The eighteenth century York Buildings Waterworks at the bottom of Villiers Street, drawn in 1797 by James Peller Malcolm (1767-1815). The picture shows the waterworks’ distinctive obelisk-shaped water tower and its smoking chimney: the first-ever steam engine in London was installed here in 1726. Survivals of London’s many waterworks are discussed in an article on p.9. (British Museum/Creative Commons)
Notes and News

The 2022 Annual General Meeting of the Society will be held on Tuesday 12 July in the spacious setting of Church House, Westminster (see the central inset of this Newsletter). We hope to see many of you there. Meanwhile many thanks to all those who have responded to requests for material for the Newsletter. Comments and suggestions are always welcome.

Delivering the Annual Publication

This year we are publishing two books: John Mackay’s London journal, a young Scotsman’s experiences of London in the year 1837-38, edited by David Coke, with nearly one hundred contemporary illustrations, and Nicholas Barbon 1640-1698 by Frank Kelsall and Timothy Walker, a biography of the property developer, financier and economist who played a key role in the development of London after the Great Fire.

We will once again be asking members if they are able to distribute copies in their areas. (They are not too large or heavy: combined weight c.1.5 kilos, c.30 x 23 cm.) Last year we handed out some 500 copies this way, saving the Society upwards of £2,500 in postal costs, a useful contribution to the cost of a publication.

We have a good number of regular volunteers, principally in and around London but also further afield, and I will be contacting you in the summer to see if you are again able to assist. I have also, many thanks, recently received offers to help in TW1, SE4 and W2, which are all much appreciated.

In the meantime there is one area where some help would be welcome – in west London, where we have some 25 members in W3, W4, W5, W7, W13 and Pinner. Please tell Simon Morris (address on the last page of this Newsletter) if you can take on any of these areas.

Out and About

Building on a fully GIS compliant version of John Rocque’s 1746 map of London, this site allows you to relate an eighteenth-century representation of the metropolis to the first accurate OS map of London (1869-80), and to a modern Google Maps environment, including satellite imagery. Additionally, the site allows you to search a wide range of eighteenth-century records of crime, poor relief, taxation, elections, and much more, and map the results onto John Rocque’s 1746 map.


Our financial contribution will be £18,525 over a two-year period. Professor Hitchcock has kindly agreed to provide information, hints and tips to help members use the maps and the data.

— Anne Ramon, LTS Treasurer

Our Latest Grant

The LTS Committee has taken a bold step into twenty-first century topographical publishing. We received and have approved a request from LTS member Professor Tim Hitchcock of Sussex University for financial help to conserve and improve a suite of databases that underlie the Locating London’s Past website www.locatinglondon.org

Exhibitions and Events

From 11 April: Magnificent Maps of London, London Metropolitan Archives (LMA). This is a chance to see the original of the ‘Agas’ map (published as part of LTS publication no. 122, 1979, The A-Z of Elizabethan London). The Woodcut or Agas map, which forms the centrepiece of a new free exhibition, is the oldest surviving map of the capital, made by an unnamed map maker in the 1570s. It is one of the earliest surviving contemporary images of London, giving a unique bird’s eye view of London, across the Thames from Southwark towards the hills of Hampstead and Highgate. The LMA’s map is one of only three prints known, all dating from reprints made in 1633. The map was printed from woodcut blocks on eight sheets, and in its present state measures approximately 2 feet 4 inches high by 6 feet wide.

May 21 (postponed from 2020), London Sailor Towns: People, Communities and the Thames. Docklands History Group conference Museum of London. For details see docklandshistorygroup.org.uk

June 11-12. London Squares Open Gardens weekend. Explore a diverse collection of green spaces from the historic and traditional to the new and experimental. For details and tickets see Londongardenstrust.org

Friday 17 and Saturday 18 June, The Becket Pageant for London and Livery Crafts Fair, in Guildhall Yard EC2, promises ‘an unforgettable day of fun, culture and celebration,’ inspired by an historic Becket Pageant which was performed by guildsmen in 1519, four hundred years after Thomas Becket’s birth on Cheapside (see Newsletter 93 Nov 2021). It will include a new musical London’s Turbulent Son by playwright, director and lively woman Emmeline Winterbotham, with music by Vahan Salorian, and involvement from local schools and community: for more details and tickets www.becketpageantforlondon.com
Unusual Destination

In response to our request for suggestions, many thanks to our member William Latey who suggests Trinity Buoy Wharf, on the north bank of the Thames at the mouth of the Lea, home to London’s only lighthouse. Here, appointed by Trinity House as scientific adviser in 1836, Michael Faraday carried out optical experiments, allowing Trinity House’s national lighthouses to benefit from his ingenuity.

Also at the Wharf are some of the first artists’ studios to be converted from shipping containers – see the website below for current exhibitions. The lighthouse also houses Longplayer, a one thousand year long musical composition, conceived and composed by Jem Finer which began playing at midnight on 31 December 1999. Longplayer is composed for singing bowls – an ancient type of standing bell – which can be played by both humans and machines, and whose resonances can be very accurately reproduced in recorded form.

The Wharf stands opposite the O2 and the Emirates cable is not far away.

Leamouth was the first home of the Samuda Bros. shipbuilders and engineers.

There is more about the Wharf on the website: trinitybuoywharf.com

Miscellanea

Victoria Park Gardens: an update

In 2016 the Government proposed to build the National Holocaust Memorial and Learning Centre. In the small open space called Victoria Tower Gardens, next to the Houses of Parliament.

Planning permission was given in 2021 following a public inquiry. The site chosen has always been controversial, with objectors campaigning under the slogan ‘right idea, wrong place’. The latest twist in the saga is that on 8 April the planning permission was quashed by the High Court.

The London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust had brought a judicial review on several counts. The one that succeeded related to the London County Council (Improvements) Act 1900, under which the southern part of Victoria Tower Gardens was created. Section 8(1) of the Act says that the land concerned ‘shall be laid out and maintained in manner hereinafter provided for use as a garden open to the public and as an integral part of the existing Victoria Tower Garden’. Surprisingly, the Government had been unaware of how it had acquired the land and what restrictions there were on its use until the Act was pointed out to it in 2019, and it then argued that the Act did not impose any restriction. The judge found that, on the contrary, “On its ordinary and natural meaning, Section 8(1) ... imposes an enduring obligation to lay out and retain the new garden land for use as a public garden”. The proceedings of the various LCC committees and other parties in 1899-1900 were pointed out, and the judge observed that these “demonstrate that the use of the land in question for a garden was a central part of negotiations during the passage of the 1900 Act”, and that “this provides strong support for the interpretation I have arrived at on the basis of the wording of section 8”. She concluded that the 1900 Act was a “material consideration” that should have been taken into account at the inquiry.

The next step is for the Government to decide whether to reconsider the location or to persist, by seeking leave to appeal or through new legislation.

The summary of the judgment is here: www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/LHPGT-v-Minister-for-Housing-Summary-080422.pdf

– Dorian Gerhold

Correction

Kings Cross Rail Lands. We apologise for inaccuracies in the article Saving the Coal and Fish Offices at King’s Cross which was published in Newsletter no. 93. The developer LRC did not go bankrupt but their interests were determined by British Rail due to the cost of the proposed railway works.
An update on Lambeth Archives

The archive collection held by the London Borough of Lambeth are one of the longest-established in London. William Minet donated the building to house them back in 1890, and actively sponsored their growth until his death in the 1930s. Lambeth Council then took control of the building in the 1950s. Longevity in archive collections is an admirable thing; less so is longevity in archive buildings, and until now Lambeth had been something of an outlier in continuing to house its archive in Minet’s original library basement.

Happily, that situation is about to change as Lambeth Archives will be relocating in the summer of 2023 to its new premises on Brixton Hill, currently at an advanced stage of construction just south of Lambeth Town Hall. It is a salutary thought that until that point, some of its records will have been shelved in the same location for 133 years.

Our new strong room will use a state-of-the-art ‘passive’ environmental system to maintain the collections at optimal temperature and humidity, removing the need for expensive electrical and mechanical environmental controls. It will also give us much-needed accrual space for ongoing collecting for the next twenty years. The search room on the ground floor above will be more than three times the size of our current one and will include both education and exhibition space. The new site is close to Brixton town centre.

Unsurprisingly, the logistics of moving two linear miles of boxed and shelved documents are considerable; planning and preparation is already well-advanced. However, we will need to close to the public in early 2023 as we enter the final stage of the relocation. We then look forward to welcoming researchers to our larger and considerably more accessible new space later in 2023.

– Jon Newman, Lambeth Archives

Searching for maps 1: Useful maps on line

Peter Cope offers some suggestions of websites which may be of interest to members.

Firstly www.romanticlondon.org . This contains high quality scans of Horwood’s map and the Faden update of 1819. The scans are so good that individual house numbers can be read and I have been able to find ancestral addresses that had previously evaded me.

Secondly the National Library of Scotland map site at www.maps.nls.uk . Particularly good are the Ordnance Survey 25” to the mile set for the whole country but including London, and the Town series which includes various sets for London. The site takes a little getting used to but it’s well worthwhile.

Finally the Charles Goad insurance maps. The originals are scanned and available on the British Library website but they themselves directed me to the Wikimedia Commons site where they are much easier to find and use.

commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Goad_fire_insurance_maps_of_London

Stuck at home for a lot of the last two years these sites have helped to pass the time and been very useful for my research. I can’t recommend them enough for anyone like me fascinated by maps!

– Peter Cope

Searching for maps 2: Hunting for lost originals.

Mike Tuffrey reports on his progress over maps of Clapham.

Readers of LTS Newsletter no. 93 will recall that the hunt is on to find lost examples of the work of Daniel Gould, notably a unique map of the village of Clapham from 1815 annotated with some 200 occupants, many prominent in the battles over abolition of slavery. Several readers responded with helpful suggestions, and one big puzzle has now been solved: the version that came up for sale in 1987 through Cartographia was acquired by Lambeth Archives. However that has since been misplaced within their collections and they are still trying to locate it. Another original manuscript version was last sighted in 1976, copied by the Clapham Antiquarian Society. That is thought to be in an unknown private collection. The copies made are of poor quality and it is hoped the occupants’ names will be legible from the originals, with modern techniques.

Daniel Gould was also surveyor to Thomas Cubitt at his Clapham Park estate around 1830 and an original manuscript plan for potential purchasers has also gone missing. A version was in the J.P.

A note from your Treasurer

Thank you for renewing your membership for 2022 and I hope you enjoy our Newsletters and publications. If your friend didn’t get this Newsletter, and they usually do, please give them a gentle dig in the ribs. Maybe they haven’t paid their subscription? If they pay now we can include them for the rest of the year.

The regular renewal date is any date the first week of January each year and it really helps if you can make your payment a Standing Order, or you schedule an automated payment for a day that week. Don’t forget to include your Member Number in the payment instructions or I won’t know it’s you. And please let us know if you change your address.

– Anne Ramon
Papworth collection at the RIBA Library in London and they too are still trying to locate it. Meanwhile an engraved version has now, thankfully, surfaced at the London Metropolitan Archives, having been misattributed in published sources to Manning & Bray, instead of correctly to Brayley. Such small slip-ups later lead to big headaches. Anyone with information about Daniel Gould is invited to contact Clapham Society member, Mike Tuffrey, on mtuffrey@talk21.com

**Discovery: The botanic gardens of Regent’s Park**

*Edward Kellow describes how research during the lockdown led to the discovery of some original plans for the Royal Botanic Gardens.*

During the first lockdown, I occupied myself researching information about the gardens in Regent’s Park for a new website being built by the Friends of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill. As a volunteer gardener in The St John’s Lodge Garden, I was amazed to discover that there had been a botanical garden on the other side of the Inner Circle, complete with a glasshouse designed and built by the same partnership responsible for the more famous glasshouse at Kew (Decimus Burton and Richard Turner).

Then, on the website of the Wellcome Foundation, I stumbled upon an 1866 plan of the Royal Botanic Gardens by E. M. Sowerby, which was wrongly described as being of The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. I contacted The Wellcome Foundation who were very helpful. They told me about the existence of more RBS related documents, that were too fragile to open. The hope was that these documents could be opened and photographed in December 2021.

True to their word, Wellcome have now photographed the documents and posted them online. They include plans and external views of the now demolished RBS glass house, a detailed and undated plan for the laying out the gardens of The Royal Botanic Society, and several designs for pergolas along the Broad Walk (in the now Queen Mary’s Gardens). Of particular interest is a drawing of ‘Suggested Terra-cotta work at the Royal Botanical Gardens by Liberty & Co London’. In the 1860s, the RBS was at the centre of the Victorian passion for new plants and new fashions in garden design. It is not known how the drawings came into the possession of Wellcome. Further research is needed. If nothing else, the rediscovery of these plans shows how much Queen Mary’s Gardens have changed.

This is a link to the rediscovered documents which can be downloaded.

[wellcome.tandemvault.com/shares/wGu03iL4B?order=asc&sort=file_size](wellcome.tandemvault.com/shares/wGu03iL4B?order=asc&sort=file_size)

— Edward Kellow

**Who owned the City of London in 1666?**

The above was the title of an article which I published in the recent *London Topographical Record*, with an introduction in *Newsletter* no 92, (May 2021), supported by a Volume of Evidence. I have now completed my post-COVID-19 checks to this, which have only necessitated a few minor changes. I have deposited bound Volumes in the London Metropolitan Archives and Guildhall Library, but if any readers would like a PDF version, please could they email idoolittle@btinternet.com. Readers may also recall that I have published Volume 3 of the *Fire Court Decrees*: there are a few copies left, which I am selling for £35 (inc. P&P) on behalf of the City Corporation. If anyone wants to buy one, could they email me before I find homes for them in libraries. Thank you.

— Ian Doolittle

**A New History of St Giles in the Fields**

*Rebecca Preston and Andrew Saint explain their plans for a new study of a rewarding area in the heart of London.*

In 2019 we were approached by the then Rector of St Giles in the Fields, Alan Carr, to write a history of his parish. Its aim, Father Carr explained, would be to put St Giles back on the map as a district of Central London with its own personality – complex, often troubled, too often forgotten.

If the survival of local identities in London owes much to chance, St Giles in the Fields has been unlucky. Once one of the largest of metropolitan parishes, it was halved in size and fated to impoverishment when St George’s, Bloomsbury, was chopped out of its territory in the 1730s (fig 1). Because St Giles came to connote slums, criminality and disease, people began to identify instead with Bloomsbury, Soho, Holborn or Covent Garden. Bedford Square, for instance, has always instead with Bloomsbury, Soho, Holborn or Covent Garden. The culmination of this indignity came when a review of Central St Giles, the colourful Renzo Piano office development opened in 2010, referred to St Giles as “a tiny, bizzarely obscure district in the heart of central London... renowned for making only two unfortunate contributions to popular culture: leprosy and alcoholism”.

— Ian Doolittle
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---
One thing Father Carr and the present Rector and Churchwardens were clear about: they did not want just ‘architecture’, or an account dominated by the fine Flitcroft church which today supplies St Giles with a core of identity (fig 3). How was it to be structured? Obviously chronology had to be part of our answer, so that we could highlight the immense changes the parish had undergone. St Giles took its name and origins from the leper hospital established out in the fields around 1117 or 18. Integral to the book is the unfolding of the parish’s development from those times to its seventeenth-century heyday and then through centuries of decline and depopulation to its ‘partial renaissance’ since the 1970s. Topography had also to take a role. Strict topography, we felt, would be a mistake in view of the excellent Streets of St Giles volume published by the Camden History Society in 2000.

What we have come up with instead is a kind of mixed economy. Up to about 1700 we follow mainly chronological lines. Then we break up the book into typologies and activities: churches and missions, schools, industry, arts and pleasures, buying and selling, housing, health, burial grounds and open spaces and, of course, the slums – the notorious Rookery and the equally impoverished courts off Drury Lane. But we decided to reserve for topographical treatment the whole northern ‘Bloomsbury’ corridor of the parish, which runs up nearly to Torrington Place and encompasses half of Gower Street as well as Bedford Square (fig 2).

Our material has turned out to be overwhelmingly rich. Under the Stuarts, for instance, St Giles in the Fields was one of London’s foremost suburbs. Aristocrats, ambassadors and high-ranking lawyers, several Lord Chancellors among them, took the innovating classical houses erected by William Newton and others in Great Queen Street and Lincoln’s Inn Fields from the 1630s. The parish church was first rebuilt in 1623–7, with the support of the stalwart Duchess Dudley, abandoned wife of the Earl of Leicester’s errant son, Sir Robert Dudley. Donors to this first rebuilding are recorded in a semi-illuminated ‘Domesday Book’ which has had little or no attention.

The many influential Catholics of St Giles were sometimes tolerated, but there were vicious bouts of persecution, as during the Titus Oates panic of 1678–9, when eleven Catholics were executed and buried in the churchyard. The relationship of St Giles with executions at Tyburn is curious. The

---

Fig 1. Bird’s eye view by Wenceslaus Hollar, showing the Strand, Covent Garden and the parish of St Giles. The date usually given for this splendid panorama is c.1658, but as often with Hollar it is difficult to be precise. Lincoln’s Inn Fields, for instance, is shown as not yet complete, though it is usually thought to have been finished by the time of the Restoration. © The Trustees of the British Museum, Q.6.136 (Creative Commons)
parish registers list 165 burials of the condemned. Presumably the practice emerged from the church’s position midway on the via dolorosa from Newgate to Tyburn. John Stow records the custom of ‘St Giles’ Bowl’ whereby malefactors were given a free drink at the hospital on the way to the gibbet. The fond belief that the tradition survived the Reformation seems to be a myth, started by Harrison Ainsworth’s popular 1839–40 novel, Jack Sheppard.

The arts in St Giles supply another rich vein. Among poets, George Chapman has a decayed monument in the church by Inigo Jones; Milton lived briefly in Holborn; and Andrew Marvell spent his final months in Great Russell Street. Hollar lived intermittently in the parish, and his superb bird’s eye view of the western suburbs shows the state of St Giles around 1658, with an element of artistic licence. Later, the Great Queen Street district became a nexus for artists, housing the tapestry works of the Great Wardrobe and then a coven of painters including Kneller’s pioneering Academy of Painting and Drawing (1711). George Vertue, the GeorgIan engraver and chronicler of art, lived nearby in what is now Betterton Street. First-rate engravers like James Basire tended to be intimately linked with the local printing industry. Huguenot craftsmen, clockmakers, silversmiths and frame-makers, were as active in St Giles from the 1690s as in Soho. The West Street Chapel, today a blank façade, started out in 1700 as a Huguenot church, sometimes known as La Piramide because of its proximity to the Seven Dials monument.

The Cockpit Theatre in Drury Lane apart, most of the famous early theatres lay beyond the boundaries of St Giles. But after the old patent system expired in 1843, music halls flourished like Westons in High Holborn. Later between 1910 and 1930 came a theatre boom, as the West End entertainment district seeped into the dying pockets of working-class industry and population east of Charing Cross Road.

The Rookery has been a source of perennial fascination. It came into focus as a haunt of criminality during the magistracy of Henry Fielding, acquiring its nickname – later extended to slums in general – in the 1790s. The underworld economy of this district, within a stone’s throw of the parish church, packed with Irish immigrants, brothels and safe houses, frustrated the authorities but intrigued fashionable bohemians and featured in...
sensational publications like Pierce Egan’s *Life in London* (1821) (fig 4). After the first cholera epidemics galvanized efforts of urban reform, The Rookery became the target of London’s first major slum-clearance road, the unloved New Oxford Street (1843–7). Charing Cross Road, Shaftesbury Avenue and Kingsway followed. The effect was to besiege the old central fabric of St Giles with streets of modern shops and offices, reducing it by 1900 to a depopulating core.

The historiography of St Giles is unusual. The first parish history, by the Vestry Clerk, John Parton, was completed posthumously by the actor and antiquarian William Herbert (1822). Rowland Dobie, a local Radical, supplied an alternative in 1829 because he felt that his native Bloomsbury had been poorly served by Parton, whose account upheld the rights and traditions of St Giles’s unelected Select Vestry. During this period of municipal agitation, attempts were made to overthrow the ‘Select’ in which Cobbett, Orator Hunt and the medical reformer Thomas Wakley played walk-on parts, but they were largely thwarted.

Victorian journalists like John Timbs, Walter Thornbury and Edward Walford all helped to enrich the chronicle of St Giles. Their anecdotes are hard to disentangle, and seldom come up to the immediacy of Dickens, whose early Sketches by Boz (1833–9), factual or fictional, include fond pictures of the street sellers, gin palaces and petit bourgeois residents of St Giles. A few amateur historians follow on, but not until the Survey of London tackled the parish in two volumes of 1912 and 1914 does one encounter professional standards of research. These, the earliest volumes of the Survey to be entrusted to the London County Council under Laurence Gomme, were undertaken in the wake of the LCC’s Kingsway–Aldwych improvements. The research and writing were entrusted to Gomme’s assistant W. W. Braines, who made an extraordinarily fine job of it. Braines’s accounts of the early histories of Lincoln’s Inn Fields, of the Holborn frontage of St Giles and of the church itself remain unsurpassed over a hundred years later. It is just a pity that his efforts stop short in the eighteenth century.

Since then St Giles has been neglected, efforts by the Camden History Society apart. Its position on the fringe of the West End has not helped. It has never, for instance, earned the lucid attention given to the seventeenth-century Westminster parishes of St Martin’s in the Fields, St Paul’s Covent Garden and St Margaret’s by Julia Merritt and others, though the ‘Bloomsbury corridor’ has been illuminated by the various studies of the Bedford Estate, not least Andrew Byrne’s excellent history of Bedford Square (1990). With a target limit of 100,000 words, we have to squeeze a quart into a pint pot. We shall do our best.

– Andrew Saint and Rebecca Preston
London’s waterworks

London has a wealth of water history, and if you know where to look – on the ground, on maps or in pictures – evocative traces of it can still be found, as Nick Higham, author of a new history of London’s water, explains.

Just west of Kew Bridge and north of the Thames stands a tall tower (fig. 1). It looks like a campanile. It is in fact a 19th century standpipe, up which water was pumped by the powerful steam engines of the Grand Junction Waterworks Company.

Today the buildings at the tower’s base – the earliest of them constructed by the company in 1838 – house the London Museum of Water and Steam and still boast some of the company’s original engines. One, a cast iron monster manufactured in 1846, is the largest working beam engine in the world and is still occasionally steamed.

Water supply is something we take for granted – turn a tap and the stuff just gushes out – and few of us ever pause to think about the infrastructure which delivers it. Londoners may be vaguely aware of the huge reservoirs west and south of Heathrow and in the Lea valley; local residents will be familiar with Thames Water’s sprawling treatment works at places like Hampton or Coppermills in Walthamstow (fig.2). But modern waterworks are functional and unalluring and easy to overlook.

In the 19th century things were rather different. London’s private water companies were proud of their engineering achievements and strove to make the structures they commissioned memorable and handsome. In many cases their pumping stations – sturdy buildings with plenty of architectural flourishes – still survive but have become surplus to requirements, as London’s water supply has been modernised and consolidated at fewer, larger sites. Happily some, like the works at Kew Bridge, have found new uses.

Some have been turned into visitor centres or gyms. The parade of engine houses built by three companies along Upper Sunbury Road in Hampton – after they were forced by legislation in 1852 to move their intakes upriver from Teddington Lock in search of cleaner water – are being converted into housing and accommodation for businesses.

And the New River Company pumping station in Green Lanes, a Scottish baronial extravaganza (fig.3), is now an indoor climbing centre – as well as a monument to the vanity of the company’s engineer, William Chadwell Mylne: those are his initials emblazoned on the buttresses, not his employer’s.

The Victorian tradition of building to impress continued into the twentieth century. Drivers heading out towards the M3 pass a fine building at Kempton water treatment works opened in 1929 by the Metropolitan Water Board, which took over London’s eight private water companies in 1904 (fig.4). It houses two of the largest steam pumping engines ever made. This too is now a museum, and one of these, ‘Worthington Triples’ is steamed on...
occasion. The machine stands some six storeys high and is, frankly, awe-inspiring.

Much of London’s water history has of course disappeared. In the eighteenth century the York Buildings Waterworks pumped water from the Thames hard by the modern Charing Cross station and the York Buildings water gate (see p.1). The gate still stands, marooned many yards from the river in Embankment Gardens; the pump house has long since vanished. But the York Buildings’ obelisk-shaped water-tower appealed to topographical artists, and it features in numerous pleasing views of the Thames shoreline, along with the chimney carrying the smoke of London’s very first steam engine.

The Chelsea Waterworks’ pumps and intake, where the world’s first filter bed was installed in 1829 to purify the company’s product, now lie beneath the approaches to Victoria Station. The Southwark & Vauxhall Waterworks’ pumps and filters at Battersea were supplanted by Giles Gilbert Scott’s monumental power station.

In more recent times redundant water features have often been repurposed rather than obliterated. The wetlands and bird reserves at Barnes, Walthamstow and Woodberry Down in Stoke Newington are all former reservoirs or filter beds. The East London Water company’s filter beds on either side of the Lea at Lea Bridge Road are semi-derelict, part-sculpture park, part-adventure playground; one set have a bird-watchers’ hide in the centre.

Going further back, London’s earliest public water supply – the medieval conduits which brought water into the City from springs outside the walls – has also left traces. Conduit Street in Mayfair is named for the first conduit, dating from 1236, which ran from springs near the modern Bond Street tube station to a public fountain or conduit house in Cheapside.

Another Conduit Street, near Paddington Station, marks the site of a second set of springs leased by the City from Westminster Abbey for a rent of 2lb of pepper a year. Eighteenth century engravings show the circular building which covered the spring, in rural surroundings (fig.5).

Nothing at all survives of the next major development in the
city’s water supply, the London Bridge Waterworks, begun in 1581. This used waterwheels in the arches of the bridge – eventually six wheels in four arches – to pump river water up for distribution in pipes of hollowed-out elm trunks. The company charged householders for a supply and was perhaps the first modern public utility, delivering services for paying customers direct to their homes.

It did not survive the demolition of old London Bridge in 1831, when its remaining customers were taken over by its great rival, the New River Company. The New River was completed in 1613, an open aqueduct originally over 40 miles long which brought water originally from two springs near Ware in Hertfordshire. It is still part of the landscape and, remarkably, still provides around 10 per cent of London’s drinking water. It has been widened and straightened over the centuries, but you can follow most of its route using a path provided by Thames Water: an invigorating tramp through North London’s straggling suburbs (fig.6). Its northermost point is on the towpath between Hertford and Ware where a nineteenth century building known as the New Gauge limits the flow to 22.5 million gallons a day.

The aqueduct originally terminated in Islington in a round pond at New River Head, hard by Sadlers Wells Theatre. Its modern terminus is at Stoke Newington but urban explorers can choose to follow the old route south, marked by a dogleg of standing water in Clissold Park, a wide grass strip in the middle of Petherton Road, a linear park in Canonbury, a ribbon of grass and trees in Colebrooke Row.

At New River Head the original reservoir and its surrounding filter beds were filled in after 1911, and the seventeenth century water house was demolished to make way for a headquarters for the Metropolitan Water Board, now posh flats. An alleyway off Myddelton Square leads to a viewpoint from which it is possible to see part of the round pond’s curving edge, and the remains of an eighteenth century windmill and pump house – the oldest surviving steam engine house in London. This building too is to be repurposed: the Museum of Illustration has taken it and plans to restore and reopen it as the Quentin Blake Centre for Illustration in 2023.

For those lucky enough to get access to the water board’s old headquarters there are two treats. One is another survivor of the medieval conduits, known as the Chimney Conduit after the open shaft or chimney that rose up next to the arched roof of its collecting tank. It was still in place behind 20 Queen’s Square in Bloomsbury in 1910, when an antiquary exploring it fell in and was obliged to swim. But later it was taken down and re-erected here. Today it squats like a miniature church among the residents’ sun-loungers.

The other treat is the Oak Room, a spectacular interior dating from 1693. When the old buildings on the site were demolished, this room was dismantled, preserved and then reconstructed in the water board’s new home. Its name comes from the oak panelling on the walls, which feature decorative swags carved in high relief, perhaps by the famed wood carver Grinling Gibbons, below a painted ceiling with a portrait of William III.

It is a very grand interior. But then, the New River Company was a grand institution, with a claim to be Britain’s first modern business corporation and also its most profitable. An historian in the 1980s estimated that if by some miracle one of its original shareholders had survived until the company was bought out in 1904 he would have enjoyed an annual return, over 292 years, of 267 per cent. Not bad for a mere waterworks.

Early days of the Parkland Walk

Appreciation of the origins of this popular pedestrian route involves both ancient and recent history.

Readers may remember the photograph in the last issue showing the stately home for bats provided by the twin railway tunnels at Highgate, which stand at the end of the stretch of the ‘Parkland Walk’ along the old railway line running NW from Finsbury Park. This route is the subject of an interesting article by Patrick Hegarty-Morrish in the excellent latest Bulletin (no. 63) of the Hornsey Historical Society. In The Parkland Walk, a multi-species history, he observes that while local users of the walk may think of it as “a rare enclave of wilderness” its ecology is something much more complicated, reflecting a landscape which evolved from forest to agriculture and then to industrial railway land through urban development, before it became officially available to the public as what is rather misleadingly termed ‘parkland’. It retains evidence of all these phases and continues to evolve. Oak and beech trees recall medieval forestry and hunting; hedgerow plants arrived after trees were cleared for agriculture; ragwort and willowherb came with the railway. The poor soil of the trackbed on the embankment encouraged bird’s foot trefoil, which later declined after enrichment of the soil through the advent of dogwalkers. In 2015 291 species and subspecies of plants were recorded.

After the trackbed was taken up in 1971, shrubs were no longer cut back and vast expanses of brambles developed. I remember this phase in the early 1970s, before the path was official. Near Finsbury Park one scrambled up (illegally) onto the embankment into a wild, sunny world overlooking the neighbouring rooftops, to gather the exceptionally good blackberries. Further along, the line ran dramatically through a cutting, where during winter snow, whooping children delighted in sliding down the steep slopes on black plastic bags. Beyond were the ghostly remains of Crouch Hill station, where in summer the dense grass and nettles along the track reached to the height of the platforms. The peaceful traffic-free scene attracted artists, among them the local artist Ben Baker who was especially drawn to the drama of the road bridges rising over the green overgrown track.

An adventure playground was built on the area which passed through Islington, but the rest of the line, which ran through Haringey, was acquired by the borough in 1974, for housing. But by the time plans were published in 1977, the concept of continuing to use the land as permanent and continuous open space had become firmly established in local opinion. Local objectors sought for precedents – not easy to find in London at that date (though an encouraging, if distant, example discovered was repurposed railway lines at Stoke on Trent). Among the reports submitted to the public enquiry in 1978, the submission from the Stroud Green Community Association was strongly critical both of the quality of the proposed housing and of the loss of amenity through disrupting the walk, reducing the mature landscape and expensively removing parts of the embankment; it criticised the council for an outdated attitude “where quantity of dwelling units is placed before quality of life”.* The borough’s plans were rejected, and so the Parkland walk became official, with David Hope appointed as a much-valued Warden. Since then proposals both for a light railway and for a road along the track have come to nothing, while its value to the public has been further demonstrated by the popularity of the walk at the time of COVID-19.


For more on the Parkland Walk see parkland-walk.org.uk, and R. Davies and D. Bevan, Rails to the People’s Palace, and the Parkland Walk, 2006.

– Bridget Cherry

On the embankment near Finsbury Park, 1970s. (Parkland Walk enquiry submission)

The Parkland walk in the cutting at Crouch Hill, 1970s, oil painting by Ben Baker. (Photo: Bridget Cherry)
This book is about the most important area of aristocratic residences in London in the century or so from the 1540s to the 1640s, housing many of the most important Tudor and early Stuart courtiers. There has been previous work on individual houses, including the LTS’s 2009 publication by Simon Thurley about Somerset House, and Patricia Croot has described the ownership of all the sites in detail, but they have never before been comprehensively examined as a group, and several of them have been little studied at all.

In addition to the special cases of the Savoy and Somerset House, the book deals with seven houses between the Strand and the Thames (Essex, Arundel, Worcester, Salisbury, Durham, York and Northumberland) and two north of the Strand (Burghley and Bedford). The area south of the Strand had been dominated by bishops’ town houses from the thirteenth century onwards. In the 1530s these sites became available to courtiers, though two clerics (Durham and York) managed to recover the freehold of their sites under Queen Mary. The existing houses were usually extended rather than replaced, and the famous prints by Hollar of Arundel House largely show the medieval house, as opposed to the new wing and innovative long galleries added later. There was usually an intermittent process of reconstruction, and Guerci identifies several periods of substantial change, such as at the Savoy in 1540 to 1560 and at the Duke of Buckingham’s house (later York House) around 1620. The two houses north of the Strand were built on new sites in the sixteenth century, and two mansions were built on new sites south of the Strand in the seventeenth century (Salisbury and Northumberland).

In the 1640s the houses were used for quartering troops, and it is not clear that the prestige of the area ever recovered. Other high-status areas became available, the land was valuable and the aristocrats were often in debt. Almost all the houses were demolished between about 1660 and 1700, though the Savoy and Somerset House remained until late in the eighteenth century and Northumberland House survived until 1874. The only remaining building is of course the York House watergate. Guerci describes the process of redevelopment, but his focus is on the period from the 1530s to about 1700 (his work on the later history of Northumberland House has been published separately).

Guerci’s research has been thorough, including work in several aristocratic archives, and it is unlikely that much remains to be discovered. The material available is inevitably uneven. For only a few houses are contemporary plans available, and inventories listing rooms are only slightly more numerous. Much use is made of the standard views and maps, from Wyngaerde’s panorama of about 1544 to Morgan’s map of 1682. It is useful to have these brought together, with the sites of the houses picked out by red outlines. New views of the houses could not have been expected, but several here are little-known, such as Hollar’s drawing of Arundel House from the river and Esselen’s view across York House towards Westminster.

For each house, the author explains how the site came into courtier hands, who occupied it and what building works were undertaken or planned. It is rarely possible to date particular buildings precisely, but Guerci takes us as far as it is possible to go. Some common features emerge. For the houses south of the Strand, the approach from the river was the most important, and many of them were hidden from the street by tenements. Views of the river were important, hence the many terraces and turrets, and so were gardens, especially at Burghley House, with its banqueting houses and mound. Many of the houses had galleries. The houses were of course richly furnished, as the inventories show, and several had notable art collections, especially the Earl of Arundel’s paintings and statues at Arundel House and the Duke of Buckingham’s paintings at York House. In 1588 the Earl of Leicester at Essex House had not only 124 pictures but also 58 maps. Intriguingly, one of the owners regarded his house as too near the river, making it ‘somewhat rheumaticke’.

For the two houses newly created in the seventeenth century, Guerci provides excellent reconstruction maps and drawings, but these are absent for the other houses, presumably in part because of inadequate information. It seems odd, however, to have previous writers’ reconstruction plans included, especially Kingsford’s of Essex House, when the author has new information that was not available to them.

Guerci makes a reasonable case that we cannot understand the country houses of the owners without knowing about their London houses, and that the latter were the centres of architectural conspicuous consumption and relatively accessible, but I was not persuaded that the case for the Strand houses being influential had really been substantiated, especially as it is so difficult to date most of their buildings. Several of the houses seem to have been architecturally unremarkable. Nor was it clear to me from the book in what ways the Strand houses were of European significance. I would like to have seen more context in terms of the overall distribution of London’s major Tudor and early Stuart houses, and the rise of other high-status areas, such as Lincoln’s Inn Fields, which
was presumably connected with the decline of the Strand houses.

Nevertheless, this is an excellent and important book which has been thoroughly researched and attractively produced. It will be the standard work on the Strand houses, and anyone interested in Tudor and Stuart London will learn much from it.

– Dorian Gerhold

In the Shadow of St Paul’s Cathedral,
by Margaret Willes, 2022 Yale University Press
300pp, 21 plates, 33 text figs and maps,
ISBN 978 0 30024 983 5

Today the name St Paul’s churchyard may evoke a green oasis behind the railings around the eastern part of the cathedral. But the name also applies to the streets which bound the cathedral site to north and south and this book is concerned with a still wider picture, extending to the hinterland north and north west, along Paternoster Row, and around the premises of the Stationers Company by Amen Corner. For several centuries the whole of this area was the heart of London’s bookselling trade, as is succinctly demonstrated by a map showing the numerous premises associated with books and printing in the eighteenth century.

The story takes us from the Middle Ages to the present day. In the crowded medieval City the area around the cathedral was the principal open space, resembling a market place, with semi-permanent booths and stalls for craftsmen supplying the needs of the cathedral and other religious bodies for books and writing materials. Book traders settled in Paternoster Row, the Stationers Company was formed in 1403, and in the sixteenth century as printing developed, books proliferated. But while the book trade is the author’s prime interest, there are excursions into other areas. An introductory chapter sets the scene with the medieval events that took place within the churchyard, believed in ancient times to be the site of a ‘folk moot’, but more definitely, the place where regular preaching was carried out at St Paul’s cross, on special occasions in the presence of the monarch. By the early seventeenth century, as John Gipkyn’s painting indicates (shown on the book cover), the royal audience was accommodated in a ‘sermon house’ built against the north wall of the cathedral’s eastern arm. The churchyard hosted very varied activities: a stopping place in the Lord Mayor’s annual procession, the setting for controversial sermons during the years of conflict following the Reformation, it was also the scene of daily commerce. The rowdy secular activities split over to invade the cathedral nave, which became known as Paul’s Walk, despite both royal and clerical disapproval from the Reformation onwards.

Less well-known aspects include the story of the drama company of boy actors from St Paul’s school, based in the churchyard in the later sixteenth century.

In the seventeenth century, the book trade flourished. In 1663 Pepys spent several hours at Joshua Kirton’s shop ‘at the sign of the King’s arms by Paul’s Cross’ at the east end of the churchyard; books he was shown included works by Shakespeare, Dugdale’s magnificent History of St Paul’s Cathedral, published in 1658 and Butler’s new satirical poem Hudibras. Such stock suggests that the bookshop was more than a temporary booth, but sadly there seems to be little evidence for the appearance of such buildings before all was swept way in the great fire of 1666. Pepys attributed Kirton’s death in 1667 to grief from his losses.

Yet St Paul’s rose again – there are some intriguing asides about how Wren’s workmen were organised – and the book trade recovered, its activities enhanced by the growth of broadsheets, then newspapers and periodicals, including the Philosophical Transactions and other publications of the Royal Society, and in the eighteenth century, by reviews and journals. Wren’s cathedral was now encircled by a railing; and the booksellers established themselves in the rebuilt houses along Paternoster Row and further north around Little Britain, encouraging trade through advertising, subscriptions, auctions and lotteries. Social intercourse was encouraged by coffee shops and literary dinners. The cathedral attracted tourists, and through the eighteenth century its immediate surroundings also became a centre for luxury shopping of all kinds, especially on the south side, as is aptly shown by illustrations of some of the trade cards. Meanwhile the Cathedral became the theatre for royal ceremonies and the state burials, notably of Nelson in 1805.

But fashionable shopping moved west. By the time of Tallis’s street views of 1838–40 many premises along St Pauls’ churchyard were still described as warehouses for fabrics and clothing, but they included only five booksellers, compared with twenty three a century earlier. However many booksellers and publishers remained in the surroundings area, including still familiar names such as Longmans, Nelson and Cassell. It all ended in 1940, when the Blitz destroyed the premises of seventeen publishers in Paternoster Row, and almost the whole of the Cathedral’s built surroundings. An epilogue sums up what has happened since, ending with the Occupy movement’s demonstration in 2011, seen as continuing the tradition of the churchyard as a place for public protest. While the historical background through the centuries may be familiar, there is much unusual detail to discover in this enjoyable book, with ample references for those who wish to pursue individual subjects further.

– Bridget Cherry


As George Formby sang in Fanlight Fanny (1935), “Up the West End, that’s the best end, where the night clubs thrive...”. For many people London means the West End, the district of shops and galleries, theatres and restaurants concentrated between Bond Street, Oxford Street, Kingsway and Strand. This is a distinctive square mile, where visitors flock and money spent in enjoyment and pursuit of the arts. The author’s focus is firmly on catering for pleasure, with particular emphasis on the performing arts.

The creation of London’s distinctive West End resulted from both a push and a pull. The push was the decline of the City as a residential area, especially after the Great Fire of 1666, although it is likely that the rich would in any case have forsaken its cramped and insalubrious streets. The pull was the location of Court and Parliament, increasingly prominent after the Restoration. These factors gave rise to an elite residential zone, accompanied by the trades and services required to cater for its residents. Extend the book’s northern and western limits by 800 yards and you encompass what was London’s premier residential district until the end of the Great War, and possibly even the Second World War.

This book divides its discourse into four main parts. The first considers the aristocratic West End of 1800 – 1850, when it was at the heart of the late Georgian consumer revolution with gaslight and plate glass making shopping an integral part of an evolving culture of conspicuous consumption. Contemporary descriptions combine exhilaration with a feeling of unreality, reflecting the excitement of looking through brightly-lit shop windows while protected from passing traffic. It was John Nash who expanded the shopping district north from Strand to Oxford Street which contained the Pantheon, an early predecessor of the department store. His Regent Street was London’s first purpose-built shopping street, while the adjacent Burlington Arcade (which “sold no article of positive necessity”) added its dolls-house charm to the spending experience. There was a nightlife too, ranging from the smart newly-founded clubs in St James’ to the ‘flash’ set fictionalised in Pierce Egan’s Life in London. Lower down were the pubs and cellars in Covent Garden and Strand. Some were certainly boozy dives with bawdy songs, but others offered political satire and mock trials, attesting to the existence of a vernacular intellectual culture.

The next section addresses the bourgeois West End, which takes us to 1914. This was the epoch when the West End became recognisably modern, and certainly more reachable, even democratised, with new bridges and railway stations increased access ten-fold, and new streets built through it to speed the clogging horse-drawn traffic. This was when the sounds of applause from the theatres and of the crowds on the streets, and the smell of cooking coming from the restaurants – possibly exotic if you were passing through Soho – came to characterise the distinctiveness of the West End. In fact the West End was tactile, even sensuous – the feel of the plush seating at the theatre and the luxury of opulent surroundings all contributing to its specialness.

Then we have what the author terms somewhat anachronistically ‘Showbiz’, with the main focus on theatre and music hall. This is clearly McWilliam’s passion, with three special maps and over one third of the book devoted to this single topic. It reads well; it is no pageant of plays and personalities but a thorough and incisive analysis of the business of theatre and we learn about the fabric and operation of theatres, their management and regulation. However, while theatres may be emblematic of the West End, the result of devoting so much space to them is that other aspects of the arts get rather cursory treatment. The world of the art market, the concert, opera and literature is each given a rather brief mention. Furthermore the last section, Hospitality, dispatches hotels, shops and restaurants in a somewhat slight 50 pages. They surely merit more detailed treatment; after all, there were far more shoppers, and at least as many diners and possibly hotel guests, as there ever were theatregoers.

The final chapter highlights two opposing themes. The opulent West End as heart of Empire celebrating the relief of Mafeking is contrasted with the spectre of exhausted shop assistants living in garrets and waiters surviving off tips. For every well-fed clubman in St James looking down at passing stragglers, McWilliams reminds us that there was someone sufficiently hungry, or angry, to throw a brick through his window. These are important and valid points, but being introduced in the final chapter and not integrated into the main text come across as afterthoughts. In summary, this book is both detailed and delightful; the author is probably right in stating that this is the first serious study of the West End, and in promising a further volume to bring the narrative up to date is giving us something to look forward to – but how
about a little less on theatres and rather more on the rest of the West End?

*The London Restaurant* is another thoughtful contribution to the study of consumption, and which goes a long way to supplying the information that McWilliam might usefully have included in *London’s West End*. It takes us through the nineteenth century restaurant in six chapters but first, as Mrs Beaton might have said, catch your restaurant. No easy task, the author tackles everything from the small café to the grand salon, and by interrogating successive Kelly’s Post Office Directories finds that the number of establishments multiplied by ten in this period. In 1910 there were some 2000 establishments, split one quarter in the City, catering for office, factory and other workers, one quarter in the West End and the balance spread throughout the suburbs.

This was the period when the chop house declined and was replaced by the more modern range of café, dining room and restaurant, serving food that might not surprise us today. Some were small owner-managed businesses where a labourer might dine for 1/-, while others were chains such as Speirs & Pond and Lyons that offered wholesome fare to a uniform standard. Women were welcome in many establishments; some were for women alone while others offered vegetarian fare. Grander establishments such as Claridge’s, the Ritz and the Savoy opened around 1890 and catered to high-end diners.

We are ushered behind the counter to look at how a restaurant was run. Drawing on both trade press and legal reports we learn about the business side – hiring staff, equipping the kitchen, procuring suppliers. The dizzying mix of risk and reward is described well despite the virtual absence of any archival records. A small business might face constant insolvency, while a large one in a favoured site could change hands for tens of thousands of pounds. The twin topics of health and regulation each receive detailed treatment in separate chapters.

Waiters get the longest chapter to themselves, and this offers a real insight into their working lives. Despite their importance as the pivot between the kitchen and the diner, their tenure was precarious and their condition might be pitiful. A waiter might scrape an existence his whole life – but one German immigrant waiter thrived at serving, moved on to managing and eventually established his own hotel – the eponymous Goring, currently favoured by Royalty. There were inevitably more ‘Georges’ (the sobriquet for the rank-and-file waiter) than Gorings, and the growth of trade unionism among waiters is a testimony to their struggle to improve their position.

There is little evidence for most restaurants and other eating establishments outside the bare entry in the street directory, and there is virtually no record of the fare, which may explain why there is little material directly on the dining experience. This is a shame, and one of which the author is clearly aware. She has drawn on visitors’ diaries and consulted observant authors such as George Gissing and George Augustus Sala to good effect, but when dishes might simply be chalked on a blackboard or announced by a waiter and few printed menus survive, we are left with our hunger unsatisfied. While acknowledging that there is no single collection of London restaurant menus akin to the extraordinary New York Public Library collection of mainly American menus, there is enough evidence to construct a chapter on the dining experience: the American and British Ephemera Societies would be delighted to assist. This putative chapter could cover how a restaurant took reservations (were they even needed?), received and sat diners. At what time did people eat? Did they go straight to the table? How was it laid, what were typical menus, did they evolve over time and what wines were offered? How was the bill presented and how was it paid before the age of plastic? Alas, we don’t know, and perhaps the author might one day find time to round off her feast of fascination with one much needed serving.

– Simon Morris

**London: 1870 – 1914. A City at its Zenith**


In turning from those long-form historical area studies, the fruit of his editorship of the *Survey of London*, to write the history of a period of the whole of Greater London, Andrew Saint has had to achieve an extraordinary expansion in geographical coverage while simultaneously undergoing a massive contraction of space in which to do so. His 2013 history of the small London parish and borough of Battersea, published for *The Survey* in 2013, luxuriated across two volumes and over 1000 large pages. In *London: 1870 – 1914* he has tasked himself with covering the entire County of London in barely 200. How can this possibly work?

Of course, there are benefits to such concision. By scrupulously acknowledging the work of other writings in more specific fields and by eschewing large strings of statistics Saint has freed himself up to write a much crisper narrative. Rather, he comes to this book with a single assumption: that he is charting a period of progress. By the end of it the reader will have come to understand how the lives of myriad Londoners – the poor, women, working class families, concertgoers, the sick, school children, frequenter of pubs and music halls, commuters – have all in their separate ways had their lives improved over its 44-year span. As such and as he notes in the preface, he sees the book serving as both sequel and counterweight, half-a-

Saint’s academic and writing career has been built on architectural history, and that emphasis remains clear from the opening page, when we are asked to consider a ghostly photograph of the grandiose yet short-lived Kensington House, that is to serve as an epitome for the unplanned philistine opulence of a just-disappearing version of Victorianism.

Given how much ground has had to be covered, careful thought has been given to its structure. Each chapter covers a decade and intercuts summaries of key events with thematic strands of social history, and sudden zooming-ins to focus on a particular style or building that is not just a moment in architectural or technical history but speaks of London as well. There is a sudden focus on the innovative Queen Anne style houses in Belsize Park in the 1870s for example, while in the 1880s it is the turn to middle-class blocks of flats, and the growing availability of electric light and the telephone that become the filters for viewing that decade.

One senses that Saint is taking the opportunity to share some long-held personal favourites. Mary Ward House on Tavistock Place gets the Arts and Crafts crown for the 1890s; Westminster Cathedral and West Ham Technical Institute are the eclectic pairing for the turn of the century; and when he writes about such buildings the judgements are cool and assured. Yet alongside due praise for public architecture, the book remains equally alive to the mediocre, the vernacular and the representative, and fair in describing them and understanding their context – be they the gaunt Five Percent dwellings blocks of the 1870s, or some of the LCC’s less architecturally adroit cottage estates of the new century. Nor is it averse to occasional succinct skewerings, such as the “big, stone-faced town hall” that Ilford acquired in 1901: “if not much can be said for its looks, it showed that Ilford was pleased with itself”.

Another element that contributes to the book’s richness of texture is the extensive use of contemporary literature as a way of contextualising or counterpointing moments in London’s history. Anthony Trollope’s novel *The Way We Live Now* and its capitalist-speculator anti-hero, Augustus Melmotte, recur through the 1870s chapter as a motif for some of the greedy self-serving developments of that decade; the contrasting poetry of decadent Dowson and barrack-room Kipling, along with Sickert’s depictions of music hall audiences, provide an entry point into the 1890s.

Into the new century, as London turns into a centrifuge, dispersing new suburbs, industry and transport infrastructure in an increasing arc around the Home Counties, it is the long-unconsidered imperial structures around the redevelopment of Aldwych (Australia House and Holy Trinity, Kingsway) in which Saint finds the last gasp of architectural excellence at the centre of empire, before the cataclysm of the Great War closes it all down and, by implication, no history, social or architectural, can ever be quite the same again.

In short: an engaging, deftly written and nicely illustrated account of the social history of London at a key period in its development, as seen through its author’s personal architectural prism; a post-lockdown book that will make you go out onto London’s streets and look again, more thoughtfully, at buildings that you had previously walked by.

– Jon Newman

The Streets of Europe – The Sights, Sounds and Smells that shaped its Great Cities
by Brian Ladd, University of Chicago Press hbk 2020 257 pages plus notes & index £20

Dogopolis – How Dogs and Humans made modern New York, London and Paris

These two books take a comparative look at the nineteenth century city; the first from a sensory, and the second from a canine-centred perspective, matching and contrasting London with its peers. A well established approach; our late distinguished member Donald Olsen wrote the renowned *City as a Work of Art* some 40 years ago, comparing the form and function of London, Paris and Vienna. But does it work here, and are we persuaded that sights and sounds shaped London, or that dogs really played any role in making it?

*The Streets of Europe* gives equal weight to London and Paris with lesser but still valuable focus on Berlin and Vienna. The author explains how contemporary interest in streets peaked between 1850 and 1900, convincingly arguing that before mid-century the challenge of regulating dirt and congestion exceeded most municipal resources, while from the early twentieth century streets were reduced to paths of communication facilitating rapid transit. By focusing on sights, sounds and smells, the author is calling our attention to how contemporaries perceived the European street as it developed from a locale of traders and their refuse to a reformed, cleansed and municipalised street.

The street has always been a feature of a city, rather than simply an unbuilt space between shops and houses. Streets favoured commerce over...
ceremony, although grand streets might be constructed to reflect municipal prestige in Amsterdam or Sienna, or to proclaim royal power in Potsdam and St Petersburg. The great cities had distinct characteristics; London displayed a “great tide of human life” with opulence interspersed with poverty. Paris emphasised public display amidst the congested streets that Haussmann reshaped from the 1850s. Berlin grew to greatness on the back of German unification, substituting provincial diffidence with a metropolitan brashfulness befitting the Chicago of Europe.

Ubiquitous street commerce was what first struck most visitors. The tempo of the markets, together with the ebb and flow of suppliers and purchasers, set the city’s daily rhythm. The hawkers that Mayhew recorded in London had counterparts in all other cities and their jostle, noise and smell was ever-present. Street vending was an eternal challenge to municipal authority and it was surely this, as much as reducing friction between shopper and passer-by or promoting hygiene, that drove regulation. This practice was eventually prohibited in Berlin, restricted in Paris but remained tolerated in London, reflecting London’s fragmented local government as much as any liberal tendency. A further factor in the growth of orderly shopping was a general transfer from open-air to open-fronted and eventually enclosed trading. The continental cities developed great covered markets while London boasted glass fronted shops at which visitors marvelled from 1780s.

The street was also focus of social activity; key was the promenade, a conspicuous display of wealth and social prominence. Distinctly continental, most references are drawn from Paris, Vienna and, later, Berlin. Dandies certainly strolled in St James – think Burlington Bertie – and coaches paraded in Hyde Park but the true flâneur needed the café terrace to see and be seen from, and perhaps London was just too cold or wet, or its pavements too narrow, to accommodate them. Street life, of a distinctly different quality, was more visible in poor areas. The author’s familiarity with French and German texts enriches the narrative by enabling him, for instance, to couple a late nineteenth century account of a teeming Deptford streetscape with a pleasing description of the inhabitants of a middling Berlin apartment block.

Some street commerce was noxious, and many streets rife with mud, filth and stench. The Parisians dressed in black, claimed the English visitor, to conceal the mud on their clothes. Londoners, retorted the Parisian, wore brown wigs to match their filthy air. Foul streets seem to have been taken for granted until the 1750s but concerns increased towards the end of the century, with the narrow and crowded streets of Paris attracting particular censure. There was definitely a mounting intolerance of filth, although the causes are difficult to pin down: the author suggesting that this may have resulted from the growth of rationalism and emphasis on physical as well as religious purity, not to mention the arrival of cholera from the 1830s. But while street cleansing began, the disposal of sewage and the presence of horses and noxious trades made this an impossible task. Overall, London led on the cleanliness stakes, Paris followed and Berlin lagged well behind.

The book concludes with chapters on two distinctly physical subjects – transport and public order, better-known and rather less ethereal topics than the title might lead us to expect. In the round, it’s fair to say that the author doesn’t convince this reader that the sights, sounds and smells shaped anything at all. In fact, quite the opposite; it was the citizens alone who held the active agency, reacting to these and other factors in a variety of ways to shape their own cities. What this book tells us, in an engaging and informative style, is a great deal about street life in four great European cities from around 1750 to 1900. It looks at them in a way not previously attempted, and by constantly comparing and contrasting helps us see London in a wider context than a single-city study.

Dogopolis takes a different approach, considering how dogs shaped three modern cities, this time New York, London and Paris. Throughout the nineteenth century dogs roamed the streets fighting, biting or, depending on your point of view, delighting. The political response was telling; stray and out-of-control dogs were associated with the poorer, often immigrant classes, and as early as 1811 New York appointed a dog collector, while the Lord Mayor of London called a few years later for the destruction of rabid dogs. As ever, no two cities took the same approach. New York dog lovers assaulted the dog collector and freed his charges so that it was forced to build a dog pound; Paris also impounded dogs, and only the British were sentimental enough to found a canine asylum, the famous Battersea Cats’ and Dogs’ Home.

Stray and rabid dogs challenged the image of the dog as a domestic pet, the author reminding us that the word is derived from the French petit, connoting little companion. It was the threat of rabies that throughout the nineteenth century focused attention on stray dogs and called for their regulation – or, more accurately, the regulation of those responsible for them. While the actual incidence of rabies was infinitesimal when compared to cholera, the cry of “mad dog” would create the same degree of panic in a crowded street as the equivalent “fire, fire” would in a theatre. All three cities introduced requirements that dogs be muzzled in public, stirring controversy among animal lovers and missing the point that there was nobody to muzzle the ownerless stray. This hysteria diminished only after Pasteur discovered an effective rabies vaccine.

Further chapters discuss breeding of pedigree dogs, noting the celebrated dog shows at Crystal Palace, the use of police dogs and the problem of dog mess; these may contain much of interest but stray a long way from the book’s purpose of explaining how dogs have made modern cities. In
short, they did nothing of the sort. A more sustainable argument might be that dogs and humans coexist in cities, and that dogs’ greatest contribution is in guarding humans and their property. You will learn more about this from the single chapter devoted to this topic in Almeroth-Williams’ *City of Beasts* (reviewed in LTS Newsletter no. 91) than you will do from this entire *Dogopolis*.

– Simon Morris

**STOP PRESS**

The Institute of Historical Research’s new London Summer School, 11 to 14 July, will focus on the theme of ‘renewal’ with stories of resilience and transformation in London from the Great Fire to the Blitz, and on into the city’s future.

This is a unique opportunity to explore London’s stories and historic places from the institute’s home at Senate House in Bloomsbury. Guest lectures and interactive workshops will investigate topics from London’s earliest history to the present day – as well as visions and policy debates concerning its future.

Special access tours and visits include St Paul’s Cathedral, with a behind the scenes triforium tour at St Paul’s Cathedral to see the Library and Great Model, and access to the nave roof space. Other special access visits will include the Museum of London, London Livery Company archives, and the fascinating secrets of Senate House itself.

Students will have access to the remarkable London collections in the IHR’s Wohl Library, including maps, rare books and a range of important primary and secondary sources. The week will also feature the inaugural Derek Keene London Lecture from Professor Vanessa Harding (Birkbeck, University of London) on *The Great Fire and the End of Medieval London*.

Other speakers and tutors will include Professor Lucy Noakes (Rab Butler Chair in Modern History, University of Essex), Dr Hannah Elias (lecturer in Black British History, Goldsmiths, University of London) and Ben Rogers (Professor of Practice, University of London, and founding director of the Centre for London thinktank), as well as IHR staff.

The London Summer School builds on the IHR’s outstanding strengths in urban and metropolitan history, and especially London history, formerly concentrated in its Centre for Metropolitan History (founded in 1988 by the IHR and Museum of London) and now based in its Centre for the History of People, Place and Community. The Summer School also draws on other high-profile projects and centres based in the IHR: the Victoria County History of England (founded 1899), History & Policy: the UK’s national network for connecting historians and policy-makers, and Layers of London, the major history mapping project which brings together historic maps, material from archives and institutions, and crowdsourced content from communities across the city.

Further programme information, and details of bursaries (application deadline 16 May) are available on the IHR website: www.history.ac.uk/ihr-london-renewal.

---

**The Newsletter Editor welcomes suggestions from readers for items in the Newsletter.**

**The deadline for contributions to the November Newsletter is 16 October 2022.**

**For contact details see the back page.**

---

**LTS Newsletter Index 2000 – 2021**

Thanks to our indefatigable committee member Simon Morris, there is now an Index covering the contents of the Society’s *Newsletters* issued from May 2000 to November 2021 (Nos 50-93). It follows the same format as the earlier index for *Newsletters* issued from February 1975 up to No 49 in November 1999.

We hope to include the index with the next *Newsletter*. It will also be available on the Society’s website.

---

**The Livery Crafts Fair**

**17-18 June, Guildhall Yard**

**Showcasing skills ancient and modern**

Inspired by the guildsmen who staged the original pageant of 1519, and Becket’s origins as the son of a City merchant, Guildhall Yard will be styled as an immersive sixteenth century experience with period entertainers and a vibrant Livery Crafts Fair. Visitors will be invited to imagine themselves as Tudor Londoners, learn about a pivotal period in British history, sample a specially brewed Becket Beer! – and watch skilled livery craft displays in an open air, COVID-19-secure environment. See also p.2.

**Entrance will be free to the public.**
London Topographical Society

The London Topographical Society was founded in 1880 for the study and appreciation of London. It is a registered charity (No. 271590) with around c. 1,360 members. The Society remains true to the vision of its founders by making available maps, plans and views illustrating the history, growth and topographical development of London at all periods, and by publishing research in the London Topographical Record. Details of all publications can be found on the Society’s website: www.londontopsoc.org
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London Topographical Society Annual General Meeting 2022

The 121st annual general meeting will be held in the Assembly Hall of Church House, Westminster at 5.00pm on Tuesday 12 July 2022.

**PLEASE BRING THIS NEWSLETTER WITH YOU AS PROOF OF MEMBERSHIP.**

**Location**
27 Great Smith Street, Westminster SW1P 3AZ.

**Entry, timing and refreshments**
Access for you – and a guest should you wish – will be from 4.00pm via Dean’s Yard. Entry to the yard is through the portal opposite the Crimea and Indian Mutiny Memorial in the parking area by the West Door of Westminster Abbey. Proceed straight ahead to the entrance of Church House.

Light refreshments will be available in the Assembly Hall.

**Disabled access**
Disabled members wishing to attend may bring their carer and should contact the Hon. Secretary, Mike Wicksteed (mike.wicksteed@btinternet.com).

**How to get there**
The venue, close to Victoria Street and Westminster Abbey, is well served by public transport.

- **Underground:** Westminster Station – Jubilee, District & Circle Lines.
- **Buses:** 11, 24, 88, 148 and 211

**History**
The original Church House, founded in 1887, was built to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of Queen Victoria. The current building was designed by Sir Herbert Baker and was officially opened by HM King George VI on 10 June 1940.

During the Blitz, the building suffered a direct hit but due to its exceptional construction only minimal damage was done. On 10/11 May 1940, the chamber of the House of Commons was destroyed and a bomb passed through the floor of the Lords without exploding which resulted in both Houses moving to Church House on 13 May where they conducted their business until June 1941. From late June 1941 until October 1950, the Commons met in the Lords Chamber, while the Lords met in the Robing Room of the House of Lords.

In 1945 the first meetings of the United Nations Preparatory Commission and the UN Security Council were held in Church House.

The building was granted Grade II listed status in 1988. It is used as a conference centre when the Church of England’s General Synod is not in session.

**Agenda**
Following a welcome by our Chairman, Penny Hunting, the meeting will comprise:

1. Minutes of the 120th meeting.
5. Election of Council officers and members.
6. Proposals by members.
7. Any other business.

Items 1, 2 and 3 can be read in this Newsletter insert.

Following the AGM there will be two short presentations. Historian John Stewart, recent biographer of Church House’s architect, Sir Herbert Baker, will talk about the building; archaeologist and architectural historian Tim Tatton-Brown will talk on the 2020 below-ground archaeology survey of the Dean’s Yard area.

**Minutes of the Society’s 120th Annual General Meeting**
**held at 5.00pm on Tuesday 31st August 2021 at the Glaziers Hall, 9 Montague Close, London SE1 9DD**

Apologies: Richard Bowden, Marion Cowe, David Elis-Williams, Sue Flockton, Jane Horton, Penny Hunting, Derek Morris, Tom Reed, Alan Ruston, Paul Simmons and Laurence Worms.

In the absence of the Society’s Chairman, Penny Hunting, Simon Morris, the Hon. Publications Secretary, chaired the meeting and welcomed members to the AGM which was attended by 171 members and guests.

**1. MINUTES OF THE 119th ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.**
The Minutes, as published in the May 2021 edition of the Society’s Newsletter, were approved and signed.

Proposed: Caroline Barron/Seconded: William Latey – Carried.

**2. MATTERS ARISING.**
The Chairman noted that progress had been made on two matters arising from the last AGM in 2019 – name badges and recognition of the work undertaken on behalf of the Society by the late Ann Saunders. All Council members were wearing name badges. Council Member Caroline Barron briefed the meeting on the setting up of the Ann Saunders Essay Prize.

**3. 121st ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR 2020.**
The Annual Report, as published in the Society’s May 2021 edition of the Newsletter, was approved.

Proposed: Peter Barber/Seconded: Rosemary Weinstein – Carried

As there was no AGM in 2020 on account of the pandemic, the Hon. Treasurer, Roger Cline, briefed the meeting on the two sets of accounts noting that the accounts, as published in the May 2020 and May 2021 editions of the Newsletter, had been approved respectively by the Society’s outgoing Independent Examiner, Hugh Cleaver who had been examining our accounts since 1988 and the new Independent Examiner, Ms Brenda Hawkins.

Accounts for 2019
Proposed: Dr MC Black
Seconded: Carol Anderson – Carried

Accounts for 2021
Proposed: Peter Whetman
Seconded: David Hawgood – Carried
Roger Cline gave a valedictory speech on retiring from the post of Treasurer after 36 years.

The Treasurer-elect, Anne Ramon, introduced herself to the members.

5. THE HON. EDITOR’S REPORT.

The Hon. Editor, Sheila O’Connell spoke about the Society’s 2021 publication: the 32nd volume of *The London Topographical Record* and briefed the meeting on the 2022 publications.

6. ELECTIONS.

a. Hon. Treasurer
Anne Ramon to be the Hon. Treasurer.
Proposed: Gerry Zierler
Seconded: Roger Cline – Carried

b. Vice-Presidents. With the deaths of Ann Saunders (2019) and Stephen Marks (2020), both posts were vacant and the Chairman proposed that the former Hon. Secretary, Patrick Frazer, and Roger Cline should be appointed.

Roger Cline – Proposed: Patrick Frazer
Seconded: Caroline Barron – Carried
Patrick Frazer – Proposed: Carol Anderson
Seconded: Roger Cline – Carried

c. Officers and Members of Council.

The Chairman advised that Council Member Andrew Thorp had resigned and thanked him for his work on behalf of the Society. He announced that the remaining current members of Council were willing to stand again:

Officers: Chairman: Penelope Hunting; Hon. Treasurer: Anne Ramon; Hon. Editor: Sheila O’Connell; Hon. Secretary: Mike Wicksteed; Hon. Newsletter Editor: Bridget Cherry; Hon. Publications Secretary: Simon Morris and Hon. Membership Secretary: John Bowman.

Members: Peter Barber, Caroline Barron, Dorian Gerhold, Peter Guillery, Peter Ross, Geoffrey Tyack, Rosemary Weinstein, and Laurence Worms.

Proposed: Ruth Hazeldine
Seconded: David Hawgood – Carried

7. PROPOSALS BY MEMBERS.

There were no proposals from the floor.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

Roger Aylward proposed a round of applause to Roger Cline for all the work he has undertaken over the years and continues to undertake, on behalf of the Society. This was duly given with enthusiasm.

PRESENTATIONS

Following the formal part of the meeting, there were talks by John Dallimore, a Past Master Glazier, on the work of the Worshipful Company of Glaziers and Glaziers Hall, and Liz Hallam Smith, a former Librarian of the House of Lords Library, who spoke to her article in this year’s publication about the Palace of Westminster and The Thames 1189-2021.

Simon Morris thanked John and Liz for their talks. He also thanked the members present for their attendance despite the pandemic and, more locally, the afternoon’s Extinction Rebellion demonstration on nearby London Bridge.

After thanking Council Members for their work over the past two years and those who had volunteered to distribute the 2020 and 2021 publications, the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 6.20pm.

– Penny Hunting, Chairman
12 July 2022


Due to the pandemic and with the approval of the Charity Commission, the Society took its 2019 business at the 2021 AGM held in Glaziers Hall. Rather surprisingly, and most pleasing in the circumstances, 171 members and guests attended.

The Society’s annual publication for 2021 was Volume XXXII of the *London Topographical Record* which comprised ten essays covering a wide range of topics and eight obituaries.

Council meetings continued to be held remotely in January, April and September, using Zoom due to the pandemic, to discuss the Society’s publications programme, membership, finances and general administration.

The Society’s total income for 2021 was £54,904 while expenditure came to £32,986.

During the year 62 new members joined the Society: at the end of 2021 there were 1344 paid-up members and two honorary members, our former auditor Hugh Cleaver and Brenda Hawkins, our current Independent Examiner.

At the AGM two Vice-Presidents were elected to fill vacant posts – former Hon. Secretary Patrick Frazer and former Hon. Treasurer Roger Cline.

The Society’s *Newsletter* was published in May (No.92) and November (No.93) with articles ranging widely over London past and present. They are available to read on the website.

– Mike Wicksteed
Hon. Secretary
# LONDON TOPOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY

## INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT year ending 31.12.2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid by members (1)</td>
<td>26,486</td>
<td>24,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax from Covenants/Gift Aid (2)</td>
<td>4,381</td>
<td>4,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total subscription income</strong></td>
<td>30,867</td>
<td>28,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net profit from sales of publications (3)</td>
<td>21,042</td>
<td>1,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received (4)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant: Scouloudi Foundation (5)</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry donations (6)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties received (7)</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income for the year</strong></td>
<td>54,904</td>
<td>33,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members’ subscription publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of current year publication (8)</td>
<td>18,633</td>
<td>32,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of current year publication</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>4,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of members’ publications</strong></td>
<td>22,313</td>
<td>37,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter printing and despatch (9)</td>
<td>6,593</td>
<td>5,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM (not held in 2020)</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website expenses (10)</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Administration (11)</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDPR expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total administration costs</strong></td>
<td>10,673</td>
<td>7,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant made to other bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of London Map Digitisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure for the year</strong></td>
<td>32,986</td>
<td>45,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Excess of Income over Expenditure

**Surplus 2021/(Deficit) 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surplus/(Deficit) 2021</th>
<th>21,918</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12,582)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BALANCE SHEET year ending 31.12.2021

### Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money in bank and Nat Svgs</td>
<td>202,173</td>
<td>194,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors and Prepayments</td>
<td>6,678</td>
<td>2,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society’s stock of publications</td>
<td>12,433</td>
<td>3,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>221,284</td>
<td>200,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas members’ postage in advance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid in advance</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible creditor</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accruals</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>8,810</td>
<td>9,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Net worth of the Society

| Net worth of the Society                   | 212,474  | 190,556  |

## Change in net worth

| Previous year’s net worth                  | 190,556  | 203,138  |
| **Surplus 2021/(Deficit) 2020**            | 21,918   | (12,582) |
| **End of year net worth**                  | 212,474  | 190,556  |

*These accounts were prepared by Anne Ramon and were examined by the Society’s Independent Examiner Miss Brenda Hanshin, who found no concerns. See her certificate overleaf.*

*If you have any questions please address them to the Treasurer Anne Ramon (topsoc.treasurer@gmail.com).*
I report to the charity’s trustees on my examination of the accounts of the charity for the year ended 31 December 2021, as set out in the Newsletter.

Responsibilities and basis of report
As the charity’s directors you are responsible for the preparation of the accounts in accordance with the requirements of the Companies Act 2006 (‘the 2006 Act’).

Having satisfied myself that the accounts of the charity are not required to be audited for this year under Part 16 of the 2006 Act and are eligible for independent examination, I report in respect of my examination of your charity’s accounts as carried out under section 145 of the Charities Act 2011 (‘the 2011 Act’). In carrying out my examination, I have followed the Directions given by the Charity Commission (under section 145(5)(b)) of the 2011 Act.

Independent examiner’s statement
I have completed my examination. I confirm that no material matters have come to my attention which give me cause to believe that:

- accounting records were not kept in accordance with section 386 of the Companies Act 2006; or
- the accounts do not accord with such records, or;
- the accounts do not comply with the relevant accounting requirements under section 396 of the Companies Act 2006 other than any requirement that the accounts give a ‘true and fair’ view which is not a matter considered as part of an independent examination; or
- the accounts have not been prepared in accordance with the Charities SORP (FRS102)

I have no concerns and have come across no other matters in connection with the examination to which attention should be drawn in this report in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.

Signed

Date

– Brenda Hawkins
100 Beechwood Road
South Croydon CR2 0AB

Registered Charity no. 271590

Financial Statements
For the Year Ended 31 December 2021
INDEPENDENT EXAMINER’S REPORT
Report to the trustees of the
London Topographical Society
(Charity Number 271590)

The Trustees have received the accounts and consider that the Charity has adequate resources to continue in operational existence for the foreseeable future.

The financial statements are in Sterling.

Stock comprises surplus books and publications held for resale, and valued at the lower of cost or net realisable value. A stock valuation exercise was conducted in early 2022 and this has resulted in a one-off uplift in valuation.

There are no Designated or Restricted funds.

No remuneration was paid to Trustees.

Notes on the 2021 Accounts:
1. The annual subscription rate is £20 per annum (or £18 if paid by Standing Order for the due date, or at least in the first week of January.) An additional £10 is due from members living outside the UK on account of higher postal charges. The number of members in 2021 was 1359 plus two Honorary Members.

2. Gift Aid. Members who are taxpayers have been able to grant LTS the authority to claim Gift Aid on their subscriptions. The committee has revisited this policy with respect to LTS activities, together with the current guidance from HMRC, and we will no longer claim Gift Aid from 2022 onwards.

3. Publication Sales. LTS has a stock of surplus annual publications which are both advertised for sale on the website and made available at the AGM. They may be purchased by members or non-members. A recent review has identified that we need to amend our stock valuation and this uplift in stock has produced a corresponding increase in net profit in Publication Sales. This is a one-off event.

4. Interest rates in 2021 were very low.

5. The Scouloudi Foundation grant. We were fortunate to receive this grant again in 2021 as it relies on investment income, and interest rates have been low in 2021. Our thanks to Hays Macintyre, who manage the fund.

6. Sundry donations. These are any extra monies received which are not specifically Donations. They are generally over-payments by members.

7. LTS publications are copyrighted for the material we own and we pay the necessary fees for any copyright images we use. We register our publications with the Publishers Licensing Service who collect the royalties paid for use of our material. In 2021 we also agreed that British Library pay us £1 a copy for their re-printing of a publication we jointly produced.

8. This year’s publication was our periodic collection of essays: The London Topographical Record, Volume 32.

9. Two Newsletters were produced, printed and posted to members in 2021. Appropriate copies of the Autumn Newsletter included subscription reminders for 2022.

10. There was no AGM in 2020 because of COVID-19 restrictions. The deposit of £900 paid in 2019 to secure Kings College for the 2020 AGM was fully repaid in 2021. The 2021 AGM was held at Glaziers’ Hall on London Bridge.

11. Website expenses (www.londontoposoc.org). We pay an annual maintenance charge.

12. Membership Administration. These costs include Welcome communications by post to new members; membership matters and enquiries; printing and distribution of reminder letters (after initial email contact, where possible); stationery.

13. Possible Creditor. Money owed 4 years ago but not claimed. This is retained in case of a future claim but will be written back after 6 years, if still outstanding.

Accounting Policies.
The financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention, and in accordance with the Financial Reporting Standard applicable in the UK and Republic of Ireland (FRS 102), the Statement of Recommended Practice – Accounting and Reporting by Charities (SORP 2015) and with the Charities Act 2011.