The 114th Annual General Meeting of the London Topographical Society will be held on Monday 7 July 2014 at the Mansion House, Walbrook, EC4N 8NH. Please note that members need to advise in advance – by Friday 20 June – if they wish to attend.

The AGM will be held in the Egyptian Hall at the Mansion House. This is only the second time the Society has had an opportunity to meet in the building which is the home and office of the Lord Mayor of London, the previous occasion being the inaugural meeting of the Society in 1880. Our chairman writes about this on p.2. The Lord Mayor, Fiona Woolf (only the second woman to hold this office), is hoping to be able to welcome us.

Agenda

1. Minutes of the 113th AGM.
5. Election of Council Officers and Members.
6. Proposals by Members.
7. Any other business.

Item 1 can be found on the Society’s website; for items 2 and 3 see pp.18-19.

Following the AGM, Ian Archer will give a short talk about the 2014 publication, *Les Singularitez de Londres*, and Sally Jeffrey will give a talk on the history of the Mansion House.

Please note that we are limited to 350 seats so, due to the anticipated interest in this venue, the Council has decided to make this a ‘Members Only’ meeting, but members who need mobility assistance may bring a guest. Seats will be allocated on a first-come first-served basis. Unlike most of our earlier AGMs, this year, due to the Mansion House’s security needs, we need to know in advance, by 20 June, who will be coming. If you wish to attend please let our Secretary, Mike Wicksteed, know as soon as possible (including the name of your mobility guest where applicable). Your name(s) will be ticked off on arrival.

In case we end up with fewer than 350 applications and you would like to bring a guest, please let Mike know when you apply for your seat and he will make a note of your wish. Any extra seating allocation will, again, be on a first-come first-served basis and Mike will advise closer to the date if guests may attend.

Mike’s email address is: mike.wicksteed@btinternet.com (preferred); his postal address is: 103 Harestone Valley Road, Caterham, Surrey CR3 6HR (if you use this, please enclose a SAE if you would like to bring a guest, in case a seat becomes available).

Arrival Admittance to the Mansion House will start at 4.45pm. On arrival please enter by the door at street level on Walbrook Street where your name will be ticked off. You will then pass through a security barrier and bags will be x-rayed.

Refreshments Due to high catering costs at the Mansion House, refreshments will be tea and biscuits, served from 5.00pm. The meeting will start at 6.00pm. We hope to provide our usual ample tea next year.

Disabled Parking The Egyptian Room has wheelchair access and a limited number of disabled parking spaces are available. If required, please contact Mike Wicksteed (mike.wicksteed@btinternet.com).

How to get there

Tube: Closest – Bank (DLR, Central, Northern, Waterloo & City lines)
Mansion House Station, a quarter of a mile away on Queen Victoria Street (District and Circle lines)

Bus: King William Street: 21, 43, 133, 501; Bank: D9, 11, 15B, 21, 23, 26; Cheapside: 8, 22B, 25, 501; Threadneedle Street: 149

Train: Liverpool Street; Cannon Street; Fenchurch Street; Moorgate; Blackfriars; City Thameslink

More information on the Mansion House is available at: www.cityoflondon.gov.uk (type ‘Mansion House’ into the search engine).
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The Mansion House revisited

On 28 October 1880 the inaugural meeting of the London Topographical Society took place at the Mansion House, the Lord Mayor’s official residence. 134 years later we are privileged to be invited to return.

The birth pangs of the Society were protracted and distant. Major General J. Baillie wrote from India in 1873 to suggest that a topographical society might take its place as a learned society alongside the Geological and Genealogical Societies. The man who picked up the ball and ran with it was Henry B. Wheatley, whose London Past and Present (1891) is now a classic. Wheatley focused on topography as the essence of the new society but the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society deplored the idea: ‘the proposed society is (to say the least) unnecessary’.

Fortunately, the formation of the LTS appealed to the Lord Mayor, hence the inaugural meeting at the Mansion House. Wheatley was put in charge of future publications and he was supported by a committee that included the civil engineer, Sir Joseph Bazalgette; the architect and editor of The Builder, George Godwin; the Clerk to the London County Council, Laurence Gomme; the author Edward Walford and John G. Crace, decorator and designer.

It is not recorded whether or not those present at the meeting were entertained to tea but it is recorded that 139 founder members enrolled. In 2014 we boast a record number of members (approaching 1,200). In 1880 the annual membership fee was one guinea; it is now £18 by UK standing order, for which modest sum members receive the Newsletters, the annual publication(s) and enjoy a convivial AGM – this year’s meeting being more splendid than any other since 1880.

Penelope Hunting

Note Stephen Marks wrote an account of the Society’s foundation and early years for the London Topographical Record vol xxiv (1980). We plan to reprint this in the Record for 2015.

Notes and News

The Society’s website, www.topsoc.org

Following members’ suggestions, as a result of some hard work by our secretary and our printers, The Ludo Press Ltd, we are placing a copy of the Newsletter on-line six months after the paper edition is circulated to our members, starting with the May 2013 edition (No 76). Hover over the ‘Newsletters’ box at the left to select the edition: the contents page contains links to the relevant articles. Weblinks mentioned are live, and you can also locate references to people and places through the search facility. We are investigating the possibility of including earlier back numbers of the Newsletter on-line as well.

The reorganisation of English Heritage into two slimmer organisations, one to deal with the portfolio of properties, the other, to be named Historic England, concerned with designation, grant and planning issues, has involved shedding of the Survey of London. The good news is that the Survey has found a new home, within the Faculty of the Built Environment at University College London. Following the publication of two areas south of the river, Woolwich (reviewed in the last Newsletter) and Battersea (see p.14) its current concern is with St Marylebone, the fascinatingly complex area of central London between Oxford Street and Regent’s Park. The other news from English Heritage which caused widespread concern was a threat to the future of the very popular Blue Plaques scheme. But largely thanks to a generous donation, the scheme will continue with a reduced staff; it is planned to erect twelve new plaques a year. For more details see www.english-heritage.org.uk/discover/blue-plaques

Latest news from the Postal Museum. Islington Borough Council have approved a planning application to develop a stretch of the old Post Office Underground Railway – Mail Rail – into a subterranean ride as part of a visit to The Postal Museum, due to open in 2016. Visitors will be able to explore the hidden world of Mail Rail under Mount Pleasant through an interactive exhibition and a ride through 1km of the original tunnels, following the same route that much of the nation’s mail took for nearly 80 years from 1927-2003.

St Stephen’s Chapel. Westminster is the subject of a research project being undertaken by the University of York. For details of programme and events see the website virtualststephens.org.uk

Martin Williams 1943-2014

The Council was well represented at Martin’s cremation and the subsequent wake in the Nash Conservatory in Kew Gardens. Although busy on a variety of projects during his retirement, including treasurership of LAMAS, Martin had been a stalwart volunteer for delivering LTS publications in the past two years. Many members sending in their
subscription cheques had remarked to me on the delivery ‘by your charming assistant’. Martin had planned to do a piece for the Newsletter on the enjoyable time he had had in meeting fellow members and discussing their various interests, but his sudden illness brought that to a halt.

We understand that the Society may be receiving a bequest from Martin’s estate and we shall find a suitably commemorative project.

– Roger Cline

Circumspice

Where is this cascade? See p.13.

Exhibitions


These are essential viewing and reading for anyone who wants to understand what is happening in London now and what the future may hold. The exhibition is not intended as a plug for the greedy developer, but is an objective investigation of the 236 buildings over 20 storeys which have recently been completed, are already in the pipeline, or for which planning permission is being sought, with the aim of encouraging further discussion. ‘Key areas of growth’ include a wide swathe of south London; do not miss the photomontages demonstrating the staggering transformations likely at Vauxhall Nine Elms and Blackfriars Road. ‘Densification’ may affect areas in Greater London as well. Proposals for towers are most numerous in the south and east, but the ‘Opportunity areas’ in the Mayor’s London Plan also include Brent Cross and Old Oak Common.

Open Garden Squares weekend. This wonderful opportunity to explore London’s open spaces is on 14-15 June 2014, organised by London Parks and Gardens Trust in association with the National Trust. For details see www.opensquares.org


William Kent was an aspiring artist from a humble background, who travelled to Italy and attracted a succession of noble patrons, chief among them the young Lord Burlington, keen to establish a new correct style of classical architecture in reaction to the baroque of the Stuart Court. Kent switched from painting to furniture and interior design, inspired by contemporary work in Rome, and then to architecture and landscape gardening. His lively and sensitive response to his clients’ requirements, ranged from appropriately small but luxurious furnishings for Burlington’s miniature Chiswick House, to theatrical interiors for aristocratic mansions (the extreme example in London is 44 Berkeley Square). Less well known are his monuments in Westminster Abbey, and some precocious excursions in the Gothic taste. He was clearly a likeable chap who endeared himself to his patrons, as one can guess from two informal reciprocal portrait sketches by Kent and Lady Burlington.

Had the Hanoverian monarchy and the government been so minded, Westminster might have been transformed into a new Rome, with court and parliament housed in classical palazzi by this versatile designer. A promising start was made in the 1730s with Kent’s new Royal Mews at Charing Cross for George II (on the site of the National Gallery), his magnificent barge for Prince Frederick (now in the National Maritime Museum), and his stately Treasury in Whitehall. But the Treasury was built without its intended wings, and next door, Kent’s Horseguards, a landmark on the King’s ceremonial route from St James’s to the Palace of Westminster, was completed by the Office of Works only after the architect’s death. Kent designed new royal interiors, but no new royal palace.

In the excellent exhibition, drawings and a huge model of a projected summer palace at Richmond demonstrate what might have been, but also Kent’s remarkable achievements. Within the tight space available, small vistas ingeniously remind one of his interest in the distant view. From lavishly carved and gilded furniture, one passes through a display of drawings for royal and public works, to a selection of the great mansions and landscapes, revealed by photos and videos. For a full discussion of Kent’s range one can turn to the book of the exhibition, but alas, this handsome but unwieldy breeze block is neither cheap nor easy to handle. It includes essays by a galaxy of leading experts; chapters of special interest for London topographers include Public Commissions by Frank
Salmon, Royal Commissions by Steven Brindle and Garden Buildings by John Harris.


An apt partner for the Kent exhibition is this celebration honouring the 300th anniversary of the Hanoverian succession. It explores the different types of art popular in the earlier eighteenth century, and their connections with members of the royal family, with due attention to their cultural roots in northern Europe. The well-known royal portraits and busts are complemented by a distinguished collection of oil paintings, and by some engaging Tudor memorabilia and miniatures, a special interest of Queen Caroline, wife of George II. One room is devoted to the innovative cartography encouraged by the military campaigns against the Jacobites in Scotland, highlighting the role of the artist Paul Sandby (who was present at the battle of Culloden). Contrasts of high and low life in London are demonstrated through Hogarth prints, and London topographers will especially enjoy the room dominated by the vast Kip panorama showing the formal avenues of the royal Park of St James, the new suburban expansion beyond, and the City on the skyline. The book develops these themes further, including the patronage of Queen Caroline and her son Prince Frederick, and a discussion of the Hanoverian palaces in Germany. Royal accommodation available in London must have appeared a poor substitute.


Kenwood House. Not a temporary exhibition, but a permanent display, Kenwood House on the fringe of Hampstead Heath, with a panoramic view of London from its grounds, and an exceptional collection of pictures inside, reopened in late 2013 after refurbishment by English Heritage. The exquisite Adam Library has been redecorated in its original colours of pink, green and blue, without the gilding added later. The entrance front has been repainted with a textured paint finish which replicates the original. Analysis of earlier layers showed that sand was strewn on the stone-coloured lead oil paint when still wet, to create the impression that the surfaces were of stone, not plaster and timber. (In reproducing this it was found more efficient to use quick-drying modern masonry paint and a compressed airgun rather than laborious and time-consuming strewing by hand!) The softer colour of the repainted entrance portico has the extra merit of harmonising with the flanking wings added in 1780. An added bonus is that the long neglected model dairy in the grounds has been repaired: the area around it will be cleared to restore the originally open views planned by Repton, but retaining three fine copper beeches after consultation with Kenwood’s tree lovers.

Changing London: New River Head

2013 was the 400th anniversary of the opening of the New River, that remarkable piece of early seventeenth-century engineering, crucial for the development of London, that created a canal to bring fresh water from Hertfordshire to the fringe of the City at New River Head, north Clerkenwell. The anniversary was celebrated by numerous walks and lectures; an account of the route, with pictorial maps, can be found online at shelford.org/walks/newriver.pdf. But, although the significance of the structures at New River Head has been the subject of a reappraisal by Islington Council, the future of this important historic site is uncertain. Recent years have seen piecemeal conversion of some of the New River Company buildings to residential use (including the former Headquarters building on Rosebery Avenue, of 1915-20, which houses the splendid Oak Room of 1693 from the Company’s Water House). Currently, planning permission for further housing has been granted, but is opposed by local amenity bodies (the Islington Buildings Preservation Trust, the Islington Society and the Amwell Society) together with the Heritage of London Trust, who have asked for a
government review by the Minister for Planning. The site is owned by a property company (Turnhold, Islington). The buildings at risk are the Engine Pump House built c.1768, partly still in use for a pumping plant, the base of the Windmill (which provided the energy for pumping water before steam power), and a nineteenth-century store building. Islington’s updated planning brief stressed the historic importance of the group as a whole, urged upgrading of the buildings to II* because of their significance both nationally and for the development of London, and recommended future use as a ‘heritage and community facility’ with public access through the site. Let us hope that that the government review will support this imaginative approach.

The Crace Collection of Maps

Peter Barber, head of the British Library Map collection, introduces the newly digitised Crace Collection

The British Library is immensely grateful to the LTS for having financed the recataloguing and digitisation of the maps in its part of the Crace Collection. The re-cataloguing has now been completed. As a result all the maps are now included in the BL’s on-line catalogue, ‘Explore the British Library’ http://explore.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/search.do?dscnt=1&dstmp=1391363018055&vid=BLVU1&fromLogin=true where previously only a handful had been available. The cataloguing also meets the latest standards. Particular maps can be searched under a wide variety of headings (though be aware that searching for the ‘Fitzroy’ family’s estates will not pick up those where the name appears as ‘Fitz Roy’). The descriptions of the printed items have succinct cross-references, where appropriate, to bibliographies and other works of reference and to related maps in the Crace Collection. In the case of manuscript maps – such as the large hidden archive of eighteenth-century plans of properties owned by the Mercers’ Company – there are references to related plans in other archives and, where possible, information on provenance. A glance at the old printed catalogue will reveal how much more information is now available.

The situation regarding the digitised images is more complicated. Many are only going to be digitised in the next financial year, because of the pressures on our imaging department, but digitised they will all be by March 2015. At the moment the BL is re-modelling its website. This complex task will take some time to complete, but until it happens the existing website has, in effect, been frozen, so that no additional items are being added to our extremely popular Crace Maps website [www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/crace/]. There are therefore two ways in which to view the images of Crace Maps.

One is to go direct to the Crace Maps website, where you will be able to zoom in to the smallest details on your chosen maps and will find an extensive descriptive text.

The alternative – particularly useful for those maps that have been digitised but are not to be found on the Crace Maps website – is to go to ‘Explore the British Library’, using Google Chrome or Firefox but not Explorer. Once there, the best strategy is as follows:

1. Click on ‘Advanced Search’.
2. In the boxes on the left, enter your search term and in the box beneath, ‘Crace’.
3. Click the red box marked ‘search’.
4. You should then get a list of hits with a summary description in blue. Some contain a thumbnail image to the left. If there is such an image, a digital image is now available.
5. Select the map that interests you and click on the summary catalogue description that is printed in blue.
6. Once you have done so, you will be presented with a list of options, the first of which is ‘View online’. Underneath you will see a red box with ‘Go’.
7. Click on this.
8. Once you have done this you will find yourself either on the appropriate page of the Crace Maps website or looking at a jpeg image of the map which you want but which is not included on the Crace Maps website.
9. You will then, finally, be able to view the image.

If you are viewing a map which is not on the Crace website, you will be able to see what the map looks like but will have difficulty, if the map is large, in viewing all the inscriptions and the detail. The map has, in fact, been scanned to a high resolution, but these high definition images will only go on-line, once the BL’s website has been completely redesigned. If you want a high resolution image, the BL will be happy to supply you with one on a CD at a relatively low cost (currently £10).

We apologise for that, but beg for a little patience. Once the problems associated with making the BL’s vast holdings of digital imagery available have been overcome, the world at large will be able to enjoy the whole of the BL’s fantastic holdings of Crace maps online – thanks to the LTS.

Peter Barber

The Kerbstone Conundrum

Sarah Day, from the Geological Society, invites your observations

Last year, an article published in Geoscientist Magazine (www.geolsoc.org.uk/Geoscientist/Archive/June-2013/Kerbstone-conundrum) drew attention to the mysterious markings which can be
seen on Victorian kerbstones up and down the country. You’ve probably seen them many times, but perhaps haven’t considered their meaning or origin.

There are numerous theories, but no comprehensive explanation for what these markings mean, or why they were etched into the rocks – mostly granites and sandstones – used as kerbstones. Theories range from the practical – the markings indicate the presence of utilities like gas pipes, hydrants and electricity couplings – to the more outlandish suggestion that they are coded indications of the presence of Masonic Lodges. Perhaps they indicate the quarry or craftsman behind the stones – but if so, why are similar markings seen in varying locations, and on different rock types? And if they mark out utilities, why are there large stretches of kerbstones in London without any, in a city which, when the stones were laid, would have enjoyed all the mod cons?

As part of Earth Science Week 2013, we asked readers to send in pictures of kerbstone markings, in an attempt to find out more about them. We received submissions from across the country – you can see some of them on our Flickr account (https://www.flickr.com/photos/99330142@N05/sets/72157635581521476/).

The marks vary widely in type and quality – from meticulously chiselled Maltese crosses and letters with serifs, to poorly shaped symbols and letters. We found symbols and numbers in Plymouth, faint crosses in Canterbury and sequences of letters in Bloomsbury. We even received images of kerbstone markings in Pompeii.

Peter Dolan, the author of the original *Geoscientist* article, has been compiling the submissions and drawing his own conclusions, but there is still no comprehensive answer to what they mean. We’d love to receive more images from across the country – visit www.geolsoc.org.uk/kerbsurvey to find out how you can submit them.

And if you have any suggestions as to what the markings mean, we’d love to hear from you – email sarah.day@geolsoc.org.uk with your suggestions.

Earth Science Week 2014 is taking place on 13 – 19 October, with a theme of ‘Our Geo-Heritage’. To find out more about taking part, visit www.geolsoc.org.uk/Earthscienceweek

– Sarah Day

**Stockbridge Terrace RIP:**

*demolition and change in Victoria and Westminster, 1959-2013*

Oliver Bradbury explores the history of the rapidly changing area close to Victoria Station

The recent demolition of a sizeable portion of prime real estate in the form of two blocks at the bottom of Victoria Street prompted this writer to research the history of the older block, amongst the oldest surviving development in Victoria. This scale of demolition in central London is perhaps an unusual sight these days but alas is part of the ongoing incremental demolition of historic Westminster.

Beneath all the chopping and changing was the remains of a Regency domestic terrace on Victoria Street; the only trace now remaining is the gutted The Duke of York pub. This locality was once Pimlico, before Victoria was christened. There was nothing here in the eighteenth century, just fields, but there was a rough plot outline by 1815. The site to the immediate north – Brewer Street (now or what was Allington Street) and Warwick Row – was developed earlier, by 1813, probably because of the proximity to Buckingham Palace. The southern block was fully built around the perimeter by 1827.

The Duke of York public house was part of Stockbridge Terrace, which originally marked the bottom end of Vauxhall Bridge Road before Victoria Street was cut through in 1847-51. It was also the southern and western perimeter of the block that has recently been demolished at the bottom of Victoria Street. This block was bound by Victoria Street to the south, Allington Street to the north and east and Buckingham Palace Road to the west. Allington Street formed a dog leg connecting Buckingham Palace Road to Victoria Street [Fig. 1].

Stockbridge Terrace was on the Victoria Street side of the block and was probably built in 1816. In 1825, when Thomas Cubitt, the developer of the block, applied for some ground in and behind Stockbridge Terrace, it was part of Vauxhall Bridge Road. The terrace was certainly built by 1821 for it is clear from Greenwood’s *Map of London* that
Stockbridge Terrace continued, interrupted by Allington Street going north, beyond our block in an easterly direction incorporating The Duke of York pub, which dates from 1821, with later stucco dressings. With the proximity to Belgravia, it appears that Cubitt was developing Grosvenor Estate land for Stockbridge Terrace and the rest of the block. Is it coincidental that the 1st Marquess of Westminster acquired the Stockbridge Estate in Hampshire in 1831? The Victoria Palace Theatre marks the easterly end of Stockbridge Terrace and the former No. 124 Victoria Street marked the cutting through of Victoria Street and was the westernmost pavilion of Philip B. Lee’s Albert Mansions of 1867-69, a composition 500 feet long.

The level of recent destruction – two blocks worth – is vandalism on a heroic scale, reflecting a complete loss of nerve on the part of Westminster Council. The current temporary open sightlines reveal Victoria to be the architectural dog’s dinner it is; a complete mess of architectural styles or non-styles, all the coherence of the Regency and Victorian town planning destroyed by twentieth-century avarice. The loss of the Stockbridge Terrace block is another nail in the coffin of what was once a very grand and proud thoroughfare lined with magnificent Victorian buildings. The only survivals now are Nos 77-95 Victoria Street, the red brick block of 1885, and Artillery Mansions, No. 75 Victoria Street.

In the 1820s and 1830s there were two pubs in Stockbridge Terrace. The Duke of York and The Kings Arms, as well as private residences and every business you would ever need: a builder, stationer, cheesemonger, grocer and tallow chandler, poulterer and baker, piano forte maker and organ builder, butcher, print seller, a milliner and dressmaker; the insurance records go back to 1824. Although the Stockbridge Terrace block was fully built around the perimeter by 1827, the first edition OS map of 1867 indicates that there had been a gradual process of infilling of the interior into a dense matrix of interlocking properties. Until at least 1920 the 1820s character of Stockbridge Terrace was well preserved, that is a domestic terrace of four storey, two bay-wide stucco-fronted town houses. Around the corner, Nos 81-85 Buckingham Palace Road [Fig. 2] was given the upwardly mobile Belgravia treatment and appears to have been updated in the 1840s, perhaps to make respectable opposite neighbours for the charming Victoria Square speculation by Matthew Wyatt built in 1838-1842.

The block to the north of Stockbridge Terrace was redeveloped early on with the splendidly High Victorian Gorringe’s Stores on the site of Cubitt houses, c.1879. This building in Warwick Row and on Buckingham Palace Road was demolished in 1961-63 and replaced with a building that no one will miss, Lakeview Court (old Thistle Hotel). Cubitt housing in Warwick Row itself was demolished in 1959 and although replaced with the ghastly Carrier House (designed in 1960 by The City of London Real Property Company Ltd [CLRP Architects], and built in 1961), the actual street – itself of considerable age – survived the complete redevelopment of the immediate area.

The 1820s appearance of Stockbridge Terrace and the rest of the block was degraded from the 1930s onwards when parts of the block were completely rebuilt, or at least refronted, but this cumulative redevelopment actually gave the block great character, albeit in a haphazard way. Sutton House, Nos 156-58 Victoria Street, was a 1930s interloper and Listed as recently as 2009; its 2013 demolition making a complete mockery of our valuable national Listing system [Fig. 3]. This was a decent Art Deco building of 1935 with beautiful
original interior fittings. The planned re-use of the Sutton House façade within a much taller, glassy monolith on the approximate site would be absurd.

Equally if not more deplorable is the demolition of the splendid 1926 Classical Midland (latterly HSBC) Bank by Whinney, Son and Austen Hall on the corner of Victoria Street and Buckingham Palace Road [Fig. 4]. The building on the adjacent site was an empty plot in 1951 – perhaps because of war damage – and therefore the undemonstrative edifice here that was recently demolished was a 1950s infill. This block continued to be spliced up with later development including the crudely Postmodern Allington Towers of 1985-86 on the site of the auditoria for a cinema of 1928-1930 by George Coles. This was the Metropole Cinema (latterly the Ask restaurant), an elegant Neo-Georgian/Art Deco building that had its foyer block on Victoria Street at Nos 160-162, next to Sutton House; it was marble-faced, with a glazed barrel-vaulted former tearoom behind the upper window, although painting had superficially spoiled its pilastered front [Fig. 5]. There was also another cinema (Cameo), a mere three doors away, using the very narrow frontage of a rebuilt Stockbridge Terrace Regency townhouse, leading to a free-standing auditorium within the Stockbridge Terrace block. Art Deco in style, it opened in 1936 and closed in 1980. Allington Towers was then built on the combined site of both cinemas.

The Stockbridge Terrace block was a classic inner London block with two named yards deep within, Watling’s Yard and Allington Place (1906-19 OS map). Although always heavily populated by businesses, any vestige of domestic occupation was probably lost when commercial Victoria Street was cut through. The Stockbridge Terrace name had gone by the time of the 1906-1919 map, if not long before.

Amazingly, there are still pockets of 1820s houses on Vauxhall Bridge Road that allow us to gain an impression of what the original Stockbridge Terrace looked like. Trellick Terrace and Pembroke Place, both by Cubitt, dated from c.1822-1827 [Fig. 6]. The rump of Pembroke Place remains, as does Belvoir Terrace, but the names have gone, as have those of Bedford Place, Howick Terrace and Gloucester Terrace.

The Duke of York pub is all that remains of Stockbridge Terrace. Although it has been mercifully spared from the recent scorched earth policy, even here the interior has been gutted. At the bottom of Victoria Street decent shops have been demolished just for replacement shops. The former bank on the corner could have been retained as a visual anchor for the new
Recreating London in 1666

LTS Member Ian Doolittle looks at challenges offered by the wealth of information available on London before and after the Great Fire

I wonder if readers of the Newsletter have seen the prize-winning video by Pudding Lane Productions? It is a marvellously evocative ‘fly-through’ recreation of the London which was devastated by the Fire in 1666. It is not of course the first attempt to give us a chance to ‘touch and feel’ those dramatic days, getting Pepys’ celebrated account to leap off the pages of his Diary. Visitors to the Museum of London – or its website – have long been treated to imaginative ‘experiences’ of this kind. Nevertheless the video spurred me to articulate a long-held belief that the historical records produced by the dramatic events of 1666 provide a wonderful opportunity to create a topographical platform for the study of London not just in that year but for decades before and after the Fire.

A comprehensive, reliable reconstruction of London in 1666 would help answer a number of important questions. First there are the dynamics of change. What actually happened after the Fire? How many people were displaced, where from and for how long? How were their properties and their neighbourhoods affected? What difference did the street widening and public building work make? And, over the longer term, was the Fire the catalyst for the transformation of the Square Mile from a cheek-by-jowl living-and-trading community to a commercial-and-business ‘space’ – or was that a much later phenomenon? Then there are the important details of occupation and ownership. Who lived where – was this determined by trade or location? Who owned what – whether as freeholder or long leaseholder, as ‘institution’ or individual? Who were the ‘mere’ occupiers and who comprised their households? If we can get documented answers to these questions we would have a solid basis for pursuing a wide range of historical enquiries – some serious academic ones but also many not-so-grand ones, which will interest individual researchers and readers.

The available records are rich indeed. At their core are those generated by the Fire itself. The LTS itself published some of the key documents at the time of the Fire’s tercentenary. There are facsimiles of the building site surveys carried out by Peter Mills and John Oliver. (Sadly, Robert Hooke’s surveys are lost.) The LTS also printed a list of ‘foundations’, i.e. permissions to rebuild. The City Corporation printed two calendars of the decrees issued by the so-called Fire Court, established to settle disputes between landlords and tenants. (There are some 1600 decrees in all and I am at work calendaring the remainder.) Then there are the maps, not the grand and abortive plans for redesigning the City (nor even Wenceslaus Hollar’s beautiful efforts) but rather John Ogilby and William Morgan’s astonishingly detailed and

The deadline for contributions to the next Newsletter is 16 October 2014.

Suggestions of books for review should be sent to the Newsletter Editor; contact details are on the back page.
surprisingly reliable map of 1676, printed as *The A to Z of Restoration London* (not to mention the LTS’s recent edition of Morgan’s 1682 map). All this might be enough on its own but the Fire occurred in the middle of the series of Hearth Tax returns. Data for London and Middlesex is already available through ‘British History On-line’ but a critical edition is about to be published by the Centre for Hearth Tax Research. Further, supplementary sources abound. The London Metropolitan Archives has ward and parish listings aplenty and through the internet-based ‘ROLLCO’ (londonroll.org) there is now ready (and expanding) access to details of apprentices and others who appear in the Livery Companies’ archives. Mention should also be made of the long series of detailed orphans’ inventories (recording room-by-room possessions). The list could go on.

Drawing this material together in a reliable, consistent way would require careful planning and co-ordination. Fortunately, there is plenty of experience and expertise out there. The Centre for Metropolitan History has run many substantial projects and through its current Director, Matthew Davies, and in collaboration with Sheffield and Hertfordshire Universities, has developed ways of generating inter-active maps of London in an initiative called ‘Locating London’s Past’ (locatinglondon.org). (CMH and partners have exciting plans to apply similar techniques over longer timescales to reveal ‘London’s layers’.) Many other well-known London historians and their institutions are helping to make sources accessible to all who may be interested. Vanessa Harding (Birkbeck) wrote a helpful piece in *History Today* recently. There is also some good work already under way, notably Jacob Field’s subtle use of the Hearth Tax data to show how Londoners experienced and responded to the Fire.

The post-Fire surveys offer only partial coverage. Quite apart from the small matter of Hooke’s missing surveys, many landowners resolved their disputes without recourse to the City Surveyors – and of course the Fire did not touch – and certainly did not destroy – all of the Square Mile. In other words, there are plenty of missing or ‘un-placeable’ pieces of the jigsaw. In coordinating information, an iterative, parallel approach would be vital, building a honey-comb structure from the surveys where possible and using the other data where not – and all the while testing the results against whatever evidence comes to hand.

If any readers think this a worthwhile endeavour I should be very pleased to hear from members by email to idoolittlehistory@hotmail.com (the joke is intentional!).

– Ian Doolittle

**Circumspice (see p.3)**

If you enter Bushey Park in the London Borough of Richmond from the north-west, and strike out boldly across the grass towards the Waterhouse and Pheasantry plantations, you may soon find yourself in soggy ground, or having to negotiate ditches and other watercourses. You may also miss one of the park’s hidden treasures: the water gardens laid out by Charles Montagu, Earl of Halifax, in the second decade of the eighteenth century.

They consist of an octagonal upper basin spilling over a fine, wide cascade of five steps into a smaller but more exquisitely shaped lower basin. Halifax was Ranger of Bushey Park and set about rebuilding his official residence, the Upper Lodge, and its grounds. In 1719 he wrote to his uncle John Montagu asking for details of an ornamental basin at his home, Boughton House in Northamptonshire, whose unusual three-lobed shape Halifax had it in mind to copy at Bushey. To supply his upper basin with water, he tapped into the existing Longford River, a 12-mile-long artificial waterway built for Charles I in 1638–39 as a water supply for Hampton Court.

After serving the water garden the Longford River heads south across the park to feed the line of wildlife-friendly plantations already mentioned, then goes on to supply a series of ornamental ponds to the east of the main Chestnut Avenue, and the avenue’s unmissable vista stopper, the Diana or Arethusa Fountain. Halifax’s water garden is, by contrast, easy to miss. Immaculately restored in 2009 after years of neglect, it is hidden away behind the Upper Lodge and its associated buildings, and guarded by formidable-looking gates to keep not you but the park’s deer out. It is open to the public – a tranquil place to sit in the sun and see and hear the Longford River’s water gently splashing over its cascade.

– Tony Aldous

---

**Subscriptions**

Subscriptions for 2014 are at the same rates as for 2013: £20 for UK addresses and £30 for those abroad. If you do not have a standing order set up, then you will need to pay by the due date of 1 January. A cheque to the Treasurer is preferred, but you can pay through the website if you wish. Payment by cheque for up to five years in advance will be accepted as a hedge against inflation.

If you fancy meeting fellow members in your locality and are coming to the AGM, how about volunteering to deliver this year’s publication around your local area? For further details, email the Treasurer before the AGM with the postal districts you could cover:
roger.cline13@gmail.com

---

Lundenwic, literally the vicus of London, is the Anglo-Saxon name for what Bede, writing in the early eighth century, described as 'an emporium for many nations who come to it by land and sea'. The name is first recorded in 673-85, in a Kentish law-code, but in its Latin version appears on Anglo-Saxon gold coins of the 630s and in a royal charter dating to c.672/4, which refers to the 'port' of London. For years, this great Middle Saxon emporium was assumed to have been located within the old Roman walled city, despite the dearth of archaeological evidence. However, following Biddle and Vince's hypothesis proposed in 1984, its location within the Strand area was confirmed beyond doubt in the following year, when extensive evidence for Middle Saxon occupation was found on the site of Covent Garden's Jubilee Hall. Further excavations followed, most spectacularly at the large Royal Opera House site, where Anglo-Saxon levels survived remarkably well, and on a large scale.

This splendidly illustrated monograph, published by Museum of London Archaeology, provides a fascinating new guide to this major port, its beginnings, and its decline. Based on eighteen separate investigations carried out between 1987 and 2000 within the area to the north of the Strand, it greatly extends the picture given in the 2003 publication of the Royal Opera House site with a wealth of detail, including an invaluable gazetteer of all sites producing evidence of Early-Middle Anglo-Saxon activity within central London. The important 2005-6 excavations under the portico of St Martin-in-the-Fields, and other sites not yet published, have also been assessed in the discussions here. All fieldwork took place in advance of development, on sites of all sizes, and sometimes in extremely difficult conditions. The resultant piecing together of Lundenwic's story from many complex and truncated fragments – rubbish pits, wells, latrines, burials and elements of structures – is a heroic achievement, which transforms our understanding of the Anglo-Saxon town.

A series of elegant maps plotting the archaeological evidence give shape to the Anglo-Saxon vic. It had three zones: south of the Strand, where a Roman road remained in use, the land sloped steeply down to an embanked waterfront, dated by dendro-chronology to AD 679: the Middle Saxon shoreline ran across Charing Cross station. A core zone of dense activity lay to the north in current Covent Garden; while at its fringes, the settlement fades into gravel quarries, horticulture and husbandry. To the north, it petered out in boggy ground south of the Roman road running along High Holborn/New Oxford Street. Its western limit was in Trafalgar Square, and confined upstream by marshy land; on the east side, the limit may extend to the Fleet valley, though this is less certain. Covering an area from Trafalgar Square to Aldwych (at least) and from the Middle Saxon waterfront to Shorts Gardens in the north, this was a substantial area; smaller than Roman London, but significantly larger than the other Anglo-Saxon emporia at York, Hamwic (Southampton) and Ipswich.

Why the trading centre was located here, rather than in the walled Roman town, remains unclear; abandoned in the early fifth century, Roman London remained unoccupied until the foundation of St Paul's in 604: Anglo-Saxon activity in the walled city appears slight in this period, and was probably confined to ecclesiastical and royal functions, until systematic reoccupation took place towards the end of the ninth century. Lundenwic probably began as a seasonal beach market along the waterfront; though evidence of fifth- to seventh-century activity is found in central London, there are no signs of organised settlement there until the later seventh century. Radio-carbon dates reveal that at that point things took off rapidly across the area. A cemetery in Covent Garden – including richly furnished burials – was built over immediately after its abandonment in the last third of the seventh century. Temporary structures such as tents and fences were superseded by signs of more structured layout, especially at the Royal Opera House site, where a regular and well-maintained street system suggest a degree of planning. The speed and organisation of this development has suggested that it was set up under a central, presumably royal, authority, to facilitate the levying of tolls on trade and transactions on commodities entering the port. A date in the 670s fits with the early documentary evidence, and suggests that it was in the reign of the Mercian king Wulfhere (658-75), whose successors continued to control London throughout the eighth century. Regional and foreign trade are well-represented in the evidence; imports such as pottery and quernstones suggest that this trade was largely with the Low Countries, northern France, and the Rhineland, though the occasional presence of dried figs and grapes may indicate more far-flung contacts. Craft activities, such as ironworking and textile production, are well-represented, and animal bones provide a rich source of evidence for husbandry and butchering, as well as diet.

Between the late seventh and the early-mid ninth century, Lundenwic belonged to an international network of similar trading centres: though shifting patterns of activity are evident over this period, its heyday lasted up to the middle of the eighth century. At its height it occupied an area of around
60 hectares, with a population estimated at 6,000. Thereafter, it shrank in size and gradually declined until the focus of the Anglo-Saxon town shifted back to the defensible walled city, under King Alfred. The authors suggest that this was probably due to several separate factors – the threat of Viking attacks, certainly, but also a series of fires in Lundenwic itself, and unrest both in England and in the Carolingian kingdoms.

No doubt future fieldwork will shed more light on this and many other tantalising questions concerning the development of Anglo-Saxon London; but this book will remain a landmark in our understanding of the history and topography of the Anglo-Saxon town. The authors are to be congratulated on a fascinating synthesis of the rich archaeological data, which provides a very readable, and richly detailed account of Lundenwic, as we can now at last begin to see it.

— Leslie Webster


In 1674 the City poet Thomas Jordan invoked the national benefits of a harmonious capital:

‘If City and Court together Consort
This Nation cannot be undone[e]
Then let the Hall ring, with God prosper the King
And bless the Lord Mayor of London’

This vision was far from the brutal realities of late unhappy times. Yet Jordan’s words were delivered at a celebration during which Charles II became the first king ever to accept the freedom of the City of London, acknowledging not only their interdependence, but also some small measure of submission on his part. The City and the King examines the role that architecture played in the construction and re-construction of the relationship between City and King during the Restoration, and explores the political, financial and rhetorical dimensions of buildings that made them powerful conveyors of meaning.

Stevenson’s focus is how the relationship between London and Charles II was negotiated through architectural form and civic space. Specifically she is interested in ‘the ways that alongside other objects... buildings were made to serve as political instruments, in part by being construed as displays of authority, homage or wealth’. Charles II’s post-Fire rebuilding of the Custom House, for example, is interpreted as a gift to the City, albeit one that also ensured the Crown’s revenue, and New Bethlem Hospital is characterised as ‘a claim for civic sanity’ not least because the events of the 1640s and 1650s were repeatedly explained by contemporaries as the consequence of political and religious madness.

Equally importantly, Stevenson is concerned with the philosophical question of how architecture and space can be given and can generate meaning. She also admits, however, that there are limits to the power of interpretation in establishing either what architects intended or what viewers perceived, referring to ‘architecture’s sheer incalculability in this context of retrospection and reading’. Her approach is empirical and theoretical with equal rigour.

Stevenson works from the assumption that how architecture was experienced and understood at the time is fundamental to our comprehension of it as an historical expression and agent. This is therefore a book about architectural embodiment – what architecture embodies and how bodies (individual or corporate) experience architecture. To establish this, she draws on a range of evidence ‘wide enough to match architecture’s resonance for my protagonists’, employing not only the buildings, their design and materials, their architects and patrons, but also pageant books, the popular press of broadsheets and ballads, songs and satires, building encomia, prints and paintings.

As one would imagine and hope, central subjects of this study are the City Gates, London Wall and the triumphal arches erected for royal entries. As well as fresh discussion of these and other familiar sites, readers will value new research on the architectural patronage of the City’s Lord Mayors and guilds. The book is structured much like one of the processions it analyses; entering through the temporary erections in honour of Charles II, Stevenson guides the reader past the City Gates to the rebuilt Guildhall and the Royal Exchange, then to New Bethlem Hospital, St Paul’s, the Monument and the parish churches, before offering a bird’s-eye view over the whole city. At the same time as creating this topographical framework, Stevenson has succeeded in giving her analysis both a thematic and a chronological structure, discussing different types of building and patronage while proceeding through the decades of the mid-century.

En route, one also encounters more intangible questions, for instance, how architecture, so often associated with durability and therefore memory, negotiated the relationship between past and present at a time when the intention of the Act of Oblivion in 1660 was to erase the past twenty-three years. The introduction of Classicism and the persistence of Gothic are undercurrents, and there are insights into the relationship between meaning and style, in which values that surpass stylistic categories often emerge as more relevant: magnificence, nobility and conformity.

It must be admitted that certain passages are not a light read. Like her subjects and her interpretation, Stevenson’s prose style is subtle, nuanced and allusive, sometimes even elusive. But, like the procession of the book’s structure, which the strong authorial voice sustains, the analysis gathers momentum and compels the reader forward. The journey is enhanced by the elegant design and judicious illustration that one expects as standard from Yale University Press but should not for that reason pass unmentioned.
Meanings, as Stevenson makes so manifest, are always mutable – as early as 1680, for example, the splendour of rebuilt London, generally so praised, could be used as an admonition against moral laxity in a City congregation. It is no surprise, therefore, that the book draws to a close with clouds of change gathering over London’s skyline: in 1683, Charles II brought quo warranto proceedings against the City and confiscated its charter, thereby reducing the City’s legal status to that of a country village. And thus it remained until 1688, by which point it was time for another King: and another entry.

– Olivia Horsfall-Turner


This is an erudite, enlightening and entertaining book. And as we have come to expect from Yale it is a handsome one. Its topic is that eternal conundrum, where does London end and the country begin? Since the formation of the Metropolitan Police District in 1829 there has been at least some administrative recognition of a Greater London but the limits created in law in 1965 (when the GLC came into existence) and in concrete by the M25 have a much older existence in the minds of both residents and visitors. The book is subtitled ‘the city, the country and the suburbs’; there is relatively little about the city, more about the country and most about the suburbs. It is rich in visual imagery and contemporary quotation, many of the sources unfamiliar, apposite and thought-provoking. The book is structured by topic rather than by place. After a short preface – ‘Beyond the Fringe’ – putting the study into a mixed academic genre of architecture, urbanism and cultural history, and a longer introduction outlining the development of London in concentric rings, absorbing places which had long histories less connected with the centre, the book has two parts. The first – ‘Paper Landscapes’ – devotes three chapters to a discussion of how the expanding metropolis was being perceived in maps, in literature and in pictures. This has invaluable information on the exploitation and marketing of those items now much loved by TopSoc members and I suspect that many of us will wish to see the Society add reproductions of some of the illustrations as items for our publications list. The second – ‘Inhabited Landscapes’ – takes four topics illustrated by selected places which exhibit those characteristics which McKellar identifies as defining the expanding metropolis. These are landscapes of pleasure (recreational suburbia, exemplified in Islington, Hampstead and Marylebone), landscapes of mobility (early commuting, exemplified by Highgate), landscapes of selectivity (the increased number of architects’ designs for suburban retreats, ending with the gentrification of cottages), and landscapes of transition (exemplified in literature by Lysons’ Environs of 1800 and its Supplement of 1811, and topographically especially in Regent’s Park).

I’m never sure about using ‘transitions’ as defining characteristics. Most historians spend their time identifying and explaining change (‘Without change there is no history’ as English Heritage at one time put it). But McKellar is right to identify Regent’s Park not just as the place where urban architecture and green landscape were combined in a single composition of outstanding beauty, but also as the place where metropolitan man tried to get the best of both worlds. In many ways what was most significant at Regent’s Park was the incorporation of the Park Villages, a specific reference to that city/country contrast which has been in the English psychological make-up for at least four centuries and which leads many city dwellers to have a romantic view of the countryside, debunked but not destroyed in George Mingay’s *Rural Idyll* in 1989. The Pinner Association has published *The Villager* almost since it was founded in 1932, perhaps in defence of their local heritage as Metroland encroached, and we have long got used to the idea of Blackheath or Highgate ‘Villages’ though both are to some extent artificial creations, straddling parish boundaries. But is Chelsea Village quite the right term to describe a property development based round a now Russian-owned football club?

This book is a major contribution to our knowledge of how London has become what McKellar concludes is ‘the first suburban metropolis’ (a nice phrase) and (less happily) ‘a modern-style multivalent spatially discontinuous conurbation’. Perhaps those two terms will satisfy both those more casual readers, who will browse this book for the visual pleasure of its illustrations or use its index to see what McKellar says about their particular bit of London, and those more academic readers, who will devour this well documented discussion of the growth of London both on the ground and in the landscape of our consciousness of what it is to be a Londoner. A large format book, not easily read in bed, but a most welcome and valuable addition to the bookshelf.

– Frank Kelsall


Last year the London artist George Scharf was celebrated with an exhibition in his native Bavaria
(LTS Newsletter, Nov. 2013, pp.15-16). From January to April this year it was the turn of the Swiss artist, Samuel Hieronymus Grimm, to be celebrated with an exhibition at the Kunstmuseum, Bern, in his native Switzerland. Both of these artists, much appreciated nowadays in Britain, till this point had been woefully neglected in their own countries.

S. H. Grimm was born in Burgdorf in the canton of Bern. He was a pupil of the painter Johann L. Aberli in the 1750s. In 1765 he moved to Paris and in 1768 he moved on from Paris to London, taking lodgings in Covent Garden with a minor printmaker, Mrs Susanna Sledge, at 1 Henrietta Street. Within months he was exhibiting at the Society of Artists and the Royal Academy. He produced satirical prints, one of the Middlesex Election for example, and another showing posh people in Hyde Park skating on the ice. Two satirical images, showing monstrous hair-styles of the moment, were published by Grimm’s landlady. He also produced a long series of drawings to illustrate Shakespeare’s plays. Prints after them were surely intended but never appeared. Towards the end of his life the Society of Antiquaries commissioned him to make copies of its Tudor paintings. These included The Wedding Feast at Bermondsey by Joris Hoenfagel and The Coronation Procession of Edward VI.

Grimm’s principal preoccupation, however, was to make pen and wash and occasionally watercolour drawings of ‘every thing curious’ as his clerical patron, Sir Richard Kaye, put it – towers, houses, churches, ruined castles, gateways, houses of correction, cascades and wells. The very extensive series of drawings he made for Sir William Burrell to illustrate his intended history of Sussex are held in the Manuscript Department of the British Library. Over one thousand drawings were made on excursions through over half the counties of England in the company of Kaye, and hundreds more were made in connection with Henry Penruddocke Wyndham’s A Gentleman’s Tour through Monmouthshire and Wales. Where London is concerned the LMA have several pen and wash drawings that he made of St Marylebone, and Camden Local History Collection have several of Kentish Town, Camden Town and St Pancras. In 1780 Grimm recorded the military encampment set up outside Montagu House following the Gordon Riots. Grimm’s most finished images, however, are those of The Distribution of His Majesty’s Maudy in 1773, which were engraved in 1777 by the Society of Antiquaries’ engraver, James Basire. Grimm’s very fine drawings for them are in the British Library’s King’s Topographical Collection.

Grimm died of ‘a mortification of the bowels’ on 14 April 1794. He was interred at St Paul’s Covent Garden. Kaye conducted the service. One strongly suspects he made far more London drawings than we know about. Let us hope one day they will come to light. Meanwhile do read this excellent catalogue.

— Ralph Hyde


This is the book to guide you around the diverse buildings which have appeared in the City of London since 1986 (following the Big Bang). They are considered area by area in twelve chapters, usefully accompanied by plans which highlight how the maintenance of the City’s quirky ancient street pattern has often dictated irregular building footprints. The well-informed critical text, refreshingly free of jargon, by the former chief Conservation Officer of Islington, discusses planning issues, different styles and the variety of building materials. Numerous excellent photos bring out contrasting shapes and surfaces, and show the buildings mostly as the pedestrian sees them, that is obliquely from the street, rather than as architects’ visions seen by pigeons in mid-air. References to public art and open spaces reinforce the message that the view from the street matters. The introduction includes a revealing account of the role of the City Corporation in encouraging the growth of London as a world financial centre, but notes that since 2007 employment in the City has fallen. So can the historic City retain its prime position? (See p.3 London’s Growing Up for alternatives.) A most useful reference book for the last twenty-five years, which have seen the replacement of almost all the buildings put up in the preceding quarter century. How long will the new ones last?

— Bridget Cherry


tend to think first. But that is to overlook London’s centuries-old role as the powerhouse of the British economy, then as now. The Survey of London’s two volumes on Battersea, however, bring home to us how considerable that role has been. A parish of 2,164 acres, larger than any surveyed for years past, the diversity, and since the 1840s intensity and ever-changing forms, of its development have presented the Survey’s team with serious problems of presentation, tackled under the masterly editorships of Andrew Saint and Colin Thom in their characteristic innovative spirit. We have two volumes thematic rather than customarily topographic in character, even if Volume 2, devoted to Housing, can follow the more familiar model. The inconvenience is, that to follow through the history of a particular area, one has to turn from one volume to the other.

It is Volume 1 that presents the greater challenge in grasping the nature of Battersea. Just up river from Vauxhall, it was ideally placed to provide London with a range of essential services not desirably located in fashionable quarters, and also free of regulations imposed by more active north bank local authorities. Further inland, bisecting both Clapham and Wandsworth Commons, by the eighteenth century it was sufficiently close to the City in terms of travelling time, yet sufficiently rural to be a desirable suburb for wealthy merchants. So already we can see emerging the character of the two volumes.

The manor, long the property of the St Johns, later ennobled as Bolingbroke’s, was sold in 1763 to the Spencers. Much of the land was held in strips, so that after an 1827 enclosure bill failed, Lord Spencer sold much of his holding piecemeal, as developers saw opportunities facilitated by the construction of Thames bridges: Chelsea, 1858, Albert, 1873, and wooden Battersea rebuilt 1885; and even more by railways. The London & South Western to Southampton, from Nine Elms (1840) and then Waterloo, with a branch to Richmond (1844); a line to link Sydenham’s rebuilt Crystal Palace with the West End (1855-8); the London, Brighton and South Coast from London Bridge and then from Victoria; finally the notoriously corrupt London, Chatham [Cheat’m] & Dover from Blackfriars and Victoria (1859-62), so that lines crossed over each other in an amazing tangle, a complex tale, recounted in Chapter 7. The nexus of lines at Clapham Junction is likened to ‘a great river broadening and breaking up into a delta’. Furthermore, the LSWR and the LCR established here their main railway works (described in detail), ensuring the future of Battersea as a railway town. The railways both facilitated the influx of armies of workers already drawn in by riverine industries and added to the demand for their labour.

Thus the population increased exponentially, multiplying twenty-five times in 60 years from 1841 to 1901 – quite as fast as any northern industrial town. ‘Nowhere was London’s Victorian growth more dramatic and transformative than in Battersea.’ A parish involved primarily in supplying cash crops for London (Battersea asparagus was renowned for its size) was converted into an industrial powerhouse, notable for supplying range of services. Most evident, with the railway works, was lighting: Price’s candles, from the 1850s, originally made from coconut; gas, manufactured from coal supplied to a wharf with capacity from 1882 for sea-going colliers, and an automated conveyor that ensured survival of the works until 1970, with gasholders culminating in the 295ft high MAN holder with its seven million cu.ft capacity; and then electricity, produced in ‘London’s most contentious historic building’, that requires a chapter to itself. Battersea Power Station was an essential element in the new electric national grid designed in the late 1920s, its enormous appetite for coal met by river and rail. The analysis of the development of its design is one of the outstanding features of Volume 1.

Giles Gilbert Scott was called in at the last moment to dress up a design determined by technical considerations (assessed by the engineer S. L. Pearce) because of his ‘rare ability for handling massive wall surfaces’, already exhibited by Liverpool Cathedral. His ‘bold revision’ of proportions and ornament created a pattern for power stations. However, the overwhelming Art Deco interiors of Turbine Hall (475x85ft), its steel gantry-runner forming an architrave, and the Control Room with walls lined in grey Italian marble, decorative trim in black Belgian, its polished teak parquet floor, a steel and glass ceiling light running its whole length, were designed by J. Halliday. This ‘great symbol of the electrical age’, obsolete by 1975, closed in 1983; the sorry story of its subsequent vicissitudes (yet to be completed) is also recounted; more than any other, ‘it represents the impotence of the heritage lobby and planning system when faced with big business at its most repressive’.

Already by 1700 Battersea’s convenient location had attracted mills and breweries, sugar-houses and lime kilns. Subsequently came chemical manufacturing, cement works, foundries and sawmills – Marc Brunel setting up steam-powered mills here in 1806. The Morgan Crucible Company established huge riverside works to supply an international market. Waterworks, too, found ample spaces for ‘depositing’ reservoirs and slow sand filter beds, until 1903 when a power station was built on the site. A London Transport bus garage succeeded a cab depot, stables and grain store. Flour milling was important from the eighteenth century to the mid-twentieth. But from that period the old industrial base of Battersea was in decline. A new Battersea was beginning to emerge. The great Covent Garden Market was re-located at Nine Elms in 1971-4, as recounted in Chapter 11: new commercial developments appeared, often to vanish a few decades later. What was very apparent from the river was new luxury housing. Battersea was being gentrified.
While many workers had travelled in on workers’ trains, tens of thousands had sought homes in Battersea itself. The story of Battersea housing is told in admirable detail, numerous plans and illustrations, interiors and exteriors, conveniently adjoining the text, in Volume 2, edited by that Master of London Housing, Colin Thom. This is the aspect of Battersea most accessible to us physically, though much of the described fabric has vanished. Important in the history of suburban development is the City merchants’ community gathered around Clapham and Wandsworth Commons by the early nineteenth century, including Wilberforce, and wealthy bankers, the evangelical Thorntons and ‘Dog’ Dent, MP (proposer of a tax on dogs, thereafter greeted with barking) in their capacious villas, now demolished.

Their sites yielded to the speculator. Victorian suburban housing was ‘one of the defining elements in Battersea’s character, and nowhere is it found in greater concentration’ than between the Commons. One of the larger Battersea developers, Alfred Heaver, ‘cut his teeth as a developer here’ with two-storey houses in long terraces with recesses for service doors, suggesting pairs of semi-detached houses. Later, somewhat to the north, he used contrasting bricks to provide a more decorative product. This area has become ‘the core of modern, upwardly mobile, child-rearing south Battersea ... “Nappy Valley”’. 

Keith Bailey’s researches into Battersea’s developers (see LTS Newsletter, 76, pp.13-14) are acknowledged as a base for this very detailed analysis of housing past and present, in which the identity of the actual builders is often ascertained, as well as of architects ranging from familiar names like E. R. Robson, the London School Board architect, to the obscure W. H. Stanbury, ‘trained as an architect to assist his self-taught [builder] father’ – like a number of sons of developers and builders. Nor are the inhabitants neglected: both the social character of a particular street or area is discussed, and also specific notable individuals – enlivened by a delightful photograph of a rather cross-looking knickerbockered G. K. Chesterton in Overstrand Mansions (one of the late-nineteenth-century blocks of mansion flats overlooking Battersea Park), which proved quite a focus of artistic talent, from Sean O’Casey to Francis Bacon.

Expected to attract middle-class residents, Battersea Park itself was proposed in 1841 as part of a parliamentary attempt to provide healthy family recreation to keep Londoners from the pub. A plan for some 200 acres immediately south of the river was devised by Pennethorne, Nash’s heir, inspired by Regent’s Park, set about with villas to make it self-financing, a concept killed by the railways taking part of the housing site. The long-drawn out project was revived by Sir Benjamin Hall when Works minister, on the pattern of Bethnal Green’s Victoria Park, creating vistas and screening parts. The LCC took over the Park in 1889, under which it was essentially a lung for the local labouring poor. The success of a sculpture exhibition in 1948 was followed by another for the 1951 Festival of Britain, and others in the 1960s. Since Wandsworth Borough took it over in 1986 new buildings and plantings have been executed.

The early history of another area, similarly harmed by the railways, that ‘never lived up to expectations’, Park Town, planned by James Knowles jnr, was elucidated in Priscilla Metcalf’s Park Town Estate and the Battersea Tangle (LTS 121, 1978). The post-Knowles phase of that area is explored in Chapter 5. In other streets, too, we find that developers’ expectations ran ahead of the market, so houses were frequently divided into flats or fell into multi-occupation. Designed specifically for the working classes however was the 42-acre Shaftesbury Park Estate (named after the philanthropic peer) of the Artizans’, Labourers’ and General Dwellings Company of 1866-7. This commercial enterprise, derived from a French cité ouvrière, ‘the most assiduously publicised and widely discussed housing experiment of its day’, proved corrupt and mis-managed, but in 1872-5 built a thousand two-storey small houses of four classes in stock brick, with red brick and artificial stone trim, and fitted with all ordinary requirements, at low rents. But by 1901 half of these contained two households. Today they attract middle-class owners, though most of the estate has been acquired by the Peabody Trust.

What emerges strongly from these two volumes is the sense of constant renewal of Battersea’s fabric. The later nineteenth century saw 17 Anglican churches built here; eight have been demolished. Most of more than 20 Nonconformist foundations have closed. Schools offer a similar record: Robson’s Sleaford Street school, of 1873-4, was extended, rebuilt a century later, closed in 2004 and replaced by housing; Latchmere, Robson’s last, closed in 1994 and was converted into flats. Mountford’s Battersea Polytechnic of 1892-4 was converted into housing in 2006-8. Plumbe’s Latchmere Baths (1881) just failed to last its century, replaced by a modern business centre. The vast Morgan Crucible Company that progressively swallowed up much of the river front departed in the 1970s for more ample fields, making way for private housing, ‘a harbinger of the area’s gentrification’. The Stationery Office Building in Nine Elms Lane (Henocq, 1980-2) went in 2010. Even the distinguished, post-modern office block, listed Marco Polo House (1987) in Queenstown Road, by Ian Pollard, is to be demolished, currently for luxury flats, offices and shops. The New Covent Garden Flower Market with its space-frame ‘waffle’ roof, built on the site of railway yards in 1971-4 (Sir R. McAlpine & Sons) is to be merged with the Fruit and Vegetable Market and its site redeveloped for 1,750 homes in blocks by Foster & Partners.

The laborious research required to record so amply Battersea’s constant state of flux excites one’s admiration for the tiny staff of the Survey, discarded by English Heritage but now given a
resting-place in the academic life of University College London's Bartlett School of Architecture. Is it believable that there are government departments of 'Culture' and 'The Environment'? Let us thank Heaven for the transatlantic generosity of the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art that has secured the publication of the two magnificent volumes.

— M. H. Port


Michael Hammerson is the longstanding chairman of Highgate Society's environmental committee. He points out in the introduction that this is the first book of old photographs to be devoted solely to Highgate (though several have taken in Highgate with one or more of its neighbouring areas). The plentiful illustrations are taken from the author's extensive collection of local postcards and represent his image of an area that he has spent decades and immense effort in defending against what the Highgate Society judges to be unsuitable development. The introduction is worth reading as a veteran campaigner’s lament on the threats currently facing Highgate Village.

The book takes the form of a leisurely stroll through the Village and, to a much lesser extent, its surroundings as they were between 1870 and 1930. The point is made in almost every caption that the scene is little changed since the photographs were taken. This alone is a tribute – albeit self-bestowed – to Mr Hammerson’s achievement.

The images have charm. Though very many have been reproduced before, they are likely to be fresh to the non-specialist reader. The captions contain few comments on anything other than the architecture in the photographs and in the introduction Mr Hammerson explains that the word limit left little room for historical explanation. Nevertheless when the author strays into the field of history, a note of caution has to be sounded. There are several errors of historical fact – Baroness Burdett Coutts, an extremely important figure in Highgate history, is wrongly stated to have died in 1896 not 1906, Lauderdale House was remodelled in its present form not in 1645 but in around 1760 and Queen's Wood was opened to the public not in 1890 but in 1898. Moreover when he moves beyond the heart of Highgate, his topographical grasp weakens as when identifying what is to be seen in a view of what are now the Crouch End Playing Fields dating from 1878. It is difficult to compare some views of the same place over time because they are placed back-to-back. These slips suggest that Mr Hammerson was working to a tight deadline and did not have time to double-check his facts or the lay-out. This is a pity, since they mar a pleasant book.

— Peter Barber


This is an investigation of three sheets of most intriguing drawings from the collections of the Earl of Pembroke that have only recently come to light. They show a series of Greenwich street elevations. Tallis-style, with what appears to be accurate detail of c.250 buildings in some of the most significant streets: the riverfront, Church Street, Croome's Hill and some of the streets of east Greenwich. The remarkable thing is that the drawings are dateable to c.1705-9 (they show St Alphege before the fall of the nave in 1710). As Peter Guillery says in the foreword, this is an extremely rare type of record for this date. The small line-drawings of haphazardly grouped large and small houses, some with fashionable shaped gables, show us the character of the unplanned town that had expanded rapidly in the seventeenth century around the royal palace. The authors are tempted to associate the drawings with a draughtsman working for Hawksmoor, then busy at Greenwich, but the reasons for their creation remain unclear. The subject matter is explored with the meticulous thoroughness associated with the authors, both longstanding experts on the history of the area, and the material is presented very attractively, enhanced by supplementary illustrations and by bird’s-eye reconstruction drawings by Peter Kent. After discussion of the character of the drawings, individual buildings are examined in detail, related to owners and occupants and to those buildings which survive today. An exemplary piece of private publishing, of more than local interest. The book is available from the Warwick Leadley Gallery, 1-2 Nelson Arcade Greenwich SE10 9JB, or by post from Julian Watson (to whom cheques should be made out), 100 Embleton Road, Lewisham SE13 7DG.

— Bridget Cherry


It appears that Amberley leaves the text and illustrations of their books to the author, with very little editorial input. This has worked well with this book, in that Peter Darley has been running the Camden Railway Heritage Trust and so has accumulated knowledge
and records of this area from the Regents Canal to the Primrose Hill Tunnel on the main line out of Euston. His book has a marvellous collection of pictures old and new, besides plans and maps of the extensive goods yard which has now been regenerated in Camden Lock market, the Roundhouse arts centre besides a supermarket and housing in the old warehouses. The captions are full and informative and there is a page of text at the beginning of eight chapters.

Fellow members of Subterranea Britannica will delight in the pictures and plans of the vaults and tunnels where ash was collected from steam locomotives, goods were transferred from railway to canal, the winding engines were housed for pulling early trains up the incline from Euston and horses were transferred in safety from one side of the yard to the other. There are pictures of the yard working in the days of horses and steam, some with pictures from the same viewpoint today. No mention of HS2 but its line will be in tunnel beside the site and its potentially destructive link line to HS1 is currently cancelled. This is a worthy successor and update to our member Jack Whitehead’s 2000 book on the same area.

The Trust needs money to pay for the extensive illustrations in the book and will make a better profit from direct sales. A cheque for at least £12 payable to the Trust sent to 21 Oppidans Road NW3 3AG will bring UK readers a copy of the book post free.

– Roger Cline


Here is a publication directly relevant to the meeting place of our AGM this summer. The seventeen statues celebrating heroic English history and poetry which are the subject of this study were part of the original 1753 scheme for the Egyptian Hall in the Mansion House, but were commissioned only in 1853 and installed in 1864, giving rise to many misunderstandings of their history. The book tells the story of their creation and sets them in the context of the Mansion House interiors.

– Bridget Cherry

**Owing to shortage of space some reviews are being held over for the next Newsletter.**


Our 2013 Annual General Meeting was held in St Clement Danes Church on the Strand and it was well attended.* Following the formalities Robert Thompson spoke of the challenges in preparing the detailed Index to the annual publication. Peter Anderson, a City guide, gave a talk on the history of St Clement Danes Church, and Elizabeth Williamson, Editor of the Victoria County History, spoke about the research by her team on the registers of St Clement Danes.

The Society’s 2013 annual publication (No. 174) was *The A to Z of Charles II’s London* 1662, based on William Morgan’s map: Robert Thompson produced the publication’s Index.

Patrick Frazer resigned as Membership Secretary having served previously, since 1978, as Publications Secretary and as our Hon. Secretary. John Bowman took over Membership Secretary duties. At the AGM, Ann Saunders announced her decision to retire from the post of Honorary Editor in 2015. Her successor will be Council Member Sheila O’Connell who is Curator of British prints before 1880 at the British Museum’s Department of Prints and Drawings.

We made the second of three grants, this year for £11,000, to the British Library in connection with cataloguing their Crace Collection London items.

During the year 82 new members joined the Society. At the end of 2013 there were 1208 paid-up members and five honorary members.

The Society’s total income for 2013 was £42,848 while expenditure came to £32,258.

As usual, Council meetings were held in January, April and September to discuss the Society’s publications programme, membership, finances and general administration.

Our Newsletter was published in May and November. Articles included: *London Explorations 3: Hampstead Heath – east to west; London Explorations 4: Osterley – Grand Union Canal – Boston Manor – and (perhaps) Pitshanger* both by Tony Aldous; *Why 99 years?* (on the length of London leases) by Frank Kelsall; *Mapping slave-ownership on to London and its districts: the Portman estate as a case study* by Dr Nicholas Draper and Rachel Evans; and, as always, many excellent book reviews.

During the year work progressed successfully on producing the Society’s Newsletter in an electronic, fully-searchable format suitable for posting on the Society’s website. The Council decided that each web edition would be published six months after the paper version of the current edition was sent to members, and so the first e-edition posted on the website was No. 76 (May 2013) followed, with the publication of this edition of the Newsletter, by the November 2013 edition (No. 77).

* Minutes of the 2012 Annual General Meeting are available on the Society’s website.
# LONDON TOPOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY

## INCOME & EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT 2013

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid by members</td>
<td>22,901</td>
<td>21,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions from earlier years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax from Covenants/Gift Aid</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>3,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total subscription income</td>
<td>26,826</td>
<td>25,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit from sales of Publications</td>
<td>7,453</td>
<td>7,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant: Scouloudi Foundation</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties received</td>
<td>6,526</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry donations</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income for the year</td>
<td>43,282</td>
<td>36,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus for the year</td>
<td>11,024</td>
<td>(4,048)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members’ subscription publications</td>
<td>11,386</td>
<td>3,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Printing (see note)</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>6,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of members’ publications</td>
<td>12,911</td>
<td>9,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>4,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website, updated in 2013</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications Storage and Service</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>2,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administration Costs</td>
<td>8,347</td>
<td>7,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant to British Museum (2009-12)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant to British Library (2012-14)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant to LMA</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure for the year</td>
<td>32,258</td>
<td>40,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BALANCE SHEET 31 December 2013

### Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money in Bank &amp; National Savings</td>
<td>165,004</td>
<td>173,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance payments</td>
<td>25,612</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Society’s stock of publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock at end of previous year</td>
<td>8,917</td>
<td>13,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to stock</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>3,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Value of publications sold</td>
<td>-7,453</td>
<td>-7,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of stock at year end</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>8,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>193,705</td>
<td>182,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas members’ postage</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid in advance</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>4,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td>5,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Worth of the Society</td>
<td>188,643</td>
<td>177,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in net worth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous year’s net worth</td>
<td>177,619</td>
<td>181,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit) for the year</td>
<td>11,024</td>
<td>(4,048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of year net worth</td>
<td>188,643</td>
<td>177,619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accounts are with our examiner and, assuming they are approved, they will be presented at the AGM. Please address any serious concerns to the Treasurer before the AGM.
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