a cousin, Lewis Loyd, who built a magnificent mansion, called Monks Orchard from the name of a nearby wood.⁴ Later he bought Ham Farm which was thus reunited to the estate. Lewis Loyd, another banker, a noted breeder of sheep and Herefords, and an active member of the local Conservative Association, died in 1891.⁶ On the death of his widow in 1902 a nephew Frederick Loyd, of Romford (Essex), then aged 47, succeeded to Lewis Loyd's

1. Clarence G. Paget, Croydon Homes of the Past, 1937, p.84.
4. The wood was named after an Addington (Surrey) family that had earlier owned lands in the area, Copeland, op. cit., p.17.
5. Ibid., pp.18-19; Paget, op. cit., p. 35.
former estates in Kent, Surrey, and Lancashire.¹

Monks Orchard was let; and the premature death of
the second tenant Arthur Gurney Preston, a manufacturing
engineer, as a result of a bathing accident, appears to have
been the chance event that caused the Monks Orchard estate,
including Ham Farm, to be put on the market in November,
1920. In all, about 1550 acres were offered for sale, in
forty-four lots.²

Preston left estate worth £195,874 gross, and the
fatality ended an era in the history of the estate. Monks
Orchard was described, at his death, as one of the
stateliest mansions in West Kent. A local newspaper
described how his grounds were always at the disposal of
the promoters of charitable and social gatherings. "Even
in a countryside famed for its natural beauty," it
continued, "the villagers welcomed every opportunity for a
sojourn at Monks Orchard where they were at liberty to
saunter at will over the delightful demesne." Preston's
death, said the newspaper, would be a severe blow to the
neighbouring village of West Wickham.³

It was, in fact, a severe blow to a much wider
area for in the sale of November, 1920, at a time of

1. "Abstract of the Title of Revell & Co., Ltd, to Freehold
   Property near Croydon," in the possession of the author,
   passim.

2. Copeland, op. cit., p.19; Tookey, op. cit.; Croydon

agricultural depression, the estate was fragmented. It was offered as a freehold residence and agricultural estate. But the sale particulars pointed out that a large part was ready for immediate building development. The estate was producing a rental of over £4,400 per annum; and facilities were advertised for fishing, hunting, and shooting.¹

The sale took place on 17 November but only eighteen of the forty-six lots were sold. The mansion, with its gardens and parkland comprising 337 acres, was bought in at £35,000; Beckenham golf course, of some 117 acres, Eden Park Farm, and the White Hart, at West Wickham, also failed to find purchasers. The same happened to the house and 318 acres of Ham Farm, which together form the subject of this study.²

Ham Farm was described as an excellent freehold agricultural and sporting property. The farmhouse had four reception rooms, nine bedrooms, three bathrooms and three W.C.s. but apparently no main sewerage. There were also stabling, a pair of semi-detached cottages built in 1878, two detached cottages, a lodge, and excellent pasture and arable. The lot was let at £347 per annum, on a fourteen-


² Ibid., 20 Nov., 1920, p.9. The same edition carried an advertisement stating that twenty-two lots had by then been sold and that offers were invited for the remainder: loc. cit., p.1.
year lease, due to expire in 1928.1

3. The First Generation Development (1920-1929)

About a month after the initial sale of the Monks Orchard estate, it became known locally that the tenant had been bought out and the land of Ham Farm sold for building.2

The bulk of the land was purchased by Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd.3 In the New Year the firm was offering in the Croydon Advertiser residential sites and park, meadow and arable land, which was described as exceptionally attractive for fruit growing, poultry farming, market gardening and small holdings.4 The firm, with offices at Moorgate Station Chambers, E.C. 2, advertised weekly in the same newspaper up to the end of May. Then, for a further month, they announced that already over one hundred purchasers, of whom very many were resident in Croydon and district, had selected and acquired sites.5 To assist the sale, the company produced an attractive illustrated brochure which makes it clear that the vendor envisaged purchase by smallholders rather than by building firms. The booklet's cover described the land, rather misleadingly,

1. GFP, Local Collection, pfS70 (333) SMI, Sale Particulars of Monks Orchard Estate.


3. Information supplied by Mr Harry W. Robertson.


as the Monks Orchard Estate; and confused the origin of that name by having an illustrative medallion of a monk in an orchard.¹

Both the verbal descriptions and the photographs stressed the rural condition of the area. But the author obviously wished to keep open the options for, in one place in the text, he wrote that the rich arable fields and meadows were equally suitable for the purposes of the small holder or for the erection of bungalows and smaller houses, and would be divided to suit the requirements of individual purchasers.² One sentence was certainly misleading; visitors, it said, "will notice how much care has been taken in the sub-division of the land to retain the charm of the hedgerows and other natural features."³ That was, simply, humbug. A local estate agent has recently written confirming this:

"At the time we Estate Agents deprecated the manner in which the lots were offered, which briefly was to sell land fronting the existing estate roads irrespective of depth. To my knowledge some of these plots had depths up to 1,000 feet, and each plot was sold for the erection of one house irrespective of frontage, depth or area. In view of this, at a later stage when a purchaser or re-purchaser found he had too much land for his needs, the only way to deviate from the 'one house' restriction was to apply to Percy Harvey Estates Ltd, who varied the restriction on payment of a fee." (4)

1. Monk's Orchard Estate, Percy Harvey Estates Ltd..... E.O.2, in the possession of Mr S.O. Connor.
2. Ibid., p.5.
3. Ibid.
4. Information supplied by Mr A. Hook.
These facts are crucial in the history of the Estate. There was no attempt whatever at planning; and the unmetalled tracks that happened to have led to Ham Farm formed initially the only roads on the new Estate, irrespective of their width, direction, or relationship to the land available for sale. Additionally, the Estate first came on to the market with a restrictive covenant of one house per plot regardless of the size of that plot, yet with the opportunity of ignoring the covenant on payment of a further sum of money.

In these respects, the Ham Farm Estate does not represent typical inter-war suburban development which, anyway, had not reached out as far as Shirley in the early 1920's. But the failure of the estate company to plan or to regulate carefully the disposal of the plots had a profound effect on what happened to the Estate subsequently. It made inevitable a haphazard growth, in the 1920's, of smallholdings; and then a second generation development, a decade later, of a more typical 1930's suburban kind, but superimposed on a skeletal road pattern to which it was patently unsuited.

1. These tracks later came to be named Orchard Avenue, The Glade, and Woodmere Avenue; the last-named has never become a through road. The later Orchard Way also existed as an even more inferior trackway.

2. Some of the plots were distinctly unusual in shape. For instance, one re-sold in 1927 had a 210-foot frontage but was only 120 feet deep: AWS, 1307, 27 Sept., 1927; SHW, 1060, 27 Sept., 1927.
Not only did the initial restriction of one house per plot inhibit a more usual type of housing development; there were also other conditions imposed on purchasers, which indicated that the immediate expectation was the creation of a semi-rural estate that only later might be built over at all substantially. Thus no caravans were allowed unless used in connection with poultry farming, horticulture, fruit growing or agriculture and the land until built on was not to be used for any purpose other than as farm land, garden ground, plant nursery or orchard.¹

The plots were often far more suited in size to some kind of farming than to normal residential usage.² Not surprisingly, therefore, one finds constant reference to various agricultural and horticultural pursuits. Several poultry farms were established; so, too, were nurseries, a market garden and a fur farm.³ Sometimes these activities were carried out on a part-time or part-family basis.⁴ No proof can be found for a belief held locally that land was specifically set aside for ex-servicemen, or that it was sold to them at a reduced rate; it is more

---

1. HWS, 1307, 27 Sept., 1927.

2. Even when the 1930's development of the Estate took place many of the houses had unusually long gardens simply because there was no other access to the back land.


4. For instance, one poultry farm was looked after by a woman whose husband was employed as a bus driver.
probably the case that the land was cheap anyway and that many of the purchasers happened to be demobilised soldiers and sailors.¹

The quality of much of the early building matched both the cheapness of the land and the purposes for which it had been sold; and somewhat naively, if truthfully, the brochure produced by Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd, had stated, "It is of interest and significance to quote...from a letter from a purchaser of land at Monks Orchard Estate written from Devonshire: 'I have been communicating with the Borough Surveyor of Croydon, and he seems to be quite reasonable about building."²

Many of the purchasers of land built their own homes, whether they had had previous experience of the work or not; some of them making, in situ, their own pre-cast concrete blocks for the purpose. The quality of one dwelling, in Woodmere Avenue, may be judged from its name—the Hut; but others have since appreciated remarkably in value as for example a £450 bungalow self-built by a

¹. Mr J.R. Hart believes that his father, who had worked at Woolwich Arsenal during World War I, paid about £300 for approximately ten acres of land in Woodmere Avenue in 1921. Other similar figures have been quoted for neighbouring land, but they are remarkable when one realises that land in a working-class part of South Croydon in about 1870 had fetched between £320 and £522 per acre; R.C.W. Cox, Some Aspects of the Urban Development of Croydon, 1870-1940 (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Leicester, 1966), p.47.

bricklayer, assisted by labourers paid at 1s. per hour, which is now, with its land, worth £8,000 or £9,000.¹

The firm of Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd, not only failed to make provision for any roads additional to the existing farm tracks; it also made no attempt to provide services for the Estate. Ham Farm itself had received its water by a pipe line from tanks on Spring Park Farm supplied by the Corporation under an agreement of 3 August, 1915; but when offered for sale, both in 1920 and in 1924, would-be purchasers of Ham Farm were told that although they would be allowed to continue to use water from this source, no supply would be guaranteed.² The brochure produced by the company said also, rather misleadingly, "the Croydon gas mains extend up to the centre of the Estate, to which the Corporation water supply is already laid."³ But in fact the remaining purchasers of land had at first no water supply at all; and some people had to walk half a mile along the cart tracks to fetch water from the farmhouse, on the assumption that it was available there.⁴ Other residents found it less inconvenient to carry it in cans from a house

¹ Information supplied by Mr Harry W. Robertson; Mr Frank W. Trent; Mrs J. Edgar.
² GPL, Local Collection, [p.870(333)]SMI, Sale Particulars of Monks Orchard Estate.
in Long Lane.

There was therefore, of course, no main sewerage. Cesspits, which cost about £5 to dig, were permitted by Croydon Corporation, and were scheduled to be emptied fortnightly, but this was rarely done on time. Likewise, there was at first no electricity though soon a high tension line linked Ham Farm with Wickham Road and there were low tension lines along the four farm tracks. In the meantime people had to fetch paraffin, for lighting, from a mile or more away at Elmers End, Beckenham.

The condition of the roads in the early days of the Estate, was extremely bad. Surveyors, in 1926, throwing out a one-hundred foot chain in Orchard Avenue returned from taking other measurements fifteen minutes later to find that it had almost disappeared into the mud; and, in bad weather, a pedestrian could only get along this road, which constituted the sole exit off the Estate to Wickham Road and to Shirley, by walking along the extreme

1. Information supplied by Mrs Irene Dodds, an early resident on the Estate.
2. CPL, Shelf 16, Folio 11, S70(1922), Map of Ham Farm, Monks Orchard.
3. Information supplied by Mr Frank W. Trent; Mr W.C. Bransby. Both were early residents.
4. CPL, Shelf 16, Folio 11, S70(1922), Map of Ham Farm, Monks Orchard.
5. Information supplied by Mrs Irene Dodds.
edge of the footpath and clinging to the wooden fence.¹

Egress in the opposite direction, towards Woodside and Elmers End, was worse still in that it was probably not even legal. This is shown by the fragmentary abstract of minutes of the Monks Orchard Owners' Association.² When that body asked the Corporation to improve the roadway that later came to be called The Glade it was informed that there was no right of way over the road except for agricultural purposes; and that, further, its condition was due largely to its unauthorised use by occupiers of Ham Farm Estate for the carting of building materials. Even, pointed out the Council in a further letter, the fact that provision existed in the new Town Planning Scheme for a fifty-foot road did not alter the position, since that Scheme merely enabled the Corporation to construct such a road when they deemed fit.³

1. Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes. At least one of the builders hired a farm cart to overcome the difficulty that motor lorries had in delivering building materials: information supplied by Mr J.R. Hart.

2. The original minutes of this Association were carefully preserved together with a small credit balance, throughout World War II when the Association was in abeyance. The records and the money were subsequently handed on to the re-formed Monks Orchard Residents' Association, in 1957; but the documents were lost in the early 1960's. Only some pages of an abstract from the earlier minutes can now be found.

3. Monks Orchard Residents' Association, minutes, Sept., 1957-Jan., 1959, containing fragmentary abstract from the minutes of the earlier Owners' Association, p.13. The Glade provided the most direct access to Elmers End Station.
To reach Woodside Station, on the north side of the Estate, the first residents were in the habit of crossing Beckenham Golf Course from the end of Woodmere Avenue. But when in 1932 the Council was requested by the Owners' Association to repair the footpath that had thus been created the Council, which owned the Course, refused on the grounds that they had no obligation to do so and that, anyway, the public had no right of access over it.\(^1\) The condition of Orchard Avenue, which led in the general direction of East Croydon Station, and the absence of a right of way at all towards either Elmers End or Woodside Stations, made nonsense of the claim in the Percy Harvey brochure that the Estate was conveniently situated as regards all three of those stations and also the one at West Wickham.\(^2\) In fact, to reach East Croydon, prior to 1924, a resident not only had to negotiate the deep mud of Orchard Avenue but also, afterwards, to walk a further two miles to the station.\(^3\) Reaching Woodside and Elmers End Stations involved walks of, respectively, half a mile or more across the golf course, or the extremely muddy continuation of The Glade, both these routes being technically illegal. Finally, it is not clear why West Wickham Station is mentioned at

\(^{1}\) Monks Orchard Residents' Association, minutes, pp.22-23.


\(^{3}\) After 1924, a 54 bus could be obtained at Shirley Park Hotel, three quarters of a mile beyond Orchard Avenue: information supplied by Mr John B. Gent.
all, since it was on the same line as Elmers End but was
two stations farther from London. It was almost two miles
from the farther end of Orchard Way, and had no bus link at
that time at all.¹

Not surprisingly, the condition of the Estate's
roads frequently attracted criticism from the Monks Orchard
Owners' Association. The Council however refused to make
up the roads except at the expense of the residents many of
whom, it was thought, did not wish to be put to the cost
even if they were capable of meeting it.² The Council did
however agree to establish contact with Percy Harvey Estates,
Ltd, who were by 1924 making some attempt to remedy the
worst of the situation. But the project was not a very
ambitious or, as it soon transpired, a very effective one
since it comprised mainly raking over the ground, filling
the pot holes with gravel and rolling, and clearing the side
ditches.³ Even where, as in Woodmere Avenue, rather more
work was to be done, with six-inch rolled flints being
covered with three inches of gravel, there were soon
complaints from the Association that clinker was being used
instead of flints, the work was not to the promised finished
depth; and further, the contractor refused to roll part of
Orchard Way at all as he would not risk taking his roller

¹ Information supplied by Mr John B. Gent.
² Monks Orchard Residents' Association, minutes, p.14.
over the sewer. The Council, however, assured the Association that the work was under the supervision of its road surveyor who had reported that he was satisfied.¹

In fact, the repairs did not withstand even one winter; and in the following Spring the Owners' Association again demanded Council action but that body was adamant that nothing could be done unless the Association could produce evidence that a large majority of the residents were willing to meet the cost.² By December of the same year, 1925, the Association claimed that it had such a majority; but when, in the following June, it reminded the Council of the position, the reply was that it was unable to recommend the carrying out of the work.³ In the same autumn it was reported that one stretch of road was "quite useless and impassable for heavy traffic and no fire-engine or other public service vehicle could reach the north end of Orchard Way."⁴

It was soon after that winter ended that, at the request of the Association, the Council informed the residents what the costs of road adoption would be. It seems from the correspondence that they could have the roads constructed to a number of different widths according to the

1. Ibid., pp.15-16.
2. Ibid., p.17.
3. Ibid., p.18.
4. Ibid.
amount they were prepared to pay, a curious abrogation of the Council's town planning responsibilities. Then in February, 1927, the Council informed the Owners' Association that it was recommending the construction of Orchard Way to a full width of fifty feet with a sixteen-foot carriageway, six-foot gravel paths next to the frontages and the balance to be left as grass verges. The Council would accept full responsibility for the carriageway whatever its ultimate width, so that only the kerbing and the footpaths would be at the future expense of the frontagers, the road charges being spread over ten years, with interest. It would seem from this arrangement that many of the grass verges that are to be found along roads built on suburban estates between the Wars may represent not a permanent attempt to improve appearance, but rather the balance of land intended ultimately for carriageway but made over to grass pending the availability of further money.

The second half of the 1920's generally marked the beginnings of a more positive attitude by the Council and closer co-operation than previously with the Owners' Association, which thereafter secured a better representation in the Chamber. In addition the Croydon Corporation Town Planning Act, 1925, led to the Croydon

1. Ibid., p.19.
2. Ibid., p.20.
(East) Town Planning Scheme Order four years later, which made detailed provisions for the future of the estate; while, also, the Croydon Corporation Act, 1927, ensured that future builders would have to lay a "first stage road", comprising foundations on which a subsequent highway could be built.\(^1\) The Town Planning Scheme applied the Street Works Acts to the area; and allowed for the adoption of the four existing roads. Further development would require a plan defining the land affected, together with the number and description of houses; there would too be a limit of six houses to the acre.\(^2\)

But all this came too late to have any effect on the first phase of development of the Estate. An irrational road pattern had been established; land had been sold off in one acre plots, regardless of depth and of the inaccessibility of back land; houses and bungalows of little aesthetic distinction and of amateur construction had been scattered among the fields and woods; various agricultural and horticultural activities had grown up; the services were inadequate or non-existent; a journey to London involved a long and difficult walk to public transport; the roads had a history of disrepair; and only one access on to the Estate,

\(^1\) Information supplied by Mr Alfred Hawkes.

\(^2\) CPL, S70(711)CRO. Croydon Corporation Town Planning Act, 1925......, Croydon (East) Town Planning Scheme Order (1929), passim. On the northern fringe of the Estate a density of nine houses to the acre was permitted.
that on the side farthest from London, had any undisputed legality.

Equally bizarre was the fate of the farmhouse, which stood in three acres of ground with tennis court, ornamental gardens, and detached stabling. In 1925, the property was sold to Rose Alice Cameron, the wife of Harry Cameron, a professional illusionist, for £5,200. On her death, in 1927, it passed jointly to her husband and to her infant son, Harold Clement Pemberton, "known as Harry Harold Cameron Junior". The following year the father bought the child's share for £1,710 and then mortgaged the entire property to a clerk in holy orders in County Cork, for £4,000 at 5% per cent. per annum. Eventually the title passed to Revell & Co., builders, of Pyresyde, The Glade.

Harry Cameron, a Scot, was known professionally as The Great Carmo; and, during his occupancy and subsequently, the house was called Carmo Manor. Although described in the title deeds as an illusionist, in fact he kept a menagerie and used Carmo Manor as his winter headquarters. People who lived on the estate at that time recollect that the silence of the night was often disturbed by the roaring of The Great Carmo's lions.

After Cameron vacated the premises, they were used

1. Monk's Orchard Estate, Percy Harvey Estates Ltd....
   E.C.2, p.9.
for smelting lead foil, until this was forbidden as a
nuisance.¹ The house was later demolished and the land
built over.² That work was done by Revell & Co., who
erected 1-49, The Glade and 2-16, Elstan Way, in 1935-
1936. The firm also commenced work on 9-11, Elstan Way
which were, much later, completed by a man named Stratton.³
Some of the houses were built on a concrete raft over the
former pond.⁴

4. The Second Generation Development (1929-1939)

It would be false to believe that the town
planning scheme of the late 1920’s had any immediate impact
on the Ham Farm Estate. Professor Ashworth has pointed out
that "The general picture of urban development between the
wars is one of confusion, of the predominance of the
haphazard, which the existence of statutory town planning
did very little to relieve. It is, in fact, the most
significant commentary on the nature and position of
statutory town planning in this period that there is
scarcely any point in inquiring to what extent it was...

1. The prevention of the use of Carmo Manor as a factory is
referred to in the fragmentary minutes of the Monks
Orchard Owners’ Association as one of their most
successful fights: Monks Orchard Residents’ Association,
minutes, p.51.

2. Information supplied by Mrs J. Edgar; OPL, xS70(9)CRO,
'This Is Up Your Street,' Croydon Times, 1954.

3. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index. It is not known why the
firm failed. It built nowhere else on the Estate.

4. Information supplied by Mr A. Hook.
adopted, for there was usually little recognizable difference between the outcome of development under town-planning schemes and development outside them."  

Certainly, the history of the Ham Farm Estate in the decade that followed the publication of the Town Planning Scheme was different from that of the previous one; but mainly for reasons quite unrelated to the plans. Only in regard to a more realistic housing density, and to a greater willingness for road adoption, did the Scheme itself have much effect. The history of the Estate in the 1930's was far more influenced by what was happening in the world outside. The spread of London into Croydon, and the spread of Croydon into Shirley, together also with the turn of the economic tide after 1932, were the main influences that changed the Estate dramatically during its second generation phase.

In Britain generally, there was considerable incentive to the would-be purchaser. This is illustrated by an advertisement in a 1934 local paper which suggested that there had been a remarkable fall in prices.  

It proceeded to prove the point by reference to a table that had been published in the current number of the Architects' Journal which compared costs then and a few years


2. Croydon Advertiser, 10 Mar., 1934, p.15.
previously. Sixty-one sets of figures were tabulated and in only one instance, that of rolled steel joists, had the price gone up. The fall in prices had been accompanied by a drop in wages so that, for instance, whereas a mechanic and a labourer had earned 1s. 9½d. and 1s. 4¾d. an hour five years previously their remuneration had since become only 1s. 7¾d. and 1s. 2½d.

In the 1920's, building on the Ham Farm Estate had not been rapid; about half the houses standing along the original farm tracks in 1938 had been built by 1929. Building had obviously taken place slowly during the previous seven years, with peaks of activity in about 1927. The directories show however that the houses rarely remained unoccupied for long, partly because many of them were built for (and frequently by) the owners themselves. Up to 1929, no new roads had been opened up at all.

But in 1926 some nearby land that had constituted a further part of the Monks Orchard Estate, and which lay immediately west of Orchard Avenue, began to be developed in a manner more conventional than that of the Ham Farm area. Progress was slow, three houses being unoccupied in Wickham Avenue in 1926, a further five in 1927, four in 1928, and eight in 1929; whilst in the adjoining Firsby Avenue, the four houses occupied for the first time in 1927 remained

1. Table 27, p.454, infra.
without further addition until 1951. But the start of house-building there, however faltering it was, gave an indication that Croydon had at last spread thus far along the main road to West Wickham. Henceforth houses on the Ham Farm Estate might still be isolated from each other; but the Estate itself would be adjacent to other areas of development. Soon, house-building along various parts of Wickham Road led to persistent demands for improved bus communication with East Croydon Station.

The time was therefore ripe for what one might describe as second generation development of the Estate, when new roads would be projected, higher-density building would be permitted and building firms, as distinct from individuals, would begin to operate.

The period of transition from the first to the second generation of building was bridged by the opening up, in about 1929, of two new roads: Cheston Avenue and Woodland Way. The former utilised an existing entrance from Wickham Road to the earlier Monks Orchard house, at a point where there stood a lodge, as there still does.

1. These totals of twenty houses in Wickham Avenue and four in Firsby Avenue represented only about one-fifth of the number built there in the next decade; and only a tenth of the entire estate which, by the 1930's, comprised Ridgmount Avenue and Verdayne Avenue as well. The estate also had a short frontage on Wickham Road.

2. At the same time the Wickham Road frontage between Orchard Avenue and Cheston Avenue was developed with houses (nos 295-307).
today. Only four houses had been built in the new road by 1931, but by 1938 there were twenty-four. Its eastern end was later developed with maisonettes, with a return exit to Wickham Road.

Woodland Way was the first new road built off one of the Ham Farm cart tracks, and it was typical of the lack of planning that characterized the development of the Estate in the 1930's. The road was a three-branched cul-de-sac, though it would have been a simple matter for Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd, to have left its northern end open. Its first three houses were occupied in 1929; by 1931 there were nine; and by 1933 there were twenty. These covered most of the land available, though there were also, by 1933, some tennis courts. The latter give some suggestion of the development of a community spirit in the area by that time; their presence gives some indication, too, of the class of person being attracted to the Estate. But what is not apparent from the local directories is the residents' three-year struggle to obtain satisfaction from the Council in the matter of street adoption, the story of which shows the ineffectiveness of the machinery of local government, despite its new town planning schemes, in carrying out street works that by almost any standards must have been

1. This is known as Tudor Lodge.
In February, 1934, the Monks Orchard Owners' Association sent to Croydon Council a petition from the residents of Woodland Way stating that the road was in a deplorable state after recent building operations and asking that it should be made up. By April the Council had authorised preparation of plans and estimates but, despite a reminder at the end of June, it was mid-September before the Association was informed how the road charges were to be assessed. The following January, 1935, and again in April, the Council was asked to start the work so that it could be completed during the summer months as the residents did not want another winter with the street as it had been during the previous wet weather. The Council promised to hasten the service of notices but four months later, in August, they again had to be urged to hurry as the bad season of the year was approaching with nothing done.

By that time, the Council had altered an earlier decision to build a road that was in part twenty-four feet wide and in part twenty-seven and had decided to make it thirty feet wide throughout, an action that delayed matters still further because negotiations had to be carried out to acquire further land. In December, the Association enquired whether anything was to be done "for the benefit of

---

1. The information is obtained from the fragmentary abstract from the minutes of the Monks Orchard Owners' Association, pp.27-30.
those unfortunate residents who are compelled to walk through the morass." The reply was hardly encouraging: so many difficulties had arisen that a Special Committee had been set up and this shortly decided to revert to the original plan for a part twenty-four and part twenty-seven foot road. The apportionments were dealt with in mid-March 1936, and on the Association's being informed of this it not unnaturally enquired when the work would commence. But frustration was increased when the Council pointed out that Statutory Notices had to be served which would not expire for four months and unless all the owners had arranged for payment in advance of that time the work could not begin before then. In fact, at the end of the four months several owners had still not made arrangements for payment of their apportionment and proceedings had to be threatened against them. Then, on 27 October, 1936, two years and eight months after the original petition, the exasperated Association again asked the Council for a definite starting date and said that, failing satisfaction, the matter would be raised with the Minister of Health. Two days later the Council announced that the work had been commenced.

By that time, other new roads were needing the Council's attention as well. One such was Homer Road, which had been cut through westwards from The Glade, near the northern end of that road, at about the time when the first new roads in the southern part of the Estate had come into existence. Typically, Homer Road led nowhere in
particular, and in the first four years only ten houses were completed there, all on the south side. But much more important than Homer Road, was the creation of Ham Farm's only new road that was ultimately to link the Estate, though by accident rather than design, with the outside world. This was Gladeside. The street map shows that Gladeside leaves Woodmere Avenue just short of that road's former abrupt termination.¹ But almost immediately it becomes a part of the Lorne Gardens-Lorne Avenue development, the only comprehensive building group on the Estate. From Lorne Gardens, Gladeside continues north, and then suddenly turns sharp right along a narrow and still unadopted trackway, immediately north of Homer Road, subsequently joining The Glade. As late as 1936 it had only twelve houses in it, but two years later it had seventy.²

At the point where it unexpectedly turns right and becomes a narrow track, the line of the road is continued northwards by Bywood Avenue which, as late as 1931, was described, somewhat inaccurately, as a "private road leading to The Glade and Ham Farm." From Gladeside, Bywood Avenue

1. In very recent years Woodmere Avenue has been extended by means of a sharp bend to the south-west to give access to some further housing development. The road remains a cul-de-sac.

2. This information and much that follows regarding the dating and amount of building on the Estate in the 1930's is taken from Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, published annually to 1930, and then in 1932, 1934, 1937, and 1939.
passes through Long Lane Wood into Long Lane, which is the road linking Woodside and Elmers End. Thus eventually and in a somewhat tortuous manner, there was provided an additional link between Woodmere Avenue and the settlements of Woodside and Elmers End, with their railway stations, to the north of the Estate.

It was in the period after 1931, then, that the second phase of building operations gathered momentum. Despite the condition of the Estate's roads, despite its isolation from public transport and the difficulty of getting speedily to London, houses began to be built in many places.

It is neither possible nor desirable to chronicle the work done in each road, particularly as only one substantial building firm, Messrs E. & L. Berg, confined itself to one particular part of the Estate. The work of most of the principal builders is dealt with below. It is only necessary here to make some general comments about the Estate map, the houses that were built, the people who occupied them, and, because of the absence of good planning, the problem of movement about the Estate and to places away from it.

Because Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd, had used the existing pattern of farm tracks as the lay-out for the division of its plots, it followed that the vast majority of any subsequent roads would be culs-de-sac. Of the twenty-seven later roads built in the period up to 1939,
thirteen were culs-de-sac, another four led only into culs-de-sac, and a further three were crescents that merely rejoined the same road a little further on. No improvement on this situation has been possible since World War II, and the proportion of culs-de-sac and crescents has indeed increased because of back-filling on previously undeveloped and unreachable land at the end of the particularly long gardens of the houses along the principal roads.

But this does not complete the planning eccentricities that stem from the way in which the Estate was originally broken up, and the failure or inability of the planning authority to put the matter right subsequently. It happens that at the north end of Orchard Way is the boundary with Beckenham and Kent. As a result, it is only in recent years that Orchard Way has been linked, even in a somewhat devious manner, with the main road beyond the boundary. Likewise, The Glade runs parallel with the Beckenham boundary and, in that instance, there is no egress from The Glade in an easterly direction. It is true that Greenview Avenue is continued beyond the border, with the same name, but the two parts are separated by a wooded and fenced no-man's land. Ash Tree Close, and Fairford Close and Fairway Close terminate at about the boundary and bear no relationship to the line of road on the other side. From the eastern end of Fairway Close to Aylesford Avenue, Beckenham, is only a few dozen feet; yet by road the shortest distance is about one and a half miles.
But if the Estate map remained unimproved throughout the 1930's, at least the new houses were almost inevitably of a better quality than those erected on the Estate in the previous decade. They were normally of two storeys, though the earlier tradition of bungalow building on the Estate persisted to quite an extent. The buildings were commonly semi-detached or terraced, and only very exceptionally were they at all experimental or unconventional in design. They were advertised widely in the local newspapers in the middle and late 1930's. If semi-detached, they usually cost between about £600 and £875. Various inducements, as are demonstrated below, were offered to get would-be purchasers to the site; to facilitate their raising a mortgage; and to ease the process of repayment.

It is possible, in retrospect, to ridicule the purchasers' lack of taste and the names that they were wont to choose for their new homes: By the Way, Melbournia, Pixies Haven, The Nest, The Nook, San Souci, Dulce Domum, Foramil, Fairsailing, Tyreseyde, Inawood, and Wywurrie. "How well," wrote one author, in his anatomy of suburbia, "these names suit the instincts and aspirations... of the suburban resident. In them he asserts his individuality, but he also shows, in common with his next-door neighbour on either side, his leaning towards rural make-believe, and the strength as well as the romanticism,
of his topographical loyalties.\(^1\)

Many of the new residents on the Estate commuted to work, particularly to London; we may assume from common knowledge of similar estates elsewhere and from the wording of the press advertisements, that they were frequently venturing their savings and their future in the first home they had ever bought. What is not apparent however, without research, is any indication as to where they had lived previously.

To find out from whence these people had come, an analysis has been made of the admission registers of three of the four state schools in the vicinity of the Estate (those for the other school are missing). The purpose was to discover where children living on the Estate had previously been educated. One problem in this research was to decide whether a child previously attending another school nearby was merely changing schools or was changing addresses as well: it is impossible to be certain on this point in any individual instance, but to eliminate the majority of such cases no child from another nearby school has been included if he or she was admitted to his or her new school at the start of a School Year. Care was also taken to avoid counting the same child, or the same family, twice. The result is clearly indicative that almost three-quarters (actually 118 out of 158) and more probably about

eight out of ten families had moved on to the Estate from elsewhere in Croydon or from places within ten miles of the centre of the town.

One cannot be sure of course that each incoming family was occupying a brand new house. But the entire Estate was far too recent for there to have been any changed social pattern; and it is quite safe to assume that, up to 1939, second or later occupants of a house on the Estate were similar in background and origin to the initial purchaser. There was virtually no movement about the Estate, only five children, in the years studied, having moved from one address to another within its bounds.

It is noticeable that, in spite of the vastly greater ease with which people could move about in the 1930's than in the 1840's, the proportion of families moving on to the Ham Farm Estate from places more than ten miles away represented only about forty-three per cent. of those not previously living in Croydon; compared with forty-five per cent. of the heads of household moving that distance into Croydon ninety years earlier.¹

If one takes a closer look at the precise place of origin of those who had moved ten miles or less on to the Ham Farm Estate, but who were not previously resident in Croydon, one finds no evidence whatever of a continuation of the migration off the chalk downs immediately to the south.

1. Cf. Table 28, p.455, infra; Table 19, p.446, infra.
of the town that was noted at the earlier date.\textsuperscript{1} Eighty-three per cent. of those newcomers who had moved ten miles or less were from the London side of the Ham Farm Estate; and only four per cent. (represented by three families from Coulsdon and Purley) were moving substantially nearer London.\textsuperscript{2} The flow of population into London noted as a feature of the Croydon area in the mid-nineteenth century had, by the 1930's, become an ebb tide.\textsuperscript{3}

It is very obvious that the migration to the Ham Farm Estate was a localised one and that most of the new arrivals were from the London direction, or from other less rural parts of Croydon. One building firm, Messrs Wylie & Berlyn, even advertised their new houses in the local Parish Magazine.\textsuperscript{4} The figures confirm the statements of various men who built houses on the Estate, one recollecting for instance that most of his clients came from north of the Estate and within four miles and that they wished to live near their relatives.\textsuperscript{5}

Something has been said already about the extremely low density of the early development on the Estate; and, even after the introduction of the Town

\begin{enumerate}
\item See p.306, supra.
\item Table 29, p.456, infra.
\item See pp.303-304, supra.
\item Shirley Parish Church Magazine, Feb.,1935, p.2.
\item Information supplied by Mr Harold W. West.
\end{enumerate}
Planning Scheme, no intensive house building was envisaged or took place. Kate Liepmann has commented on the increased cost of the provision, in such areas, of services like roads, gas, telephones, shops, postal delivery, and refuse collection; and she has pointed out the impossibility of assessing the waste of time and energy and the difficulty of assessing the cost to the tax- and rate-payer and to the tradesmen of scattered development of the Ham Farm Estate type.\(^1\) One study of the period showed that as building density rose from 250 to 350 houses per mile of street, there was a fall in weekly delivery costs per household of from 9.3 to 7.7 per cent.\(^2\) "Surely," an earlier town planner had suggested, "the ideal town is one which is as compact as the minimum of public health will allow."\(^3\) The advertisements for the Ham Farm houses, however, contained comments like the following: "The road abounds in well-grown trees and pretty gardens providing ideal countrified surroundings not usually associated with modern development."\(^4\)

But the condition of the roads in bad weather continued to be a source of irritation to the residents, even as late as

\(^1\) Kate K. Liepmann, \textit{The Journey to Work}, 1944, p.105.
\(^2\) John Cripps, \textit{The Distribution of Milk: A Study of Town Delivery Costs}, 1938, p.75.
\(^3\) Thomas Sharp, \textit{Town and Countryside}, 1932, p.149.
\(^4\) HWS, 1059, 29 May, 1934.
1936

Off the estate, the public transport provision was inadequate. From June, 1924 until October, 1927, there was a weekday bus service along Wickham Road, linking Liverpool Street with West Wickham. Another service ran between Croydon and West Wickham from 1930 onwards; and it seems probable, therefore, that Wickham Road was on a bus route continuously from 1924. But by the 1930's, the Ham Farm Estate was only one of a number of places along the three miles of road to East Croydon Station that was growing in size and overburdening the existing service.

Correspondence in a local newspaper in 1935 shows this to have been true. The Secretary of the Spring Park Residents' Association, which comprised membership on another estate off Wickham Road wrote that his Association had been in constant negotiation over the previous two years, firstly with the London General Omnibus Company and subsequently with the London Passenger Transport Board and that, although there had been undoubted improvements in the services from time to time, these were not in proportion to the rapid development taking place. The columns of the local newspapers frequently carried complaints of this nature, sometimes with the additional suggestion that buses

2. Information supplied by Mr John B. Gent.
leaving East Croydon Station for other parts of the town were over-sufficient. Eventually, the local M.P. took up the matter with the Board which then made improvements to the service within a month. There is little doubt that the Board provided an improved service only belatedly as a result of such pressures, rather than through forethought. Indeed, the Joint Hon. Secretary of another residents' body, the East Ward Electors' Association, commented that when he complained about the inadequacy of the service the Board asked for specific instances of persistent delay, presumably because they had no staff responsible for such a study.

There was, however, an advantage of travel by bus to East Croydon in that, once the commuter reached that Station, he could be at either Victoria or London Bridge in under twenty minutes.

Beyond the northern bounds of the Estate lay, as has been said, Long Lane which led to Woodside and Elmers End Stations, both of them on the same slow line to London Bridge, Cannon Street, and Charing Cross. The 54 bus had used that road since 1924, and does not appear to have been the target for so much criticism, presumably because along that part of its route virtually no other house-building was taking place. In any event, it was less than a mile across

1. Ibid., 2 Feb., 1935, p.16.
3. Ibid., 1 Feb., 1936, p.9.
the golf course from the centre of the Estate to Woodside Station; and some parts of the Estate were not much farther from Elmers End Station.

It is noticeable, however, that when Messrs E. & L. Berg built their houses in the Lorne Gardens area they stressed particularly the Wickham Road and East Croydon route rather than that via Long Lane and Woodside or Elmers End; presumably because the East Croydon journey to London Bridge or Victoria took only half as long as that to a London station from either Elmers End or Woodside. In addition, the East Croydon line which had earlier been the subject of competition and conflict between rival companies, may possibly have had lower season ticket rates than the Addiscombe line via Woodside and Elmers End until 1937.

In practice, the people north of the site of the farm house tended to use Woodside and Elmers End; and those to the south, East Croydon.

1. Ibid., 24 Feb., 1934, p.15.

2. Incredibly, British Railways Board has no record, for the two lines, of the actual season ticket rates in the 1930's. It is probable, but by no means certain, that anomalous and differential fares between the London, Brighton and South Coast and the South Eastern and Chatham sections of the Southern Railway had been ironed out about ten years after the grouping, that is by 1931. Certainly they had disappeared by Oct., 1937: Mr C. Atkinson, Archivist, British Railways Board; Mr A. C. Streatfield, Assistant (Customer Relationship), British Railways, Southern Region; Mr John H. Scholes, Curator Historical Relics, British Railways Board; Mr J. E. Shelbourn, Editor, ABC Railway Guide and Hotel Guide.

3. Information supplied by Mr Harry W. Robertson.
Messrs E. & L. Berg’s brochure referred to the Estate in these terms:

"The Estate adjoins the Beckenham Golf Course and the social and sporting amenities are amply represented, both locally and in Croydon, there being numerous golf and tennis clubs, first class cinemas and similar entertainments. Churches of all denominations, and very excellent schools are also a feature of the locality.

"On the main Wickham Road there is a first-class shopping centre, and of course, Croydon offers shopping facilities second to none in the country." (1)

But some of this was builders’ licence. There were no public houses, only a few shops, one church, one school, and no cinema on the Estate. In the northern part, some shops were erected in Bywood Avenue, near The Rosery. Others were erected in Woodmere Avenue, near the Estate centre. None were built at all in the southern part. But there were some small ones in Wickham Road. In the view of at least one local builder shops were a bad risk. Residents’ tended to oppose them because of their effect on property values.

There was also a long delay in the provision of adequate schooling; and there is no secondary school anywhere on the Estate even today. At first, newcomers to


2. Messrs Connor & Timblick built two there in 1934; Messrs Wylie & Berlyn a further five between 1936 and 1941. The latter firm also built a filling station, opposite, in 1935: Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.

3. Information supplied by Mr Harold W. West.
the Estate merely sent their children to whichever existing school happened to be least far away—particularly to Ashburton, in Long Lane, and Shirley Church School, in Spring Park Road. At the latter school’s Prize Distribution in July, 1932, the Headmaster drew attention to the remarkable increase in numbers on the roll amounting to eighty per cent. in the previous two-and-a-quarter years.\(^1\)

The following January, children over eleven years of age were transferred to the new Davidson Senior School all forty of them being taken there daily by a bus owned by the Education Committee.\(^2\)

In the previous October it had been reported that numbers at Shirley Church School had continued to increase steadily and that 272 children were on the roll. Therefore this transference of forty did not nearly represent the increase noted earlier by the Headmaster. Shirley Church School must still have been very overcrowded since no major addition had ever been made to the original buildings of 1885. However, by 1936, a new Council Junior School had been built farther east, in West Way; and in that year, too, the Estate’s only school was opened. This was Monks Orchard Junior School, in The Glade, on a four-acre site that had been acquired by the Council.\(^3\) The situation had

---

2. Ibid., Dec., 1932, p.8.
given the Monks Orchard Owners' Association much cause for complaint over the years up to 1936. Even after that date, senior schoolchildren were faced with a very awkward journey across the town if they won a place at a grammar school.

Equally notable was the failure of the Church to provide any satisfactory meeting place on the Estate: a sign of the change that had taken place since the 1850's when, as Sir John Summerson commented in his foreword to Dr Dyos's book on Camberwell, a building estate "would never 'go' without a good big church." As late as May, 1936, the Vicar of Shirley was telling his Annual Parochial Meeting that a proposed church hall for the Estate had been under consideration for many years but that the scheme had been delayed because it had been considered unwise to do anything until the roads were properly made up. A site had apparently been purchased as early as 1926 but nothing had been done at that time to raise funds. By the middle of 1936, the Vicar felt there was need for a church hall and a priest-in-charge; and, at a meeting in July attended by the Bishop of Croydon and some eighty parishioners, the architect, A.H. Jones, announced that between £2,400 and

1. Ibid., 29 Feb., 1936, p.15.
3. Croydon Advertiser, 2 May, 1936, p.11.
£3,000 would be required to cover the cost of the building and of the furniture and fittings. In November, 1936, the plans were passed by the Council and by then Louis Paish had promised to stand as guarantor at the bank for any money that might need to be borrowed. The following May, work on the temporary building commenced, by which time the estimated population of the Estate was almost four thousand. The Curate of Shirley was made Priest-in-charge and, by July, he was appealing for Sunday School staff. Evidence that the need for a church was there and was indeed overdue, is shown by the fact that the Sunday School opened with 170 children and eleven teachers on the books; and the new choir immediately attracted eleven men and women and ten boys.

By the end of 1938, the Conventional District of St George had a treasurer, assistant, and distributing secretary for the magazine, two churchwardens, ten sidesmen, and a Parochial Church Council numbering fourteen. There was much other evidence of a flourishing church organisation.

Earlier, in 1936, the Monks Orchard Owners

1. Shirley Parish Church Magazine, Jul.,1936, p.3; Aug., 1936, p.3.
2. Ibid., Nov.,1936, p.3. Paish was a partner in the firm of Paish, Tyler, & Crump, see pp.316-377 infra.

The erection of a permanent church was delayed by the War, its foundation stone being laid in Mar.,1952, CPT, Z570(9)CRO, "This Is Up Your Street," Croydon Times, 1954.
Association had discussed the possibility of building a hall of its own but the cost had been daunting; a project for a cinema had likewise been contemplated, but abandoned. It was left, therefore, to the Church and to private enterprise to provide, rather belatedly, some community life for an Estate which must in winter time, at least until the roads were adopted, have been very much isolated from Croydon, its nearest town.

5. The Builders

Many people built houses on the Estate, but it would seem that none of their business records survive. Fortunately, however, many of the principal builders are still alive; or at least their children are. It is from interviews with them that a considerable amount of the information that follows has been obtained.

The method has its limitation in that it is subjective; but the alternative would be an almost complete absence of knowledge about the people and the processes which resulted in this farm land of the early 1920's being changed in two decades to a suburb comprising about 1,500 houses.

The seven builders who themselves or whose relatives have been questioned are Messrs Trent, Berlyn, Connor, Hart, Berg, and West, and Mrs Pym. Between them, they were principals of firms that built at least forty-

seven per cent. of the houses that were on the Estate by 1940. These firms built at least 20, 150, 86, 19, 116, 262, and 36 houses respectively. Two other firms have been considered as well, but only in outline because no relatives have been traced. There are two further firms that are credited in the Town Hall's records of the Estate with more than twenty houses apiece. What follows, therefore, is a reconstruction of the background and activities of nine of the eleven most important firms on the Estate, including the four making the largest individual contributions.

The information sought at each interview included details of each builder's occupational background and previous building experience, if any; the amount and cost of land purchased; the ways in which capital was raised; the extent to which restrictive covenants on the land were observed; road conditions on the Estate; the size and nature of the labour force used, including the extent to which professional architects were employed; speed of construction and sale; methods of advertising; sale difficulties; profitability of the work; and previous place of residence of purchasers. Very many of the facts that have thus been obtained and recorded would otherwise have been lost.

1. The percentage is quite probably much higher. About 250 houses do not appear to be accounted for in the Town Hall card index, and some houses attributed to individuals are indexed under the name of the plotholder rather than the builder so that it is impossible to discover who the builder was without an examination of each separate set of plans.
Richard William Trent

One of the first men to move on to the Estate and then build houses there was Richard William Trent who died in New Zealand in 1966, whence he had emigrated fifteen years before. His father was a manufacturer and exporter of airtight show cases, and Richard was apprenticed as a carpenter. He served as a skilled artificer in the Royal Naval Air Service in the latter part of World War I and was one of the very first to occupy land on the Estate, arriving there in 1921, soon after his twenty-first birthday. He built himself a bungalow, casting his own concrete blocks in situ, and very soon found that other people offered him employment to help them build their own homes. He was also given work by other builders, his particular aptitude being an ability to cut up a house-roof on the ground and then assemble it with virtually no further adjustment.

By 1925, he was in speculative building on his own account, and designing his own houses; but he found that unless he kept a limit to his activities he had no time to perform his own particular skills. He worked very long

---

1. The information that follows about Richard William Trent was supplied by his brother, Mr Frank W. Trent. The value and the limitations of evidence obtained in this way and the reasons for using it at all are referred to on pp.7, 373-374, supra. Where such evidence is contradictory or open to reasonable doubt it has not been quoted.
hours, and his only hobby was his work; but he always remained a craftsman rather than a man of business. He built a small number of houses later, at Sanderstead (Surrey), Shepperton (Middlesex), and Green Street Green (Kent), but his business was at no time a large one, with never more than six houses under construction. He probably never employed more than about twenty men at any one time, and more usually only two or three.

He had no difficulty in selling his houses, relying particularly on a good decorative finish. He would never allow his men to specialise in any one trade, but he always let out electrical work to sub-contractors as he was fearful of electricity. His men were paid a penny or twopence per hour above the standard rate; but received no overtime money although they were encouraged to work as long as they liked at the firm's normal pay rate. The plasterers and lathers, especially, were able to earn very high wages in the summer months but are said to have been improvident and lived in near-destitution in winter. Trent paid a bonus of £5 to any of his workmen who sold a house to a casual caller; he also encouraged would-be purchasers to picnic in the garden of the property they fancied. He built the bulk of the houses at the western end of Woodmere Avenue.¹ He also did work in Woodmere Gardens; and some in

¹ For example nos 83-87 and 80, the former built in 1934 and the last between 1935 and 1936: Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
Orchard Way, Gladeside, and Orchard Avenue. His business was unaffected by the Depression.

**Paish, Tyler, & Crump**

A more conventional type of building firm that was very active elsewhere in the Shirley and Addiscombe areas, but which seems to have shied away from detailed involvement on the Ham Farm Estate, was Messrs Paish, Tyler, & Crump. Later known as Paish, Tyler, & Co., the firm had offices at 1, Addiscombe Road, Croydon, and at 141, Shirley Road.

The principals formed a development company known as Addiscombe Garden Estates, through which they carried out a great deal of business. Another firm, called Border Estates Ltd, had a registered office at the same addresses up to the middle 1930's and so was probably connected with them in some way. In later years, Addiscombe Garden Estates, at least, is thought to have been taken over by New British Garden Estates though, as late as the 1950's, it still had an office of its own in George Street, Croydon.¹

The original firm of Paish, Tyler, & Crump, obtained consent in 1929 for fourteen houses in the part of Firsby Avenue that was on the Ham Farm Estate, but only four of them were built. They also erected 45-47, Orchard Avenue in 1928 and 39, Orchard Avenue in 1931, on plots adjacent to

---

¹ Information supplied by Mr Denis H. Crump, son of the former consulting architect to Messrs Paish, Tyler & Crump; Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.
the Firsby Avenue site.\textsuperscript{1} This really constituted a part of the very slowly developing estate off Wickham Road, west of Orchard Avenue.\textsuperscript{2} The firm otherwise appears to have taken no part in building on the Ham Farm Estate. The reason for this is not known, but it must have been a compelling one as the firm was so active elsewhere in the district.

\textbf{Mrs Pym}

Few women have ever been builders in their own right, and the story of Mrs Pym's activities is an unusual one.\textsuperscript{3} Her maiden name was Stokes and she had married a commercial traveller in artists' materials.\textsuperscript{4} The Pyms, with their family of children, moved from North Mitcham (Surrey) on to the Ham Farm Estate in 1923, occupying at first, on a twelve-year permit, an ex-army hut.\textsuperscript{5} They went there as a means of obtaining a smallholding for one of their sons, who was an invalid. They soon helped to form the Monks Orchard Owners' Association and Mr Pym was chairman for the first two years. Within five years of

\begin{itemize}
\item 1. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index. The houses were larger than most of those built subsequently on the Estate.
\item 2. See pp.352-353, supra.
\item 3. The information that follows was supplied by her daughter, Mrs Irene Dodds.
\item 4. Hence Stokes Road, although until the Corporation insisted on a change it was called Pym Road.
\item 5. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
\end{itemize}
their arrival, they had built a permanent home; but soon afterwards Mr Pym died, at the age of 52.

The family was thus virtually destitute; and to obtain an income Mrs Pym decided to build on some of her land. To do so, she employed sub-contract labour. By 1930, three bungalows, Kenwood, Killindene, and Vespers, had been built; and, at about that time, Mrs Pym bought a further three-acre plot of land from Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd, though she later re-sold part of it. Subsequently she built at least thirty-five dwellings, mostly bungalows, employing her own bricklayers and labourers or otherwise using tradesmen on sub-contract. She or her invalid son designed her first houses and Melville Brown, a qualified architect, who lived on the Estate and who did work in the late 1930's for several builders there, drew up the plans of some of her later houses.

The first houses she built were advertised in the Croydon Advertiser. Later, when building competition on the Estate became more intense, Mrs Pym had a board erected at the north end of The Glade, but the houses were advertised in her son's name. She commenced to build a house before seeking a purchaser for it and she found that many prospective buyers claimed a shortage of capital, even for the deposit. Her speed of building has been described as leisurely. She depended on bank loans, and it is probable that she lacked adequate capital; also, her being
neither a man nor a skilled craftsman may have been taken advantage of in her negotiations with her sub-contract labour. Of four bungalows she was permitted in Gladeside, in 1933, only two were built; two in Stokes Road in 1935 were abandoned, then completed; and two consents for bungalows in Ash Tree Way, in July, 1938, lapsed. The last houses she built before the War, in Stokes Road, took a long time to complete after consent had been given: one took seventeen months, another two nine months, and the remaining four thirty-two months each. Some other land that she had bought, in Ash Tree Way, she re-sold because it was thickly wooded, and it was not finally developed until after World War II.

Because her house-building was piecemeal and was spread over a long period of time, it resulted in the creation of a number of culs-de-sac, such as Glenwood Way, Lavender Way, and Stokes Road. The work principally involved the filling-in of random plots of ground not required by the more substantial builders, a reminder that the Estate had no overall planning supervision and control.

Mrs Pym died in 1949. The family has done no building since her death.

J.R. Davies, Ltd, and J.W. Hall & Son, Ltd

Two firms that both built a more substantial block of houses than Mrs Pym were J.R. Davies, Ltd, and J.W. Hall & Son, Ltd. Unfortunately, information about both firms is

1. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
John H. Davies, already a builder, was living at The Drive, Beckenham (Kent) in 1925; and later, until 1937, the firm had its head office in Beckenham High Street. During the next two years, Davies & Sons were at Elwill Lodge, Elwill Way, Beckenham. The firm did not advertise in the Beckenham directories; Beckenham Council minutes provide lists of planning applications, but do not state who submitted the plans; and some of the borough's Planning Department records were destroyed during the War, whilst others are missing. A John Rennison Davies who lived in 1946 at Wendover, Stone Park Avenue, Beckenham, has been traced to Hampshire, but has not replied to enquiries.¹

Between 1934 and 1937, the firm built 7-23 and 4-26, Gwynne Avenue, the architect being T. Sykes. The houses were conventional three-bedroom, two-reception ones with tiled bathroom and kitchenette, and garage space. Ten pounds secured one, the total deposit was £35, and they cost between £650 and £700 each, repayment being from 17s. 9d. per week. A show house was open from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. daily, including Sunday.²

1. Information supplied by Mr. A.H. Watkins, Borough Librarian, Bromley.

thirty-nine houses of Stoneleigh Park Avenue, a road linking The Glade and Ash Tree Way, from 1934 onwards. The land on which these houses were built constituted a single Percy Harvey lot, no. 106; and the firm probably built only two other houses on the Estate, 169-171, on the opposite side of The Glade, between 1935 and 1936. The houses were all of the same distinctive appearance and were advertised as Sunray Chalet Homes. The third bedroom was on the ground floor; and the main bedrooms had wash-basins. The houses were rather more expensive than those built by J.R. Davies, Ltd. Although £10 secured one, £40 had to be paid on completion, the total cost was £740, and repayment was at the rate of 20s. 8d. per week. The firm had previously built more expensive property in Addiscombe Road, Upfield, and Fitzjames Avenue, Croydon. It is now a holding company of property at Horley (Surrey). Both the founder and his son have been dead for some years.

**Wylie & Berlyn**

Messrs Wylie & Berlyn built many houses in various parts of the Estate, about 150 being attributed to them in the Town Hall's index of Planning Consents. Except for a substantial part of Chaffinch Avenue and The Rosery, their buildings were scattered about the Estate, either

---

2. Information supplied by Mr Harold W. West.
3. Information supplied by Mr A. Hook.
individually or in small groups.

As a lad, H.G. Berlyn had worked for a time in an office, and had also been apprenticed on a farm in Essex. Subsequently he had farmed in a very small way at Addiscombe where he had rented, for instance, an acre of rough land in Ashburton Road. In 1922 his father died and his mother, having a number of other, younger, children bought an acre and a half of land, together with a bungalow, at the north end of The Glade. Berlyn was by then about eighteen and his intention was to keep poultry and pigs, but he quickly realised that the prospects for contracting on the Estate were good. He therefore bought a horse and cart. Two years later, with no previous intention or experience of building, he entered into partnership with a Mr Wylie, who also had not built houses before. Wylie subsequently suffered from ill-health, but remained in the business for many years. The following year, a Mr Tardrew also joined the firm.

The one and a half acres that Mrs Berlyn had bought had been part of a ten-acre lot owned by S. Robinson; and after Wylie and Tardrew had joined Berlyn, the firm rented the balance of the land which had, by that time, been bought as speculation from Robinson by A. Hobbs, a civil engineer.

1. The information that follows was supplied by Mr H.G. Berlyn, one of the founders of the firm, and by Mrs J. Edgar. Topographical details are from Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim; Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
servant. Messrs Wylie & Berlyn did not build on the land, but turned it into a sports field; and in 1927 the firm erected there its first building. This was the Glade Pavilion, whose large hall later played an important part in the social life of the Estate until 1939 when it became a British restaurant and, later, a skin warehouse. It is now used as an engineering works.

Before the end of the 1920's, Messrs Wylie & Berlyn were building bungalows in The Glade, near the junction of Chaffinch Avenue. They deposited plans for at least one more in the same vicinity, in 1930, and a further six in the same road in 1931, together with plans for a house in Orchard Avenue and six bungalows in Woodland Way. By then, the business was progressing well and fifteen more sets of plans were deposited in 1932, six of them for houses in a new road, The Rosery, and two others in Bywood Avenue and Orchard Rise. The following year, apart from plans for fifteen houses in The Rosery, The Glade, Orchard Rise, Bywood Avenue, and Chaffinch Avenue, seven shops were also proposed for Bywood Avenue.

Little is known about the business affairs of the firm, but it was obviously making steady if unspectacular progress. In 1934 it concentrated its efforts particularly in Chaffinch Avenue and Close where a further thirteen houses were commenced, and where the firm had a substantial
In Chaffinch Avenue, the following year, Messrs Wylie & Berlyn began to build a further thirty houses; and they also built a petrol filling station in Bywood Avenue. Another twenty planning consents were given in the following year, by which time Chaffinch Avenue had been fully built up by the firm. The houses there were offered for sale at between £575 and £725, repayment being from 15s. 3d. per week, and the deposit from £30.

The years 1937 and 1938 were ones of contraction, if the number of planning consents is a good yardstick. But it is possible that the firm was heavily engaged in these two years on consents obtained in 1936; one cannot be certain because many of the cards housed at the Town Hall that give details of the planning consents do not state the date of completion. It is also probable that some cards for those years are missing. Perhaps, too, the firm was busy elsewhere. Certainly it was advertising frequently in the local newspapers at that time. In the early part of 1937 it claimed that there were many types of house to

1. Now occupied by P.R. Lowe, Ltd, engineers.
2. Croydon Advertiser, 1 Mar., 1936, p.11.
3. There were seventeen, though two granted in Jun., 1939, were not proceeded with, presumably because of the War.
4. The firm built a number of houses in West Wickham (Kent), and Coulsdon (Surrey); and, occasionally, at Addington, Addiscombe, and Kenley (Surrey), and at Woodside.
choose from. It was also offering to built to clients' own requirements. In April, 1937, for instance, it advertised "Contract Jobs at Speculation Prices. If you want something a little different, we offer our help to design a Dwelling to suit your own individual requirements. It costs no more than the Ready-built House. You choose your plot, your style, your price."\(^2\)

In the middle of 1937, Messrs Wylie & Berlyn were offering for sale houses at Tower View, where there was a concrete road. There were two types, at £825 and at £850.\(^3\) Similar houses were being built by the firm at Bradmore Way and Chaldon Way, Coulsdon (Surrey) and at Welcomes Road, Kenley (Surrey). A year later the firm was advertising that it could erect "all types of air raid shelters."\(^4\)

Normal house building continued, however, though the imminence of war probably accounts for the only recorded abandonment by the firm of work that had reached the planning consent stage, that on two houses in Woodmere Avenue, the plans for which were registered on 15 June, 1939.\(^5\) However, two chalet bungalows in Lavender Way,

---

3. Ibid., 5 Jun., 1937, p.16. Nos 6-8, 14-16, 40-42, Tower View East are of the £825 type.
4. Ibid., 12 May, 1939, p.15.
5. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
registered in July and September, 1939, respectively, were completed by January, 1940.¹ Two other houses, registered in early 1939, were finally finished in May, 1942.²

Mr Berlyn maintains that the firm established a particularly good relationship with its employees, due to the fact that length of service was rewarded with increasing privileges relating to sickness benefit, help with property purchase, and holidays with pay. During the partnership, fourteen of its workers bought their own homes with assistance from the company. A number of sub-contractors were used, for example bricklayers, plumbers, and tilers; but the firm relied mainly on a large proportion of regular employees. Most of the firm's houses were designed by the partners, assisted greatly by the son of one of them, Harold Tardrew. They sold very well, but advertisement was minimal, most potential buyers being introduced by other, satisfied, clients. The firm had a collateral account with the Halifax Building Society, as an aid to clients' purchase.³ Mr Berlyn believes that in the early years of the Estate many people who would otherwise have purchased property there were dissuaded from doing so by its remoteness, by the difficulty of shopping, and the

¹. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
². Ibid.
³. For an explanation of builders' collateral, see Appendix VII, pp.465-469, infra.
inadequacy of the bus services.

The firm mostly built to order, only occasionally doing speculative work. It had few years when there was a severe shortage of clients; and the firm was not anxious to grow too fast at any one time as it wished to keep its loyal labour force busy, and therefore happy. Presumably, it felt best able to do this if it was kept small enough for personal supervision and contact.

After the War the firm continued to build houses and, in 1949, became a limited company. The principals then left the firm, but it was carried on by a number of the employees and sub-contractors who bought the shares. Mr Berlyn returned to his first love, farming, at Warlingham (Surrey) and, more recently, in Devonshire. The firm remains at its pre-War address, 6 Bywood Avenue, but now only trades as a builders' merchant.

Connor & Timblick

Another builder on the Ham Farm Estate who had no previous experience of the trade was William James Connor. He came to Shirley as a gymnastic instructor at St Olave's L.C.C. children's home, now the Shirley Schools, in Wickham Road; and he was an early resident of Orchard Rise. 1 Seeing that land on the Estate was gaining daily in value he

1. He lived at no. 37. The information that follows was supplied by his son, Mr S.O. Connor. Connor, senior, presumably kept stock as a sideline for, in 1924, he deposited a plan for six pig pens in Orchard Rise: Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
bought a seven-acre lot near the northern end of The Glade, which had been arable, under oats, at the time of the break-up of the farm. His intention was to divide up the land into building plots and re-sell it at a profit. But, before that happened, he met Edward Timblick who, it is thought, had worked already for Messrs Wylie & Berlyn. The two men, Connor and Timblick, soon went into partnership, the former providing the capital and the latter the building expertise. The first-fruit of their combined efforts was a pair of houses at the southern end of The Rosery, built in 1933.

In that same year, S.O. Connor, son of the gymnastic instructor, and himself a chemist employed in the borax mines of Chile and, latterly, in Peruvian and Venezuelan oilfields, returned to England, largely because of the Depression. Being without work, he joined his father's firm which, in the meantime, was building a bungalow at 32, Bywood Avenue and a pair opposite. A little later in the same year, 1934, work commenced on a bungalow (number 2) and a pair of houses (numbers 18-20), in Brookside Way. This was a new road linking The Glade and Bywood Avenue and stood on the site of a part of the speculative purchase made earlier by William James Connor.

At about the same time, Timblick withdrew from the partnership on amicable terms and S.O. Connor became the firm's principal director. Almost all the south side of Brookside Way was then developed, during the second half of
1934 and in 1935 (numbers 1-31). Two shops were built in Bywood Avenue (numbers 22-24), next to those erected by Messrs Wylie & Berlyn. Between 1936 and 1938 a further fourteen houses were built on the north side of Brookside Way (numbers 4-16, 22-34), four houses in Meadow Avenue, numbers 153-157, The Glade, and numbers 26-30, The Rosery.\(^1\)

During the same period the firm built eight bungalows in Tower View, numbers 1-21, Greenview Avenue, and numbers 41-45, Ash Tree Way.\(^2\)

There was one other project that the firm attempted in the period between the Wars, but which was blocked by the restrictive covenants regarding density. The conflict between William James Connor and local residents over the proposed development is best described in the words of the surviving fragmentary minutes of the Monks Orchard Owners' Association. Although subjective, these minutes give the background to a bitter struggle which was to last right through the 1930's and was resumed after World War II. It represented a conflict of interests which, because of the very nature of the Estate's development, has a parallel in many other parts of the area in the last twenty years.

---

1. The Brookside Way houses were of three types costing respectively £750, £765, and £790. The deposits were respectively £38, £39, and £40, and repayments 19s., 20s. 2d., and 20s. 9d., per week: Croydon Advertiser, 11 Apr., 1936, p.12.

2. Messrs Connor and West jointly had the roadway of Greenview Avenue built.
The initial scene of the controversy was land on the south side of Orchard Rise, at the rear of William James Connor's own house. There, in 1931, in the words of the Owners' Association minutes, he "completely disregarded the covenants and built two semi-detached properties.....Redcote and San Lorenzo on part of one plot and part of another, thus infringing two restrictive covenants....." These buildings were immediately west of his own house. In the same year Connor submitted plans to Croydon Council for the erection of sixteen houses and a service road south of Orchard Rise as a part, it seems, of a much larger scheme to erect fifty to sixty houses in the Parkfields area. But the plans were rejected as being "not in keeping with the Town Planning Scheme." The state of the relationship between Connor and the local residents may be guessed from the Owners' Association minutes, which noted: "It would appear that Connor has been warned on various occasions of these restrictions and has ignored all references to them except verbal abuse of which he is very capable."

Two years later he applied, under Section 84 of

---

1. Monks Orchard Residents' Association, loc. cit., unpaginated. Mr S.O. Connor has expressed the view that Percy Harvey Estates Ltd was prepared to ignore the restrictive covenants on payment of a fee. William James Connor was not yet building houses himself and Redcote and San Lorenzo were erected for him by E.S. Hart: p.395, infra.

2. Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory, passim.
the Law of Property Act, 1925, for the discharge or modification of the restrictive covenants over the land west of the already-mentioned San Lorenzo, and lying at the rear of all the nearby properties, an area of just over two acres in all. Despite the opposition of local residents, the official arbitrator who heard the evidence, in accordance with the Act, decided that the ninety-five foot frontage, west of San Lorenzo, might have a detached house on a frontage of not less than sixty-five feet; and that there might also be an access road to the land at the rear, on which could be built not more than four detached dwelling houses of a prime cost of not less than £700 per house.

The permitted development did not follow. But a precedent had been set. In 1935, when controversy arose over proposed house-building at the rear of The Crest, also in Orchard Rise, the Owners' Association minutes noted, "these restrictions were continually over-ridden by the official arbitrator under Section 84 of the....Act." This particular proposal again did not materialise; but two years later, in 1937, a further application to build a house on half the plot occupied by The Crest was granted, "subject to there being a frontage of seventy-five feet to the new dwelling," a figure that suggests that the application was

1. This was because, according to Mr S.O. Connor, a limitation of four houses made the project not worth while.
not an unreasonable one. The outcome was that Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd, lifted the restriction and the owner of The Crest built a further house on his plot, known as Colindale.

The following year, the owner of The Crest contemplated further development, this time at the rear of his house. It was then discovered that he had built Colindale on a fifty-five, instead of the stipulated seventy-five foot frontage, having cunningly retained the balance of twenty feet for an access road to the land at the rear. He pursued the matter further in 1939, to the extent of having hard-core dumped on his ground ready for the construction of the road, and having plots pegged-out. But War supervened before development could begin. After the War, a further bitter struggle ensued over the land at the eastern end of Orchard Rise, on which maisonettes have since been built. There was also a dispute over the ground for which Connor's earlier project, which had been a forerunner for all the subsequent controversy in Orchard Rise, had been planned. Yet another cul-de-sac, Oakview Grove, has now been sited there.

Messrs Connor & Co employed their own bricklayers, decorators, and labourers, numbering no more than about six at any one time. The other tradesmen, such as electricians, plumbers, carpenters, and plasterers, were sub-contractors, because of the impossibility of keeping them employed continuously unless building operations were carried out on a large scale. The firm's houses were usually semi-detached
and were of conventional size and lay-out, with three bedrooms and two reception rooms. Some of them were designed by S.O. Connor himself, and others by Melville Brown, who worked also for Mrs Pym and for Messrs Wylie & Berlyn.¹

No comprehensive advertising was done by the firm, except in the Croydon Advertiser, the main method of attracting custom being by means of a show house. The houses sold as fast as the firm could build them, although S.O. Connor admits that that was not very fast. He estimates that about a dozen or a dozen and a half were completed each year between 1933 and 1937. Most of the purchasers bought their houses through building societies. The firm dealt particularly with the Huddersfield Building Society which offered attractive terms requiring five per cent. deposit and five per cent. builders' collateral.²

The firm resumed building after World War II. William James Connor, its founder, died about four years ago.

E.B. Hart

E.B. Hart was not a building tradesman.³ But he came from a long line of craftsmen, his great-grandfather

¹ See p.378, supra.
² For an explanation of builders' collateral, see Appendix VIII, pp.465-469, infra.
³ The information that follows is supplied by his son, Mr J.R. Hart.
being a carpenter, his grandfather a wheelwright, and his father a shipwright. The family lived at Plumstead (Kent) and, during World War I, Hart worked as a boy in nearby Woolwich Arsenal. His ambition in life was to grow roses commercially and, with this in mind, he got employment in a fir nursery in Wickham Road. His parents bought a plot of ground of about ten acres in Woodmere Avenue for about £300, soon after the land first came on the market; and there he built a house, number 55. It was named Rosecot, presumably because of his ambition, and he erected it in his spare time.

Once it was completed, he moved in and started up his own nursery. But soon afterwards his father died and he lacked sufficient capital to keep the business going. Therefore, with the experience behind him of building his own house, he started to work for other builders on the Estate. At first he dug footings for Trent, but later he worked at various trades for others as well.⁠¹ Trent's brother describes him as "a very hard-working man with an artistic tendency," who was especially good at designing and building attractive fireplaces with stock bricks.⁠²

About 1930, Hart went into partnership with a man named Spriggs. In that year they built four bungalows in

---

¹. He did brickwork for Mrs Pym and possibly for Messrs Wylie & Berlyn; information supplied by Mrs Irene Dodds.

². Mr Frank W. Trent.
The Glade, and also Connor's two bungalows in Orchard Rise that broke the restrictive covenants regarding one building per plot.\(^1\) Hart and Spriggs are recorded as having built in 1931 a bungalow in Orchard Way and two in Orchard Rise. But in 1932 they appear to have started nothing further, and their first registered project in 1933, for two bungalows in Orchard Way, was abandoned.\(^2\) There is little doubt that at this stage the partners were seriously undercapitalised. Trent's brother says that although Hart had artistic ability he had little business acumen and that he was twice declared bankrupt.

At the end of 1933 Messrs Hart & Co. built a bungalow in Elstan Way. In 1934 they built three bungalows in Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Close, and also one in Orchard Avenue that was completed within nine weeks of the plans being deposited. In 1935 the firm built its first house in The Glade in six weeks and also two houses in Woodmere Avenue and a bungalow in Woodmere Close. The only other house that the firm is registered as having erected was 134, Orchard Way, built at the rear of 132 in the winter of 1938-1939.

From about 1936, if not before, Hart was also doing contract repair work (for Croydon Education Committee, for example), employing about twenty to twenty-five men in

---

1. See p.390, supra.
2. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
that connection. House building must have been, therefore, something of a sideline for his firm, although he built rather more than the Town Hall's card index credits him with. Because of his other activities, he did not have cause to use sub-contractors, except plasterers and electricians. He tended, in the main, to build to clients' own specifications, or to his own design, on land that they had already acquired; and this is another hint of his own personal lack of capital. He died prematurely, his end possibly accelerated by overwork and anxiety.

**Messrs E. & L. Berg**

Only one building firm that operated on the Ham Farm Estate had already gained a wide experience of house building elsewhere and also still flourishes today. It is reasonable, indeed, to regard this as the one orthodox suburban building firm on an estate that in the main attracted amateurs and building trades journeymen who saw that greater profit was possible from self-employment, on however small a scale, than from working for other masters.

The firm of Messrs E. & L. Berg was founded in 1923, and first built houses at Staines (Middlesex). By the mid 1930's it had six estates in process of construction, comprising perhaps 700 to 1,000 houses in all. One of these estates was at Ham Farm, and it consisted of a single compact unit. The firm fully developed one lot, and

---

1. Information supplied by Mr Ellis Berg.
resisted any temptation to erect even a single dwelling elsewhere in the area. It built two standard types of semi-detached house, and no bungalows. It advertised these houses nationally by what were, at the time, advanced means of publicity. In all these ways its methods and practice were different from those of the other building firms on the Estate.

It was in 1933 that Messrs Berg became interested in the Ham Farm Estate. The firm was attracted by the comparative cheapness of the land which was probably attributable to its isolation. It purchased a fourteen-acre lot which had been one field and which, sometime after the original sale of the early 1920's, had become Lorne Poultry Farm. The land cost Messrs Berg £7,323; that is about £523 per acre, which was a considerably higher price than the typical figure of £50 per acre about ten years previously.

Lorne Farm had, under the original Percy Harvey Estates covenant, been the only dwelling permitted on the lot. The later Town Planning Scheme, however, had made possible development at a density of six houses to the acre; and Messrs Berg applied for that figure to be increased to twelve. A compromise figure of eight was eventually agreed upon. The land was located near the centre of the Ham

1. Messrs Berg built 116 houses on the land. This represents almost exactly eight per acre.
Farm Estate and was on a small ridge, with good views to the north. A wood, in proximity to the east, is still there. Before starting to build, the firm had its own concrete roads laid by Messrs Wimpey at a cost of £8,647. They formed an oblong, the south-western side being a part of Gladeside, and the remainder being named Lorne Avenue and Lorne Gardens. The total cost of the land, additional road charges (£168), road contract, garage crossings (£463), solicitors' charges and contingencies (£600), and an extra drain connection (£180), was £17,383, representing almost exactly £150 per house.

Plans were deposited with the Council for all 116 houses in December, 1933; and the houses were all completed by February, 1938. ¹ Once the preparatory work had been finished and the first houses were ready for occupation, they continued to be completed at the rate of two every week, and that was also the selling rate. The houses were built and then sold; sometimes, up to half a dozen were finished and awaiting sale, but never more, but the builder considered that a completion rate of three per week would have been too fast. Presumably because of the distance from the firm's other contemporary activities, rather than because it was of a size too small to carry a large permanent staff, only the labourers and general foreman were employees; all the trades were sub-contracted.

¹. Croydon Town Hall, Card Index.
By early 1934, Messrs E. & L. Berg were advertising their Ham Farm houses in the local newspaper at £825, total repayments on a 90 per cent. twenty-one year mortgage being 22s. 4d. per week; and at £725, repayable at 19s. 8d. per week.¹ A year later they were advertising what were described at "Berg's Money Back Mortgages" by which the purchaser was entitled to a cheque for £332. 10s. (later this was increased to £447) with the title deeds of the house. It is not clear precisely what was implied by the scheme except that presumably since the money was not paid until the purchaser received his title deeds this can be taken to mean that he obtained it only on the termination of the mortgage. A thoughtful buyer might well have preferred to pay a little less each week and not receive the bonus. In any event, all mention of the "Money Back" scheme was dropped from the advertisements after a few months.²

The firm produced for what it described as its Gladeside Estate a detailed brochure.³ This pointed out that clients had to put down only £5 to secure a property and that they could then pay the remainder of the ten per

---

1. Croydon Advertiser, 24 Feb., 1934, p. 15. There was later an increase in prices to £875 and £775, for the same properties, with corresponding increases in the amount of repayment: see Appendix VII, p. 464, infra.


cent. deposit by instalments up to the date of occupation. Once the deposit had been found, a client could delay completion of the formalities until he was ready to move into the house, and would be charged no interest in the interim.

But Messrs E. & L. Berg not only produced a brochure about the Ham Farm Estate. The firm also published a quarto New Estates Magazine. This is yet another reminder that the company was in a quite different category of business from its smaller and less experienced competitors on the Ham Farm Estate. The magazine was edited by Ellis Berg, one of the brothers who constituted the partnership. It included numerous articles on buying a home, on housewifery, on beauty care, and on radio and cinema personalities; it contained numerous advertisements by firms which, no doubt, supplied Messrs Berg with such things as fireplaces, steel windows, electrical appliances, doors, kitchen units, and domestic boilers; and it gave details of the various Berg estates.

The firm also advertised in the Daily Mail and the Evening News; it exhibited at the Ideal Home Exhibition; and paid famous radio stars, such as Mabel Constanduros, to visit a Berg estate and there be photographed by the national newspapers.

W.H. West, Ltd

W.H. West, and his son Harold, were both carpenters who worked as sub-contractors on various houses that were being built close to the Ham Farm Estate during the early 1930's. Realising that there was more money to be made out of building than mere carpentry they saved £1,000 each and then bought an existing bungalow in Gladeside, with four or five acres of land attached, drove through a road 180 feet long, and erected their first pair of three-bedroom bungalows in a period of three weeks. These were built in that short time so that they would be available for inspection over the Easter week-end of that year, 1935. They sold at £595 each.²

During the same year, the firm commenced work on twenty-four houses in Ash Tree Way numbers (58-58 and 51-55), two in Ash Tree Close, and thirty-two in Fairhaven Avenue (numbers 1-21 and 2-42). The last road was presumably on the land that had been purchased earlier in the year. These Fairhaven Avenue houses were advertised as being of "Tudor Design", and were offered for sale at £615, doubtless for terraced houses, £635 for semi-detached, and at £650 with room for garage. Repayments were, respectively,

1. The information that follows was supplied by Mr Harold W West.

2. These bungalows do not appear to be recorded in Croydon Town Hall, Card Index. There is, however, reference to 67, Gladeside, a house built apparently by someone named West between Aug. and Nov. 1934.
The Ash Tree Way semi-detached houses were £5 dearer and repayments 1d. per week more, otherwise prices were the same there.² The houses were cheaper than almost any others on the Estate, and Mr Harold West asserts that it was this fact that attracted would-be purchasers.

In 1936, apart from the completion of Ash Tree Way and single houses in Woodmere Avenue and The Glade, the firm concentrated its efforts in Greenview Avenue where, between May and January of the following year it erected forty-five houses (numbers 2-54, 23-57). In 1937 W.H. West, Ltd., built twenty-four houses in Fairford Avenue, five in The Glade (numbers 166-174), and two in Orchard Avenue (numbers 103-105). In the same year and the two following they built thirty-two houses in Aldersmead Avenue (numbers 1-31, 2-32),³ At the same time they erected a further thirty-nine in Fairford Avenue (including numbers 67-81, 82-104), four in The Glade (numbers 116-122), and a substantial number in Tower View.⁴ The houses in the last-named road were sold, with copper piping, electric clocks and fires, garage space, and an additional cloakroom on the ground floor, at £790,

3. Repayments on these were 1d per week; ibid., 20 Jan., 1939, p.16.
4. Ibid., 7 Jan., 1938, p.16; 11 Feb., 1938, p.16.
repayments being at the rate of 16s. 5d. per week, and the
deposit from £40. There was a three years' guarantee.¹

The houses were later advertised as having a home laundry
unit.² By 1938, the firm was planning to build 126 houses,
outside the Estate, at Redhill (Surrey); but only twelve
were finished when War broke out and they were immediately
requisitioned.

On the Ham Farm Estate, W.H. West, Ltd, paid for
groundwork, painting, plumbing, and bricklaying by the day;
the remaining trades being sub-contracted. A paper-hanger,
employed by the firm, would come in at nine a.m., trim his
own rolls, paper three bedrooms, dining-room, drawing room,
and hall and landing, and would be sweeping-up ready to
vacate the house by four thirty p.m. Indeed, the whole
keynote of this firm was speed. It had arrived late in the
inter-War history of the Estate, at a time when land was
becoming scarce. Once it came up for sale one had to move
fast. When new land was obtained, a member of the firm
would go to the Town Hall and see the officials responsible
for the sewers and the plans and within a few days the whole
deal was settled. Then, to avoid any possible shortage of
capital, the firm would work very rapidly at eight houses
in widely varying stages of construction rather than on
twenty or thirty each at a rather similar stage to the

¹ Ibid., 15 May, 1937, p.17; 11 Feb., 1938, p.16.
² Ibid., 11 Mar., 1938, p.16.
others. Clients were not allowed to vary the specification for, "if one wanted a serving hatch, they all would. At the price they had to take the house as it was." In the interests of speed, the firm also sold its houses as cheaply as possible. Its publicity also, whilst lacking the sophistication of that of Messrs E. & L. Berg, had a drive about it that was frequently lacking in the advertising methods of other firms.\(^1\)

The Abbey National Building Society co-operated with the firm in making purchase possible; the arrangement being that on the first six houses W.H. West, Ltd, left behind about £130 on each one and £30 on every house thereafter. To assist the process W.H. West, Ltd, built under a slightly different name on each site, as collateral was not repayable until two-thirds of the loan had been paid off and to use the same name would have delayed repayment. Therefore, simultaneously, the firm operated as W.H. West, Ltd; West & Sons, Ltd; West Houses Ltd; and West (Redhill) Ltd.\(^2\)

One interesting piece of information volunteered by Mr Harold West was that tradesmen offered builders gifts to obtain advance information about the arrival of new purchasers. United Dairies, Ltd, paid five shillings for

\(^1\) See, for instance, ibid., 8 Apr., 1938, p.16; 13 May, 1938, p.16; 3 Jun., 1938, p.16; 10 Jun., 1938, p.17.

\(^2\) For more information on builders' collateral, see Appendix VIII, pp.465-469, infra.
each address and removal date, so that it could have available on the doorstep a free sample of dairy goods. W.H. West, Ltd, used to meet such requests; but not those of furniture removers, who might be the means of landladies hearing some time in advance that their tenants were leaving.

The firm, now known as H.W. West & Sons, Ltd, still exists in the town, with offices at 139, Shirley Road.

General conclusions

Not all the facts sought were forthcoming. Few builders, for instance, remembered precisely how much their land had cost them; and only one, Mr Ellis Berg, had a written record of his transactions. Mr Harold West was alone in volunteering the amount of profit he made on each house.¹ Indeed, the smaller builders probably had only a vague idea, even at the time, what their profit margin was. But certain important facts do emerge from the detailed consideration of the seven building firms that, between them, erected half, and probably more, of the houses built on the Estate between the Wars.

Firstly, few of the seven had already built houses elsewhere. Two firms were founded by carpenters, only one of whom was a building tradesman, one by a housewife, one by a farmer and haulage contractor, one by a gymnastic instructor and a chemist, and one by a rose grower. Five

¹. Between £120 and £130.
of the seven firms had principals who were already resident on the new Estate before they began to build houses for other people.

Amongst the principals there was thus a remarkable lack of expertise on the constructional side of the work or in business management. There was frequently inadequate capital, moreover, for subsequent growth. Some of the building was speculative, and some contract. Would-be purchasers were limited in number by a frequent inability to raise the necessary deposit, which ranged from £30 for the cheapest houses built by W.H. West, Ltd, to £82 for those erected by Messrs E. & L. Berg. From the evidence available, repayments seem to have ranged from 15s. to 23s. ld. Messrs Wylie & Berlyn built a few houses that sold at £575, £35 less than the cheapest ones offered by W.H. West, Ltd. Messrs E. & L. Berg's £875 houses were the most expensive that have been noted among the many advertisements studied, though those of Messrs Paish, Tyler, & Crump on the very edge of the Estate may well have been more expensive than this. Neither legal nor road charges were imposed as separate items. Most of the firms had an arrangement with a specific building society and took advantage of builders' collateral schemes.

The builders advertised, generally, in a rather unimaginative way in the Croydon Advertiser. One or two, had strategically-placed boards on the Estate; some relied substantially upon the attractions of a show house, or on
apparently good workmanship. Only the one firm that had
built houses elsewhere, Messrs E. & L. Berg, appears to have
advertised nationally or even regionally. Owing to the fact
that most firms were under-capitalised, the rate of building
was slow. The companies that claim they remained small from
choice were in fact almost certainly inhibited from growth
by management that lacked business capacity. The firm of
Messrs E. & L. Berg was quite different from all the others
in the extent of its building activities, the breadth and
nature of its advertising, and its general air of
professionalism. Its houses were the most expensive that
have been noted in the Estate's advertisements, and they
were the only ones provided with completed street works.
They were, however, the cheapest houses built by the firm
before the War. Elsewhere the houses they erected were
mainly detached dwellings costing £1,000 or more.

The proportion of sub-contract work to direct
labour and the quality of workmanship and supervision varied
considerably from one firm to another. Some of the
employees appear to have received, by the standards of the
time, good money for a long working day in summer, but are
said to have lived in near-destitution in winter. The
demarcation between various trades was frequently blurred by
employers, and in many cases the criterion by which a man
was judged was his speed of performance. Only one firm,
Messrs Wylie & Berlyn, claimed to have had any particular
regard for the long-term loyalty or well-being of its staff beyond that required by statute.

6. The Estate Since 1945

Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd, had planned the layout of the Ham Farm Estate only in a negative sense. The lots that they had sold had been sub-divided haphazardly at a later stage. This had resulted in the survival of a considerable quantity of undeveloped land that was inaccessible from the farm tracks and even from the additional roads (mainly short culs-de-sac) that had been created subsequently. Most of the undeveloped land constituted the furthest extremities of people's gardens. But because of the extraordinary depth of these gardens, it had been cultivated but rarely. By the end of World War II building land was sufficiently scarce and expensive in the whole of Greater London for builders, estate agents, and private individuals with building licences to make tempting offers to house owners on the Estate to sell their surplus. The problem of access could, of course, be overcome if adjoining owners sold their back land. At least one of them, moreover, sold his entire plot, whereupon his house could be demolished and an access road built on the site.

Even before the Second World War the restrictive covenant of one house per plot had been ignored. Percy Harvey Estates, Ltd, had yielded to financial inducements to permit what they had expressly forbidden in their original
conditions of sale. In the Orchard Rise area there had also been a conflict over in-filling, the Borough Council supporting the local residents, but decision of the official arbitrator appearing to favour the builder.¹

After the War, attempts at in-filling multiplied. One example was that of Argon Properties, Ltd, who applied to build about seven hundred houses on 26 acres of land east and west of Orchard Way and at The Glade. The Borough Council rejected the application on the grounds that the density would be excessive for the locality and that the proposed development would be out of character with that already existing in the neighbourhood.² A petition bearing 740 signatures of nearby residents who supported the Council's objections to the plans was produced and the application failed.³ But others, of more modest dimensions, succeeded. In addition, Gladeside and Bywood Avenue, The Glade, and Orchard Way, are now used extensively at rush hour by private cars, though all attempts to provide public

1. There had also been complaints to the Council in 1933, when the houses in Orchard Way were numbered in a way that implied provision for additional houses to be built later in between the existing ones, "a method of development directly opposed by the opinion of the majority of owners:" Monks Orchard Residents' Association, minutes, p.25.

2. Croydon Advertiser, 6 Aug., 1965, p.2. The Council also maintained that the introduction of high blocks of flats, town houses and maisonettes would be incongruous in an area which has been developed predominantly with single- and two-storey dwellings.

3. Ibid.
transport have been resisted.

But such changes have not profoundly altered the wooded landscape at the southern end, the absence of community life, the comparative isolation, the absurd road pattern, or the diverse quality of the house design and construction. All these features stem from the date when the Estate first came on to the market, the way in which the plots of land were sold, the kind of residents attracted to the Estate, and the people who saw the possibility of acquiring wealth by building homes for other people.
CONCLUSIONS

The first of the four parts of this dissertation describes an investigation of the development of Croydon's Rectory Manor Estate, where building commenced in the 1830's and continued, slowly, throughout the century. The aim of the enquiry was to see whether that area, near the main shops and close to what was initially the principal railway station of the town, developed along similar lines to the districts elsewhere in the town that had formed the subject of an earlier study.¹

The tentative conclusions reached then had been that slope and soil, the existence or absence of obnoxious slums and industries, and the whim or the chance death of a substantial landowner, had all played a part in influencing the physical and social environment. It appeared, too, that Croydon's development was almost entirely self-generated. The land, owned mainly by Croydon men, had had its use altered largely by Croydon men. They, and especially the tradesmen, had bought the building plots, financed the house construction, profited from the rents and, accordingly, grown influential in the affairs of the town.

The present examination of the Rectory Manor

Estate has confirmed the facts noted earlier about other parts of the town. Such matters as slope and the presence nearby of slums or industry again greatly influenced quality of development. Further as elsewhere, the division of building land into narrow plots, perhaps only fourteen or fifteen feet wide, placed a limit on the quality of house that could be erected; or rather, perhaps, reflected the vendor’s judgement that the locality was not likely to be socially attractive to future residents.

Slowness is again found to be the keynote of the development, despite the proximity of the station and the shops; and there appears to have been even less response to external economic stimuli than was noted previously. In other considerations too the Rectory Manor estate provides an almost exact parallel with the areas of Victorian development elsewhere in the town that were studied earlier. These include an increasing number of shops converted from houses, an absence of restrictive covenants, the strength of the market in land suitable for cottages but not for middle-class housing, and also the under-capitalisation of the builders, their lack of business experience, and their extreme parochialism. The characteristics of Victorian development near the town centre thus turn out to be remarkably similar to those of the urban fringes. Further, the features show a close parallel with those recorded
elsewhere in the Home Counties.¹

But Croydon's rapid development in the nineteenth century must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the town had a much earlier history as a market centre; and that in the Victorian era, whilst so much new building was going on, the heart of the town was deteriorating and was acquiring an increasingly evil reputation. The second part of the dissertation, therefore, sets out to show in some detail how and why that was happening. It does so as a prelude to an examination of the methods by which the community strove to put its house in order.

It was noted that in Glasgow, nineteenth century urban redevelopment was tackled in five ways, only the last being markedly effective.² Glasgow, of course, has little in common with Croydon; yet a detailed investigation of the processes of redevelopment in central Croydon during the same century shows that the first four means of improvement were apparent there as in Glasgow, and that they occurred in the same order. In Croydon, like Glasgow, the first means


of improvement - that is reliance on laissez-faire, on philanthropic bodies, and on a rigid enforcement of public health legislation - left the evils largely unresolved. The only variation in the process is that the fourth means of improvement, municipal purchase and demolition followed by private enterprise redevelopment, was adequate to clear the slums of central Croydon; but those studied in Glasgow disappeared only when the fifth method of redevelopment was introduced, that is of rebuilding, as well as clearance, being carried out by the corporation.

The study of the Market area, Croydon's central slum area, reveals that as in Glasgow the idea that urban improvement would automatically follow from laissez-faire was based on the fallacy that obsolete buildings would show a diminishing return until eventually demolition and rebuilding would be more profitable. What actually happened was that the middle-classes left the district and the houses were let off at equally high rents, but to an increased number of people who were prepared to tolerate overcrowding to spread the burden of cost, the landlord thus having no incentive or need to rebuild. In any event, rebuilding would not have resulted in improvement to the area since the land was too profitable to leave untenanted, and replanning was out of the question because of fragmentation of ownership.

Likewise, the study of Glasgow has its exact parallel in the Croydon Market area in the matter of the
second means of urban improvement, that is by use of philanthropic bodies and good works. A close look at the unprofitable and unsuccessful Croydon Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Society Ltd and at the dedicated missionary work organised by one young Croydon curate provides plentiful evidence of the uphill task that the well-meaning middle-class Croydonians, most of them Anglicans, faced in their self-appointed task. The people they tried to help might be both humble and respectful; but the exhortations to be temperate and to work regularly had little effect and, anyway, they were often no more than temporary inhabitants of the area. The lodging house keepers, one or two of whom at one time or another came to enjoy a decade or more of near monopoly in the locality, seem equally to have disregarded the efforts of the philanthropists. Their willingness to allow sermons to be preached in the lodging house kitchens may only indicate a general complacency about what went on there rather than any particular desire or hope that their lodgers might be reformed.

As in Glasgow, so in Croydon, the third means of nineteenth century urban improvement, that is the enforcement of the public health Acts did force some reformation upon the very worst private landlords; and one is left with a feeling of admiration for the dedication, and doggedness, and indeed bravery, of the officials who tried to enforce the law. But any improvements were piecemeal
and, like *laissez-faire* or the activities of philanthropists, could never result in the destruction and re-planning of an entire urban area.

That action required the intervention of the municipal authorities which, in turn, awaited not only rejection of the older ideas of the inviolability of property but, also, the creation of an administrative machine empowered both legally and financially to take the necessary decisions. The dissertation shows that the town's Board of Health, inspired by a local doctor, strove and very nearly succeeded in its early years in removing the worst slums and in improving the main shopping street at the same time. But enthusiasm for the idea was not matched by similar enthusiasm for the necessary expenditure to be incurred, and the scheme foundered.

Even the new Town Council's first attempt to carry out this project, in 1884, was a fiasco; but it did serve to bring to light clearly the political and social and personal conflicts, and also the numerous important side issues that were complicating any attempt at a major improvement in the town. The dissertation, however, shows that by the 1880's the necessary powers existed to get rid of the infamous area in the immediate vicinity of the Town Hall, once the right leader emerged. That man was a middle-aged shopkeeper never prominent previously in the affairs of the town, and shortly afterwards to be destroyed by the odium of the Liberator Building Society frauds, with which his connection
was very marginal. Although, for that reason, he was subsequently never honoured by his town, it was he whose skill and patience and oratorical ability brought to fruition, between 1888 and 1892, the scheme which Croydon had for so long desired and needed. It was highly successful not only in ridding the place of its worst slum area but also of creating a town centre of which its late Victorian inhabitants could be proud.

But the achievement of the objective, at little more than half the estimated cost, shows that municipal enterprise in late Victorian times could bring about successful urban redevelopment in a way that laissez-faire, philanthropy, and the enforcement of the public health Acts had all failed to do.

Such municipal success would have been very difficult to attain, however, if Croydon had not been expanding rapidly throughout the nineteenth century. In the third part of the dissertation an attempt has therefore been made to discover information about the people who constituted the town's growing population; where they came from and who they were.

To do this in depth would, of course, require a complete thesis in itself and so the study has been confined to an examination of the situation in the middle of the nineteenth century, though there is reason to believe that further investigation may well prove that at least many of
the conclusions are applicable over a much wider span of time.¹

The findings are simply stated. The Croydon of 1851 had about four thousand heads of household. A quarter of them were native to the town, more than half had been born within ten miles of it, and only one-tenth more than one hundred and fifty miles away. The town still lay in the direct line of population movement into the capital and was receiving a considerable accession of people from the neighbouring but isolated North Downs villages just to the south. People from nearby villages to the north were moving away from Croydon towards London; and therefore those newly arrived from the south were perhaps in the course of a similar movement, although one must not exaggerate the extent to which there was a flow of population in only one direction. Croydon received few people from places to east and west that had poor communication, trading, and marketing links with the town. By contrast, parishes lying along coaching roads into the place provided twice as many people as parishes at the same mileage but not so situated.

Distance, decline or total absence of local industry at a migrant's place of origin, and the attractions of London and of areas of industrial expansion elsewhere in the country all had a predictable effect on the extent of

¹ See, for example, pp.361-363, supra.
migration into the town. As regards distance, the number of people coming from places more than ten miles away was in almost exact proportion to the number in the town, both in terms of social class and of occupational group. The only exceptions were domestic workers coming from places between ten and thirty miles away and also Irish farm labourers, both groups providing an unexpectedly big influx.

In the case of migrants travelling less than ten miles into Croydon the situation was different. There is evidence that the working-classes in that category were comparatively immobile. Also, despite the general pattern of population movement away from Croydon towards London, more than thirty per cent. of Croydon's entire upper- and middle-class heads of household had been born in London and suburban Surrey. This high migration rate of the well-to-do into the town was perceptibly on the increase and had doubtless been stimulated by the building of the railway in the late 1830's. It seems, too, that the newer parts of the town were more attractive than the old to the latest people to arrive and that the new middle-class houses on, for example, the Rectory Manor Estate were especially popular with newcomers from the inner London suburbs and also from places a considerable distance away from Croydon.

By the middle of the century commuting to London was a normal feature of life among those able to afford two or more domestic servants. Less than a hundred years later, people of similar occupational and social standing, though
by then unable to afford any domestic servants at all, were commuting from Croydon to London in their thousands, for by then Croydon's population had grown to a quarter of a million and much of the heathland and many of the farms and private estates had been built over.

The dissertation therefore considers finally one such piece of development. One cannot be certain to what extent it is typical, because insufficient work has yet been done on the inter-war London suburbs for the conclusions to have general validity. But a subjective judgement, made on completion of the study and based on facts not apparent when it was started, is that the area looked at, the Ham Farm Estate, was almost certainly untypical to the extent that in the two decades between the Wars it had two distinct generations of development. The first of these is represented by a fortuitous and haphazard growth of small holdings arising from the fact that the land came on the market for building when many other plots were still readily available in more accessible and well-serviced parts of the town. The second generation of development, quite different in character, is represented by what one thinks of as being a more usual inter-War suburban growth. This comprised more neat and orderly but architecturally uninspiring semi-detached houses and bungalows, their quality controlled to some extent by building by-laws but erected with little or no regard to existing town planning legislation. The honouring of this legislation more in the
breach than in the observance was perhaps encouraged by the fact that the Estate had already been burdened with the random and uncontrolled development of the previous decade.

During the 1920's, no attention had been paid to road alignments or to the absence of services; a ridiculous restrictive covenant of one house per acre was to lead to endless difficulties once land became scarcer and in the meantime it had been broken on payment of a fee. The houses or, more often, bungalows had frequently been built of inferior materials, by amateurs, with scant attention to legal requirements and less to aesthetic effect. The tragedy in all this is that one firm had initially owned all the building plots and could have done much, both for its own profitability and for the future of the Estate, to plan and control the development. Further, the folly of the company had been matched by the ineptitude of the local authority, by the fallibility of the town planning legislation, by the failure of the Church, and to some extent at least by the indifference of the London General Omnibus Company and of the London Passenger Transport Board. Those residents who had banded together to form the Monks Orchard Owners' Association had had to wage constant war against authority in all its forms to achieve even a tolerable standard of life for the Estate. That war was not won until the middle 1930's, by which time the second generation of housing was well under way.
It is clear both from the earlier study of Croydon and from the present dissertation that the nineteenth century houses were built by men who were frequently craftsmen from neighbouring streets, and who were chronically under-capitalised. They do not seem to have been very business-like and each erected only a very small number of houses. But it is perhaps more surprising to find that in some respects the position was little changed by the time the Ham Farm Estate was developed in the 1920's and even in the 1930's. There, only one builder in seven appears to have kept detailed accounts of his transactions. Probably several of them had neither the time nor the ability to calculate their return on capital or even to work out a simple profit and loss account. Few of them had already built houses elsewhere, and the principals included a housewife, a farmer, a gymnastic instructor, a chemist and a rose grower. Five of the seven firms studied had principals who were already resident on the new estate before they took up building.

There was, accordingly, a remarkable lack among the builders of practical and business expertise and of capital. These facts, especially the last, made for a slow rate of building. Advertising was unimaginative though, of course, brash by comparison with that of the nineteenth century. Aided latterly by cheap money, however, few completed houses remained unsold for long.
Two of the building firms still flourish, though only one is in the hands today of its founder and his descendants. The risk element was great, not only for the builder but also for his employees, many of whom had an insecurity of employment more akin to that of their nineteenth century counterparts than to that of their successors thirty years later.

It is clear that in many ways chance played as much a part in the development of a housing estate in the 1920's and 1930's as it had done fifty or a hundred years earlier. The theories of good planning existed and in some places they were implemented, at least superficially. But more commonly they were simply ignored in the scramble and gamble to make a quick profit before credit ran out.

It seems that the characteristics of Croydon's development had changed far less in a century than had almost any other aspect of the town's life. They have changed very much more, however, in the subsequent thirty years. Certainly the large-scale redevelopment of the town centre in the 1950's and 1960's has been utterly different in scale, in method, in speed, and in motive from that of the 1880's. It is time that this also was examined and recorded.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. TABLES

The basis for calculation of the figures contained in Tables 1 to 5, 11, 13, 14, and 27 is The Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, published approximately biennially between 1851 and 1869; and Ward’s Commercial and General Croydon Directory, published biennially between 1874 and 1888, annually between then and 1930, and again in 1932, 1934, 1937 and 1939. These directories were compiled with extreme care and only very occasional allowance has had to be made for houses wrongly placed, or omitted.

We know from the foreword of the 1911 directory that its publisher aimed to compile it in early October, but to keep it corrected up to the last week in November, which was only a week before delivery commenced. Therefore the so-called 1911 directory in fact shows the residential situation in the autumn of 1910; and figures compiled from that directory would be listed in these tables under 1910. The same principle has been followed for all years.

Houses have not been counted as completed until an occupant is named for the first time; consistency could only be ensured in that way.

Tables 6 to 10, and 15 to 26, have been compiled
from the 1851 and 1861 census returns for Croydon.\textsuperscript{1} The terms "household" and "occupied property" have been taken as synonymous in this context.

Table 12 has been compiled from page 66 of the bound minutes of the town's High Street Improvement Scheme. These minutes and also those of the High Street Special Committee are housed at Croydon Public Library and deal with the Corporation’s redevelopment of the Market area.\textsuperscript{2} They are to some extent, though by no means entirely, complementary.

Tables 28 and 29 are compiled from the following school admission registers: Ashburton Senior Mixed School, First Admission Register, 1931-1940, held at Ashburton Secondary Boys' School, Shirley Road; Ashburton Junior School, Admission Register No.1. Aug., 1925– Jul., 1936, held at Ashburton Junior Mixed School, Long Lane; Monks Orchard Junior School, First Admission Register, 1936-1946, held at Monks Orchard Infant and Junior Mixed School, The Glade.

It was hoped, also, to use the admission registers of St John's Junior School, Shirley, the hamlet's Church school, but they are missing for the period prior to 1942. The registers have been analysed up to 3 September, 1939

\textsuperscript{1} Public Record Office, H.O.107, 1601; R.G.9, 447-451, respectively.

\textsuperscript{2} These are referred to elsewhere in the text as HSIS and HSSC, respectively.
except in the case of Ashburton Junior School which, at the opening of Monks Orchard Junior School, in 1936, ceased to serve the Ham Farm Estate.
Table 1. Houses in the Parson's Mead Area, 1850-1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1858</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1877</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1898</th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>1938</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ainsworth Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby Grove and Road</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcroft Road</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Grove</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Place</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson's Mead</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE INCREASE PER ANNUM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Houses in the Parson's Mead Area, 1860-1883

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1873</th>
<th>1875</th>
<th>1877</th>
<th>1879</th>
<th>1883</th>
<th>1938</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ainsworth Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby Gve &amp; Road</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcroft Road</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Grove</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Place</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson's Mead</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Annum</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Houses in the Parson's Mead Area, 1887-1899

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1893</th>
<th>1895</th>
<th>1897</th>
<th>1899</th>
<th>1938</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ainsworth Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Road</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby Gve &amp; Road</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcroft Road</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Grove</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Place</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Road</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson's Mead</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE INCREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER ANNUNUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4. Houses in the Drayton Road Area, 1850-1873

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1854</th>
<th>1858</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1864</th>
<th>1875</th>
<th>1938</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cairo Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir Church St</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir Drayton Pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth Road</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur Drayton Pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon New Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Increase per Annum**

|                  | 11 | 5  | 12 | 1  | 10 | 1  | 0   |

Note: The data shows the number of houses in different areas of the Drayton Road area from 1850 to 1875, with the number of houses in 1938 included. The average increase per annum is also provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1875</th>
<th>1877</th>
<th>1879</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frith Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North End</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson's Mead</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth Road</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon New Road</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ROADS</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV. INCREASE PER ANNUM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1893</th>
<th>1894</th>
<th>1938</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Road</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frith Road</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North End</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson's Mead</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth Road</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon New Road</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ROADS</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV. INCREASE PER ANNUM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 6-10. Inhabitants of the Market Area in 1851 and 1861 (latter figures in brackets)

### Table 6. Heads of Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>OCCUPIED PROPERTIES</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Hill</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St</td>
<td>19(18)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St</td>
<td>13(15)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rw</td>
<td>29(21)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68(61)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100(100)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(rounded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>OCCUPIED PROPERTIES</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACES&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Hill</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle St</td>
<td>6(8)</td>
<td>5(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15(16)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>22(26)</td>
<td>10(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(rounded)

1. In outline, the occupational groups are as follows:—
   A Independent; B Professional and Clerical;
   C Agricultural; D Craft and Industrial; E Distributive;
   F Domestic; G Transport and Sustenance; H Miscellaneous.
   For full details, see Appendix VI, p.463, infra.

2. A represents the Parish of Croydon. B to F represent English parishes at distances from Croydon of under 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 30, 30 to 75, and 75 to 150 miles respectively. I represents Ireland, and J the remainder of Europe other than Scotland and Wales. For full details, see Appendix IV, pp.459-460, infra.
### Table 7. Entire Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>OCCUPIED PROPERTIES</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE PER PROPERTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell Hill</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>33(41)</td>
<td>4.7(5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St</td>
<td>19(18)</td>
<td>115(132)</td>
<td>6.1(7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St</td>
<td>13(15)</td>
<td>99(172)</td>
<td>7.6(11.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rw</td>
<td>29(21)</td>
<td>202(245)</td>
<td>7.0(11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68(61)</td>
<td>449(590)</td>
<td>6.6(9.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell Hill</td>
<td>20(23)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>1(4)</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
<td>1(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St</td>
<td>48(43)</td>
<td>7(6)</td>
<td>17(13)</td>
<td>18(14)</td>
<td>11(19)</td>
<td>9(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St</td>
<td>41(37)</td>
<td>5(8)</td>
<td>16(27)</td>
<td>16(37)</td>
<td>8(26)</td>
<td>4(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rw</td>
<td>69(74)</td>
<td>9(8)</td>
<td>16(27)</td>
<td>35(43)</td>
<td>25(25)</td>
<td>11(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178(177)</td>
<td>22(23)</td>
<td>52(71)</td>
<td>70(98)</td>
<td>50(73)</td>
<td>25(51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell Hill</td>
<td>-(1)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St</td>
<td>-(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>1(24)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td>1(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St</td>
<td>1(6)</td>
<td>-4(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
<td>-2(2)</td>
<td>-1(-)</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rw</td>
<td>5(12)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>19(23)</td>
<td>3(12)</td>
<td>5(-)</td>
<td>-(-)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6(20)</td>
<td>5(6)</td>
<td>22(55)</td>
<td>3(12)</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(rounded)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(4)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>5(9)</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>2(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A represents the Parish of Croydon. B to G represent English parishes at distances from Croydon of under 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 30, 30 to 75, 75 to 150, and over 150 miles, respectively. H represents Scotland and Wales, I Ireland, J the remainder of Europe, K Asia, L America, and M is used for people whose birthplace cannot be categorised. For full details see Appendix IV, nn.459-460. infra.
Table 8. Lodging Houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HILL STREET</th>
<th>KING STREET</th>
<th>MARKET STREET</th>
<th>MIDDLE ROW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied properties</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>19 (18)</td>
<td>13 (15)</td>
<td>29 (21)</td>
<td>68 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging houses</td>
<td>- (3)</td>
<td>5 (11)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>13 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>33 (41)</td>
<td>115 (132)</td>
<td>99 (172)</td>
<td>202 (245)</td>
<td>449 (590)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodgers</td>
<td>- (13)</td>
<td>22 (53)</td>
<td>33 (110)</td>
<td>75 (147)</td>
<td>130 (323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of lodgers per property</td>
<td>1.2 (1.8)</td>
<td>2.5 (3.0)</td>
<td>2.6 (7.3)</td>
<td>1.9 (7.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of lodgers per lodging</td>
<td>4.4 (4.3)</td>
<td>16.5 (4.8)</td>
<td>12.5 (22.0)</td>
<td>10.0 (18.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%
Table 9. Lodgers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>61-70</th>
<th>71-80</th>
<th>81-90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rounded)</td>
<td>(323)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NUMBER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Total  | 130 | 18   | 8     | 3     | 1     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     |
| (rounded) | (323) | (61) | (27) | (6) | (5) | (1) | - | - | - | - |

| NUMBER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Total  | 130 | 9    | 51    | 70    | 70    | 9     | 51    | 70    | 70    | 70    | 70    |
| (rounded) | (323) | (33) | (123) | (167) | (167) | (33) | (123) | (167) | (167) | (167) | (167) |

<p>| NUMBER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Total  | 130 | 18   | 9     | 39    | 54    | 18    | 9     | 39    | 54    | 18    |
| (rounded) | (323) | (33) | (123) | (167) | (167) | (33) | (123) | (167) | (167) | (167) | (167) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP¹</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(323)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(31)</th>
<th>(111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (rounded)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP (contd.)¹</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(323)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(35)</th>
<th>(28)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(84)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (rounded)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE²</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(323)</th>
<th>(47)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>(42)</th>
<th>(67)</th>
<th>(56)</th>
<th>(34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>(323)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (rounded)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE (contd.)²</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(323)</th>
<th>(17)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(31)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>(323)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (rounded)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In outline, the occupational groups are as follows:—
   A Independent; B Professional and Clerical;
   C Agricultural; D Craft and Industrial; E Distributive;
   F Domestic; G Transport and Sustenance; H Miscellaneous;
   I Housewifery. For full details, see Appendix VI, p.463, infra.

2. A represents the Parish of Croydon. B to G represent English parishes at distances from Croydon of under 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 30, 30 to 75, 75 to 150, and over 150 miles respectively. H represents Scotland and Wales, I Ireland, J the remainder of Europe, L America, and M is used for people whose birthplace cannot be categorised. For full details, see Appendix IV, pp.459-460, infra.
Table 10. Personal and Family Mobility

(a) Heads of household living in same property in both 1851 and 1861 16
(b) Line (a) expressed as a % of total number of 1861 heads of household, i.e., 61 (1) 26

(c) Family units living in same property in both 1851 and 1861 61
(d) Line (c) expressed as a % of total 1851 population, i.e., 449 14

(e) Lodgers living in same property in both 1851 and 1861 1
(f) Line (e) expressed as a % of total 1851 lodger population, i.e., 130 (2) 1

(g) Lodgers living anywhere in the area in both 1851 and 1861 3
(h) Line (g) expressed as a % of total 1851 lodger population, i.e., 130 2

1. The 1861 figure has been taken in this instance because it represents the lower number of properties, the remaining ones having become derelict and unoccupied.

Table 11. Lodging Houses in Middle Row, Market Street, and King Street, 1864-1892

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Middle Row</th>
<th>Market Street</th>
<th>King Street</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 49 properties in the three streets but from 1883 five former lodging houses in Middle Row were empty and derelict.
Table 12. Premises and People Affected by Demolition of the Market Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREMISES</th>
<th>MALES ADULT</th>
<th>MALES CHILD</th>
<th>FEMALES ADULT</th>
<th>FEMALES CHILD</th>
<th>INHABITANTS PERM. TEMP.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shops(15)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public houses(2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered lodging houses(15)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private lodging houses(10)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores(4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private houses(6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL(52)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The number of shop premises does not tally with the details given in Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory because, probably, it does not take into account any sub-divisions of property (cf. Table 13, p.440, infra).

Source for the above Table: HSIS p.66.
Table 13. Movement of Businesses due to Demolition of the Market Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BUSINESSES</th>
<th>APPARENTLY CEASING TO TRADE IN THE TOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOVING TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW/EXISTING</td>
<td>NEARBY STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PREMISES IN SAME STREET</td>
<td>IN TOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PREMISES DEMOLISHED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Hl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High St</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey St</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Movement of Businesses due to Redevelopment of the Market Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS PREMISES BUILT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BUSINESSES ARRIVING FROM</th>
<th>OPENING APPARENTLY EXTRA NEW TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLEARED/EXISTING PREMISES</td>
<td>NEARBY STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Hill 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Hl 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High St 32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle St 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey St 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. Birthplace of 1851 Heads of Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>NO. OF 1851 HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish of Croydon</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5 miles from Croydon</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 miles from Croydon</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30 miles from Croydon</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75 miles from Croydon</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150 miles from Croydon</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150 miles from Croydon</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland and Wales</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Europe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Europe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3773</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| England- total                                       | 3574                            | 95         |
| Remainder of British Isles- total                    | 121                             | 3          |

For a more detailed explanation of place of birth, see Appendix IV, pp. 459-460, infra.
Table 16. 1851 Heads of Household Related to the 1821 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>(a) NO. OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD IN 1851</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>(b) POPULATION OF THAT AREA IN 1821</th>
<th>RATIO OF (a) TO (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9,254</td>
<td>1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Croydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(miles):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21,139</td>
<td>1:74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>756,131</td>
<td>1:991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,198,000</td>
<td>1:1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,534,989</td>
<td>1:3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,952,384</td>
<td>1:9956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,899,494</td>
<td>1:35450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland &amp; Wales</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,809,874</td>
<td>1:63861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3618</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14,181,265</td>
<td>1:3920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. London and suburban Surrey is included in the area between 5 and 10 miles from Croydon. The Table does not include 155 heads of household born outside England, Scotland, and Wales. For a more detailed explanation of place of birth, see Appendix IV, pp.459-460.
Table 17. Heads of Household Born in (i) Rural and (ii) Industrial Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>(a) CROYDON HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD IN 1851</th>
<th>(b) POPULATION OF COUNTY IN 1821</th>
<th>RATIO OF (a) TO (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Cumberland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>156,124</td>
<td>1:26,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Durham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>193,511</td>
<td>1:27,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Cornwall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>261,045</td>
<td>1:37,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Lancs.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,052,948</td>
<td>1:61,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Devon</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>438,417</td>
<td>1:13,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Lancs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,052,948</td>
<td>1:61,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Salop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>198,311</td>
<td>1:28,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Staffs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>345,972</td>
<td>1:26,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Wilts.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>274,482</td>
<td>1:4,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Warwicks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>219,574</td>
<td>1:13,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This Table shows the number of Croydon heads of household in 1851 born in (i) a rural county or a county with declining industry and a known excess in 1851 of migration over immigration, and it compares that figure with the number born in (ii) an approximately equidistant but far more industrialised and urbanised county.
Table 18. 1851 Heads of Household Born Between 75 and 150 Miles from Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NO. OF CROYDON HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD BORN IN THAT COUNTY</th>
<th>HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD PER 100,000 OF THE 1821 POPULATION OF THAT COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilts.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leics.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glos.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcs.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notts.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbys.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefords.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincs.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 397

N.B. The counties are listed in order of increasing distance.
Table 19. Place of Residence of Selected 1851 Heads of Household Immediately Before Migration to Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>(a) % OF ALL HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD BORN IN EACH PLACE</th>
<th>(b) NUMBER OF SELECTED HOUSEHOLDS</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL IN (b)</th>
<th>% IN COL. (a), RE-CAST TO EXCLUDE NATIVES OF CROYDON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England:—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15)</td>
<td>10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles):—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15)</td>
<td>10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>40)</td>
<td>26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>25)</td>
<td>24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9)</td>
<td>16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland &amp; Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The phrase "selected 1851 heads of household" refers to those households noted from the census returns of that year as either (i) having at that time two children of any age, the elder having been born outside Croydon and the younger within the parish, the gap in their ages being less than six years; or (ii) having had their most recent child born outside the parish less than six years before the census; see p. 301, supra.
### Table 20. Place of Residence of Selected 1851 Heads of Household Immediately Before Migration to Croydon; and Population of that Locality in 1821

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number of Households Migrating to Croydon</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Population of Place in 1821</th>
<th>Ratio of (a) to (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21,139</td>
<td>1:255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>756,131</td>
<td>1:3,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,198,000</td>
<td>1:9,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,534,989</td>
<td>1:34,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,952,384</td>
<td>1:158,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,899,494</td>
<td>1:389,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland &amp; Wales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,809,874</td>
<td>1:936,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>395</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,172,011</strong></td>
<td><strong>1:28,630</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The phrase "selected 1851 heads of household" refers to those households noted from the 1851 census returns as either (i) having at that time two children of any age, the elder having been born outside Croydon and the younger within the parish, the gap in their ages being less than six years; or (ii) having had their most recent child born outside the parish less than six years before the census: see p.301, supra.
Table 21. Social Class and Birthplace of 1851 Heads of Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England:—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles):—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland &amp; Wales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In outline, the social classes are as follows:—
   U Upper-Class; I Upper Middle-Class; II Middle-Class;
   III Lower Middle-Class; IV Skilled and Semi-Skilled
   Working-Class; V Unskilled Working-Class. For full
   details, see Appendix V, pp. 461-462, infra.
Table 22. Social Class and Birthplace of 1851 Heads of Household Expressed as Percentiles

Two columns are devoted to each Social Class. The first column gives the percentages of Croydon Heads of Household in 1851 born in each area. The second column gives the percentage of people from a particular area belonging to each social class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>SOCIAL CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England: Croydon</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>SOCIAL CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England: Croydon</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In outline, the social classes are as follows:—
   U Upper-Class; I Upper Middle-Class; II Middle-Class;
   III Lower Middle-Class; IV Skilled and Semi-Skilled Working-Class; V Unskilled Working-Class. For full details, see Appendix V, pp.461-462, infra.

2. The totals in col.(m) are detailed in Table 21, p.446, supra. The figures in col.(n) give the percentage of 1851 heads of household born in each area.
Table 23. Social Class of 1851 Heads of Household Born Within Ten Miles of the Town

Three columns are devoted to the upper- and middle-classes, and three columns to the working-classes. The first column in each case gives the number of Heads of Household in Croydon in 1851 in those social classes; the second column expresses the first column as a percentage of Total (i); and the third column expresses the first column as a percentage of Total (ii).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>UPPER- AND MIDDLE-CLASSES</th>
<th>WORKING-CLASSES</th>
<th>TOTAL (ii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles):-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (i)</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. For full details of the class divisions, see Appendix V, pp.461-462, infra.
Table 24. Social Class and Birthplace of 1851 Heads of Household Born Between Five and Ten Miles from the Town

Three columns are devoted to the upper- and middle-classes, and three columns to the working-classes.¹ The first column in each case gives the number of heads of household in Croydon in 1851 in those social classes; the second column expresses the first column as a percentage of Total (i); and the third column expresses the first column as a percentage of column (ii).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE²</th>
<th>UPPER- AND MIDDLE-CLASSES</th>
<th>WORKING-CLASSES</th>
<th>TOTAL (ii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) London</td>
<td>123 46 58</td>
<td>89 18 42</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Suburbs of London</td>
<td>108 40 41</td>
<td>158 32 59</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Rural areas</td>
<td>37 14 13</td>
<td>248 50 87</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (i) OF (a), (b), and (c)</td>
<td>268 100</td>
<td>495 100</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For full details of the class divisions, see Appendix V, pp. 461–462, infra.

² (a), above, refers to the City of London and its immediate environs; (b) to the suburbs of London (as they were in 1851) and to other places between Croydon and London; and (c) to places east, west, or south of Croydon.
Table 25. Social Class and Place of Residence of Selected 1851 Heads of Household Immediately Before Migration to Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles): -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland &amp; Wales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The phrase "selected 1851 heads of household" refers to those households noted from the 1851 census returns as either (i) having at that time two children of any age, the elder having been born outside Croydon and the younger within the parish, the gap in their ages being less than six years; or (ii) having had their most recent child born outside the parish less than six years before the census, see p.301, supra.

2. In outline, the social classes are as follows: - U Upper-Class; I Upper Middle-Class; II Middle-Class; III Lower Middle-Class; IV Skilled and Semi-Skilled Working-Class; V Unskilled Working-Class. For full details, see Appendix V, pp.461-462, infra.
### Table 26. Occupation and Birthplace of 1851 Heads of Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England: Croydon</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland &amp; Wales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Europe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In outline, the occupational groups are as follows:--
   A Independent; B Professional and Clerical; C Agricultural; D Craft and Industrial; E Distributive; F Domestic; G Transport and Sustenance; H Miscellaneous. For full details, see Appendix VI, p.463, infra.
Table 27. First Generation Houses on the Ham Farm Estate, 1922-1929

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1922</th>
<th>1923</th>
<th>1924</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1926</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1929</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Glade</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Ave.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Rise</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Way</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmere Ave.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>452</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 1938 figure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. Probable Previous Place of Residence of Ham Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>35 plus 59</td>
<td>16  plus 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances from Croydon (miles):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 150</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>158 plus 59</td>
<td>equals 217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The method of calculation is described on pp. 361-362, supra. Account has not been taken of any children admitted from another school in the immediate neighbourhood at the commencement of a School Year as they may not have been changing addresses. Children admitted from such schools at other times are plussed in the above Table. It is impossible to say how many of them were changing addresses as well as schools.
Table 29. Ham Farm Families that had Probably Lived Previously Within Ten Miles of Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directions from which Residents had Come</th>
<th>Distance from Croydon within Five Miles</th>
<th>Five to Ten Miles</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of Ham Farm – Within the area of the London County Council</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the London County Council area but on the London side of Ham Farm</td>
<td>23(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East or west of Ham Farm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Ham Farm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The method of calculation is described on pp. 361-362, supra.

2. Twenty of these were from Beckenham (Kent), the parish immediately north of the Estate.
APPENDIX II

CALCULATIONS NOTED BY THE AUCTIONEER PRIOR TO THE SALE
OF BROAD GREEN HOUSE on 7 DEC., 1891

The calculations are quoted in full because they indicate clearly the various financial factors that entered into consideration in the sale and purchase of a private estate for urban development. The quotation is from HWS, 24, 7 Dec., 1891.

"Broad Green House, Calculations—Plots 30' each

Main Road 12 plots @ £180
Handcroft Road 16 plots @ £135
New Roads 41 plots @ £120
New Roads—plot with stabling, say
Handcroft Road—plot with greenhouses

add materials of house, timber, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Road 12 plots</td>
<td>£2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcroft Road 16 plots</td>
<td>£2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Roads 41 plots</td>
<td>£4,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Roads—plot with stabling</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcroft Road—plot with greenhouses</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add materials of house, timber, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£9,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct cost of roadmaking, sewers and water mains 1,070 ft. about</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses 5%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate total by development</td>
<td>£8,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From this total speculators would deduct for loss of interest on purchase money during development say 5% on £6,400 for 4 years—£1,200—taking ½</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of profit expected at least</td>
<td>£2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So I do not think the property will fetch much more than £6,000. E.G.C."

E.G.C. was, presumably, E.G. Carpenter of Messrs Blake, Haddock and Carpenter. Bidding in fact started at £4,000, climbed rapidly to £6,000 and then mounted, mainly by units of £50 or £100 to £9,500 at which price the property was bought in. The following day it was bought by private contract for £9,000 and within twenty-four hours re-sold at a cash profit of £500: see p. 44, supra.
(458)

APPENDIX III

ALDERMEN AND COUNCILLORS ESPECIALLY CONCERNED WITH THE IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>RELIGION 1</th>
<th>POLITICS</th>
<th>WARD 2</th>
<th>WHETHER GENERALLY IN FAVOUR OF SCHEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Allder</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chas Bowyer</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>U.N.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Coldwells</td>
<td>Outfitter</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Cent.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn Cooper</td>
<td>Shoe mfr</td>
<td>C.E.(T)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas Davies</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thos Dobson</td>
<td>Coal mcht</td>
<td>Cong.</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Cent.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Farley</td>
<td>Builder, etc.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Hinton</td>
<td>Prvsn mcht.</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas W. Hobbs</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Cong.</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Miller</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. Newberry</td>
<td>Tradesman</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>S.N.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn Pelton</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Cent.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saml Rymer</td>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>Cent.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.J. Shirley</td>
<td>Wine mcht</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Taylor</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cent.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn Thrift</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>RELIGION 1</th>
<th>POLITICS</th>
<th>WARD 2</th>
<th>WHETHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir R. Barrow</td>
<td>Leather mcht</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Drak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thos Edridge</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>C.E.(E)</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drak Foss</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>C.E.(E)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Goodwin</td>
<td>W. India mcht</td>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>S.N.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alf. Layton</td>
<td>Master printer</td>
<td>C.E.(E)</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>S.N.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chas Morland</td>
<td>Umbrella mfr</td>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas Weightman</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Local tradesmen or commuters (details not known)

Rbt Allen (West); Jas Benson (U.N.-Yes); Geo. Gurney (East); W. Hopekirk (U.N.); P.W.M. King (Con.-S.N.); Julius Klein (West); Theodore Gelrichs (U.N.); F.C. Pascall (S.N.); Jas Smith (S.N.-No); W.T. Smith (South); Dr Francis Thompson (South).

1. C.E.- Church of England; (T)- Tractarian; (E)- Evangelist.

APPENDIX IV

THE AREAS REFERRED TO IN THE ANALYSIS OF THE 1851 CENSUS

A. The Ancient parish of Croydon, including Norwood, Shirley, and Waddon.

B. Five Kentish and seventeen Surrey parishes with centres not more than five miles from the centre of Croydon (1). Included are Sutton, Streatham, Hayes, and Warlingham.

C. Parishes with centres more than five miles but not more than approximately ten miles away from the centre of Croydon. This area comprises the northern and central parts of East Surrey, the north-west corner of Kent, the City of London and its immediate environs, and a few places West of London such as Westminster, Kensington, and Hammersmith. Included, also, are Kingston-upon-Thames, Epsom, Bletchingley, and Orpington.

D. Places with centres more than approximately ten miles but not more than approximately thirty miles away from Croydon. This area comprises the remainder of the western half of Kent, the north-east quarter of Sussex, the remainder of Surrey, the eastern tip of Berkshire, the remainder of Middlesex, the southern tip of Buckinghamshire, South Hertfordshire, and much of South-West Essex. Included are Maidenhead, Guildford, Horsham, Uckfield, Maidstone, Chatham, Rayleigh, and Hertford.

E. Places with centres more than approximately thirty miles but not more than approximately seventy-five miles away from Croydon. This area comprises all Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Hampshire, the Isle of Wight, and Oxfordshire; all the parts of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, and Sussex not included in area D, supra; and all the parts of Kent not included in areas B, C, D, supra.

F. Places in England more than approximately seventy-five but not more than approximately 150 miles away from Croydon. This area comprises the nineteen counties listed in Table 18 (2).

G. Places in England more than approximately 150 miles away from Croydon. This area comprises the counties of

1. Distances are measured in a straight line.
2. See p. 445, supra.
Cheshire, Cornwall, Cumberland, Devonshire, Durham, Lancashire, Northumberland, Westmorland, and Yorkshire, together with the Isle of Man (1).

H. Scotland and Wales, irrespective of distance from Croydon.

I. Ireland.

J. The remainder of Europe.

K. Asia.

L. America.

M. A designation used in connection with people whose birthplace was not known, or not given, or was indecipherable, or who were born at sea.

No natives of Africa or Australasia were recorded.

1. In practice, not one Croydon head of household was a Manxman.
APPENDIX V

THE SOCIAL CLASSES REFERRED TO IN THE ANALYSIS OF THE
1851 CENSUS

U. Upper-Class. Households with eleven or more resident domestic servants (1).

I. Upper Middle-Class. Households with six to ten resident domestic servants.

II. Middle-Class. Households with three to five resident domestic servants; or fewer than three where the head of household had an occupation demanding considerable professional training (e.g., an attorney or surgeon), or a university education (e.g., an Anglican clergyman), or a good social background (e.g., an army officer). Auctioneers, surveyors, nonconformist ministers, schoolmasters, veterinary surgeons, and civil engineers not included unless described as university graduates, or qualified by having the requisite number of house servants. Master craftsmen not included even if they had sufficient servants to qualify, those with two or more servants being placed in category III.

III. Lower Middle-Class. Households with two resident servants (two or more in the case of master craftsmen and shopkeepers); or one servant or none at all where the head of household had an occupation demanding some formal education or at least some degree of literacy (e.g., auctioneers, surveyors, nonconformist ministers, schoolmasters, veterinary surgeons, civil engineers), or where the head of household was a merchant or a person of independent means but with insufficient servants to be placed in a higher category.

IV. Skilled and Semi-Skilled Working-Class. All those not included in categories U, I, II, III, or V.

V. Unskilled Working-Class. Labourers, messengers, porters (not rail), servants (except where the title was qualified, e.g., gentleman's, or brewer's servants), mangle keepers, hawkers, charwomen, page boys.

1. The term "domestic servant" as used here includes butlers, nursemaids, governesses, and pages, and others employed about the house; but it does not include staff who were resident in buildings away from the main house, as they were enumerated on separate schedules and, anyway, it is not always clear in such cases who their employer was.
washerwomen, draymen, clear starchers, odd men, potmen, and people stated to be engaged in "domestic duties."

Note. In the case of innkeepers, lodging house keepers, and proprietors of boarding schools, where domestic staff might be disproportionate in number to the real social status of the head of household, discretion has been used in any grading based solely on that criterion. The number of cases is too slight to affect the general validity of the statistics. Equally, there is some difficulty in assessing the precise degree of skill required by ostlers; the number is, once more, not statistically significant.
APPENDIX VI

THE OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS REFERRED TO IN THE ANALYSIS OF THE 1851 CENSUS

A. Independent. People of independent means; proprietors of houses, land, rents, etc.; gentlemen; people described as of no occupation but who were obviously wealthy.

B. Professional and Clerical. Professional men; clerks; brokers; authors; rate collectors; army and navy officers; missionaries; clerics.

C. Agricultural. Agricultural salesmen; dealers, workers, tenants, and proprietors connected with farming, horticulture, and forestry; gamekeepers; huntsmen; veterinary surgeons.

D. Craft and Industrial. Masters and journeymen engaged in any craft or industry except those directly concerned with agriculture.

E. Distributive. Shopkeepers, merchants, and dealers (except in agricultural goods); hawkers.

F. Domestic. People engaged in household duties; private coachmen; gardeners; governesses; washerwomen.

G. Transport and Sustenance. People concerned with sea, river, road, and rail transport, and postal communication (not at the professional level); hotel, inn, and lodging house keepers and employees.

H. Miscellaneous. Soldiers and sailors (not officers); policemen; people on parish relief; a few others who do not readily fit into categories A to G.

I. (Market area only). Housewives.
APPENDIX VII

EXTRACT FROM SPECIFICATIONS OF THE TWO HOUSE-TYPES BUILT
BY MESSRS E. & L. BERG, ON THE HAM FARM ESTATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type BS</th>
<th>Type AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freehold price</td>
<td>£775 (earlier £725)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly repayments</td>
<td>21s. 7d. (19s. 8d.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of rooms:
- Hall: 12' 6" x 6' 3"
- Drawing Room: 11' 6" x 11'
- Dining Room: 13' x 12'
- Kitchen: 8' 7\(\frac{1}{2}\)" x 8'
- Bedroom 1: 13' x 11' 7\(\frac{1}{2}\)"
- Bedroom 2: 11' 7\(\frac{1}{2}\)" x 11' 6"
- Bedroom 3: 7' 6" x 7'
- Bathroom: 6' 9" x 5' 9"

- Hall: 13' 6" x 6' 9"
- Drawing Room: 13' 9" x 11' 6"
- Dining Room: 14' 6" x 12' 7\(\frac{1}{2}\)"
- Kitchen: 8' 9" x 9'
- Bedroom 1: 14' 6" x 11' 4\(\frac{1}{2}\)"
- Bedroom 2: 11' 6" x 11' 6"
- Bedroom 3: 8' 3" x 8'
- Bathroom: 6' 9" x 5' 11"

Front door. Chromium plated letter plate and knocker.
Door fittings. Chromium lever handles throughout.
Switches. Flush switches throughout.
Hat and coat cupboard in Hall.
Wardrobe cupboard in Back Bedroom.
Medicine cupboard in Bathroom.
Bath with chromium plated shower fitting.
Tiled surround to Reception rooms with raised hearths.
Electric fires in Bedrooms.
Curtain boxes and runners fitted complete throughout the house.
Tarmac paving to garage run-in.
Front path. Cement paving.
Brick-built garage extra £40.

Concrete. Washed ballast and English cement.
Bricks. Front elevation- English multi, red and other facings.
Rear and side- London Brick Company’s rustic facings.
Damp course. Double slate.
Roof. Close boarded and English tiles.
Timber. Yellow deal.
Flooring. Columbian pine in narrow widths (AS type).
Tongued and grooved deal (BS type).
Fencing. Close boarded with square trellis top.
Wall tiling. Bathroom and Kitchen 4' 6" high.
Hot water. Independent boiler. Heavy-gauge tanks.
Coved ceilings to all rooms.
Windows: Steel casement.
Larder. Tiled shelf.
APPENDIX VIII

A NOTE ON BUILDERS' COLLATERAL

In discussion with several of the Ham Farm Estate builders it became apparent that they relied on what they referred to as "builders' collateral", known in other parts of the country as the "builders' pool", to bridge the gap between the very small deposit paid by a purchaser and the amount of the balance that the building society was prepared to advance on the property.

The system fell into disrepute and thus came to be controlled more rigidly by virtue of the Building Societies Act, 1939, which followed on a much-publicised legal dispute between the Bradford Third Equitable Society and Mrs Borders, who had purchased a house on which collateral security had been provided, at Coney Hall, West Wickham (Kent), only some two or three miles from the Ham Farm Estate.

The Ham Farm Estate builders interviewed in the course of research for this dissertation gave somewhat conflicting evidence on the methods and evils of builders' collateral and, therefore, the opinion was sought of Mr J.O. Spalding, Head Office Solicitor to the Halifax Building Society. He said that the subject and the evils that it produced and the attempt to deal with the situation in the 1939 Act form ample material for a thesis in themselves. He went on, however, to describe so clearly and succinctly the background to this important but little known aspect of
inter-War housing development that it seemed sensible to reproduce the main part of his explanation here.

After referring to E.A. Wurtzburg and J.W. Mills, Building Society Law, 12th Edition, 1964, p.214, et seq., where the subject is dealt with shortly, he continued as follows:-

"Prior to 1939 houses were being sold on very narrow profit margins and in many cases a purchaser was able to obtain possession with the help of a mortgage, if he could find only £5 or £10 by way of deposit. Building Societies have always restricted their advances on the security of a dwellinghouse itself to a certain percentage of the value of that house, but equally they have always been prepared, and still are prepared, to go above that percentage if additional security is provided. The mechanics of this arrangement are that if the borrower defaults the Building Society sells the property. If the Society is lending say 95% of valuation the house itself may not realise that figure, particularly if it has been neglected or maltreated and, therefore, the Building Society wants some other security mortgaged to it so that it may sell that as well and thus give itself extra cover as it were. Nowadays it is most frequently done by using Insurance Guarantee Policies, but in the 1930’s builders regularly entered into arrangements with Building Societies whereby they deposited a certain amount of cash with the
Society and charged that cash deposit to it by way of security, and it was used as additional security for the mortgages which the Society then granted to the builders' customers, i.e., the purchasers of the houses. As houses were completed and sold and the mortgages paid off to a certain figure so the appropriate part of the cash deposit was released and was immediately available for use as collateral security in connection with further houses which the builder was erecting. The cash deposit with the Society by the builder could be added to if his building activities expanded but the point was that it was a flexible arrangement which became known as the "builders' pool"; obviously in Croydon it was called "builders' collateral".

"A builder could, in fact, circumvent the procedure of certain Societies if he set up a new company for each estate he developed, because within whatever limits Societies placed on such arrangements he could have a new "pool" for each company. A prudent Society would, I should have thought, have seen through this device, and it is, perhaps, something which ought not to be investigated too closely even at this length of time."

"The principal vice of this system was that purchasers did not know that any collateral security was

1. See p.404, supra.
being provided, in short they bought their houses in ignorance of the "pool deposit arrangement" between the Building Society and the builder. Therefore, they sometimes found that their houses were not worth so much as they had thought because, whatever steps a Society takes to warn its members that its valuation is for its own purposes, and that they must always obtain their own advice, the public, by and large, depend on the amount which a Building Society will lend to reassure themselves that the price that they are paying is right. Mrs Borders was such a person, but.....in her litigation against the Bradford Third Equitable Society, the decisions, both at first instance and in the Court of Appeal, turned on a number of other points as well. The real point about [the] Borders [case] was that it publicly ventilated some of the evils of the "builders' pool" system and even before the litigation was complete (there was another case called Salisbury and the Halifax Building Society and I am glad to say that the Halifax won) two Bills were being brought forward in Parliament to try to cure them. These resulted in the Building Societies Act 1939 and its two relevant provisions were first that if a Building Society was taking collateral security from a third party like a builder it had to send a notice to its prospective member saying so, and secondly that the regulation of "builders' pools" and the release of money from them became closely regulated by Statute. The Building Societies Act 1939 has now been consolidated with other legislation into
the Building Societies Act 1962. Section 26 deals with additional security and says shortly that the only additional security a Building Society can take is such as may be specified in the Third Schedule to the Act, and that if a cash deposit or "pool" arrangement is contemplated it is subject to precise regulation by the Fourth Schedule. The "pool" arrangements are now called "continuing arrangements".

"The "builders' pool" system is not much used nowadays because, I think, other forms of additional security are easier to administer and generally more satisfactory. However, the same system is applied quite widely in arrangements with employers who move their people about the country, and in order to facilitate such movement guarantee their advances. There are certain exemptions to the Act, for example Banks and very large companies, and they do not have to make cash deposits. I suppose, therefore, that, speaking very broadly, one could say that the evils brought to light by the Borders case produced legislation which, although regulatory in intent, seems in practice to have relegated the "builders' pool" to a very minor position in the realm of additional security."
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3. Bibliographical Note

Much of the research for this dissertation was carried out in the reference department of Croydon Public Library where a mass of manuscript material relating to the town is deposited. It is well-indexed; but much of it is stored in the basement, uncovered and on open shelves.

As with the author's previous dissertation, considerable use was made of some 2,000 or so particulars of sale of properties in the town. Most of these documents have been deposited at the Library by Messrs Harold Williams and Partners, estate agents; and the remainder were previously in the possession of a local resident, Captain R.R.B. Bannerman. They have been indexed by the Library staff; but have not, so far as is known, been much used previously. Their particular value lies in the fact that
quite apart from the printed information and large-scale plans many of them have manuscript notes made by the auctioneer. These give details about the biddings and purchasers; and sometimes also manuscript comments about the features of the estate that, presumably, the auctioneer thought important enough to make known before he invited bids.

In addition, Messrs Harold Williams and Partners have, at their office, bound volumes containing particulars of most of the sales that they have handled in the town and elsewhere over the last 150 years. In some cases, these documents supplement the records deposited by the firm at the Library.

Then, too, there are stored at the Public Library most of the surviving archives of local government in the town. These formed the basis of the investigation into the decay, demolition, and redevelopment of the Market area. They include the detailed manuscript minutes of the Local Improvement Commissioners and the later and even more detailed ones of the Sanitary Committee of the Local Board of Health. Both these sets of records are concerned with the minutiae that made possible the completion of a detailed picture of the Market area and of the attempts to remedy the worst of its evils. The more generalised minutes of the

---

1. See Chapter II, pp.94-289, supra.
Local Board of Health itself, the printed reports of that Board and the 1884 Report of the Poor Dwellings Committee also contributed background information. The registers of lodging houses that were required to be kept by the 1848 Public Health Act have unfortunately not survived.

The most invaluable local government archives of all for this dissertation, without which no proper study could have been made of the final process of demolition and redevelopment of the Market area, are the two bound volumes of the minutes of the High Street Improvement Scheme and the High Street Special Committee. Their contents to some extent overlap but, between them, they made it possible to trace the details of the newly-created Corporation's successful scheme to redevelop the town centre.

Even more than in the case of the previous study, the local newspapers provided invaluable material, especially in connection with the work on the Market area. Apart from a few missing issues in the very early years, there is a continuous run on microfilm of the Croydon Advertiser, which was founded in 1869. It always exerted a considerable influence in the town's affairs and in the nineteenth century inevitably supported the Liberal cause whilst the Croydon Guardian gave comfort and encouragement to the Tories. The Croydon Guardian is not on microfilm and it has been defunct for many years, but most if not all its numbers are available as are those of the Croydon Chronicle.
Another useful starting point for research was the Biographical Index of Croydon Residents, compiled and stored at the Public Library. Because of staff shortage it is neither complete, nor is it entirely accurate; but it gave, for example with its recording of date of death, a valuable lead to biographical information in the local newspapers. It proved particularly helpful in the compilation of the list of Aldermen and Councillors especially connected with the Improvement Scheme.\(^2\)

A further card index that is not generally available to the public but of which any student of Croydon's nineteenth and twentieth century urban development should be aware is that held at the Town Hall and relating to planning consents. Theoretically, there is a card for every grant of permission since 1870. The record is not quite complete however and not all the cards have as much information as one might expect. There was for example no general attempt when houses on the Ham Farm Estate were

---


2. See Appendix III, p.458, supra.
numbered to change the recording of the original house name or vague identification on the cards. Sometimes, too, the named applicant for planning permission was the future owner-occupier; more often, but not inevitably, it was the builder. However, any defects must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the cards make it possible to date far more individual houses in the town and to associate them with particular builders than is possible by any other method.

It is remarkable how much material relating to development of only a few decades ago has already been lost or thrown away. Perhaps the best example of this that came to light during the present work was the disappearance of the minutes of the inter-War Monks Orchard Owners' Association. What happened is related above. Almost equally serious is the destruction of its pre-1935 records by the firm of solicitors that acted for Percy Harvey Estates Ltd when they bought and sold the Ham Farm Estate in the 1920's. That action has probably removed any possibility of analysis of the origins or occupations of the purchasers, or the cost or the speed of sale of the plots even though the transactions took place within living memory.

1. See p.343n, supra.

2. Information supplied by Mr A.W. Ellison, of Messrs Ellison & Co., Cambridge.
Again, although the admission registers of three of the four state schools in the vicinity of the Ham Farm Estate, that is Monks Orchard, Ashburton Junior and Ashburton Senior, were examined to discover where children new to the Estate had previously been living, the record is not complete because the registers for the oldest of the four, Shirley Church School, cannot be traced for the period previous to 1943. They were probably lost when the school's premises were destroyed during the War. But nobody knows for sure.

The third main part of the dissertation, which sought to discover something about the pattern of migration into the town in the years prior to 1851, relied almost exclusively on a detailed analysis of the town's census returns for that year and for 1861. They are, of course, housed at the Public Record Office and are too well known to require further description or comment.

So much, then, for the primary sources used in the preparation of the study. By contrast, printed books, with one exception, made comparatively little contribution to the body of knowledge. That exception was in connection with John Ollis Pelton's Relics of Old Croydon which describes,

2. Information supplied by Mr K.J. Revell, Chief Education Officer, London Borough of Croydon.
in some detail, the last few years of the slums there and the processes leading to their disappearance. Reference was also made from time to time to another of Pelton's books, Memorials of Croydon Within the Crosses; to Bannerman's Forgotten Croydon; to Paget's By-Ways in the History of Croydon; and to the typescript recollections of William Page. But none of these books are of a high standard academically and it was necessary to treat their contents with care and reservation.

By contrast, the local directories are exceptionally reliable. The Commercial and General Directory of the Town of Croydon, was founded in 1851 and subsequently published every few years up to 1869. Then Jesse Ward, the remarkable founder of the Croydon Advertiser, took it over. He published it from 1874 under the title of Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory and between 1878 and 1884 it was published biennially, then annually until 1930, and again in 1932, 1934, 1937, and 1939. The accuracy and completeness of these books has been

1. GPL, §70(9) PAG, WM Page, My Recollections of Croydon Sixty Years Since, 1880.

2. He is the subject of an interesting biography: Anon., Jesse Ward, Native of Ipswich and Townsman of Croydon, 1951.
described in some detail elsewhere.\textsuperscript{1}

Numerous articles were studied in connection with this work, especially for Chapter III on population movement into Croydon in the first half of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{2} The one that proved to be of the greatest value was that by C.M. Allan, on the redevelopment of Glasgow.\textsuperscript{3} Comment has been made elsewhere about the quite remarkable similarity that was finally revealed in the chronology of urban improvement in what are two utterly dissimilar towns.\textsuperscript{4} Analogies with Croydon’s urban development and redevelopment were also sought from a considerable number of unpublished theses; those that particularly described situations or made findings relevant to this study have been listed.\textsuperscript{5}

In the study of the Ham Farm Estate, considerable use was made of verbal evidence offered by builders and their descendants and also, to a lesser extent, that of people who were resident there in the early days. This was not done as a substitute for research or written records;

\begin{enumerate}
\item Cox, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.164-165.
\item See pp.290-328, \textit{supra}.
\item For example, pp.413-414, \textit{supra}.
\item See pp.471-472, \textit{supra}.
\end{enumerate}
but rather because the kind of information obtainable from such people was simply not available in any other way. It has been said previously that the technique of interview is much more familiar to the sociologist than to the historian. Facts must be separated from subjective judgements and, where the border line between the one and the other is blurred, assessment of the evidence must, accordingly, be no more than tentative. But unanimity of opinion on some particular point is a useful guide to a possible fact; for example the bad condition of the roads of the Estate in its early years.

Although the dissertation is about the urban development and redevelopment of one town, Croydon, it was compiled in an awareness of the need to avoid what one writer has described as "the pitfall of extreme parochialism." To this end, constant reference was made to books, articles, and theses dealing nationally, or regionally, or in regard to other specific towns with the problems that were here being considered in connection with Croydon. They were used, it might reasonably be claimed, "as tools in the task of recreating the history of a local community." 

1. Cox, op. cit., p.165
3. Alan Everitt, 'The Study of Local History,' Amateur Historian, Winter 1964, p.44.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>19, 25, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal heavers</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godden, Rich.</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cock</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockerell, Mr</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockerell, S.P.</td>
<td>104n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Tavern (Castle Coffee Tavern)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Stores</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colyridge Rd (353670) 330
Coles, Dr 147
Colindale, Orchard Rise 392
Colls & Son, Messrs 181
Commerce Hse, Manor Rd, Wallington 265n
Commercial and General Directory of Croydon 424, 478
Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police 276-277
Commissioners of Property and Income Tax 59
Common Lodging Houses Act, 1851 135-136, 188
Common Lodging Houses Act, 1853 135-136
Compton, Sy 299n
Coney Hall, West Wickham 465
Congregationalists 179, 182, 251, 458
Connor, S.O. 9, 387-388, 390-391, 393
Connor, Wm Jas 372, 387-390, 392-393, 395
Connor & Co., Messrs 368, 387, 392
Connor & Timblick, Messrs /see "Connor & Co., Messrs"/
Conservatives 178, 212-213, 216, 224, 242, 249-252, 333, 258, 474
Constanduros, Isabel 406
Coombe Farm 331
Cooper, Ald. Jn 203, 209, 237, 251n, 458
Cope, J. Rob 9
Cork, County 349
Corn market 275, 277
Corn trade 97n, 100, 106, 112, 114-115, 120, 275, 277
Cornhull, E.C. 35
Corry 296, 444, 450
Corry Rd (317657) 23
Corporation Acts /see under Croydon Corporation Acts/
Coulson, Horatio Syd. 181
Council cott, Mint Walk 267, 270-271, 277, 288
County Court 96
Courtenay, Archbp 22
Coventry 103
Cowell, Alf. Burton 178-179
Cowley, Alf. 178
Cozza, Luigi 144
Creamer Rd (320652) 25
Crest, Orchard Rise 391-392
Cricketers, Shirley Rd 149
Criminal Court, Town Hall 106
Critchlow, F. 9
Cromwell Rd (332642) 2, 284n
Cross Rd (330661) 23
Crowley, Mr 196
Crowley fam. 315
Crown Hse 96
Crown Inn 26-28, 59n, 95
Croydon & Home Counties Permanent Bldg Soc. 21
Croydon Auxiliary to the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews 178
Croydon basket carriage 29
Croydon branch, London City Mission 178
Croydon Canal Act, 1801 49n
Croydon Central Stn /see "Central Croydon Stn"/
Croydon Charity Soc. 241
Drive, Beckenham, The 380
Driver, R.C. 255
Drummond, Jn 30,60
Drummond, Mr 196
Drummond, Wm 30,51-52
Drummond & Co., Messrs 59n
Drummond Rd (322658) 23,57n, 62,64,72
Dulwich, Sy 291
Duncan, Ann 153
Duncan, Geo. 144n,151-154, 160,184
Duncan, Mrs 153
Duppas Hl Lk 82n,85
Duppas Rd (316650) 23
Duppas Terr. (319650) 23
Durham 296,444,460
Dyos, Dr H.J. 3,7,43,65,91, 296n,306n,370

Eades Yd, Pitlake 55-56
East Croydon Stn 2,23,195, 213,230,276,327,344,353, 365-367
East Grinstead, Sx 99,106, 155,298-299,311n
East India Co. 4,331
East Surrey 19,309,311
East Surrey St. 102n
East Ward 458
East Ward Electors’ Assn 366
Eastbourne, Sx 291,298
Eastcheap, E.C. 36n
Ebbutt, Messrs 77n
Ebbutt, Thos Hyde 77
Ecclesiastical Commissioners /
see "Church Estates Commissioners" /
Eden Pk, Kt 291,330
Edgar Pk Farm 335
Edgar, Mrs J. 9,382
Edridge, Sir Frdk T. 259,271, 458
Edridge, Sir Thos Rich. 139, 142-143,153,177-178,181, 183r,185
Edridge, Syd. G. 44n,257

Education Committee / see "Croydon Education Committee"
Edward VI 27
Eland Rd (317652) 23
Elborough, C.M. 254n

Eldon, Earl of 331
Eldon Av. (355657) 330
Electricity 55,342
Elis David Charity 181,257
Elis David Rd (319655) 165, 177,181-182
Ellis, Sir J. Whittaker 255
Elmers End, Kt 291,330,342-343,358
Elmers End Stn 343-345,358, 366-367
Elmwood Rd (318668) 23
Elstane Wy (362668) 330,350, 395
Elwill Lodge, Elwill Way, 380
Beckenham
Elwill Way, Beckenham 380
Elys Davy Charity / see "Elis David Charity"
English Channel 204
Epsom, Sy 31,50,459
Epsom Rd (315652) 23
Epsom Rd, Ewell 264
Epsom Town Stn 50
Essex 382,459
Evangelicals 251,458
Evening News 400
Everitt, Prof. A.M. 8,100
Evitt, F. 209
Ewell, Sy 264,291
Eynsford, Kt 299n
Factory Lk. (317659) 23,67
Fairfield, Park Lk. 2,23,191, 231-233,238,241,247,276
Fairfield Halls 23
Fairfield Rd (328654) 231
Fairford Av. (359676) 330,402
Fairford Cl. (361676) 359
Fairhaven Av. (357671) 330, 401
Fairholmes Rd (314667) 23
Fairs 19,97,113
Fairway Cl. (361675) 359
Fairweather, H. 46
Farley, Coun. J. 458
Farley, Sy 291,305
Farndale, Dr W.A.J. 9
Fawkharson Rd (321664) 23
Fawsett Rd (320652) 23
Fell Rd (324654) 23,270
Fever epidemic,1852-1853 128-130
Fiennes, Celia 99
Finberg, Prof, H.P.R. 8
Fire Stn 111-112
Firsby Av. (361662) 330,352-353,376-377
Fish market 95,101,114n
Fishmarket St. 101
Fitzjames Av. (344655) 361
Fitzjohns Av., Hampstead 175n
Fleash Market / see "Surrey St."
Flower, J. Wickham 181
Forgotten Croydon 478
Fortuna 208
Foss, Ad. Frdk 251n,458
Fountain 280
Fox and Hounds 36n,41n
France 323
Francis Rd (318670) 23
Frant, Sx 299n
Free Libraries 227
Freeman, L.W. 9
Freeman, Sam. 51-52
Friends' Rd (327653) 23
Frith, F. 52n
Frith Rd (322656) 23,62-64,83,115,431
Fritsch, G. 270,273
Fulham Terr., Handcroft Rd 75-76
Fyresyde, The Glade 349,360
Gas 19-20,55,70,192,341,364
Gas & Coke Co. / see "Croydon Gas & Coke Co.",
Gaynor, J. 9
General Hospital 23
Gent, Jn B. 9
George St. (328658) 2,23-24,29n,73,95-96,119,213,231,245-246,376
Germans 155
Gillet & Johnston (Croydon) Ltd 86
Glade Pavilion, The 303
Gladeside (357672) 330,357,376,379,396,401,409
Gladeside estate 399
Gladstone 251n
Gladstone Rd (329667) 23
Glasgow 5,173,175,188,190,243n,254n,413-415,479
Glenwood Wy (358670) 379
Gloucestershire 445
Glover, A.P. 8
Glowsworm 185,187
Goddard, Thos 71
Godson, Coun. Rich. 282,458
Godstone, Sy 86,106,299
"Golden Age of Farming" 306
Goodwin, Coun. Thos. W. 21,203,458
Gospel Temperance Hall 96
Gough, Wm 51n,60-61,72
Gower, Mr 193
Grafton Rd (316661) 23
Grand Surrey Iron Railway / see "Surrey Iron Railway"
Grant Bros Ltd 265n,280-282
Grantham, Jn 177-178,180
Gravel 231-232
Gravesend, Kt 200
Great Carmo, The / see "Cameron, Harry"
Great George St, London 208
Greater London 408
Green Street Green, Kt 375
Greenside Rd (315668) 23
Greenview Av. (362672) 330,359,389,402
Greenwich, Kt 291
Greenwood Rd (320670) 23
Gregg Schs 44
Grenaby Av. (327666) 23
Grenaby Rd (327666) 23
Greyhound Hotel 95-96,130n,282
Grindle, F.V. 9
Grove Cotts 29n
Guildford, Sy 459
Gurney, Coun. Geo. 203,246n,458
Gwynne Av. (357670) 330,380
Gwyne Av. (357670) 330,380
Hackney, Mx 325
Haddock, Mr 233,255,279
Halifax Bldg Soc. 10,338,465,466
Haling Down 91
Haling estate 2
Hall & Son Ltd, J.W. 379-381
Hallett, Joseph 83-84
HALLETT, Wm 83-84
Ham Farm 332-336, 338, 341-342, 349-350, 354, 357, 368
see also "Carmo Manor"
Ham Farm estate 6-7, 9, 291, 329-410, 420, 422, 426, 454-456, 464-465, 475-477, 479-480
Hammersmith, Mr 291, 459
Hampshire 315, 380, 459
Hampstead, Mr 144, 175
Hancock Rd (317664) 2, 22-23, 31-33, 39-41, 43-48, 67, 74-76, 78, 81, 88, 90, 427-429, 457
Handcross estate 2, 57-64, 68-69, 90
Handcross Field 49
Hansens's Court see "Nelson Sq." /
Harold Williams Colln 472
Harp 74
Harpden races 154
Harris, Wm 88
Harrison's Rise (317653) 23
Hart, E.B. 9, 372, 390n, 393-396
Hart, J.R. 9, 340n, 393n
Hart & Co., Messrs 395
Hartley Rd (320668) 23
Hathaway Rd (319666) 23
Hatton Rd (315664) 23
Hausmann 197
Hawkes, Alf. 9
Hayes, Kt 306, 459
Hayton, J.D. 209
Hazeldean Rd (329655) 23
Heasman, Margaret 167
Heath, Baron see "Heath, R.A."
Heath, R.A. 181, 185
Heathfield Rd (325647) 30n
Hedgis, Thos 25n
Hedgis Yd (322657) 29n, 58n, 64, 69
Henman jnr, Chas 276, 279
Herefordshire 297, 445
Hertford, Herts 459
Hertfordshire 459
H estley, Dr 142
High Sch. 23
High St., Beckenham 380
High St., South Norwood 273
High St., Improvement Cmttee 203, 205-206, 208-210, 214-216, 219-221, 250
Higham Ferrers, Northants 98
Highway rate 37n
Highways Depot, Mitcham Rd 275
Hill St 322
Hillcrest View, Beckenham 330
Hitchen, Mr 9
Hobbs, A. 322
Hobbs, Coun. Jas W. 202-203, 225n, 458
Hobbs, Messrs J.W. 225
Hodges, Charlotte 165
Hodges, Mary Ellen 165
Hogan, Geo. 20
Hollycombe, Pitlake 87
Home Brewery 149
Home Dept 136
Home Rule 224, 226
Homer Rd (358672) 330, 356-357
Honourable East India Co. see "East India Co."
Hook, A. 9
Hooker & Webb, Messrs 260
Hopkirke, Coun. W. 203, 458
Hopkins, Mrs Margaret 153
Horley, Sy 106, 299n, 381
Horniman, W.H. 181
Horryocks, Wm 169
Horse Shoe Inn 120
Horse trade 107, 112
Horsecroft 33
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<td>23</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>157-158</td>
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Knott, Geo. Alex. 264
Labourers' Dwellings / see "Shaftesbury Bldgs"
Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Soc., Ltd / see "Croydon Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Soc., Ltd"
Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Act, 1851 182, 188
Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Act, 1866 182
Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Act, 1867 182
Lacey, Rbt 26n
Lake Rd (368660) 330
Lamberhurst, Kt & Sx 299n
Lambert, Allen Jn 7ln
Lambeth, Sy 291
Lambeth North 224
Lambeth Rd (315665) 23
Lambeth Water Co. 212n, 240
Lancashire 296, 334, 444, 460
Land & House PropertyCorpn 23n
Land & Investment Co. / see "Croydon Land & Investment Co."
Land & Provincial Meat Stores 287n
Landon, R. 265-266
Langland Gdns (367660) 330
Langdowne Rd (327660) 23, 286n
Lascelles & Co., W.H. 276
Latham, Baldwin 180, 200
Latimer Rd (319653) 23
Laud St. (323651) 23
Lavender Way (358671) 379, 385
Lavinia Villa, West St. 83
Law of Property Act, 1925 391
Layton, Ald. Alf. 203, 458
Leary, Pat. 168
Leather Bottle Lane 322
Leeds Steel Works Ltd 263n
Legg, Albert 84
Legg, Hy 84-85
Leicester 192, 229, 293
Leicester Rd (334666) 82
Leicester University 8
Leicestershire 445
Leighton St., East (316662) 23
Lennard Rd (321663) 23
Lenny, Chas 29, 68
Lewes, Sx 298-299
Lewis, G. 9
Lewisham, Kt 291
Lewisham Hill, Kt 255
Liberal Unionists 226
Liberals 178-179, 213, 216, 242, 249-252, 458, 474
Liberator Bldg Soc. 223, 225, 416
Liepmann, Kate 364
Lillico, Coun. 286n
Lincolnshire 297, 445
Liverpool St. E.C. 365
Lloyd, Theodore 181
Lloyd's market garden 30
Lloyd's Way, Beckenham 330
Local Board of Health 19-21, 58, 110-112, 119, 128, 130-132, 135-137, 141-143, 147, 150-152, 156-159, 175, 180, 189, 191-201, 218-219, 416, 474
Local Board of Health's Sanitary Cttee / see "Sanitary Cttee"
Local Government Act 236
Local Government Board 253, 269, 272, 274, 278
Locks Bottom, Kt 147
Lodge Rd (319668) 23
London & County Banking Co. 72, 95, 227
London & Croydon Railway Co. 49-50
London Brick Co. 464
London Bridge Stn 366-367
London, Brighton & South Coast Railway Co. 50, 195, 230-233, 247
London City Mission 178, 184
London City Mission Hall, Cairo Rd 79
London County Council 225, 456
London Echo 209
London General Omnibus Co. 365, 421
London Passenger Transport Board 365-366, 421
London Rd (320663) 2, 22-23, 25, 28, 31-34, 36, 38, 40-41, 45-49, 67, 70, 82, 83n, 90, 245, 427-429, 451
London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews 178
Long Lane (350671) 330, 342, 358, 366-367, 369, 425
Long Lane Wood 330, 358
Longheath estate 330
Longley Rd (316665) 23
Lord of the Manor 22
Lorne Av. (359669) 330, 357, 398
Lorne Gdns (359670) 330, 357, 367, 398
Lorne Poultry Farm 397
Lower Church St. (319656) 23, 430
Lower Drayton Pl. (319657) 51, 54-55, 78-80, 430
Loyd, Frederic 333
Loyd, Lewis 333
Loyd, Sam. Jones 333
Luigi, Jn 144
McSweeny, P.C. 26n, 134
Maidenhead, Berks 459
Maidment, Wm R. 9
Maidstone, Kt 459
Man, Isle of 460
Manchester 162
Mann, Sarah 176
Mann the plumber 127-128
Manning, G.E. 8
Manor Rd, Wallington 265n
Mare, Jn 85
Market 2, 5, 22-23, 94-289, 413
Market area 94-289, 320-322, 413-414, 425, 432-441, 473-474
Market Err., Pitlake 87
Markets 19, 113
Martin, Dr 103
Martin, Elizabeth 266
Martin fam. 267
Mason's Av. (324650) 23
Matthews, Jn Thos 178
Matthews, Royd H. 9
May, Geo. 178
Mayor 166n, 204, 215, 228, 237-238, 247
Mead Cotts, Handcroft Rd 88
Mead Grove (319661) 73n, 427, 429
Mead Pl. (320661) 427-429
Meadow Av. (358674) 389
Meat trade 63, 102, 105, 114
Memorials of Croydon Within the Crosses 478
Merstham, Sy 49, 104, 105n, 114
Merton, Sy 291
Merton Cotts, Bearfield Rd, Kingston upon Thames 163
Methodists 251, 458
Metropolitan Association for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes 177
Metropolitan Police 277
Mettrup, Mrs Sheila 10
Mid Kent Railway 194
Middle Street (323655) 96, 116n, 211, 281-283, 285-286, 441
Middlesex 150, 459
Midhurst, Sx 99
Midhurst Av. (314669) 23
Miller, Coun. David 203, 208, 216, 227, 458
Miller, Wilkins & Co., Messrs 10
Miller's Corner 227
Milton Rd (328665) 23
Ministry of Health 356
Ministry of Housing & Local Government 208
Mint Walk (325654) 23, 95-96, 231, 270-271, 288
Mint Walk Cotts see "Council cotts, Mint Walk"
Mission Cotts, Lower Drayton Pl. 78
Mitcham, Sy 54, 57, 291, 305-307
Mitcham Rd (316661) 2, 23, 40, 65, 90n, 273, 321
Monks Orchard 333-337, 340, 352
Monks Orchard Infat & Jnr Mxd Sch. 9, 369, 425-426, 477
Monks Orchard Residents' Assn 343-344
Monmouthshire 297, 445
Montague Pl., Montague Rd 71, 75
Montague Rd (319663) 23, 71, 75, 427-429
Moore, Joseph 69
Moorgate Stn Chambers, E.C. 336
Morland, Coun. Chas 203, 222, 458
Morland, Jn 181
Morland, Thos 33n
Morland estate 82
Morland Rd (335665) 2, 178
Morning Chronicle 104
Mowlem & Co., Messrs 263n
Mulgrave Rd (327650) 23
Municipal cotts see "Council cotts, Mint Walk"
Municipal Lodging Hse, Pitlake 267, 270-271, 273-275, 276, 288
Muriel Terr., Sumner Rd 78, 86
Mutton, Jn 86
Mutton, O.J. 86
Myrtle St. 41n
Nairn, Ian 283
Walden & Collyer, Messrs 117n
Napier Rd (327654) 89
National Land Soc. 38n
Nelson Sq. 95, 123, 128, 133, 141-142, 155, 175, 190, 260
Neville Rd (329668) 23
New British Garden Estates 376
New Cress, Kt 325
New Croydon Stn see "East Croydon Stn"
New Estates Magazine 400
New Government Offices 208
New Surrey St. 209
New Zealand 374
Newberry, Coun., Geo. 203, 458
Newbury, K.M.G. 9
Newby, W.B. 265-266
Newby, Messrs W.B. 265
Newcastle 162
Nichols Court 122
Nichols, Chas F. 271n
Niemeyer, Hy 271n
Night in Middle Row, A 137
Noble, Ambrose 183n
Nolan, Tim. 122
Norbury 291
Norfolk 297, 445
North Downs 100, 291, 305-306, 318, 362, 418
North End (325657) 2, 22-26, 25, 28, 31-32, 51n, 57-59, 64, 68, 72, 90, 95, 119, 159, 165, 209, 215, 224, 245-246, 262, 275, 431
North End Hall see "Civic Hall"
North End Hse, North End 51n
North End Lodge, London Rd 45
North Mitcham, Sy 377
Northamptonshire 445
Northcote Rd (329673) 84n
Northumberland 460
Norwood 103, 207, 211, 220, 236, 239-240, 459
Norwood News 211, 475
Norwood Review 239
Norwood Ward 239
Nottingham 293
Nottinghamshire 445
Nova Rd (320665) 23
Oak Alley 95, 116, 124n, 253
Oakfield estate 2, 25
Oakfield Hse 23
Oakfield Rd (321662) 23
Oakview Grove (366664) 392
'Observer' 217
Oelrichs, Count Theodore 458
Old Fish St. see 'Fishmarket St.'
Old Jail 95, 280
Old King's Head see 'King's Head'
Old Palace 2, 23, 78, 108, 321
Old Palace Rd (321655) 23, 115
Old Town (319653) 23, 68, 321-322, 329
Oracle 104
Orchard Av. (362660) 330, 338n, 342, 344, 352-353, 376, 383, 395, 402, 454
Orchard Rise (366665) 330, 383, 387, 390-392, 395, 409, 454
Orchard Way (364670) 330, 338n, 345-346, 359, 376, 395, 409, 440
Oxpington, Kt 459
Otwell, D.V. 9
Oval Rd (332661) 85
Overseers of the Poor 290n
Overstone, Lord see 'Loyd, Sam. Jones'
Overton, Hy 51-52, 70
Overton's Yd (322655) 69-70, 95-96
Owen, F. Jn 9
Oxfordshire 322, 459
Page, Sam. 276, 286n
Page, Wm 478
Page the brewer 70n
Page & Overton's Brewery Ltd 10, 70n
Paget, Clarence G. 100, 478
Paget, Rich. 71
Paish, Louis 371
Paish, Tyler & Co., Messrs 376
Paish, Tyler & Crump, Messrs 9, 376, 406
Paladium Cinema 96
Paper Makers' Provident Soc. 178
Parish Church 2, 22-23, 68, 184, 321
Parish officers 171-172
Park Farm 330
Park Hill estate 2, 30n, 212, 239, 241
Park Hill Recreation Ground 23
Park Lane (326652) 2, 23, 73, 173, 177, 231
Park St. (324655) 23, 95-96, 261
Parkfields 330, 390
Parliament St., London 208
Parson's Head Enclosure Act, 1823 33
Parsonage see 'Rectory'
Pascall, Coun. F.C. 458
Pay, Chas E. 87
Peard, J. Davis 212-213, 246n
Peckham, Kt 59, 291
Pelton, Coun. Jn 20, 44, 92, 198-199, 201, 203, 206, 208, 458
Pelton, Jn Ollis 101, 102, 117, 192, 198, 217, 222, 252, 264, 477-478
Pemberton, Harold Clement see 'Cameron jnr, Harry Harold'
Penfold, Mr 171-172, 192
Penge, Kt 28, 291
Percy Harvey Estates Ltd 336-338, 340-341, 344-345, 354, 358, 378, 381, 390n, 392, 397, 408, 476
Permanent Bldg Soc. see 'Croydon Permanent Bldg Soc.'
Peru 388
Pescud, J. 87
Pescud, the Misses 87
Petty, Rev. Canon Ronald 9
Petworth, Sx 99
Pevener, N. 283
Philpot, Dr (Medical Officer of Health) 141-142, 150-151, 155, 160-162, 221-222
Pickhurst, Chiddingfold 208n
Pickbeam, Drdk 86
Pillory 106-107
Pitlake (319656) 22-23, 32, 41, 84, 87, 89, 159
Plumstead, Kt 394
Police Court 276n
Police Stn 23, 28, 165, 169, 231, 276-277, 288
Political activity 108
Polytechnic Sch 96
Poor Dwellings Cmttee 58, 133, 167, 175, 182, 189, 474
Poor Law Guardians 196
Poor Law Union 28
Poor rate 37n
Poplar Walk (322660) 23
Porter, Ay 147
Porter, Rosetta 147
Porter, Sarah Ann 147
Porter, Selina 147
Porter, Thos 146
Post Office 95-96, 120, 197, 275-276
Post Office Savings Bank 145
Postmaster General 276
Potter, W.P. 209
Pottinger, Maria 154
Preston, Arthur Gurney 334
Price, R.W. 283
Pridgy's Yd (322656) 96
Prince of Wales 276n
Prince of Wales beerhouse 95, 117, 121, 146
Provident Dispensary  see "Croydon Provident Dispensary"
Public Health Act, 1848 135, 189, 474
Public Health Act, 1875 239
Public Health Act, 1936 135
Public Health Dept 9
Public Library 8-9, 28, 162, 231, 276-277, 425, 472-473, 475
Public Record Office 477
Public Records 39
Pump, public 127-128
Pump Rail (325645) 23
Purley, Sy 291, 363
Purvis, Wm 59n
Putney, Sy 291
Pym, Mr 377-378
Pym, Mrs 9, 372, 377-379, 393-394
Pym Rd  see "Stokes Rd"
Quakers  see "Society of Friends"
Racecourses 33, 186
Railway Accident Mutual Insurance Co. 85
Railway Bell 159
Railways 19, 23, 35-37, 57, 63, 55, 67, 89, 112, 118, 194, 197n, 218, 238, 308, 312, 320, 366-367, 419, 463
Rayleigh, Ex 459
Raymond, Geo. 286n
Rectory 22
Rectory Manor estate 2, 4, 22-93, 291, 323-324, 326, 411-412, 421, 424, 431
Rectory Manor house 30, 33
Redhote, Orchard Rise 290
Redhill, Sy 405
Reed, Messrs Neville v30n
Regent's Pk 176, 208
Regis, Joseph 35
Reigate, Sy 106
Reigate stone 105n
Rehies of Old Croydon 477
Revell & Co., Messrs 349-350
Raymonds, Archbp 97
Ridgemount Av. (359658) 330, 353n
Rigby, Thos 270
Rising Sun 30
Robertson, Harry W. 10
Robinson, Carew Saunders 79, 181
Robinson, Col. Mosse 224
Robinson, S. 322
Robinson Gruce 95, 128
Roffey & Clark, Messrs 265n
Romford, Ex 333
Rose beerhouse 121
Rose cott., Derby Rd 42n
Rose cott., Upper Drayton Pl. 55n
Rosecot, Woodmere Av. 394
Rosemary Lane, London 151
Rosery, Thc (356673) 330, 368, 381, 383, 385-389
Ross Group Ltd 64n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Commission on Market Rights and Tolls 112-113</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes 243n</td>
<td>243n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Naval Air Service 374</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Oak 95,121</td>
<td>95, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudge-Whitworth Cycle Depot 287n</td>
<td>287n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin, Jn 117n,121,329</td>
<td>117n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Rd (329670) 23</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland 297,445</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymer, Ald. Sam. Lee 181,203, 216,243,458</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans, Herts 94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Abbey 94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew's Church 2,329</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Augustine's Church 9,251n</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Augustine's Church Bldg Fund 251n</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Botolph 97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George's Conventional District, Shirley 371</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George's-in-the-East riots 184</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Hilda's College, Oxford 8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James's Church 23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James's Fk (322667) 23</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James's Rd (323669) 2,23, 77,321</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John the Baptist 97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Church, Shirley 329</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Church of England Infant &amp; Jnr Mxd School, Shirley 9,369,425,477</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Grove (318655) 22-23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Rd (318654) 23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's, Waterloo Rd 187</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary, Charterhouse 243</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthew 97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas Chantry 27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Olave's L.C.C. Children's Home (see &quot;Shirley Residential Sch&quot;)</td>
<td>287b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviour's Convent, Bermondsey 22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Pl. (321651) 23</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury v Halifax Bldg Soc. 468</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army 53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo, Orchard Rise 390-391</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanderstead, Sy 291,305,315n, 375</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandford, E.W. 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sansinana Co. Ltd 64n</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinia 181</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargood, Frd Jas 178-179</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday market 97,100,106, 112,115</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders, Mr 236n</td>
<td>236n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Hl (322653) 23,95, 280</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Rd (see &quot;Scarborough Hl&quot;)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholes, Jn H. 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board 21,26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland 293,432-433,436n, 442-443,446-448,452-453, 460</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Sir Gilbert 329</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Scrubator' 114m</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker, W.R. 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selborne Rd (336651) 30n</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selhurst 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selhurst Rd (331675) 51n</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selston 291-292</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selston Rd (332634) 2,30n</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September fair 97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Dials, London 5,131</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn 298sn</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage 19,189,342</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury Bldgs 163,177, 181-183,269 (see &quot;Surrey St.&quot; )</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shambles, The (see &quot;Surrey St.&quot;)</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon, H.A. 327</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharman, Wm 172</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Inspector 28,29m</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelbourne, J.E. 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon St. (322651) 23</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd, Rbt 149</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepperton, Mx 375</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship 95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley 9,70n,291,322,329, 331-332,338,342,351,370, 376,387,459</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley, Coun. G.J. 458</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley jnr, Jn 78,80-81,83</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley snr, Jn 78-80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley, Mrs 80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shirley & Sons, W. 7ln
Shirley Av. (351660) 330
Shirley Church Sch / see "St. John's Church of England Infant & Jnr Mxd School, Shirley"
Shirley Cott. 331
Shirley Hl, Shirley 331
Shirley Hse 331
Shirley Parish Church Magazine 363
Shirley Pk Hotel 331n, 344n
Shirley Residential Schs 330, 367
Shirley Rd (353658) 2, 149, 331, 376, 405, 425
Shirley's Freeholds and Leaseholds 79
Shotton, Rbt 39n
Shropshire 296-297, 444-445
Siddons Rd (315654) 23
Silverdale Rd (317654) 23
Sir Robert Peel 83
Skeats, Clementine 168
Smith, Ian F. 10
Smith, Coun. Jas 174, 458
Smith, P.C. 26n, 134
Smith, Coun. W.T. 458
Smithfield Market 102
Society of Friends 181-182, 251, 458
Somerset 445
Sopley Cotts, Cairo Pl. 56n
South Croydon 91-92, 34On
South Eastern Railway Coy. 194
South End (324647) 2, 24-25, 262-263
South London 298n, 327n
South Norwood 211-212, 214, 273, 291
South Norwood Ratepayers' Assn 240
South Norwood Ward 458
South Suburban Co-operative Soc. 45n
South Ward 458
Southbridge Rd (322648) 71
Southern Railway 367n
Southsea Rd (317663) 23
Southwark, Sy 291, 310, 325, 437n
Spalding, J.O. 10, 465
Spriggs, Mr 394-395
Spring Pk Farm 341
Spring Pk Residents' Assn 365
Spring Pk Rd (359654) 369
Spurgeon's Tabernacle, West Croydon 251
Staffordshire 296, 444-445
Staines, Mx 526
Stanley, H.M. 226
Stanton Rd (322665) 23
Stapelton & Sons, Messrs 266
Staples, Ellis Brown 86
Star Picture Hall 53
Starr-Bowkett Benefit Bldg Soc. / see "Croydon Starr-Bowkett Benefit Bldg Soc."
Station Rd (322661) 23
Steer the younger, Jas 60
Steer, Mr 144n
Stepney, Mx 149
Still, H. 113
Stocks 106-107
Stoke Newington, Mx 224
Stoke Newington British Sch 224, 250n
Stokes Rd (359672) 377-379
Stone Pk Av., Beckenham 380
Stoneleigh Pk Av. (360675) 330, 381
Stratford, Archbp 97
Strathmore Rd (325667) 23, 283
Stratton, Mr 350
Streatfield, A.C. 459
Streatham, Sy 29, 34, 291, 308, 459
Street Works Acts 348
Streeter's Hl 95, 116-117, 124n, 253, 264
Stretton Rd (335666) 82
Stroud Green Ia. / see "Shirley Rd"
Suffolk 297, 445
Sugden, J. 181
Sullivan, Mary 168
Summerson, Sir Jn 370
Summer Rd (317665) 23, 33, 45, 78, 81, 86, 427, 429
Sun Court, Cornhill, E.C. 35
Sunday School Union / see "Croydon Sunday Sch. Union"
Sunningdale Hse, Bensham Manor Rd 84
Sunray Chalet Homes 361
Surrey Iron Railway 19,49,54, 105n
Sussex 322,459
Sutton, Sy 29,54,283,291,459
Swift & Co. Ltd 64n
Sydenham, Kt 286n,291
Sydenham Rd (327664) 23,62n
Sykes, T. 380
T.A. Centre 23
Taberner Hse 276n
Tamworth Autos 54
Tamworth Fl. (320656) 57n, 64n,87
Tamworth Rd (321659) 23,49- 50,52-54,57-59,63-64,68- 69,72,74,83-84,87,90n, 202,430-431
Tancock, Mr 11ln
Tancock, Wm 60,69,77n
Tandridge, Sy 310
Tanner & Sons, Messrs 266
Tardrew, Harold 386
Tardrew snr, Mr 382
Tavern in the Town 283n
Tavistock Grove (326666) 23
Tavistock Rd (325664) 23
Tavistock Sec. Girls' Sch. 54
Taylor, Daniel 114
Taylor, Miss I.D.10
Taylor, Jn Mann 144,175
Taylor, Coun. Martin 203, 282n,458
Technical College 23
Telephone Exchange 96
Tenison, Archbp 29-30
Tenison's Charity, Archbp 29- 30
Thames 19,162,291,303
Theobald Rd (317658) 23
Thirsk, Dr Joan 8
Thompson, Dr Francis 458
Thompson, Mr 261
Thornhill Rd (323667) 23
Thornton Heath 241,263n,291
Three Tuns 95,106
Thrift, Ald Jn 203,208,251, 458
Thursday market 97,112
Tidy, Wm 81
Timblick, Edw 388
Times 104
Titsey, Sy 87
Tooting, Sy 54,291,306
Tower View (361665) 330,389, 389,402
Town, The 103
Town Clerk 97,113-114,203, 239,253,258-259,262,268, 278
Town fair / see "July fair" /
Town Hall Gdns 276,288
Town Surveyor 192
Tractarians 251,458
Tracy, Martin 10
Tramways 20,25n,54,178,198, 200-201,327
Tramways Co. / see "Croydon & Norwood Tramways Co." /
Treasury 208
Trent, Frank W. 10,374,394- 395
Trent, Rich. Wm 10,372,374, 394
Trevelyan, G.P. 226
Triangle, The 56
Triangle Yard 56
Trinity Sch. of Jn Whitgift 33ln
Trolley bus services 54n
Tudor Lodge, Wickham Rd 354
Turner, Wm 168
Tussaud, Louis 261
Uckfield, Sm 298,459
Union Bank 95
Union Rd (324669) 23
Union St 157
United Dairies Ltd 404
Upfield (348657) 381
Upper Drayton Pl. (322658) 51,54-55,71n,86,430
Upper Elmers End Rd, 330
Beckenham
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Greensand</td>
<td>105n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Norwood Ward</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land sub-committee</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Walk (353659)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation Court</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, W.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venables, Joseph</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdayne Av. (358658)</td>
<td>330, 353n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestry</td>
<td>73, 112, 192, 217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestry Clerk</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>223, 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicar of Shirley</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarage Rd (314655)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria, Queen</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Stn</td>
<td>291, 366-367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigers, Francis</td>
<td>178, 181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinchett the butcher</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine Cottage</td>
<td>29n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>56n, 159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon</td>
<td>2, 22, 88, 291, 315, 322, 459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon Marsh</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon Marsh Ltd</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon New Rd (320658)</td>
<td>23, 52, 71, 78-79, 81, 85, 87, 430-431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon Rd (317653)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldrons, The (320648)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>293, 297, 432-433, 436n, 442-443, 446-448, 452-453, 460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller, David</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallington, Sy</td>
<td>265-266, 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walpole Rd (325658)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walters, Wm Melmoth</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth, Sy</td>
<td>261, 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandle, River</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandle Pl</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandle Rd (323650)</td>
<td>23, 271n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth, Sy</td>
<td>49, 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Det. Sgt</td>
<td>163-164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Jesse</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward's Commercial and General Croydon Directory</td>
<td>424, 478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham, Sy</td>
<td>29, 291, 305, 357, 459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Rd (317650)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>296, 444-445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Land Commissioners</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Land Trustees</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Cuttee</td>
<td>210, 214, 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Pl., Derby Rd</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Rd, London</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters, Geo.</td>
<td>29n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterworks Yd (322654)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins, A.H.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watton, Wm Stephen</td>
<td>58, 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wawman, Thos</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wawman &amp; Sons, Messrs Thos</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddal &amp; Co. Ltd, W.</td>
<td>64n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday market</td>
<td>97, 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightman, Cound. Jas</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Hall Mission</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome's Rd, Kenley</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weller, Tim.</td>
<td>51n, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Rd (325657)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Rd (318667)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Terr., St James's Rd 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendover, Stone Pk Av.,</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckenham</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Ann</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Frdk</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Harold W.</td>
<td>10, 372, 389n, 401-402, 404-405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Thos</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, W.H.</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West &amp; Sons Ltd / see &quot;West Ltd, W.H.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West &amp; Sons Ltd, W.H.</td>
<td>10, 405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Croydon</td>
<td>54, 251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Croydon Men's Hostel / see &quot;Municipal Lodging Hse, Pitlake&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Croydon railway bridge</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Croydon Stn</td>
<td>2, 19, 22, 35, 36, 38, 41, 49, 66-67, 69, 202, 213, 327, 411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Houses Ltd / see &quot;West Ltd, W.H.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kent</td>
<td>19, 309, 311, 334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ltd, W.H.</td>
<td>401-406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pl., Waddon New Rd</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (Redhill) Ltd / see &quot;West Ltd, W.H.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West St. (323649)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ward</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Way (359657)</td>
<td>330, 369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wickham, Kt 291,329,334-335, 353, 365, 384n, 465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wickham Stn</td>
<td>344-345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield Rd (318657)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westman Cotts, Lower Drayton Pl. 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>291, 459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whipping post</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Jane</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Thos</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Son, T.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart, West Wickham</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White's building yd</td>
<td>77n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitechapel, Mr</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehorse Rd (325669)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehouse Villas, Clarendon Rd</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitgift, Archbp</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitgift Hospital</td>
<td>see &quot;Whitgift Hospital&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitgift Hospital 19,76,95-96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitgift Sch.</td>
<td>10,19,71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittington Life Office</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickham Av. (361660) 330,352-353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickham Rd (358657) 330-331,342,353-354,365,367-368,387,394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wight, Isle of</td>
<td>81, 459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilford Rd (324670)</td>
<td>168, 269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins, J.W.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Harold</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, J.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams &amp; Partners, Messrs Harold 10,472-473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>296,444-445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon, Sy</td>
<td>291,306n,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimpey, Messrs</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Rd (322668)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window duty</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter, Harriet</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woburn Rd (324663)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Mr</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock, Mr</td>
<td>144n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Wy (362663) 330,353-356,383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmansterne, Sy</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmere Av. (358667) 330,338n,340,344-345,357,366,375,385,394-395,402,454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmere Ct. (358667) 330,395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmere Gdns (357666) 330,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods, Sam.</td>
<td>177-178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside 2,186,291,322,330,343,358,384n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside Stn 2,344,358,366-367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock Rd (327651)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Arsenal</td>
<td>394,340n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>297,445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workhouse</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War I 53,64,115,331,340n,374,389,394,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II 6,21,24n,46,59n,343n,359,379-380,385,387,389,392-393,403,407-409,420,477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Frdr</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Jas</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Jas Spurrier</td>
<td>78-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylie, Mr</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylie &amp; Berlyn, Messrs 9,363,368,381-389,393-394,406-407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gate, Regent's Pk</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Levi</td>
<td>44n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young's Fire Proof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositories 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeitz, W.</td>
<td>36n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

Page facing 2, line 28. For "Triangle" read "area"

Page 2. For "St James Road" read "St James's Road"

Page 9, penultimate line. For "Kingston-upon-Thames" read "Kingston upon Thames"

Page 20, line 20. For "Tramway" read "Tramways"

Page 76, penultimate line. For "Terrace" read "terrace"


Page 106, line 13. For "Stocks and Pillory" read "stocks and pillory"

Page 226, line 10. For "Coldwell's" read "Coldwells"

Page 275, first paragraph. The Lodging House closed its doors for the last time on Sunday 2 November, 1969. The Council refused to take responsibility for rehousing 22 of the 55 residents on the grounds that they were in regular employment and should be able to find their own accommodation. A further 14 have been admitted to old people's homes and others are being looked after by the Housing Committee or the mental health authorities, or have opted to find their own accommodation: Croydon Advertiser, 31 October, 1969, p.1.
URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT IN CROYDON, 1835-1940

Summary of thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Leicester by R C W Cox MA, March 1970

An earlier dissertation illustrated the causes, methods and parochialism of the nineteenth and twentieth century development of two Croydon suburbs. ¹

The first of four sections of the present thesis seeks and finds analogies in the development of another, and more central, part of the town. It also shows that the urban growth of Croydon was influenced by its being a long-established market town.

Yet, ironically, whilst so much new building was proceeding, the market area itself was deteriorating and acquiring an increasingly evil reputation. The second part of the dissertation shows how and why this was happening and examines the attempts to find a remedy.

Ultimate success, through municipal compulsory purchase, was only possible because greatly increased resources of finance and expertise had become available with the town's rapid growth. The third part of the dissertation, therefore, sets out to discover more about this growth; to find out who the new Croydonians were, and from whence they had come. It shows that in the mid-nineteenth century Croydon was still in the line of population movement towards London, despite considerable working-class immobility and an out-flow from London, small numerically but influential financially and politically, of upper- and middle-class people.

These last were the forerunners of the thousands of daily commuters of the mid 1930's. It seemed appropriate, therefore, to conclude the dissertation with a study of an inter-War housing estate. This brought to light abundant evidence of incompetent methods of land division and sale, the fallibility of planning legislation, builders' under-

---

capitalisation and lack of expertise, the apparent insecurity of their employees, the strong element of chance in the way the estate developed, and the short distance that incoming residents had moved.

It would seem that the characteristics of Croydon's development changed far less in a century than did almost any other facet of the town's life.

I certify that the thesis is the result of work done mainly during the period of registration.

(M C W Cox)
16 March 1970