

Durham E-Theses

Continuity and change in Durham city: an historical geography of a nineteenth century small town

Susan Barbara Holt

How to cite:

Holt, Susan Barbara (1979) Continuity and change in Durham city: an historical geography of a nineteenth century small town. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8014/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN DURHAM CITY:

AN HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF A

NINETEENTH CENTURY SMALL TOWN

A thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of Durham

by

Susan Barbara Holt

(in two volumes)

VOLUME ONE

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged

November, 1979

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the historical geography of the Municipal Borough of Durham, a relatively small nineteenth century town, in order to compare it with contemporary larger towns and with pre-nineteenth century towns. Discussion of a number of key themes is followed by an analysis of residential patterns and an evaluation of the processes underlying them.

At mid-century Durham was a manufacturing town with both large and small employment units. In economy and population size it contrasted earlier centuries but more continuity was seen in terms of townscape. Dwellings built during the later nineteenth century formed a small but distinct part of the housing stock and an examination of the processes of housing provision showed no clear linkage with selected aspects of the regional economy. Instead, a detailed study of building applicants, by means of nominal linkage techniques, showed varied types of applicants operating on different types of building site. Constraints on building imposed by local authorities were found to be of slight importance. As a final key theme it was found that the social structure of this small town had attributes associated with larger towns of the period.

All these themes are drawn upon in order to describe and explain patterns of residence within the town. No sampling techniques are used; instead each household in 1851 and 1871 is matched with its dwelling. Relationships can be detected between household types and rateable value, a surrogate for rent, and marked differences emerge between the heterogeneity of rateable values and social characteristics of most of the old town and the greater homogeneity of the new streets.

In this town, in contrast to other published studies, residential patterns cannot be attributed either to its size or to its social and economic character. Instead explanation must be sought in the inherited distribution of property in fictional ownership and in the character of nineteenth century building operations and finance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents	i
List of Figures	v
List of Plates	xii
List of Appendices	xiii
Conversion of Imperial Measures to Metric	xvi
Conventions in Footnotes	xvii
Acknowledgements	xviii
 CHAPTER ONE :	
INTRODUCTION	1
 CHAPTER TWO :	
POPULATION LEVELS AND TRENDS	
1. Introduction	17
2. The Size and Growth of Population, 1548 to 1911	27
3. Durham City in comparison with other towns in Co. Durham, 1548 to 1911	38
4. Factors contributing to population Change	40
Notes	49
 CHAPTER THREE :	
CHANGES IN THE LOCAL ECONOMY	
1. Introduction	57
2. Durham City in the mid-nineteenth century; the industrial structure	59
3. Durham City in the mid-nineteenth century; the structure of firms	64
4. Economy of nineteenth century Durham City compared to earlier centuries	69

5. Changes in employment in Durham City during the nineteenth century	74
6. Investment patterns	90
7. Conclusion	92
Notes	94

CHAPTER FOUR :

CHARACTERISTICS OF NINETEENTH CENTURY
BUILDING

1. Introduction : Approaches and themes	104
2. The building cycle for Durham City, 1850 to 1915	110
3. Relationships between economic indicators and the building cycle in Durham City	117
4. The character of the building process	125
5. Building participants	135
6. Conclusion	174
Notes	178

CHAPTER FIVE :

THE COMPOSITION OF THE TOWNSCAPE

1. Introduction	190
2. The street plan	198
3. Plot patterns	228
4. Fabric	245
5. Conclusion	261
Notes	264

CHAPTER SIX :

FORMS OF LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

1. Introduction	284
2. Inherited local government structures	287
3. Eighteenth and early nineteenth century local government structures	295

4. Nineteenth century local government structures	298
5. Conclusions	304
Notes	306

CHAPTER SEVEN :

INFLUENCES OF LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

1. Introduction	317
2. Trends in Mortality	318
3. Influence on the development of the townscape	331
4. Changes in administrative policy	338
5. Comparison between Durham Local Board of Health and Durham Paving Commission	343
Notes	354

CHAPTER EIGHT :

THE SOCIAL CHARACTER OF THE TOWN

1. Introduction	368
2. Identifying classes and social trends	370
3. Durham as a traditional town	381
4. Durham as a small town	387
5. Conclusion	388
Notes	390

CHAPTER NINE :

SOCIETY AND HOUSING

1. Social area analysis of nineteenth century towns	396
2. The character of enumeration districts in Durham MB. in 1851 and 1871	397
3. Streets and parts of streets	413
4. Households and their dwellings	418
5. Conclusion	431
Notes	433

CHAPTER TEN :

PROCESSES OF CHANGE

1. Points for discussion	440
2. The role of social and economic change	443
3. The development of social areas	444
4. Durham as a small nineteenth century town	465
5. The role of nineteenth century building	466
Notes	476

CHAPTER ELEVEN :

CONCLUSIONS	477
FIGURE 20. Street Names	483

VOLUME TWO

Figures	484
Plates	541
Appendices	564
Bibliography	701

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Curtilage infill	484
2. Size of town kernels in relation to built up area	485
3. Population growth	486
4. Baptisms & Burials, Durham City & suburbs, 1570 to 1850	487
5. Burials in 'plague years'	488
6. Durham MB. Population Structure	489
7. Birthplaces of household heads, Durham MB., 1851	490
8. Birthplaces of household heads, Durham MB., 1871	491
9. Durham MB., birthplaces of population, 1851	492
10. Birthplaces of carpet workers in Durham MB.	493
11. Birthplaces of paper workers in Durham MB., 1851	494
12. Railways & market days in 19th century Co. Durham	495
13. Population & mortality estimates, 1851 - 71	496
14. Carriers from Durham City	497
15. Durham Street Plan	498
16. Peninsula sited towns	499
17. Urban Plans	500
18. Spacing of medieval markets	501
19. Lordship & townplans	502
20. Street names	503
21. Parish and township boundaries	504
22. Co. Durham parishes	505
23. Churchyards & rows, Durham and suburbs	506
24. Plot & row dimensions	507
25. Crossgate	508
26. Tenure divisions within buildings	509
27. Elvet North row	510
28. Dean & Chapter property, Durham MB.	511

29. Landownership & building in the vicinity of Durham City	512
30. Engraving Cover	513
31. Closes	514
32. Building plans, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915	515
33. Dwelling applications, Durham MB., & coal output from the NE. coalfield, 1850 to 1915	516
34. Building applications in relation to the bank rate, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915	517
35. Bank rate trends & building applications, Durham MB.	518
36. Dwelling applications & certificates in Durham MB. 1850 to 1915	519
37. Dwelling applications & building workforce, Durham MB. 1850 to 1915	520
38. Bye-law streets	521
39. The Avenue Estate, 1873 to 1919	522
40. Institutional Land Use	523
41. Building in Crossgate & Framwellgate	524
42. Building in St. Giles parish	525
43. Building in St. Nicholas parish	526
44. Building in Elvet	527
45. Building in Gilesgate Moor	528
46. Residences of carpet workers, 1851 & 1871	529
47. Rateable values, Durham MB., 1850 & 1870	530
48. Municipal Boundaries	531
49. Water supply & sewerage in Co.Durham, 1848 to 1900	532
50. Co.Durham Causes of Death	533
51. Values & types of dwellings, Durham MB., 1850 and 1880	534
52. Enumeration Districts, Durham MB.	535
53. Professional heads of households	536
54. Paper workers, 1851	537
55. Drift Geology	538
56. Buildings with through passages, 1919	539
57. Butchers at Durham Market	540

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>page</u>
2.1 Population estimates for the parishes of Durham City and suburbs in 1563	32
2.2 Population estimates for the parishes of Durham City and suburbs in 1674	34
2.3 Population estimates for St. Giles and St. Nicholas parishes between 1674 and 1793	35
2.4 Population estimates for selected towns, Co. Durham, 1548 to 1801	38
2.5 Crude mortality for St. Nicholas and St. Mary-le-Bow parishes in 1563	43
2.6 Population increase by decade, comparing Durham MB. to Durham Union, Sunderland and Co. Durham, 1801 to 1911	47
3.1 Industrial occupational structure of the workforce, Durham MB., 1841, 1851 and 1861	60
3.2 Occupational structure of Durham MB. and Gateshead in 1841 and 1871, as a percentage of the total workforce	62
3.3 Occupational structure of the Durham MB. workforce, males to females 1841 to 1871	74
3.4 Occupational structure of the male workforce, Durham MB., 1841 and 1911	76
3.5 Transport workers, Durham MB., 1841 to 1871	79
3.6 Occupational structure, 1841 to 1871, Durham MB., of workforce employed in the professions and public service	80
3.7 Employment in domestic service, Durham MB., 1841 to 1871	83
3.8 Changes within employment in dealing, Durham MB., 1841 to 1871	84
3.9 Employment in woollens and metal manufacture, Durham MB., 1841 to 1871	85
3.10 Comparison of manufacturing employment for Durham MB. and Gateshead, by size order, 1841 and 1871	86
4.1 Application totals and certificate of completed building totals for each applicant, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915	126

4.2	Building intervals, Durham MB., 1859 to 1899	128
4.3	Building intervals by decade, Durham MB., 1859 to 1899	129
4.4	Building intervals by decade, Durham MB., 1859 to 1899 comparing applicants making a single application with all applicants	130
4.5	Comparison of building intervals, Durham MB., 1859 to 1899, by activity of the applicant	131
4.6	Distribution of building applications for Durham MB. by month, January 1850 to December 1899, inclusive	132
4.7	Building intervals for buildings completed within ten months, Durham MB., 1859 to 1899	132
4.8	Occupations of building plan applicants, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915	155
4.9	Number of dwellings included in each building application, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915, by decade	156
4.10	Workforce in building construction, Durham City, 1841 to 1871	162
4.11	Building firms, Durham City, 1850 to 1910	163
4.12	Duration of building firms, Durham City, 1849 to 1909	165
4.13	Building sites in building applications, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915, in relation to occupations of building applicants	167
4.14	Occupations of building applicants, Durham MB. for sample years, 1866 to 1897	169
4.15	Scale of applications, sample building boom and slack years, Durham MB.	170
4.16	Balance between dwelling applications and certificates for each participant, Durham MB., 1859 to 1895 inclusive	171
4.17	Participants with an excess of five or more dwelling applications or certificates, Durham MB., 1859 to 1895 inclusive	171
4.18	Building and ownership activity by participants, Durham MB., 1850 to 1879, by decade	172
4.19	Building and ownership activity by participants who owned property in the period 1850 to 1880	173

4.20	Housing stock growth in nine towns of Co.Durham, 1801 to 1851 and 1851 to 1901	176
5.1	Nineteenth century property boundaries and relation- ships to local land rods, Elvet Borough and Barony	235
5.2	South Street East row, relationship between nineteenth century property boundaries and local land rods	236
5.3	Comparison between burgage totals in 1542-3 and 'ancient burgage' totals in the Enclosure Awards of Crossgate, Elvet and Framwellgate	239
5.4	'Ancient burgages' under church leasehold, by district	242
5.5	Sources of income of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, sample years 1641 to 1842	243
5.6	Ownership of rateable units by district, Durham MB., 1850 and 1880	244
5.7	Relationship between total value and room total, inventories of Durham City and suburbs, 1540 to 1599	256
7.1	Crude mortality, by decade, 1841 to 1900	320
7.2	Crude mortality, by decade, 1841 to 1880, for the registration districts of Co. Durham	320
7.3	Age specific death rates for males and females under the age of 5 years, Co. Durham registration districts, 1851 to 1860	322
7.4	Co. Durham river basins and cause of death from waterborne diseases, by registration districts, 1851 to 1860 and 1871 to 1880	326
7.5	Crowding in Durham MB. and Co. Durham, 1801 to 1901	328
7.6	Smallpox deaths, Co. Durham registration districts, 1851 to 1860 and 1871 to 1880	330
7.7	Applications to build in yards, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915	334
7.8	Building applications and rejections, Durham MB., 1849 to 1914	339
7.9	Durham Corporation and Local Board of Health. Duration of office compared to occupation, 1835 to 1914	341
7.10	Attendance at Durham Paving Commission meetings, 1814 to 1849	345

7.11	Income of Durham Paving Commission in 1845, 1846 and 1848	347
7.12	Expenditure of Durham Paving Commission in 1845, 1846 and 1848	348
7.13	General District Rates as a source of income to Durham Local Board of Health, 1865 to 1875	349
7.14	Sources of rateable value, Durham MB., 1850 to 1886	350
8.1	Socio-economic status of heads of household, Durham MB., 1851 and 1871	377
8.2	'Gentry' listed in Walker's Durham Directory, 1857 to 1907	380
8.3	Owner occupation, Durham MB., 1850 to 1919, for selected years	382
8.4	Proportion of population owning property, Durham MB., 1850 to 1880	383
8.5	The socio-economic class of heads of household in Western Hill, Durham, 1861 and 1871	385
9.1	Types of enumeration district, Durham MB., 1851, by ranking socio-economic characteristics of heads of households	399
9.2	Types of enumeration district, Durham MB., 1871, by ranking socio-economic characteristics of heads of households	401
9.3	Professionally and casually employed heads of household by enumeration district, Durham MB., 1851 to 1871	404
9.4	'Artisan' heads of household, Durham MB., 1871, by enumeration district	405
9.5	Female heads of household and working wives, Durham MB. 1851, by enumeration district	406
9.6	Household 'inmates' Durham MB. 1851, by enumeration district	408
9.7	Households with resident servants, Durham MB. 1851 and 1871, by enumeration district	408
9.8	Numbers of resident servants in households with resident servants, Durham MB. 1851, by enumeration district	409
9.9	Persons aided by City of Durham Charitable Stock, by township, Durham City 1800	411

	<u>page</u>
9.10 Proportion of households with resident servants, by street, Durham MB., 1851	414
9.11 Dwelling type and occupation of head of household, Framwellgate, 1871	418
9.12 Success rate in matching households and dwellings, Durham MB., 1850-1 and 1870-1	420
9.13 Dwelling type and socio-economic class of households, Durham MB., 1850-1 and 1870-1	421
9.14 Dwelling type and socio-economic class of households, a) Gateshead, 1851 b) West Hartlepool, 1851	422
9.15 Socio-economic heterogeneity within shared houses, Durham MB., 1850-1	423
9.16 Socio-economic heterogeneity within shared houses, Gateshead, 1851	424
9.17 Socio-economic heterogeneity within shared houses, Durham MB., 1870-1	424
9.18 Households with resident servants compared to housing in eleven towns of Co.Durham, 1851	425
9.19 Distribution of socio-economic classes by assessed rateable value of dwellings, Durham MB., 1850-1	427
9.20 Distribution of assessed rateable values of dwellings by socio-economic classes, Durham MB., 1850-1	428
9.21 Socio-economic classes and rateable values of dwellings, Durham MB., 1850-1	429
9.22 Household types within socio-economic class III and rateable value of dwellings, Durham MB., 1850-1	430
9.23 Socio-economic classes and rateable value of dwellings, Durham MB., 1870-1	431
10.1 Artisan heads of household in 1871 and the age of streets built between 1800 and 1870, Durham MB.	441
10.2 Origins of heads of households in old and new streets, Durham MB. 1851, arranged in Registrar-General's regions	453
10.3 Origins of heads of households in old and new streets, Durham MB. 1871, arranged in Registrar- General's regions	454

LIST OF PLATES

	<u>page</u>
1 a & b. The Hallgarth Barn, Elvet	541, 542
2. No. 4, Owengate	543
3. Timber framed house, Millburngate	544
4. 'The Big Jug', Claypath	545
5. 'The Curtains', South	546
6. Silver Street	547
7. Rectory of St. Mary-the-Less, South Bailey	548
8 a & b. The Chancellor's House, The College	549, 550
9. Atherton Street	551
10. Sadler Street, a facade	552
11. No. 4 Church Street	553
12. No. 4 North Bailey, vertical and horizontal sash windows	554
13. Holly Street, Tyneside flats	555
14. Western Hill	556
15. Elvet Villa	557
16. Springwell Villas	558
17a. Gladstone Villas	559
17b. School Lane, Didsbury, Manchester	560
18a,b & c. Magdalene Street, front , end and rear views	561, 562 & 563

LIST OF APPENDICES

	<u>page</u>
1.1 Size of urban settlements in England and Wales, 1801 and 1851.	564
2.1 Quality of burial registers, parishes of Durham City, 1538 to 1841.	566
2.2 Quarterly balance of baptisms, parishes of Durham City, 1538 to 1751.	571
2.3 Seasonal baptism distribution, St. Nicholas' parish, Durham, 1538 to 1751.	578
2.4 Population estimates, parishes and townships of Durham City and suburbs, 1548 to 1801.	582
2.5 Infant mortality in the parishes of Durham City, 1798 to 1841.	584
2.6 Place of birth of persons buried, 1798 - 1812, Durham City and suburbs (5 parishes).	586
2.7 Contribution of natural increase and net migration to population growth, Durham MB. and surrounding districts, by decade 1841 to 1900.	587
3.1 Booth's Industrial Occupational Classification.	590
3.2 Coal mines in the vicinity of Durham City.	593
3.3 Origins of carpet weavers, Durham MB., 1851.	597
3.4 Employees declared by employers resident in Durham MB. 1851 and 1871.	598
3.5 Trade Guilds of Durham City.	599
3.6 Durham markets.	601
3.7 Composition of the committees of the Joint Stock Gas Companies in Durham City, 1845 and 1873.	603
4.1 Nominal Linkage.	606
4.2 Building periods, the time span between building application and the certificate of completion, in relation to the bank rate.	626
4.3 Building applicants, Durham City, 1850 to 1879, inclusive.	627
4.4 Ownership of Rated Dwelling Units, Durham City, 1850 to 1880.	639a
4.5 Duration of building firms, Durham City, 1849 to 1914.	640

4.6	Land ownership, Durham City townships, from the Tithe Awards.	649
4.7	Estate developers and building applicants, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915	651
4.8	Apparent Owner Occupation in streets built between 1820 and 1919, Durham City.	654
5.1	'Rows' documented in the streets of Durham City and suburbs	655
5.2	Street names of Durham City and suburbs	657
5.3	Acreage of parishes and extra parochial places, Co. Durham, 1831.	664
5.4	'Vills' in the vicinity of Durham City and suburbs.	665
5.5	Local land measures.	668
5.6	Dean and Chapter of Durham, income 1542/3 to 1842/3, by sample years.	669
5.7	Correspondence between nineteenth century property boundaries and local land rods, South Street, West row.	670
6.1	Amercements, Durham Court Baron, 1752 to 1868	671
7.1	Age structure of registration districts, Co.Durham 1851 to 1860 and 1871 to 1880.	672
7.2	Age specific death rates, Co.Durham registration districts, 1851 to 1860 and 1871 to 1880.	673
7.3	Occupational structure of Durham Local Board of Health, 1849 to 1914.	675
7.4	Durham Local Board of Health members, 1849 to 1914.	678
7.5	Length of office on Durham Corporation, by decade, 1835 to 1914.	683
7.6	Proposers and seconders for building applications to Durham Local Board of Health, 1849 to 1862.	684
7.7	Durham Paving Commission finance.	685
9.1	Heads of household, socio-economic classes, Durham MB., 1851 and 1871, by enumeration district.	686
9.2	Descriptions of occupation in the census enumerators' books, Durham MB. 1851 and 1871, designated as 'professional' and 'casual'.	687

	<u>page</u>
9.3 Descriptions of occupation in the census enumerators' books, Durham MB. 1871, designated as 'artisan'.	688
9.4 Population, households and houses, Durham MB., 1801 to 1901.	689
9.5 Working wives, Durham MB., 1851, by enumeration district and by street.	691
9.6a. Resident servants by household, Durham MB., 1851, by enumeration district.	693
b. 'Visitors' per household, Durham MB., 1851, by enumeration district.	
c. Lodgers per household, Durham MB., 1851, by enumeration district.	
9.7 Socio-economic range of heads of household in new and old street, Durham MB. 1851 and 1871.	695
9.8 Rateable value of dwellings by township, Durham MB., a) 1850, b) 1870.	698

Conversion of Imperial measures
to Metric

Linear measures

1 inch	=	25.4	mm
1 foot	=	0.305	m
1 yard	=	0.914	m
1 chain	=	20.117	m
1 furlong	=	0.210	km
1 mile	=	1.609	km

For local measures see Appendix 5.5

Area measures

1 acre	=	0.405	ha

Currency

£.s.d. indicates a pound divided into 20 shillings
or 240 pence

This is written as £.s.d. or, in lower,
denominations as, for example, either 2s.
or as 2/-d.

£.00 indicates a pound divided into 100 pence,
£0.05 or 5p indicates 1s. or 12d.

CONVENTIONS IN FOOTNOTES

CC.	Church Commission collection
D.Adv.	'Durham Advertiser'
D. & CD.	Dean and Chapter of Durham collection
D.Co.Adv.	'Durham County Advertiser', otherwise known as the 'Durham Advertiser'
D.City	Durham City collection
D.CRO.	Durham County Record Office
DDPD.PK.	Durham University, Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, Prior's Kitchen
DDPD. SR.	Durham University, Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, South Road
DJ.	Dixon-Johnson collection
DR.	Diocesan Records
Du.GD.	Durham University, Department of Geography collection
Du. LC.	Durham University, Local Collection, Palace Green Library
Du. Routh	Durham University, Routh Library, Palace Green
D.S.St.	Durham City Library, South Street, Local Collection
EP.	Ecclesiastical parish, parochial collections
Ferens	Ferens collection
HC.	Hallmote court records
HC.PP.	House of Commons, Parliamentary Paper
HL. PP.	House of Lords, Parliamentary Paper
LBH.	Local Board of Health
MB.	Municipal Borough
PRO.	Public Record Office
RD.	Rural District
RDC.	Rural District Council
SS.	Surtees Society
UDC.	Urban District Council
VCH.	Victoria County History
Walker	Walker's Durham Directory and Almanac, Local

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have assisted me during my research for this thesis. In particular I extend my thanks to the Social Science Research Council for finance which made the research possible and Professor W.B. Fisher of the Department of Geography, Durham, for allowing me to use the facilities of the Department over an extended period. My supervisor, Brian Roberts, has given a great deal of encouragement over many years and I thank him for all the various roles he has played in relation to my research; as only a supervisor can.

I am also indebted to the staff of Durham University Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, especially to Mrs. L.J. Drury, Miss M. McCollum, Mr. P. Mussett and Mr. M. Snape, but also to Mr. J. Fagg, who cheerfully taught me the rudiments of palaeography. I would also like to thank the staff, past and present, of Durham County Record Office and the Keeper of Science Books at Durham University, the staff of Palace Green Library, the University Surveyor, Dr. C.W. Gibby, the Rev. Dr.G. Roe and the staff of Durham City Surveyor's Department for access to collections of material or to undeposited material.

My thanks go, as well, to Dr. M.J. Daunton of the Department of Economic History for entertaining discussions on nineteenth century topics and to Mrs. M. Bell for typing the thesis so admirably.

It is impossible to mention by name all the people who have helped me; they, and the other record offices and libraries who gave me access to material and who answered queries, are mentioned in specific footnotes. Again, it is impossible to thank individually all the householders of Durham who, over the years, have shown me round their houses and who have even shown me their deeds.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family who took me, at an early age, to look at parts of Manchester and Salford which are now demolished. My interest in the nineteenth century may still surprise them but I am most grateful that they awakened it in me.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The investigation of any topic is constrained by the implicit assumptions of the researcher, regardless of the quantity or nature of the evidence for that topic. For the study of nineteenth century towns there is often an abundance of documentary material, much of it, and especially the decennial censuses, suitable for quantitative analysis. Yet in sifting through such data initial assumptions and approaches are just as important as when appraising more qualitative material. Indeed, despite a wealth of material, existing studies of nineteenth century towns draw heavily upon two models; firstly the ecological modes of the Chicago school of Burgess and Park and, secondly, Sjoberg's model of the preindustrial city (1960). Both suggest that the form of the city reflects the nature of the society whether, as in the Sjoberg model, that society is divided into ranks or castes or, as in the case of the ecological school, society is divided into socio-economic groups. Many case studies of British towns have applied such ideas. In the most part these have been studies of rapidly growing towns including both larger towns such as Sunderland (Robson 1966, 1969) and Edinburgh (Gordon 1970) and smaller towns such as Leicester (Pritchard 1976) and St. Helens (Jackson 1977). To these must be added a very few studies of slower growing towns such as Morgan's study of Exeter (1971).

Both models assume that with changes in technology and parallel changes in society there is a progression from an urban settlement where the elite live in the most accessible positions, in the centre, and the lower ranks on the peripheries, to an urban settlement where the upper classes live on the peripheries and the lower classes in the inner urban areas. They infer the mechanisms producing the form of the settlement from the form of the settlement itself. This, in case studies of

nineteenth century towns, involves the risk of being ahistorical (Whitehand & Patten 1977:257).

Burke has asked a question which the existing case studies have not answered, 'what was an industrial city?' (1975:16) and, how do towns such as Exeter compare to industrial and preindustrial towns? Is the link between technology, society and urban form so tidy and are the 'archetypal' large, rapidly growing nineteenth century towns merely one category of town among a spectrum of nineteenth century urban forms?

It was the larger nineteenth century towns which excited comment from their contemporaries and which have attracted more recent studies. Larger towns had their conditions investigated and published both in Parliamentary papers and by novelists of the period so for scholars of the early twentieth century, to whom the census enumerators' books were not available, larger towns were certainly better documented. Mantoux, writing in the 1920's, considered industrial towns by the examples of Ashton, Blackburn, Bolton, Bury, Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, Oldham, Preston, Rochdale, Sheffield, Stalybridge, Stockton, Tyldsley and Wigan (1961 ed.:358-363). All but Tyldsley had a population, in 1851, in excess of 20,000 and four had a population exceeding 100,000. Much later Briggs (1963) selected Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, London, Middlesbrough, and colonial Melbourne to illustrate nineteenth century cities: three large provincial cities, the capital, a colonial capital and a large new town. Yet when he wrote, material was becoming available for much smaller towns in the form of census enumerators' books (Beresford 1963) and trade directories so since that date a size bias cannot be justified in terms of documentation.

In terms of sheer numbers the total of urban case studies have been numerous, though of varied quality (Dyos

1973 : 24) but these have not eliminated the bias against small towns among scholarly studies (Armstrong 1974 : 10, Everitt 1974 : 29, Marshall 1974 : 19). Again it is difficult to justify this bias. Just as it cannot be justified on the grounds of documentation, so it cannot be justified by labelling nineteenth century small towns as untypical although Glynn did this when commenting on Exeter (1970 : 222). Firstly, small towns have not been investigated, it has only been assumed that they contrast the larger towns and, secondly, small towns numerically outnumber the larger ones since they form the base of the urban hierarchy (Appendix 1.1).

But it cannot be denied that the proportion of the population, in England and Wales, living in large towns increased during the nineteenth century. In 1801 16.9% of the population lived in towns of over 20,000 but by 1891 this had risen to 53.6% (Weber 1899 : 47). In addition the larger provincial towns were growing both in number and in size. Liverpool, with a population of 82,295, was the largest provincial town in England and Wales in 1801 and it was followed by Manchester and Salford with a joint population of 84,020. By 1851 there were twelve urban places of at least 80,000 population while Liverpool and Manchester and Salford, still the largest provincial towns, had populations of 375,955 and 303,382 respectively. So, without doubt, the importance of the largest towns cannot be ignored but they must not be assumed to be the only nineteenth century towns.

Williams, a nineteenth century writer, considered that towns with between 2,000 and 20,000 population could be considered small towns (Weber 1899 : 49). These included both many of the nineteenth new towns and many of the hundreds of towns which had been in existence during the Middle Ages; towns which are listed by Beresford and Finberg (1973). But not all 'historic towns' fell into this category in the nineteenth century since even in

the seventeenth century the largest provincial town, Norwich, had exceeded the size range of this category. In the 1670's it appears to have had a population of about 21,000 (Green & Young 1975 : 24). The smallest 'historic towns' were similarly excluded since the smallest in the seventeenth century could have less than 1,000 population (Clark & Slack 1976 : 11, 63) and several had less than 2,000 population. Patten gives estimates of population in Guildford, Hertford, Newark and Penrith in the 1670's and for Stafford, Stockport and Congleton in the 1660's which show each to have been between 1,000 and 2,000 population (1978 : 109, 110). At the turn of the nineteenth century there were still a number of these tiny boroughs, but most lost their legal urban status under the terms of the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835. (1)

The overwhelming majority of towns, however, in the seventeenth century appear to have been of the size 2,000 to 20,000 population (Patten 1978 : 106, 109, 110). They were urban not only by legal definition but also by functions. So too were the towns in this size range in the nineteenth century and the census of 1851 effectively took 2,000 population as a dividing line since it recognized that 'populous places' of more than 2,000 inhabitants were distinct from rural settlements (Law 1967 : 125), despite them not having the legal status of being a borough. By that date, as well, the boroughs were nearly all over 2,000 population, one of the smallest, Tamworth in Staffordshire, having a population of 1,915. In seventeenth century terms these settlements were towns; in nineteenth century they were still urban but they were small towns since they were being compared to the size of London and to the largest provincial towns.

Yet these small towns, of less than 20,000 population during the nineteenth century, have been studied mainly in

terms of their medieval and early modern periods when many were closer to the apex of the urban hierarchy. Studies by extra-mural classes, such as that for Ashbourne in Derbyshire (Henstock 1978) may in the future redress the balance but as yet urban studies tend to categorize towns Southampton (Platt 1973, Burgess 1963), Oxford (Hassall, 1974, Salter 1960-9) Winchester (Biddle 1976a) and Canterbury (Urry 1967) have had research published on their medieval periods but not on later periods, Worcester has had a study of the sixteenth century (Dyer 1973) but not later centuries and even the Atlas of Historic Towns, edited by Mrs. Lobel, (1969, 1975) has 1800 as its terminal date of interest. On the one hand texts discussing medieval towns (Beresford 1967, Platt 1976) tend not to discuss their later development while texts discussing nineteenth century towns tend not to discuss their earlier development (Briggs 1963, Dyos & Wolff 1973).

As with all generalizations exceptions to the rule exist and must be mentioned. Hill has published work on Lincoln which spans both the nineteenth century and earlier (1966, 1974), as has Kellett on Glasgow (1961, 1969). Exeter has been treated by a number of different authors with interests in different periods (Morgan 1970, Johns 1969, Newton 1966, 1968, 1977) and Straw has discussed Nottingham, a large nineteenth century town, in terms of its nineteenth century and earlier development (1967). In addition there have been studies compiled under the auspices of the British Association and the townscape based work of Hoskins (1952) and Conzen (1958, 1960a, 1960b, 1966, 1968).

Such chronological division has arisen in part from studies being source-orientated and even Hill's studies of Lincoln illustrate this since they are self-contained volumes drawing on different evidence (1966, 1974). On the one hand studies of medieval towns have been accompanied by the editing and publication of manuscript sources, as in the case of Winchester (Biddle 1976a) and Oxford (Salter 1960-9, Hassall 1974), and have used research methods which utilise scholarly appreciation of documents, archaeological evidence and the townscape. Beresford's work on the medieval towns of the Bishop of Winchester (1959), that by Carus-Wilson on Stratford-on-Avon (1965), Finberg's on towns in Gloucestershire (1957) and the analysis of medieval Southampton by Burgess (1963) all illustrate this approach. On the other hand work on nineteenth century towns has used different sources; local administrative records (Fraser 1976, Hennock 1973), the censuses (Amstrong 1967), newspapers (Marshall 1958) or a variety of sources including estate papers (Daunton 1974) and the stress has been more to quantifying the data.

Not only have different sources and approaches to sources been utilised in studies of nineteenth century towns compared to studies of earlier towns but also general approaches have differed. One difference in approach is that few studies of nineteenth century towns have employed morphological analysis though, as ever, there exist a small number of exceptions. Beresford used morphological analysis in his work on Leeds (1961) as did Ward in his study of the same town (1960, 1962). Mortimore on Bradford (1963, 1969), Rowsley on Sheffield (1975) and Maguire on Belfast (1976) also used this approach. In the case of Leicester, Pritchard outlined both the possibility of an ecological approach and the possibility of a morphological approach

but he saw the two as alternatives and he took the morphological approach no further (1976 : 7,8).

But even those writers who have taken the townscape of nineteenth century towns into account have tended to ignore the division made by Conzen into the 'kernel' of a town and its 'accretions' (1960a : 11-12) and have stressed the 'accretions' to the exclusion of the 'kernel', or have studied new towns which had no kernel as at Saltaire (Dewhurst 1960) or St.Helens (Barker & Harris 1954). For London the analyses have been of Hampstead (Thompson 1974, 1977, Olsen 1973), the Chalcotts estate (Summerson 1963), Camberwell (Dyos 1961, 1967), South London (Dyos 1954) and Paddington and Hammersmith (Reeder (1968) rather than the City itself. Olsen's overview of London again contains this bias since he discusses new areas using the evidence of estate records and building journals (1976) so it is only Hole, mentioning central area redevelopment within a study of working class housing provision in London and other towns (1965) and Lambert, describing the medical problems encountered by Sir John Simon (1963) who have made reference to the older part of the metropolis.

Most towns had kernels. The exceptions were the nineteenth century new towns and the very few dockyards and spas founded in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Yet the kernels tend either to have been ignored, as at Exeter (Morgan 1971) or briefly dismissed, as in the case of Cardiff (Daunton 1977). Only at Liverpool (Lawton 1955) and at York (Armstrong 1967) did analysis encompass both the kernel and the newer areas. In a rapidly growing urban area such as London, Cardiff, or Manchester (Fig.2) the bias towards the newer areas may be justified in terms of the balance of population in the kernel as compared to the newer areas, or in terms of the areal

extent, but a danger is that the nature of the kernel is never scrutinised.

Instead it tends to be assumed that the property boundaries shown on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey plans are the medieval burgage plots. Beresford, for example, uses such plans to illustrate his discussion of medieval towns (1967) and Anderson projects back the age of property units in Norwich (1959). It also tends to be assumed that by the nineteenth century these plots had reached a state termed by Conzen as 'high building coverage' (1960a : 63) when the curtilage behind the building on the street frontage had been built up as far as was possible. Such a situation has been described by Engels in the kernel of Manchester in the 1840's (1892 : 81-2), Beresford in Leeds (1961), Lawton in Liverpool (1955 : 383) and Cox in Croydon, where the plots underwent 'repletion' (1973). Yet it was not the case in every town. Some, such as Warkworth in Northumberland (Fig. 16), even now have curtilages as gardens, others, such as Wallingford in Oxfordshire (Rodwell 1975 : 160,161), Alnwick in Northumberland (Conzen 1960a : 79), the twelve historic towns of Berkshire scrutinized by Astill (1978) and Durham, Chester-le-Street and Bishop Auckland in Co. Durham (Fig.1) have, or had, in the nineteenth century, some curtilages infilled with buildings but others still open as gardens.

A second difference in approach is that social area analysis has been used in the study of large nineteenth century towns. It has also been used for small and slowly growing twentieth century towns such as Hereford (Jones 1956), Oxford (Collinson 1960) and Newcastle-under-Lyme (Williams &

Herbert 1962) but the techniques are more appropriate to towns such as Sunderland which were large and which were growing rapidly (Robson 1969).

But even at Chicago development was influenced by antecedent property rights (Fellman 1957) so the question must be asked, has the influence of property rights been underestimated in the growth of British towns? Since Ward's initial work on Leeds (1960) some influence cannot be denied but the more studies that are compiled of the aims and management practises of estates involved in urban development the more important seems this influence. To take two examples, the Windsor Estate in Cardiff was well organised leasehold development (Daunton 1972) but the Norfolk Estate in Sheffield had weak control over its leasehold developments (Olsen 1973). Gaskell concluded, on the evidence of a number of Pennine towns, that the role of the large estate was important (1974) and Kellett illustrates details of such influence both in Glasgow, in the case of the Hutcheson Estate being broken up between 1772 and 1802 (1961 : 214-5) and when he mentions that railway companies planning a route into or through an urban area chose to negotiate with large estates since this simplified purchase of land compared to dealing with a large number of small landowners (1969a : 18).

How far do greenfield developments of the nineteenth century compare to those nineteenth century developments in existing urban kernels? How far do new towns such as Birkenhead (Patmore 1970), Cheltenham (Richardson 1916), Horwich (Turton 1962), Huddersfield (Springett 1977), Merthyr Tydfil (Carter 1968), Millom (Harris 1966), Royal Leamington Spa (Chaplin 1972, Lloyd 1977), or Seaham Harbour (Hughes 1965),

or boom towns such as Hull (Forster 1968, 1972) or Wigan (Jackson 1977), which were built on large rural estates (2) represent a simplified relationship between urban development and antecedent property rights? Does the emergence of socially homogeneous districts in large towns reflect social changes; a capitalist society rather than a feudal one, or does it reflect building homogeneity and estate policy?

A small nineteenth century town whose economy was not entirely domestic in nature, which was growing, which was socially stratified into classes and which was large enough for the entire population not to be known personally to all other residents (3) may be useful in dividing the social influence from the housing influence. In the census enumerators' books data is available person by person, household by household (Armstrong 1966) so the only value of sampling is to reduce the volume of data to be analysed. This is unnecessary in a small town and in the town under study, Durham Municipal Borough, the total population in 1851, numbering 13,188, was approximately the same size as Armstrong's 10% sample of households in York out of a total population of 30,000 to 40,000 (1967 : synopsis, 1968 : 81).

Sampling has been used widely, not only by Armstrong (1966, 1967, 1974) but by Lawton (1955) and Lawton and Pooley on Liverpool (1975) and by Marshall for the much smaller town of Kendal (1974) but if the full population is used other techniques can be utilised and especially record linkage, house repopulation or nominal linkage techniques as used by Holmes for Ramsgate (1973).

Durham Municipal Borough was large enough to be examined in certain Parliamentary reports of the 1840's, the Health of Towns report ⁽⁴⁾ and State of Large Towns and Populous District report ⁽⁵⁾ but was small enough never to exceed 20,000 population during the nineteenth century. In 1801 its population was 7,530, in 1851 it was 13,188 ⁽⁶⁾ and only in the twentieth century did it exceed 20,000 (Sharp 1944). From the twelfth century it had been a borough ⁽⁷⁾ and in the nineteenth century it had a tradition of local government which was stronger than in many other towns of the North East. There had been a municipal corporation since 1565 (Weinbaum 1943 : 33), unlike Darlington which was governed by a manorial court and vestry (Smith 1967).

As a case study it had the advantage of reasonable, or good, documentation. With a few exceptions, the census, ratebooks and local authority records were preserved. The actual building plans submitted to the local authority had been destroyed ⁽⁸⁾, there were no ratebooks for the period between 1880 and 1919, the 1861 enumerators' books had been damaged ⁽⁹⁾ and there were very few business records. But the town had a local annual directory ⁽¹⁰⁾, a local weekly newspaper, 'the Durham Advertiser' from 1814 (Birkbeck 1971) and records for one of the earliest Local Boards of Health, formed in August 1849. ⁽¹¹⁾ Maps covered the town from the sixteenth century onwards (Turner 1954) and the first edition Ordnance Survey plan of 1856 was one of the earliest to be based on that scale (Harley 1964). Also the enumerators' books of the census were neat, the districts rarely cut across streets (Fig. 52) and only in Gilesgate Moor 4:5c, St.Nicholas

: 12, was difficulty experienced in reconstructing the enumerator's 'walk'. These entries could be matched to the ratebooks since the occupiers were responsible for paying the rates and their names, as well as those of the owners, were entered into the ratebooks. ⁽¹²⁾ Further discussion of the sources will be made as each is used.

All case studies run the risk of being too individual (Thirsk 1966 : 10) but against this criticism must be set the necessity of balancing case studies, which can step outside old frameworks of approach, against generalizations drawn from existing overviews or even other case studies. Durham was, and is, a specified town in a specific region but it is not investigated as a case study for its own sake. Firstly it is compared to other towns in order to set it in a wider context and to test how typical it was but, more importantly, it is seen as a starting point from which to re-evaluate nineteenth century towns through the means of nominal linkage.

In turn the economy, townscape, administration and social attributes of the town will be examined. In Chapter 2 the population trends are outlined, since they help to indicate broad economic trends, then the local economy itself is introduced in Chapter 3. Building in the nineteenth century and the inherited townscape are the topics of Chapters 4 and 5 while the forms of administration and the implementation of policies are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7. Social stratification and social relations are then appraised in Chapter 8. As it is a small town it is not necessary to select one theme out of a mass of documentary evidence as

did Anderson for Preston when he considered household structure (1972a) or as did Foster for social relations in Oldham (1968, 1974). Rather all themes can be discussed and all these themes are necessary since they build up to an object of this study; to see the nature of a nineteenth century small town and the nature of spatial relations between households. The latter is discussed in Chapters 9 and 10.

The approach is quantitative when the data permits but descriptive in other cases. Measurements are given in Imperial units and pounds, shillings and pence to avoid anachronism, except where tables are given in pounds and pence in order to fit the page. A conversion table from Imperial units to metric is given at the front of the volume. Spelling of place names similarly follows that used in documentation and where spelling changed, as from Fieldhouses to Field Houses, from Harberhouse to Harbour House and from Framwelgate to Framwellgate so the spelling in this study alters. This may appear arbitrary but even at the present time Framwellgate also appears on street signs as Framwelgate. Also, in using the term 'medieval' the period between the eleventh century and the sixteenth century is denoted. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are termed the 'early modern period' and the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are referred to individually.

Durham was administratively complex, as will be discussed in Chapter 6, and this has to be taken into account when presenting data. Strictly the City of Durham was co-terminous only with the parish of St. Nicholas so prior to

1835 the whole town will be referred to as the City and suburbs of Durham but after 1835 the whole town will be referred to as Durham Municipal Borough, abbreviated to Durham MB.

1. 5 & 6 Wm. IV cap. 76 An Act to provide for the Regulation of Municipal Corporations in England and Wales.
2. England was a land of large estates even in the seventeenth century (Habakkuk 1940). In the nineteenth century this was still true but the balance of size of estates varied from county to county (Thompson 1963). Therefore rural areas would often contrast town kernels where ownership was divided among a large number of small owners.
3. Wirth (1957) has argued that above a few hundred population people cannot all know each other personally but he also notes that the US. census uses a population criterion of 2,500 to denote urban status (p.48) and that an urban settlement is a "relatively large, dense, and permanent settlement of socially heterogeneous individuals" (p.50).
4. PP.HC. 1840 xi. 277 ff.
5. PP.HC. 1844 xvii.
6. Printed census volumes.
7. Ballard (1913), Dodds (1915), Beresford (1967).
8. Personal communication, Mr. George, City Engineer's Department, Bylund Lodge, Durham.
9. In addition the microfilm of the 1861 census in Durham CRO. was poor.
10. Walker 'The Durham Directory and Almanack', 1846 and annually. Du LC. and D. CRO. sets of volumes. Referred to subsequently as Walker's.
11. DDPD.SR.D.City Vol. 160 9th August 1849, letter to the General Board of Health.
12. DDPD.SR.D.City Vols. 137, 140, 142, 148.

CHAPTER TWO

POPULATION LEVELS AND TRENDS

1. Introduction

The value of a detailed analysis of population levels and trends for any specific place or locality exceeds the conclusions stemming solely from demographic questions. Firstly, it may provide a surrogate for local economic trends, and in particular employment opportunities, and, secondly, it may indicate the degree of continuity in a community. But in neither case can a simple relationship between the surrogate and the wider topic of interest be assumed and indeed, after analysis, the firmest conclusions deriving from demographic sources will still relate to questions concerning the quality of the source material and factors such as mortality and fertility. But, in a town such as Durham, where economic information for the nineteenth century is derived from static sources, and in particular the decennial census, or for earlier periods is derived from eclectic sources, as discussed in Chapter 3, and, where changes in the social aspects of the community can be perceived only through qualitative sources, as discussed in Chapter 8, population forms a valuable, though problematical, framework.

Problems arise out of both detail and out of general assumptions in evaluating local economic trends from demographic sources. The size of the workforce is as pertinent as the total population but, prior to the 1801 census, there is no means by which to divide the economically active and the dependent populations. The age at which children began work is unknown and there is no reason to postulate a constant age either from region to region or decade to decade. Household size and composition are similarly open to debate, as the

discussion of Laslett's work (1972a, 1972b) by Thomas (1977 : 1226), and others, indicates. After the 1851 census, when relationships within households are described in the enumerations (Armstrong 1966, 1968, Anderson 1972:55) more substantial comments can be made but even after 1851 problems of detail remain.⁽¹⁾ Age structure could illuminate the question of dependant parts of the population but, again, in many localities, including Durham, it is the 1851 census which provides the earliest detailed source of information.⁽²⁾

If population trends, the outcome of a changing balance between local births, deaths and migration, are seen as a surrogate for local economic trends a number of implicit relationships must be taken into account; the separate relationships between fertility, mortality or migration and local economic trends and the relationship between mortality and fertility themselves. Wrigley has argued, from the study of Colyton in Devon, that fertility was not constant and that family limitation was practised in the early modern period (1966); a conclusion which appears to link fertility to economic trends. Case studies have indicated that crude mortality ⁽³⁾ has not been constant over the four centuries for which parish registration exists but interpretations of such changes have stressed either relationships between mortality and economic trends or relationships between mortality and independant disease cycles. On the one hand Palliser linked mortality in sixteenth and seventeenth century Staffordshire to changes in corn prices (1974:71) while on the other hand Post, investigating the plague (1976:14), and Luckin, investigating typhus (1976), stressed changes

in the nature of the specific diseases. The latter view casts doubt upon the idea of using population as a surrogate for local economic trends for if fertility and mortality are linked to factors such as employment and the cost of living the balance of population will also reflect economic factors, since migration tends to compound this relationship. But, if mortality is even partly the outcome of independent disease cycles the population balance must be seen as less closely related to local economic trends. In the second section of Chapter 7 it will be argued that indeed certain diseases do appear to have altered in their impact on the population of the town and the surrounding area in the nineteenth century, irrespective of medical and administrative measures. This cannot be ignored in this demographic study of longer chronology since it is clear that the town experienced severe epidemics (Fig.4) but it will be argued that the effects of such peak years of mortality can be judged against longer term population trends.

Relationships between migration and local economic trends might appear uncontroversial since movement in search of work either into or out of the town could be expected. But an unknown degree of constraint arose from the application of the Acts of Settlement (Buckatzsch 1951). Eversley accepted that their application became less strict during the eighteenth century (1957:413) which supports the use of population as a surrogate in the later eighteenth century but leaves doubt as to the sixteenth, seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Yet for those centuries there is overwhelming evidence of both migration and mobility. Studies of small towns in East Anglia

(Patten 1973, 1976) and, at the other end of the scale, London (Spufford 1970, Wrigley 1967:7) have all verified the idea of strong population mobility and Wrigley goes as far as to estimate that for the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries one in seven adults spent some fraction of their life in London (1967b). On the grounds of this great scale of migration and mobility picked out in these other case studies of the early modern period, it will be assumed, in this study, that Acts of Settlement did not exert a powerful constraint on population movements.

For the nineteenth century a general conclusion may be drawn that population was mobile (Darby 1951:392, Friedlander & Roshier 1966, Smith 1951). In this particular discussion the balance between long distance movement as illustrated in studies of seasonal workers (Samuel 1973, Freeman 1957:274, Lawton 1959) or skilled workers (Gwynne & Sill 1976:74) and short distance movement, as emphasised by Redford (1926), is not of prime interest. Rather the scale of migration is important.

A study of population trends in the town of Durham has particular problems and strengths arising from the nature of local data sources. Prior to 1548 the usual demographic sources are not available; Co.Durham was not included in the Domesday Book (Darby 1962:419) and Boldon Book of 1183, although sometimes described as a domesday for Durham ⁽⁴⁾ was primarily an episcopal rental (Lapsley 1905:259) which excluded both non-episcopal estates and details of places 'at farm'. Durham City fell in the latter category. ⁽⁵⁾ In addition the county was not included in the 1377 Poll Tax

returns (Baker 1973 : 191, Glasscock 1973 : 139) or in the 1524 - 5 Lay Subsidy. (6)

The earliest static sources are, therefore, the Chantry Returns of 1548 (7), followed by the Ecclesiastical Returns of 1563 (8), the Protestation Returns of 1641 (9), the Hearth Tax of 1674 (10) and the Diocesan Book of 1793. (11) From 1801 there are decennial censuses whose strengths and weaknesses have been discussed at some length by other writers (Beresford 1963, Armstrong 1966, 1968). Another source, the Muster Returns, were available for the early modern period and were cited by nineteenth century local antiquaries including Surtees (1840 iv(2):7) but these were not employed in this study as they are generally considered to be a weaker source. The dynamic sources employed were the parochial registers of the six parishes comprising Durham City and suburbs (12) together with the registers of non-Anglican congregations. In the 1840's these were replaced, in this study, by the returns of the local Medical Officer of Health and of the Registrar-General.

Glass has noted that demographic source material alters in quality over time (1965 : 240) and that there was a major decline in quality in parish registration in the late eighteenth century (1973 : 118, Krause 1965). The latter problem does not appear to have been serious in the Durham data since Bishop Barrington instigated registration reform in 1798 and required more detailed information than was required under the national register reform, the Rose Act of 1812. (13) On the other hand non-Anglican congregations existed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and were

increasing in strength in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. St.Oswald's parish registers included papist burials throughout the seventeenth century ⁽¹⁴⁾, two Catholic "mass houses" in Elvet were mentioned in the 1774 Visitation ⁽¹⁵⁾ and these claimed to have existed from 'time immemorial'. ⁽¹⁶⁾ There also existed, from the seventeenth century, a Congregational meeting place ⁽¹⁷⁾, and a meeting of the Society of Friends (Mackenzie & Ross 1834 : 402). After visits by John Wesley to the town in the 1780's (Curnock 1909 : 16) Methodist congregations appeared; the earliest built a chapel in a yard off Old Elvet, later known as Chapel Passage ⁽¹⁸⁾, to which was added a New Connexion congregation meeting in Old Elvet from 1829 ⁽¹⁹⁾ and a Primitive Methodist meeting in North Road. ⁽²⁰⁾ In addition there was a group of Independants during the years 1778 to 1821, when they joined Claypath chapel. ⁽²¹⁾

These were the non-Anglican congregations but how strong were they numerically and did their existence impair parochial registration? The Catholic community appears to have been small until the 1840's (Doyle 1977 : 4) but Catholicism was stronger than in many other parts of the country and a traveller to Durham in 1780 expressed his surprise at their local strength. ⁽²²⁾ Doyle's opinion was based on the numbers of baptisms recorded and his view is strengthened, with regard to Catholic residents in the town itself, in that the congregation appears to have been drawn from a wide area. ⁽²³⁾ Recusant declarations of 1616 named only seven women in St.Oswald's parish ⁽²⁴⁾ while Protestations of 1641 indicate a Catholic population of fifty one men; 4.7% of those listed. ⁽²⁵⁾

Non-Anglicans formed approximately 10% of households in St. Nicholas parish in 1732 and about 17% of households in St. Giles parish in 1754 according to visitation records (Surtees iv(2) 1840 : 165). This proportion appears to have remained constant in the following decades since in the 1774 Visitation the number of non-Anglican households in the parishes of the suburbs were said to total 198.⁽²⁶⁾ But by 1851 more than two-thirds of the places of worship and attendances on Census Sunday in the surrounding area of Durham Union ⁽²⁷⁾, were non-Anglican. However, this trend was not necessarily identical to that within the town.

These congregations were numerically significant but they did not necessarily impair registration records. Birth or baptism records are extant for each of the local congregations with the exception of the Society of Friends, and these records were included in these analyses. ⁽²⁸⁾ Indeed in certain cases the bias may be towards repeating these non-Anglican register entries in the Anglican registers, an example being the registers of St. Nicholas which record baptisms conducted in Claypath chapel. ⁽²⁹⁾ In the case of burials none of the non-Anglican congregations had any means of burial until the Catholic cemetery was opened in the 1860's, by which date there are civil registration returns. ⁽³⁰⁾ The exceptions were a single burial in the forecourt of Claypath Chapel ⁽³¹⁾ and a small number of Catholic burials at Harberhouse, to the North of the town, which had had a medieval chapel. ⁽³²⁾ However, the latter practice was recorded by the Anglican clergy ⁽³³⁾ and was discontinued during the eighteenth century.

To return to Glass' comments on the quality of parochial registration; neither the question of a late eighteenth century registration crisis nor the question of non-Anglican congregations appear to prejudice a demographic study of the town but the more general question of the varying quality of the various registers over the centuries must also be taken into account. Some periods are obviously incomplete. Five of the six Anglican register series fail to cover the period of the Commonwealth and Protectorate and the sixth, St. Nicholas, where the Mayor appears to have acted as a civil registrar (Newton 1966 : 194 - 5) is not complete. Between 1710 and 1725 St. Giles had a "scandalous neglect" of its registers ⁽³⁴⁾ and there are cases where entries are missing at the end of volumes. ⁽³⁵⁾ In addition the registers commence at different dates so although St. Oswald's begin in 1538 and St. Nicholas in 1540, those for St. Giles only commence in 1584 ⁽³⁶⁾ so only from the last date can aggregates be assembled for the whole town.

The extent of registration defects were calculated using firstly a division between four major, or large, parishes and two minor ones ⁽³⁷⁾ and then by recognisable data loss; for any parish for a full year, or for parts of a year within a parish. In the case of the major parishes the absence of either burial or baptism entries for more than two months was noted as a defect. For the minor parishes this was ignored as there were far fewer entries in total. Years with defective burial entries for the period 1538 to 1841, inclusive, amounted to 44.1% of years, a frighteningly high proportion. This was still high when calculated for the period 1584 to 1841,

inclusive, for which registers exist for all the major parishes. The proportion of defective years in this period was 33.9% (Appendix 2.1).

Another check was to total the baptisms over all the parishes in the town each year and to evaluate the distribution of baptisms over each year. Totals were formed for January 1st to Lady Day in each year, a quarter, and for the remaining three quarters. Although it could be expected that some quarters would have larger proportions of baptisms than others it was not expected that the proportion lying within the January to Lady Day quarter would vary greatly year to year. Great variation was taken as an indication of defective baptism entries. Between 1538 and 1841, inclusive, 42.1% of years had defective entries and between 1584 and 1841, inclusive, 31.5% of years had defective entries (Appendix 2.2). These calculations corroborated the extent of defectiveness seen in the first calculation. The early years were particularly poor. In St. Nicholas' parish, between 1540 and 1635 ⁽³⁸⁾ 18.4% of years had no baptism entries and 64.6% of the remaining years had abnormal distributions of baptisms over the quarters (Appendix 2.3).

Yet another source of doubt as to the accuracy of early demographic sources arose out of the varying areas covered by each since the large parishes included surrounding rural areas (Fig. 21). The Chantry Returns of 1548 and the Ecclesiastical Returns of 1563 ⁽³⁹⁾ appear to have included the rural surround while the Protestation Returns of 1641 and the Hearth Tax of 1674 differentiated between the urban

township of the Elvets and the rural township of Shincliffe in St. Oswald's parish, but again, they did not subdivide the other large parishes into urban and rural parts. (40) In the 1563 Returns and in 1774 and 1790 St. Margaret's was divided to isolate the rural and populous area of Croxdale from the urban area. (41) Such biases could not be removed but were not judged of major significance in themselves.

2. The Size and Growth of Population, 1548 to 1911

No reliable estimates can be made concerning the size of the population of Durham City and suburbs in the medieval period since the estimate of 2,000 population in 1377 (Dobson 1973 : 36), based on Donaldson (1955 : 10 fn.) who in turn was quoting Russell (1948) is not founded on local documentary evidence. Indeed Russell commented that Co. Durham lacks data for 1377 but then suggested a population for the town of about 2,000 by means of extrapolation from neighbouring counties (1948 : 143, 145). Instead it may be suggested that throughout this period the town was smaller in population than Newcastle-upon-Tyne for which, as a royal borough, more tax returns are extant and more population estimates have been made. On the basis of the Lay Subsidy of 1296 Newcastle's population can be calculated as at least 1,400 (42) while from the Poll Tax of 1377 it was approaching 4,000 (Welford nd : 190). It cannot be estimated how much smaller Durham was but as Newcastle had a smaller population in 1377 than towns such as Lincoln, Salisbury, King's Lynn or Beverley (Welford nd : 190), some idea can be gained of Durham's rank among the provincial towns.

Many studies, including ones for York (Bartlett 1959), Banbury (Harvey 1969) and Gloucester (Lobel & Tann 1969), have concluded that in the fifteenth century their populations were falling. A similar conclusion is drawn by Lomas for Durham and its suburbs on the evidence of Durham Priory rentals (1973). Recently Langton has challenged the assumption of falling population in a case study of mid-fifteenth century Gloucester (1977) but in itself his challenge is not conclusive since it rests on a single priory rental of 1455. Rather the challenge is wider, and indeed includes Langton's own study since in analyses of fifteenth century town population trends tend to be based on certain types of evidence and, in particular, rentals pertaining to ecclesiastical houses. Yet often these properties are not distributed evenly over the urban area and, in the case of Durham, there is a marked bias towards property in the suburbs. In addition, there are few indications whether the ecclesiastical properties can be taken as a surrogate for all the urban property; there are no indications whether secular or ecclesiastical lords made more favourable terms for their tenants. Neither decay in certain specific parts of a town or new building, as in Langton's study, can be extrapolated over a whole town without further evidence.

To go further on this general theme is beyond the scope of this particular analysis; it is a topic here only so far as to evaluate existing work on Durham in the fifteenth century. Lomas has described decay (1973). To some extent he is verified, since in the suburbs, even in the sixteenth century ⁽⁴³⁾, there were burgrave plots lying waste (Chapter 5 fn. 107) but on the other hand his conclusions must

be tempered by the realisation that his comments refer solely to ecclesiastical property, mostly to the suburbs and that in general property units are a very crude framework with which to judge population trends.

After 1548 data from which to estimate the population of the town is still crude but the problems are connected with the selection of multipliers, how to move from an estimate of a portion of the population to an estimate of the total population, rather than being concerned with connexions between tenure units and population. The Chantry Returns of 1548 simply refer to 'howseling people' ⁽⁴⁴⁾, the Ecclesiastical Returns of 1563 refer to households, the Protestation Returns of 1641 merely list males over the age of eighteen, the Hearth Tax of 1674 appears to list households, and the Diocesan Book of 1793 totals houses. Only the last source gives crude population estimates; the rest must be increased by an appropriate multiplier. A multiplier is, of course, only a tool in analysis but as each source demands a different multiplier it is important to consider their selection with care. Work in other areas has produced multipliers which may or may not be applicable in specific localities (Hallam 1958, 1961, Laslett 1972a : 47, 1972b : 130-131) so in the case of this town, Durham, a range of multipliers have been used for certain sources in order to see whether a clear population trend emerges in spite of a range of possible population levels at each date for which there is data.

Using the multiplier used by Hoskins for the 1548 Returns, assuming a child population of 40% of the total, (1959 : 171) a population of 3,639 may be suggested for the

City and suburbs. This is a very similar multiplier to that employed by Titow in studies of the thirteenth century where he suggested, on the basis of the 1851 age structure, a child population amounting to 36.88% of the total (1961). Titow's multiplier would give a very similar population estimate for the town to that already calculated; 3,560 persons compared to 3,639 persons. Both these multipliers are wide open to criticism but it is easier to criticize than to substitute another multiplier since their weakness, stemming from a lack of knowledge as to the age structure of past populations, cannot be surmounted without recourse to family reconstitution. For the town of Durham this is impossible at this period since the parish registers are neither complete over the town nor of sufficient quality (Appendix 2.1).

A population estimate based on Muster Returns (VCH. 1928 iii : 46, Surtees 1840 iv : 5-10, 165) is much lower, at between two and three thousand. This, if compared to estimates derived from the 1563 Ecclesiastical Returns (Table 2.1), would indicate population growth but as the estimate based upon the Chantry Returns is preferred, since the source is stronger, very little, if any, population growth is suggested for the town between 1548 and 1563.

By necessity, the population in 1563 can only be estimated within a range since the Returns of that year only totalled households. The question, 'how large was a household at this date?' has led to the use of a range of suggested household multipliers. The lowest, 3.5 persons per household by Russell (1945 : 162, 1948), is now considered too low (Titow 1961 : 222) and a higher multiplier of 4.75 has been

suggested by Laslett (1972b). No multiplier can be accepted with certainty and especially since household sizes have fluctuated even in the decades since the 1801 census, from which date more detailed figures exist. Even in the thirty years from 1801 to 1831 average household size in the town of Durham altered from 3.9 in 1801 to 5.3 in 1811 before shifting back to 4.6 in 1821 and 4.5 in 1831. ⁽⁴⁵⁾ There are problems in the use of a household multiplier; problems of definitions, of relationships between population growth and available housing and other local social and economic conditions.

The range of possible populations for the town in 1563 is from 2,749 persons, using Russell's multiplier, to 3,925 persons using a multiplier of 5.0 persons per household (Table 2.1). Which end of a range of possibilities is to be preferred? In balance, Laslett's multiplier appears more reasonable since it is supported both by more detailed work than Russell's estimate and by independent case studies. A local census at Ealing, Middlesex, in 1599, for example (Allison 1963), gave an average household size of 4.81, excluding a school. This is not the same multiplier as Laslett gave but it supports a picture of larger households rather than small.

By 1641 the population of the town appears to have fallen since the Protestation returns only list 1,082 men. If this is multiplied by 10/6, as suggested by Hoskins (1959 : 173), the population may be estimated at 2,595, but the multiplier assumes an equal balance between the sexes and a child population amounting to 40% of the total. Neither is likely to be a correct assumption. Firstly, there is no

Table 2.1 Population estimates for the parishes of Durham
City and suburbs in 1563

<u>Parish</u>	<u>Household</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Multiplier</u>				
		<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.75</u>	<u>5.0</u>
St. Giles	107	375	417	482	508	535
St. Margaret	208	728	811	936	988	1040
St. Mary-le-Bow	40	140	156	180	190	200
St. Mary-the-Less	31	109	121	140	147	155
St. Nicholas	205	718	800	923	974	1025
St. Oswald	194	679	757	873	922	970
Total	785	2749	3062	3534	3729	3925

Source : BM. Harley 594 P. 186-191.

reason to suppose why the age-structure of a small town should remain constant and reflect the national age structure of 1851, especially since the late sixteenth century saw very high mortality in plague years (Fig. 4) during which different age groups may have been more susceptible than others. In addition it is known from other localities that fertility was not constant (Wrigley 1966) and, finally, 1641 was a year in the midst of civil disturbances; the local effects of which can be judged against Surtees' description of the town being deserted in the previous year when the Scots invaded the North of England (1816 i : xcv-xcvi).

An estimate of population based upon a list of adult males may, therefore, be too low but, on the other hand, the population of the town appears to have been decimated in the 1590's (Fig. 4) and the 1615 Muster Returns indicate a tiny population. When the latter source (Surtees 1840 iv : 7) is multiplied using the calculation employed by Hoskins (1959 : 171) the apparent population for the whole town is only 1,344. Now musters are a weaker source so probably

exaggerate the population fall but together with the evidence of plague years from explicit descriptions in the parish registers and the 1641 Protestation Returns they do indicate that a fall took place. The severity of the fall, however, cannot be appraised with any accuracy.

The Hearth Tax returns of 1674 indicate a population size similar to that in 1563; the losses of the late sixteenth century had been made good (Tables 2.1, 2.2). As in 1563 a range of estimated population levels can be suggested, since a household multiplier has to be used, but within this possible range a higher multiplier and higher population estimate is to be preferred. The returns themselves do not state whether the lists can reflect houses or households; Patten (1971 :22) prefers the latter. The distinction could be critical in the town of Durham since in 1801 the household average size was 3.90 persons but the 'houseful' average size, to use Laslett's term (1972a : 86-8), was 7.35. ⁽⁴⁶⁾ One check exists and indicates that indeed the 1674 tax returns refer to households. This is in St. Giles parish where a house cess, taken in 1699, indicates a total of forty houses. ⁽⁴⁷⁾ If this is multiplied by the 1801 'houseful' multiplier of 7.35 a population for the parish emerges of 323 persons while if the 1674 Hearth Tax of 80 households is treated as household data and is multiplied by 4.0 the resulting population estimate is 320, or, if multiplied by 4.5, is 360 persons, both of which correspond to the total derived from 1699 data.

From this comparison alone the St. Giles figures would indicate an average household size smaller than the 4.75

preferred by Laslett (1972b) but this presumes that the 'houseful' multiplier of 7.35 for 1801 is accurate for the late seventeenth century. This cannot be assumed and the purpose of comparing the 1674 and 1699 data for St. Giles' parish was not to derive any multipliers but to indicate that the 1674 data was so distinct from 'house' data that it should be accepted as 'households'. Instead the town should be compared to household multipliers derived from data referring to other places in the county. From the visitation returns of 1774, 1790 and 1810 average household sizes for different places in the county are 3.7, 4.2, 5.0, 5.2 and 6.1 (48) while one for papist families in St. Oswald's parish, Durham, in 1774 is as high as 7.9. (49) There is, therefore, a range from which to chose a multiplier but the evidence tips slightly towards the larger households, to Laslett's estimate of 4.75, or even larger.

Table 2.2 Population estimates for the parishes of
Durham City and suburbs in 1674

<u>Parish</u>	<u>Stated 'house-</u> <u>holds'</u>	<u>Multiplier</u>				
		<u>3.5</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.75</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>6.0</u>
St. Nicholas	235	823	1058	1116	1175	1410
S. Bailey	29	102	131	138	145	174
N. Bailey	59	207	266	280	295	354
St. Oswald	118	413	531	561	590	708
St. Margaret	190	665	855	903	950	1140
St. Giles	80	280	360	380	400	480
Total	711	2490	3201	3378	3555	4266

Source : D.CRO. M6/1 (copy of PRO. 330 E 179/106/25)

During the eighteenth century there is very little information from which to estimate the population of the town until the Diocesan Book of 1793, over a hundred years

after the Hearth Tax Returns. Only two parishes, St. Nicholas and St. Giles, have population estimates contained in visitation returns (Surtees 1840 iv : 165). In the former a stated 440 households in 1732 may be multiplied to give a population for that parish of 1,980 and for St. Giles the 120 households in 1753 may be multiplied to give a population of 540. (50) If these parishes contained a constant proportion of the population of the town it would be possible to estimate the total population from these two parishes in these two years. But it is clear, as is shown in Table 2.3, that this was not the case and therefore no estimate can be made for the town between 1674 and 1793.

Table 2.3 Population estimates for St. Giles and St. Nicholas parishes between 1674 and 1793

<u>Year</u>	<u>St. Nicholas</u>		<u>St. Giles</u>	
	<u>Population Estimate</u>	<u>% of total population</u>	<u>Population Estimate</u>	<u>% of total population</u>
1674	1116	34.5	380	11.3
1699	-		323	
1732	1980		-	
1753	-		540	
1793	1477	23.1	919	14.4

Sources : D.CRO. M6/1 (PRO. 330 E 179/106/25), DDPD. SR.DR. xvii. 1, Surtees (1840 iv : 165)

Between 1674 and 1793 the population of the town virtually doubled. Using the average 'houseful' size in the town in 1801 of 7.35 and the houses totalled in the Diocesan Book (51) a population estimate for 1793 is 6,401 persons. This multiplier is distinctly higher than the national average of 5.6 persons per house in 1801 (52), but it corresponds to the regional tendency to overcrowding in the

nineteenth century rather than the norm of one family per house elsewhere in England.

Over the 119 years between 1674 and 1793 the population had an average growth of 0.75% per annum but in St. Nicholas and St. Giles parishes more detail can be seen, although the two parishes do show different periods of rapid and slower growth. Between 1674 and 1732 the population of St. Nicholas parish appears to have increased an average of 1.33% per annum while in the years 1732 to 1793 its population appears to have fallen an average of -0.42% per annum. In contrast, the population of St. Giles parish fell in the late eighteenth century, rose in the early eighteenth century and rose more rapidly in the late eighteenth century. Between 1674 and 1699, the population appears to have fallen -0.26% per annum, between 1699 and 1753 it appears to have risen 1.24% per annum and between 1753 and 1793 it appears to have risen 1.75% per annum.

All these growth rates are accurate only to the degree of accuracy of the population estimates and the population decline in St. Giles between 1674 and 1699 is particularly suspect, being drawn from two such dissimilar sources. (53) On the other hand the trend towards more rapid population growth during the eighteenth century in St. Giles parish does mirror Flinn's findings for England and Wales as a whole (1970) and the trend in St. Nicholas parish in the late eighteenth century may reflect a shift from residential use of the centre of the town to increased commercial use. It does not appear to reflect underenumeration in 1793, since the 1801 census enumeration for the parish gave a population

total of 1,754 persons. It may, however, reflect an over-estimation in 1732 when the visitation return gives a round figure of 440 households. (54)

In 1794 Granger guessed that the population of the town was 9,000 (1794 : 8) but this figure was not reached until 1821. His estimate, however, illustrates a general point that where an urban population is growing quickly observers will tend to exaggerate the size of that population. In the Diocesan Book of 1793 several examples of this tendency can be seen; for Darlington the population was estimated as 6,000 but the 1801 census gave the figure 4,670 and for Sunderland an estimate of 20,000 population was given in 1793 but the 1801 census gave the figure 12,412. Between 1793 and 1801 the population of the City and suburbs of Durham appears to have increased by 1,129 or 2.21% per annum, a very rapid rise probably perceived by Granger although not estimated accurately by him.

During the nineteenth century and early twentieth century the population of the town more than doubled from 7,530 persons in 1801 to 17,550 persons in 1911. (55) Except for the decades 1811 to 1821, when the population grew 2.35% per annum, and 1831 to 1841 when it grew 3.98% per annum, and the decades 1841 to 1851 and 1881 to 1891, when the population fell slightly, the period saw slow rates of increase of less than 1% per annum. Between 1801 and 1811 population growth amounted to 0.56% per annum and between 1821 and 1831 it was a mere 0.31% per annum but these were low growth decades for the first half of the nineteenth century. It was in the second half of that century when such low growth rates

were usual. Between 1851 and 1861 the population only grew 0.68% per annum, between 1861 and 1871 it grew even less, the increase only amounting to 0.23% per annum and between 1871 and 1881 it was scarcely any better at 0.37% per annum. At the turn of the century there was slightly faster growth for between 1891 and 1901 and between 1901 and 1911, the population rose 0.87% per annum but the last decade must be set in the context of a boundary change in 1904 ⁽⁵⁶⁾ so strictly was a decade of slower growth. (Table 2.6).

3. Durham City in comparison with other towns in Co. Durham, 1548 to 1911

Whereas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Durham City, together with its suburbs, appears to have been the largest town in the county, second to Newcastle-upon-Tyne in the North East of England, its rate of growth in the second half of the seventeenth century appears to have been slower than either Gateshead or Sunderland and during the eighteenth century it fell behind both these towns in terms of population size (Table 2.4).

Table 2.4 Population Estimates for selected towns ⁽⁵⁷⁾, Co. Durham, 1548 to 1801

<u>Town</u>	<u>1548</u>	<u>1563</u>	<u>1641</u>	<u>1674</u>	<u>Year</u> <u>1793</u>	<u>1793</u> ^{a.}	<u>1801</u>
Barnard Castle	1,424	1,444	-	1,777	-	-	2,966
Bishop Wearmouth	980	903	1,394	(380) ^{e.}	2,800 ^{b.}	-	6,690 ^{c.}
Darlington	-	1,739	1,476	1,715	-	6,000	4,670
Durham	3,639	3,729	2,595	3,377	6,410	-	7,530
Gateshead	1,400	1,458	2,103	1,782	8,400 ^{b.}	8,000	8,597
Hartlepool	448	323	356	-	860	-	993
Stockton	-	627	465	656	-	929 ^{d.}	4,009
Sunderland	-	-	734	2,503	-	20,000	12,412

Sources : see Chapter 2 footnotes 7 to 11 inclusive, with multipliers ⁽⁵⁸⁾

a. Population estimate given b. included rural area

c. Bishop Wearmouth and Bishop Wearmouth Panns, d. local census 1792, e. Bishop Wearmouth Panns

Chalklin has suggested that by 1700 the population of Sunderland numbered between five and ten thousand (1974 : 5) which would imply that Sunderland was already larger than Durham in the seventeenth century. This is not borne out by the Hearth Tax returns of 1674; even when Sunderland and the adjacent Bishop Wearmouth are totalled together (Table 2.4). Instead it appears to have been the eighteenth century which saw great increases in population on the Wear, at Sunderland and Bishop Wearmouth, and on the Tyne, at Gateshead, in contrast to slower growth in the other towns of the county including Durham. (59)

Compared to other towns in England of similar size in 1801 the population increase of Durham was slow but was not remarkably slow in the first half of the nineteenth century. Durham numbered 7,530 in 1801 and 13,188 in 1851 and this growth was similar to that at Bury St. Edmunds, Salisbury and Whitby who all grew from between 7,000 and 8,000 in 1801 to between 10,000 and 15,000 in 1851. (60) This was slower growth than at Lincoln or Gloucester who numbered between 15,000 and 20,000 population in 1851 (61), or Bury, Brighton, Huddersfield, North Shields, Portsmouth and Southampton who all numbered between 25,000 and 100,000 by mid-century. Bradford had grown even more rapidly and in 1851 had 103,778 population. (62) Compared to towns with between 10,000 and 15,000 in 1851 Durham's growth had been slower in the first half of the nineteenth century than Barnstaple, Bedford, Boston, Bridgwater, Carmarthen, Congleton, Hereford, Kendal, Louth, Newark, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Pembroke, Rochdale, Scarborough, Stafford, Tiverton, Truro, Warwick, Winchester, or Wisbech (63); places which not only included new industrial

towns but also old market towns.

The remarkable contrast was between the population growth of Durham and that of other towns in the county during the nineteenth century (Fig. 3). In the North East as a whole the population growth in each decade frequently exceeded the national growth rate (Rowe 1971 : 119) with towns such as Sunderland sustaining these faster growth rates up to the 1880's (Robson 1969 : 78). Towns in the county divided into those which grew rapidly; Sunderland with Bishop Wearmouth, Gateshead, South Shields, Stockton and Darlington and those which grew slowly; Durham, Bishop Auckland, Hartlepool and Barnard Castle. The two groups were quite distinct (Fig.3). In addition the rural area surrounding Durham City, the administrative area of Durham Union, experienced a rapid population rise in the second half of the nineteenth century (Fig.3) so it is the town itself which is an anomaly in that it grew slowly and that indeed this was slow growth since it was not seriously underbounded (Fig. 48).

4. Factors contributing to population change

It has already been argued that the population of the town was static between 1548 and 1563 (page 30) but it has not been discussed how natural increase, the balance of births and deaths, and local net migration contribute to this. Births and deaths can only be judged by the surrogate of baptisms and burials recorded in the parochial registers and, in addition, St. Oswald's parish is the only parish for which an analysis can be made. St. Nicholas' has registers but they are of too low a quality to be useful (Appendix 2.1, 2.3).

For St. Oswald's parish the estimated population in 1548 is 3,639 and in 1563 between 2,749 and 3,729 (Table 2.1). Between these two dates there was, therefore, either a static or a slightly declining population but the former conclusion is preferred. (63a) The registers show the total number of burials to be very similar to the total number of baptisms, being 281 and 288 respectively (64) so the effect of net migration for the period appears to have been negligible.

For all the parishes in the town for which there is data, the period between 1563 and 1641, the next year for which a population estimate can be made, fell into two sub-periods. The earlier, from 1563 to 1600 saw a strong excess of burials over baptisms when both are smoothed by a ten year running average (Fig. 4) but from 1600 to 1640 there was an excess of baptisms over burials. In St. Oswald's parish the population decline between 1563 and 1641 can be estimated as 355 persons (65), all of which can be attributed to the balance of baptisms and burials. Burials exceeded baptisms by 485 (66) but the discrepancy between this and the apparent population loss can be explained by the loss of baptism data for the years 1593 to 1598 (67) and by slight inaccuracy in each of the two population estimates.

The earlier sub-period, from 1563 to 1600, saw several years of exceptionally high mortality. The years 1589, 1597 and 1598 were described as plague years (68) with the latter two years being particularly severe. The February Quarter Sessions of 1598 were transferred from Durham to Bishop Auckland (King 1973 : 36) and 828 burials were recorded, about eight times as many as the previous ten years (Fig.4).

In addition 1587 was noted as a plague year in the registers of St. Margaret's parochial chapelry ⁽⁶⁹⁾, as a year of high prices and "lacke of bredde" in St. Oswald's parish and in St. Nicholas' parish. ⁽⁷⁰⁾ The years 1600 to 1641 saw fewer years of such severe mortality, though there was plague in 1604 ⁽⁷¹⁾ and high mortality in St. Giles' parish in 1639. ⁽⁷²⁾ Plague again occurred in 1644 (Surtees 1840 iv : 5-10).

Whether these 'plagues' were bubonic plague or whether they were diseases such as dysentery, typhoid or typhus cannot be judged since there are no descriptions of symptoms. Both the 'plague' of 1589 and that of 1597 had autumnal inceptions which do not clearly identify the disease. (Fig.5).

If the plague years are excluded the crude mortality rates of the mid-sixteenth century are similar to those in the town in the mid-nineteenth century and estimates for the late sixteenth century are slightly higher. The average crude mortality for the years 1851 to 1860 was 24.97/1000 while the crude mortality for St. Nicholas parish in the single year of 1563 was of the order 21.15/1000 to 28.69/1000 and that for St. Mary-le-Bow 19.05/1000 to 25.69/1000 (Table 2.5). For the period 1563 to 1641 only three years, 1585, 1591 and 1592, have burial data for all the parishes of the town which are not obviously defective. Taking a population estimate of 3,500 for the 1580's and 1590's the evidence of the total burials in the town gives slightly higher crude mortality rates of 34.29/1000 in 1585, 37.71/1000 in 1591 and 28.86/1000 in 1592.

Table 2.5 Crude Mortality for St. Nicholas and St. Mary-le-Bow
parishes in 1563

<u>Parish</u>	<u>Population Estimate</u>	<u>Crude Mortality/1000</u>
St. Nicholas	718	28.69
	800	25.75
	974	21.15
St. Mary-le-Bow	109	25.69
	121	23.14
	147	19.05

Sources: Table 2.1; D.CRO.EP/Du SN 1; D.CRO.EP/Du MB 1

It was the 'plague' years which forced the average mortality rates up over the 1580's and 1590's and which contributed to the lack of population growth in the town between 1563 and 1674. In 1597 the burial rate reached 100/1000 population and for the two years following both the burial and baptism numbers remained pitifully low (Fig.4). This burial rate was not exceptional since McKeown has calculated that the London plagues of the late sixteenth century produced even higher crude mortality and suggests that in 1563 the crude burial rate was of the order of 250/1000 and in 1593 it was of the order of 120/1000 (1976 : 70).

McKeown has dismissed the idea of plagues reducing population growth (1976 : 70) but his work has concerned population growth for England and Wales as a whole and for London. In the latter case there were strong net gains from migration (Wrigley 1967b.) which would cancel out the effects of specific years of high mortality so Durham and London are not comparable. Then McKeown's conclusions for England and Wales are not necessarily comparable to Durham since epidemics were so often localized (Hoskins 1966 : 137). (73)

In 1674 the population of the town was approximately the same size as in 1563 (Tables 2.1, 2). Losses in population in the 'plague' years at the end of the sixteenth century had been made up by 1674 but whereas in the period 1563 to 1641 those losses were being eliminated by natural increase (Fig. 4), from about 1660 to 1680, with the exception of the end of the 1690's, burials exceeded baptisms. Therefore, in the two decades after the Restoration, either baptism was less universally practised or recorded, or the local population had reached a peak during the unrecorded decade of the 1650's, or the population was rising through net migration gains.

Separate sources of evidence point towards the last possibility. These sources are the new regulations governing the grazings in the townships of Elvet and Gilesgate. Re-definition of the rights does not automatically point to an immigrant population since both a recent enclosure ⁽⁷⁴⁾, and a rise in the number of cattle kept ⁽⁷⁵⁾ is involved in Gilesgate township. But the new regulations for both Elvet and Gilesgate laid such emphasis on the rights of residents, in relation to their being either born in the township or 'strangers', who were resident but who had come by reason of marriage, inheritance or apprenticeship ⁽⁷⁶⁾, that newcomers must have been viewed as a threat to an existing fine balance between grazings and cattle. This in turn confirms the net migration gain indicated by the balance of baptisms and burials in relation to long term population trends since although in Gilesgate the new regulations could be the outcome of enclosure and changes in available grazings, in Elvet there is no known enclosure at this period.

Year to year the balance between baptisms and burials varied but by using a ten year running average clearer patterns emerge. Burials outnumbered baptisms in the first half of the eighteenth century, then, during the 1750's baptisms temporarily exceeded burials, after which burials again exceeded baptisms until the 1790's (Fig. 4). Hodgson suggests that over the whole of the middle Wear valley, around the town, natural increase was low in the eighteenth century (1973 : 141) but the registers for the town, including both Anglican and non-Anglican, suggest that there was natural wastage. Yet at the same time the evidence of the 1674 and 1793 population estimates suggests that the population of the town was actually rising (Table 2.4) so this rise must be attributed to gain from migration.

Between 1793 and 1801 there appears to have been both rapid population growth (Table 2.4), an excess of baptisms over burials, which grew stronger in the early nineteenth century (Fig. 4) and gain from migration. (77) The latter is corroborated by the improved parish registers dating from 1798 (78) since they give the residence of deceased persons and these addresses are clearly not local residences but rather parishes of settlement under the Poor Laws. In St. Oswald's parish the workers at the cotton factory (Surtees 1840 iv : 25) and members of their families, who died between 1798 and 1808, were all recorded as residents of parishes elsewhere in the county and the proprietor was from Cheshire. (79) In St. Nicholas parish, for the years 1798 to 1812, places of residence are recorded which are as far afield as Southern England (Appendix 2. 6) while St. Margaret's

parish, described by Eden as full of woollen and carpet workers (1797 : 179) ⁽⁸⁰⁾, has interesting though not such explicitly informative entries. In St. Margaret's burial registers half the entries between 1802 and 1811 give no details of residence. This omission could have arisen from negligence or from an unwillingness to allocate either the 'parish of settlement' or St. Margaret's parish as the residence of a newcomer. Since the entries lacking details of residence are scattered amongst other entries giving details the gaps are unlikely to have arisen from negligence so they may indicate migrants to the town.

Analysis of nineteenth century population growth must divide into two periods on account of the quality of information. Before 1850 the evidence comes from parish registers, other church registers and the decennial census but after 1850 detailed year by year reports exist for civil registration of births and deaths in the town. ⁽⁸¹⁾ In neither half of the nineteenth century did population growth in the town exhibit the same trends as in the county or in Sunderland (Table 2.6). The town showed some similarity to the area of Durham Union, the surrounding area, in the first half of the century but from then the growth patterns were dissimilar.

Between 1793 and 1801, between 1811 and 1821 and between 1831 and 1841 the town appears to have gained population not only through natural increase (Fig.4) but also through migration. In the decade 1811 to 1821 this migration gain was small, and can be calculated as 886 persons, between 1793 and 1801 it can be calculated as about 1,000 persons but between 1831 and 1841 net migration gain appears to have been a massive 3,130. ⁽⁸³⁾ In the other decades of the early nineteenth

century, 1801 to 1811 and 1821 to 1831 there appears to have been net loss from migration.

Table 2.6 Population increase by decade, comparing Durham MB. to Durham Union (82), Sunderland and Co.Durham, 1801 to 1911

	<u>Durham</u>	<u>Durham Union</u>	<u>Sunderland</u>	<u>Co.Durham</u>
1801 - 11	5.6 %	4.7 %	3.0 %	10.8 %
1811 - 21	23.5	19.2	22.7	16.9
1821 - 31	3.1	7.2	27.7	22.3
1831 - 41	39.8	68.8	30.4	27.7
1841 - 51	- 6.8	44.0	24.3	26.9
1851 - 61	6.8	25.6	22.4	30.1
1861 - 71	2.3	30.9	25.6	34.8
1871 - 81	3.7	32.9	18.6	26.6
1881 - 91	- 0.5	10.4	12.4	17.2
1891 - 01	8.0	1.9	10.9	16.8
1901 - 11	5.1	nk.	3.5	15.4

nk. Not known

Sources : decennial printed censuses, Robson 1969 : 77,
Table 3.2 for Sunderland data.

In the second half of the century each decade had net migration loss to some degree (Appendix 2.7); a balance disguised by the slow growth of the population in all the decades except the 1840's and 1880's (Table 2.6).

To summarize; in the late sixteenth century and up to the mid-seventeenth century rises and falls in population appear to have been the product of a balance of births and deaths, so far as baptism and burial data indicate. There is no evidence of net migration gain or loss in this period but, in contrast, from the middle of the seventeenth century right through until the first decade of the nineteenth century, there appears to have been a net gain from migration. This was followed by half a century of decades

which alternated net migration gains and net migration losses. The pattern became more constant after the mid-nineteenth century with each decade between 1851 and 1911 sharing net loss by migration. Against these trends evidence of the local economy can be judged more clearly.

1. The 1851 census enumerators' books do count whole families as lodgers while the 1871 enumerates families separately.
2. Family reconstitution is impossible since the parish registers tend only to give names and not family details. The 1841 census does not show family relationships (Armstrong 1966).
3. Taking no account of age structure. Morrow (1978 : 426-7) has suggested that fertility and mortality may be linked in that plague may reduce female fertility. Wrigley has, however, argued against this effect at Colyton (1978).
4. Lapsley 1905 : 259. More modern commentators such as Welldon Finn (1963) make no such comparison.
5. Liber Censuulis vocati Domesday Book, Additamenta ex Codic. Antiquiss. London 1816. p.565.
6. Brewer J.S. ed. Letters & Papers Foreign & Domestic, Henry VIII 1524-1526, vol. 4 pt.1, London 1870 547 pp. 232-9. Pat. 16 Hen. VIII p.2 ms:ld. to 8d.
7. Raine J. ed. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes. Surtees Society 22 1850, Appendix vi pp. lix-lxxvi.
8. DDPD. SR. copy of B.M. Harley 594 f.187 ff.
9. Wood, H.M. ed. Durham Protestations. Surtees Society, 135 1922 pp.118-130, 144-147.
10. D.CRO. M6/1 Lady Day Assessment 1674, PRO.E 179/106/25, Patten (1971:15) comments on the superior value of the assessment compared to the tax returns.
11. DDPD.SR.DR.xvii.1 Durham Diocesan Book, 1793.
12. D.CRO. EP/Du MB 1, 2, 3; EP/Du ML 1,4; EP/Du SG 1,2,4,5,6,17; EP/Du SM 1,2,3,4,6,30,31,32; EP/Du SN 1,2,3,9; Headlam AW. ed. The Parish Registers of St. Oswald's, Durham, Durham 1891; St. Oswald's undeposited registers, by kind permission of Rev. Dr. G. Roe, No. 7 Christenings 1653-1781, Marriages 1653-1781, Burials 1653-1680; Baptisms 1782-1812; Marriages 1782-1812; A Register of Baptisms, & from Jan. J. 1782; vol. 6 Burials 1678-1800; Burials 1801 (1801-1812); Register of Burials 1831-53; Register of Baptisms 1848-1870; DDPD.SR. Bishop's Transcripts, St. Oswald's parish.
13. D.CRO. EP/Du SM 4 Letter dated 30th Sept.1797, new format from 1st Jan. 1798 to give for burial entries:- name, abode, descent, profession or trade, date of death, date buried, age, in populous places, such as Durham City, the street where lived and cause of death (where known).

14. Headlam AW. ed. The Parish Registers of St. Oswald's, Durham. Durham 1891.
15. DDPD. SR. Auckland Castle Episcopal Records. 1774. p.155.
16. D.CRO. M5/2 PRO. 66 RG. 4 46, a comment made when they deposited their registers. In addition 'The Catholic Register' lists St. Cuthbert's, Elvet, as dating from 'time immemorial'.
17. D.VCH. ii : 67 though they claimed a date of only c.1757 when they deposited their registers. D.CRO. M5/2 PRO. 66 RG. 4 2279.
18. Curnock N. ed. J. Wesley. The Journal. London 1909-1916 vol. vi p.281, vol. vii p.397-8, fn. 398. The Old Elvet Chapel has been dated as 1808 by Curnock and as 1812 by the congregation when the registers were deposited D.CRO.M5/2 PRO. 66 RG. 4 1253.
19. D.CRO . M5/2 PRO. 66 RG. 4 473.
20. Bethel Chapel, date plaque 1856.
21. D.CRO.M5/2 PRO. 66 RG 4 2665.
22. Hist. MSS. Comm. Report ix App. ii 383 fn. p.67.
23. D.CRO.M5/2 PRO. 66 RG 4 46, 473, 3450.
24. Headlam AW. ed. 1891 pp.57-8.
25. Wood HM. ed. Durham Protestation Returns SS. 135 1922 pp. 118-130, 144-147.
Hudleston CR. ed. Durham Recusants' Estates 1717-1778. SS. 178 1958 indicates 21 recusants, resident in Durham and suburbs, enrolled between 1717 and 1728.
26. DDPD. SR. Auckland Castle Episcopal Records 1774 pp.151-153r. St. Mary-le-Bow 2, St. Mary-the-Less 1, St. Giles 21, St. Margaret 150, St. Oswald 24 non-Anglican households. St.Nicholas return states "There are few Papists, but many Presbyterians and Quakers who have each a Meeting-House" - there are no numbers given.
27. HC. PP. 1852-3 lxxxix. 419 Census of Great Britain. 1851. Religious Worship. Durham Union : Total places of worship 90, non-Anglican 67.8%; total attendances 20,688, non-Anglican 66.0%.
28. D.CRO. M5/2 Claypath Chapel 1752 to 1810, Framwellgate Chapel 1778 to 1836, Wesleyan, Old Elvet, 1815 to 1837, Methodist New Connexion 1832 to 1840, Catholic 1739 to 1810, 1809 to 1821 and 1821 to 1839, Catholic (Jesuit) 1768 to 1827.
29. D.CRO. EP/Du. SN. 1,2.

30. Walker's 1875 p.43-6. Obituary to Father Ralph Platt.
31. D.CRO. M 5/2 PRO. RG. 4 2279.
32. OS. Durham XX. 13.
33. Headlam AW. ed. The Parish Registers of St. Oswald's, Durham.Durham. 1891 pp.185, 193, 234.
34. D. CRO. EP/Du SG. 4. Burials are not entered for the years 1712 to 1723, inclusive, and baptisms are not entered for the years 1710 to 1723, inclusive.
35. St. Oswald's lacks burials from 1597 to 1600. Headlam AW. ed. 1891.
36. D.CRO. EP/Du SN 1, SG 1, Headlam AW. ed. 1891.
37. Major parishes were taken as being St. Giles, St. Margaret (strictly a parochial chapelry), St. Nicholas and St. Oswald. Minor, smaller, parishes were taken as St. Mary-le-Bow and St. Mary-the-less. St. Mary Magdalene is included in the registers of St. Giles. No registers appear to be extant for the Cathedral precincts although they were cited for the years 1609 to 1812 in Rickman's 'Parish Register Abstract', 1831 p.91.
38. The registers were rewritten in 1635 D.CRO. EP/Du SN 1.
39. see footnotes 7 and 8.
40. see footnotes 9 and 10. As St. Oswald was the largest parish with the largest rural part its division was of the greatest importance. The rural areas of St. Giles, and St. Margaret were largely moorland and uninhabited up to the late eighteenth or nineteenth centuries (Figs. 21, 29) DU. Routh,Armstrong Map 'The county palatine of Durham' (1768).
41. see footnote 8, DDPD. SR. Auckland Castle Episcopal Records 1774 p.149 and DDPD. SR. DR. xvii.1. Diocesan Book vol. 1 p.127.
42. Fraser 1968 : xlv,states that the Lay Subsidy of 1296 assessed Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Pandon for 295 households. This, using a household multiplier of 4.75 (Laslett 1972b) gives a population estimate of 1,402, to which must be added a proportion of the population who were exempted through poverty.
43. DDPD. PK. Receiver's Book II, 1542-3.
44. The OED. derives this word, houseling, from the verb 'housel', to administer the Eucharist. The meaning is those people who are communicants.

45. Printed census volumes. Average household size 1801 3.9, 1811 5.3, 1821 4.6, 1831 4.5.
46. Printed census 1801. Population 7,530 houses inhabited 1,024.
47. SS. 95 1895 p.94 6d. per house giving a total of £1.25.
48. DDPD. SR. Auckland Castle Episcopal Records. Visitations 1774, 1790, 1810. 1774 Darlington 6.0, 1790 minimum 4.2 Monk Hesleden, maximum 5.0 Gateshead, 1810 minimum 3.7 St. Margaret Durham maximum 5.2 St. John Sunderland.
49. DDPD. SR. Auckland Castle Episcopal Records. 1774 Visitation p.155 Twenty four Papist families - 190 persons.
50. Surtees (1840 iv : p.165) cites these visitation records.
51. DDPD. SR. DR. xvii.1. Diocesan Book 1793. Total houses listed; 872. Excluding the small parish of St.Mary-le-Bow.
52. Cheshire (1854 : 47, Table iv).
53. The 1674 Hearth Tax was a national taxation which Patten describes as being levied on "Hearth Tax paying units rather than levied on 'houses' " (1971 : 22). The 1699 house cess was a local collection by the grassmen of the parish and is given as a total, not unit by unit as in the Hearth Tax.
54. Surtees (1840 iv : 165).
55. Printed census volumes. Population enumerated for Durham City (1801-31), Durham MB. (1841-1911)

1801	7,530	1861	14,088
1811	7,953	1871	14,406
1821	9,822	1881	14,932
1831	10,125	1891	14,863
1841	14,151	1901	16,151
1851	13,188	1911	17,550
56. Gee (1928 : 4) VCH.iii. See also Chapter 7 fn. 114 and Fig. 48.
57. Other markets such as Chester-le-Street, Staindrop, Stanhope and Wolsingham lay in larger rural townships or parishes from which they could not be separated.
58. Multipliers used were:- 1548 add 40%, 1563 4.75/household, 1641 10/6, 1674 4.75 and 1793 x 7.35/house.

59. These Wearside and Tyneside towns were the coalmining or coal shipping towns. Nef (1932 i).
60. Bury St. Edmunds population 1801 7,655, 1851 13,900, Salisbury population 1801 7,668, 1851 11,657, Whitby population 1801 7,483, 1851 8,040. Printed census volumes.
61. Gloucester population 1801 7,579, 1851 17,572, Lincoln population 1801 7,398, 1851 17,536. Printed census volumes.
62. Bradford population 1801 6,393, 1851 103,778, Brighton population 1801 7,339, 1851 69,673, Bury population 1801 7,072, 1851 31,262, Huddersfield population 1801 7,268, 1851 30,880, N.Shields population 1801 7,280, 1851 8,882, Portsmouth population 1801 7,839, 1851 72,096, Southampton population 1801 7,913, 1851 35,305. Printed census volumes.

63. <u>Town</u>	<u>1801 population</u>	<u>1851 population</u>
Barnstaple +	3,748	11,371
Bedford	3,948	11,693
Boston	5,926	17,518
Bridgwater +	3,634	10,317
Carmarthen	5,548	10,524
Congleton	3,861	10,520
Hereford	6,828	12,108
Kendal	6,892	10,377
Louth	4,236	10,467
Newark	6,730	11,330
Newcastle-under-Lyne	4,604	10,290 +
Pembroke+	1,842	10,107
Rochdale	-	29,195
Scarborough	6,409	12,915
Stafford	3,898	11,829
Tiverton	6,505	11,144
Truro	2,358	10,733
Warwick	5,775	10,973
Winchester	5,826	13,704
Wisbech +	5,541	10,594

Sources : printed censuses 1801 and 1851

+ parish

- 63a. cf. Table 2.1, discussion, page 30 , and Appendix 2.4.
64. See Appendix 2.1 and 2.2.
65. Population estimate 1563 922, population estimate 1641 567. This gives a discrepancy from the total of baptisms and burials in the period (Headlam ed. 1891) of 130.
66. Calculated from Headlam ed. 1891.
67. See Appendix 2.3
Lack baptisms 1594, 1595, 1596 and 1597, low totals 1593, 1598.
To calculate baptisms for 1593 to 1598 inclusive :-
- | | |
|---|---------|
| Average 1583 to 1608 excluding 1593 to 1598 | |
| i.e. average 1583 to 1592 | = 24.00 |
| average 1599 to 1608 | = 29.80 |
| Average | = 26.90 |
| Minimum | = 144 |
| Maximum | = 178 |
- This maximum is likely to be too high since baptisms fell in number over the whole town in the period 1598 to 1600 following the 1597-8 plague (Fig. 4).
68. D.CRO. EP/Du SG. 1 18th August 1589 "plague began the first time in geleyait", August 1597 "plague began the second tyme", EP/Du SN1 for 1597 "Great Visitation" p.35, Surtees (iv 1840 : 7) quoting Mickleton "Poor Durham this year was almost undone".
69. D.CRO. EP/Du SM 1.
70. Headlam 1891 p.31 "many poore peple weare supposed to dye for lacke of bredde", D.CRO. EP/Du SN. 1.
71. D.CRO. EP/Du SG. 1, Headlam 1891 p.43.
72. 46 burials compared to 14 in 1637, 22 in 1638, 14 in 1640 and 19 in 1641 D.CRO. EP/Du SG 1.
73. A point of interest is that 1597 was the last time the high status area of North Bailey, St. Mary-le-Bow, was decimated by plague (Fig. 5). The residents may have moved out in subsequent plague years as burials and baptisms are low. This may indicate that in this particular town plague had less of a long term demographic impact in the seventeenth century than in the sixteenth century.
74. D.CRO. EP/Du SG. 3 p.41 "Durham 1693 A Note of Lands paying Tyth to ye Church of St. Gyles and taken out of a Copy found in ye Study at Old Durham - taken out of Copy drawn by Mr. Elias Smyth Anno 1655".

75. Barmby 1896 SS. 95
p.15 1591 36 or 37 cows = £3.12.8d. @ 2s./cow
p.37 1610 80 cows = 13s.4d. @ 2d/cow
p.110 1726 315 stints = £15.15.1d.@ 1s./stint
1610 for "bull hay", 1726 for a law suit
Seven sixteenth century probate inventories for
St. Giles parish list cattle or horses :-
D. Probate 1572 John Gaire 2 kye, 1 horse,
1573 Robert Hudispeth 4 kye, 1 mare, 1586 John
Wilkinson nk., 1587 Ralph Wilson 7 kye, 1 ox, 1 mare,
2 horses, 1587 Will. Wilson 2 kye, 1 whie, 1 calf,
1 why stirk, 2 mares, 1596 John Taylor nk., 1597
John Humble 2 kye, 1 whie.
Not all may have been pastured locally. See Durham
Probate John Carter 1598, Thomas Oliver 1573,
John Stowt 1582, John Wall 1565, Hugh Whitfield 1578.
76. Barmby 1896 SS.95 pp.96, 97, 110, D.CRO.EP/Du S0.114
77. 1793 population estimate 6,401 (Table 2.4)
Total baptisms recorded 1793 (inclusive) to
1801 (inclusive) = 1,887
Total burials recorded = 1,760
Population estimate for 1801 from baptisms
and burials = 6,528
Population recorded in 1801 census = 7,530
Indicating a migration gain of 1,002, or about 1,000
Sources : D.CRO. EP/Du SN. 3, 9, ML 1, 4, MB 3,
SG 6, 17, 18, SM 4, 6, DDPD. SR. Bishop's Transcripts
for St. Oswald's parish and undeposited registers.
78. See above, footnote 13.
79. DDPD. SR. Bishop's Transcripts, St. Oswald's parish.
A total of eight families recorded.
80. See also Chapter 3 footnote 63 et al.
81. Civil registration does not isolate the town since Durham MB.
was included in Durham Registration District along
with a large mining area (Fig. 49) and was divided
between St. Nicholas and St. Oswald sub-districts.
Their population differed from those of the town
(Fig. 3). The data for the town could be separated
out using the Medical Officer of Health's reports
which have survived in a great number of different
sources (see Appendix 2.7).
82. Durham Union for the years 1801 to 1841 by totalling
the constituent parishes.

83.	1793 population estimate 6401		
	Baptisms 1793 (incl.) to 1801 (exclu.)	=	1,887
	Burials	=	1,760
	Expected population 1801		6,528
	Net Migration + 1,002		
1801	population 7,530 (census)		
	Baptisms 1801 (incl.) to 1811 (excl.)	=	2,340
	Burials	=	2,883
	Expected population 1811		8,073
	Net Migration - 120		
1811	Population 7,593 (census)		
	Baptisms 1811 (incl.) to 1821 (excl.)	=	2,873
	Burials	=	1,890
	Expected population 1821		8,936
	Net Migration + 886		
1821	Population 9,822 (census)		
	Baptisms 1821 (incl.) to 1831 (excl.)	=	2,985
	Burials	=	2,229
	Expected population 1831		10,578
	Net Migration - 453		
1831	Population 10,125 (census)		
	Baptisms 1831 (incl.) to 1841 (exclu.)	=	3,761
	Burials	=	2,865
	Expected population 1841		11,021
	Net Migration + 3,130		
1841	Population 14, 151 (census)		

CHAPTER THREE

CHANGES IN THE LOCAL ECONOMY

1. Introduction

Although it is recognized that Victorian towns were economically diverse it is a common assumption to see the large towns and smaller, slowly growing towns as a contrast. It is within the context of large towns that studies of employment structure, management, investment and growth industries have concentrated while the smaller towns have been commented upon in general terms implying that they were relics of a pre-industrial urban economy. Briggs wrote "the market town looked towards the past" (1959:44) and Newton described Exeter as doubtfully Victorian since it lacked economic growth and indeed stagnated (1968:xi, 17) while Simpson and Lloyd commented that the town was largely unaffected by industrialisation (1977:8) and at York, Armstrong described the economy as bypassed by the Industrial Revolution (1974:16-23).

Everitt has made a plea that market towns of the last century were not an anachronism (1973:235, 1974:37, 38) but others only hint at this. In Newton's study of Exeter are such hints of local economic change, not only in terms of the town as a social centre, which he documents, but also in terms of its industrial structure since the ancient crafts were in decline (1968:81). Unfortunately the degree of change and type of change in Exeter's economy are not described fully so the question remains, and not only for Exeter but for all small nineteenth century towns, what was the nature and degree of economic change?

Three aspects illustrate the local economy; firstly

the structure of the economy, the range and balance of industries and employment, secondly, the industrial organization, the size of firms and the nature of management and, thirdly, the character of investment and reinvestment. The first two aspects form the evidence for two questions. What was the structure of the local economy of Durham City in the mid-nineteenth century and how did this differ from other towns in the North East of England and elsewhere in England? Also, how was the local economy altering both within the nineteenth century and compared to earlier centuries? A third question arises out of the aspect of investment, why was there change?

Investment is, metaphorically, the watchspring of the local economy while the employment structure and structure of firms are the clockcase and cogs but since census enumeration books and directories outweigh eclectic business records ⁽¹⁾ the local sources impose both a descriptive approach, as used by Marshall in his study of nineteenth century Furness (1958), and an emphasis on the first two aspects and questions concerning the local economy.

2. Durham City in the mid-nineteenth century; the industrial structure

Rowe, discussing the occupation structure of the town in 1871 described it as having a 'non-industrial, market and cathedral city nature' (1973:127) yet in 1841, 1851, 1861 (Table 3.1) and 1871 (Table 3.2) the leading occupational group, as classified by Booth's industrial classification (Booth 1886, Armstrong 1972) ⁽²⁾, was manufacturing. This was followed by much smaller domestic services, dealing and

professional groups implied in the term 'non-industrial town'. Rowe did not use Booth's classification (1973:121-3) so some divergence of opinion must be allowed but it cannot be held that Booth's classification greatly distorts the employment structure of the town. Booth's has weaknesses, it is not purely an industrial classification, it mixes retail and craft industry, it mixes factory and craft industry and it is not comparable to modern industrial classifications⁽³⁾ but its strengths are that it was a contemporary view, that it recognized the strength of the casual labour force and that it has been used for other local studies; for York (Armstrong 1967, 1972, 1974), for Liverpool (Lawton & Pooley 1975) and for Cardiff (Daunton 1977), to name but a few. Comparisons between studies are thereby facilitated to a greater extent than 'ad hoc' classifications still employed in locally orientated work. ⁽⁴⁾

Table 3.1 Industrial occupational structure of the workforce, Durham MB., 1841, 1851 and 1861

Industrial Group	1841		1851		1861	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
AG	301	6.82	480	7.88	316	4.95
M	239	5.25	170	2.79	316	4.95
B	227	4.99	465	7.63	603	9.45
MF	1619	35.59	2188	35.92	2103	32.95
T	49	1.08	155	2.54	331	5.19
D	424	9.32	735	12.07	799	12.52
IS	310	6.82	325	5.34	270	4.23
PP	220	4.84	394	6.47	512	8.02
DS	1151	<u>25.30</u>	1180	<u>19.37</u>	1132	<u>17.74</u>
Total	4549	100.01	6092	100.01	6382	100.00

Sources HC.PP. 1844 xxvii. 34-42, 1852-3 lxxxviii. 2.792-797, 1863 liii. 2. 790-796

See Appendix 31

The proportion of the workforce engaged in manufacturing was similar but not identical to that at Gateshead , in both 1841 and 1871 (Table 3.2). Gateshead had larger proportions employed in mining, which reflected a long history of Tyneside coal mining (Smailes 1935), building and transport, including shipping. It also appeared to have a larger proportion casually employed, category IS 2, but this may reflect poorer enumeration. (5) Durham City had larger proportions in dealing, D, the professions and public service, PP, and domestic service, DS, and these sectors, described by Rowe as the professions, services and consumer goods, were also larger than in Middlesbrough in 1871 (1973:127).

There was some tendency, therefore, for Durham City to be more orientated to services and professions than other towns in the region, and to have a larger female labour force, but in a wider regional context it had lower proportions of the total workforce in services and professions than York in 1841. In that year Durham City had 4.84% of its workforce in public services and professions compared to 7.02% at York (6) but the two towns had virtually identical proportions in domestic service; 25.3% at Durham compared to 25.23% at York. Armstrong chose to group handicraft manufacture with dealing, retail and wholesale (1974:28) and suggested that only 8.9% of the male workforce and 2.2% of the female workforce were occupied in modern manufacturing and extractive industry. Such regrouping is not helpful in the case of Durham City for two reasons; firstly, mining was a more important employer than at York and, secondly, the major manufacturing employers were not small handicraft workshops but large carpet factories,

paper mills and engineering works. (7) At Durham the combination of transport, dealing, industrial services, public service and professions and domestic service outnumbered manufacturing employment but in Booth's classification these first three categories overlap with manufacturing, leaving the last two, the professions and domestic service, when combined, as smaller than manufacturing. It cannot be denied, therefore, that manufacturing was important in the employment structure of the town.

Table 3.2 Occupational structure of Durham MB. and Gateshead⁽⁸⁾
in 1841 and 1871, as a percentage of the total
workforce

	1841		1871	
	Gateshead	Durham	Gateshead	Durham
AG	4.62	6.82	1.84	10.82
M	12.88	5.25	5.02	4.26
B	5.46	4.99	8.50	9.97
MF	39.35	35.59	41.87	31.60
T	3.63	1.08	8.21	3.96
D	8.01	9.32	11.33	12.38
IS	10.55	6.82	11.53	5.76
PP	3.93	4.84	3.72	8.30
DS	11.57	25.30	7.98	12.95
Total	100.00	100.01	100.00	100.00
Occupied Pop- ulation	6,691	4,549	13,883	5,677
Total Popul- ation	20,405	14,151	48,627	14,406

Sources : HC.PP. 1844 xxvii. 34-42, 1873 lxxi.1. 534 ff.

Comparisons with the towns of Liverpool, Manchester and Salford, Birmingham, Bristol and London in 1871 are not strictly possible since Lawton and Pooley (1975:56) analysed males over 20 while the 1871 Durham figures (Table 3.2) refer to the total workforce including 3,604 females. In the

aforementioned towns the proportions of the adult male workforce employed in manufacturing were, respectively, 34.0%, 49.56%, 64.48%, 43.9% and 39.2% which were all higher than Durham's proportion; 31.60% of the total workforce.

Some contemporary descriptions of the town stressed the castle and cathedral in contrast to Darlington which was "a manufacturing town" (Kohl 1844:87,91) or mentioned its mustard trade ⁽⁹⁾, an unusual rather than important eighteenth century manufacture. Fuller descriptions stressed its manufactures (Whellan 1856:171, Fordyce i 1857:360, Mackenzie & Ross i 1834:432) with Pigot's 'National Commercial Directory' commenting in 1834

"The trade of Durham is of considerable importance : manufactories for carpets, wool combing, and worsted spinning are carried on to a considerable extent, and upon the river Wear and the smaller streams are corn and paper mills. Here are iron and brass founderies, three good breweries, several rope walks, tanning yards, and some respectable malting establishments. In the immediate neighbourhood is the great northern coal field..." (Pigot 1834:147)

Total employment was diverse but although the town was a market and a retail centre for the surrounding villages ⁽¹⁰⁾ and had a far larger professional and service employed population than those surrounding rural and mining villages ⁽¹¹⁾ and by Harris' classification of towns by their employment (1943) it could, even in 1871, be termed a manufacturing town. Briggs might attempt to classify late eighteenth century towns as industrial, market, port or specialist (1959:44) but Durham City illustrates that market towns cannot be assumed to be non-industrial.

3. Durham City in the mid-nineteenth century; the structure of firms.

The large integrated firm was not a new phenomenon in the nineteenth century, large concerns such as the Crowleys (Flinn 1862), the London Lead Company (Raistrick & Jennings 1965) and the Macclesfield Copper Company (Chaloner 1952-3) were late seventeenth or early eighteenth century foundations, but these were exceptional; leviathans among the herring. Neither was the factory a new phenomenon since in the cotton industry mills were operating in the eighteenth century (Chapman 1965) and in the Yorkshire woollen industry adaptation from a domestic 'putting-out' system was underway (Heaton 1972:87). It was, as Pollard has commented, the introduction of powered machinery which gave these large firms the advantage (1965:18) but although large integrated firms which owned the workplace, the power and the materials dominated certain industries in the nineteenth century, and notably textiles, brewing and engineering, in other industries, such as tailoring, shoemaking (Foster 1974:85), straw hat making (Beloff 1943:134) and furniture making (Hobsbawm 1968:53) small firms, or large firms with out-workers, persisted even into the present century.

Foster has drawn a contrast between Oldham, a large growing town dominated by employment in large mills and Northampton, a small town with unmechanized domestic industry (1968:1,2,80-7). But does Durham present such a contrast to Oldham as does Northampton? What size were firms in Durham City and how important were large firms in the employment structure of the town?

Pollard has suggested that in textiles 200 workers and in coalmining 120 to 150 workers were large firms in the first half of the nineteenth century (1965:20-1). This scale was equalled by the Durham carpet industry. In 1835 between 170 and 180 were employed in Henderson's factory ⁽¹²⁾ and others at a second factory in Framwellgate (Mackenzie & Ross 1834 ii:432). In 1841 the census listed 144 woollen workers ⁽¹³⁾ which, since Blacket and Gainforth of Framwellgate had been bankrupted in 1840 ⁽¹⁴⁾, must represent the Henderson workers. ⁽¹⁵⁾ The Factory Returns of 1850 ⁽¹⁶⁾ noted one worsted weaving mill in the county which, although not named, probably refers to Henderson's. The mill employed 300 persons. Whellan's Directory in 1856 estimated the Henderson workforce to be about 400 (1856:171) while in 1871 William Henderson declared a workforce of 534. ⁽¹⁷⁾

Undoubtedly this firm underwent change in size and in management after its foundation in 1814. Tattershall has suggested that it began on an out-working basis (1966:108) which, although not supported by documentary evidence, is more likely than Hughes' suggestion of a mechanized factory (1940-1:127) since the central mill was small ⁽¹⁸⁾ and firms such as Pease at Darlington were still organized in the 1790's on a part domestic, part centralized basis (Pollard 1965:48). The central mill was certainly partly power driven by 1835 and perhaps by 1823 ⁽¹⁹⁾ but remained part power weaving and part hand weaving throughout the nineteenth century (Anon.1894:23). The premises were extended in 1853, 1859 ⁽²⁰⁾ and 1887 (Anon.1894:23).

In 1851 it presented some features of an integrated

firm, having its own agent and a structure of foremen in the mill but it had some features of an older style of management since its three clerks were part time ⁽²¹⁾ and the weavers were employing their own assistants. ⁽²²⁾ In 1870 all the processes, except spinning, were conducted at the mill and the firm employed its own designer. ⁽²³⁾ Similarly the Framwellgate mill, in 1840, had departments for all the processes. ⁽²⁴⁾ By 1894 the design and marketing were London based (Anon.1894:23). The company began as a family concern with the third generation making it a limited company (Anon.1894:23). Their successors, the Mackays began as a partnership, became a private company in 1921 and then a public company in 1953 (Tattershall 1966:108).

In the coal industry there were both small pits, relicts of the first half of the century when the Durham City area was a 'landsale' area, and large pits dating from the 1840's or later when railways helped to open the district up as a 'seasale' area (Appendix 3.2). Kepier, Sidegate and Elvet pits were privately owned while Framwellgate Moor, Old Durham and other newer pits were managed by shareholding companies (Green 1865-6:237) and had larger workings and larger workforces. Framwellgate Moor, even in a crisis in the early 1850's, employed up to 100, while Houghall in 1884 employed 281 and Old Durham employed 248 in 1870 (Grant 1973:8). In contrast Elvet, Swallow Leazes, employed between 50 and 60 in 1843 ⁽²⁵⁾ and between 55 and 85 in 1875 (Grant 1973:8) and Sidegate employed about 40 (Grant 1973:5).

The building industry showed some increase in the size of firms between 1851 and 1871 with the largest employer in 1871 employing 104 men and boys ⁽²⁶⁾ but most other

industries were small scale in terms of employees. The paper mills to the west of the town and employing local residents (Fig. 54) were small, at least on the evidence of their buildings, (Shorter 1971:155); the mill at Butterby in 1815 having been 100 feet long (Walker 1818:45-6). In other industries there are signs of specialization, increased scale of production and wider catchment of capital. Amongst iron manufacturers were both nailmakers and engineers specializing in mining equipment ⁽²⁷⁾, the number of brewers in the town fell from eight in 1851 to six in 1871 and two in 1891 ⁽²⁸⁾ and milling was no longer a private family concern. ⁽²⁹⁾ But these are general impressions lacking extant business records to provide corroboration.

Pollard has suggested that as firms became larger the number of clerks employed increased (1965:164). This is not clear in Durham City since in 1841 61 clerks and two accountants were enumerated, in 1851 18 clerks and three accountants, in 1861 24 clerks and four accountants and in 1871 13 clerks and six accountants. ⁽³⁰⁾ But in 1841 law clerks appear to have been enumerated with other clerks while in 1851, and subsequent censuses, they were classified under law. This accounts for the apparent decline in numbers between 1841 and 1851 (Table 3.6) but does not rule out the existence of small firms without clerks alongside large.

Indeed in 1851, of the 98 employers who declared the number of their employees, 72.5% employed less than five persons and only one, a coach builder, employed more than 50. Clearly these enumeration descriptions are incomplete since the Henderson brothers gave no details as to their employees

and many other employers, including the coalowners, were not resident in the town. In 1871, of the 72 employers who declared the number of their employees 52.8% employed less than five persons, two builders employed more than 50, one builder employed more than 100 and the Hendersons employed more than 500 (Appendix 3.4). The mode was one employee in 1851 and two employees in 1871.

Durham City in the mid-nineteenth century illustrates that there is no simple division between towns with large employment units and towns with small employment units. Hints of this occur in comments by previous writers since Hobsbawn draws the conclusion that even in Manchester and Salford employment was not dominated by large factories until the second half of the nineteenth century (1968:40) and since Pollard has illustrated that the factory system and the domestic system were not discrete but graded into each other with both large domestic systems on the one hand and factory outworkers on the other (1965:48). Foster contrasted Oldham with Northampton. In 1841 at Oldham about 6.5% of the labour force were employed in 50 mills (Foster 1974:80)⁽³¹⁾ but three decades later in Durham 6.75% of the labour force are known to have been employed in firms with more than 50 employees and this proportion excludes coalminers employed in large pits. ⁽³²⁾

Descriptions of occupation given in the Durham census enumeration books use old guild terms of 'master', 'journeyman' and 'apprentice' but the use of these terms does not imply a domestic structure of employment since the terms are frequently applied to carpet factory workers and

paper mill workers which were outside the guild structure even before 1835. (33) The majority of firms were small but a significant proportion of the workforce was employed by large firms and these firms were large even in comparison to contemporary national scales of size of firm in their respective industries.

4. Economy of nineteenth century Durham City to earlier centuries

Compared to the nineteenth century sources illustrating the structure of the local economy are sparse and tend to refer to legal organization of the economy, the market and the guilds, rather than to actual employment and activity. Such biases cannot be eliminated. Setting aside the economy of the late medieval town which Dobson, in despair, describes as one about which we can form almost no idea (1973:36), the sources relating to the town in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century appear to show a market town with craft industry and retailing many of whose burgesses were engaged in some agriculture. These elements of market, guilds and agriculture were still present in the nineteenth century town but their character had altered.

There is no doubt that at least between the fifteenth century and the nineteenth century small scale craft industry was organised within guilds. The city had a range of trades represented, unlike the smaller borough of Hartlepool in the county, where the trades were undifferentiated (Sharp 1816:105-6), but the various occupations do not appear to have been numerous enough to form separate

guilds and the guild structure of the sixteenth century, confirmed by the charter of Bishop Matthew in 1602 (Todd 1931) was of amalgamations and 'portmanteau' titles (Appendix 3.5). Their political importance and economic monopoly was shorn from them under the Municipal Reform Act of 1835 ⁽³⁴⁾ but they lingered on as trustees of property. ⁽³⁵⁾ But even in their centuries of monopoly it is impossible to evaluate their relative importance compared to each other since their records are incomplete and the composition of the corporation was designated in the municipal charters.

The weekly Saturday market at Durham was part of a weekly cycle within the county until the nineteenth century (Fig. 12). Each of the boroughs in the county had a market and fair (Dodds 1915) and in addition there were markets at Wolsingham, Staindrop, Stanhope and Middleton-in-Teesdale (Appendix 3.6). Over the county the spacing between medieval markets was wider than in Derbyshire, Devon Lancashire or Oxfordshire and was far wider than in Suffolk (Fig. 18) probably because unlike these counties Co.Durham lacked mesne lords who would create rival markets. In the seventeenth century the market at Durham faced rivalry from Darlington (Whiting 1952:67) but up to the early nineteenth century it survived as an agricultural outlet (Bailey 1810:282) A report of 1826 described areas within the market allocated to poultry, cattle, skins, wheat, fruit and potatoes ⁽³⁶⁾ but a list of small tolls on the market stalls in 1836 indicated agricultural produce together with craft products and informal retailing of spice, pottery and

clothes (37) and in 1857 Fordyce described it as a general provisions market (i:359). In 1849 the 'Durham Advertiser' was reporting a decline in the corn market, which it blamed on the market tolls (38) and this decline in corn was paralleled in a contraction of the cattle market. Between 1848 and 1887 (39) the area of the county from which butchers at the Durham market were drawn contracted, the number of butchers fell and the number of empty stalls rose (Fig.57).

Market spacing was altered during the nineteenth century in three respects. New markets were created as at Houghton-le-Spring (40) and Seaham Harbour (41), market days were altered (42) and as Saturday markets grew more popular the Saturday market at Durham faced rivals at Sunderland, Stockton and Seaham (Fig.12) and, thirdly, the intrusion of railway lines disturbed existing market catchment areas.

If Freeman's comments on the formation of Poor Law Union areas are correct, that they were based upon the market area of the chief town (1970:291), Durham's market area in the first half of the nineteenth century can be seen to have been badly served by railways compared to other markets in the county (Fig.12). It was coal transportation which motivated many lines in the county (Tomlinson 1914:437) and it was a lack of interest in the town rather than opposition of local landowners (43) which allowed it to become a backwater on the railway network. The relative and increasing disadvantage was clearly recognized by the Corporation who pursued a policy of inquiry and petition on all possible railway link ideas. (44) Not only was the rail link in the 1840's circuitous, the town only being served by branch lines to Gilesgate (45) and Shincliffe (46), but it was claimed

that the Durham fares were disadvantageous ⁽⁴⁷⁾, that merchandise was delayed in transit ⁽⁴⁸⁾ and that the timetable was inconvenient for users of the market. ⁽⁴⁹⁾

As the market lost its corn and cattle character not only access by rail but also the lack of space (Fordyce 1857 i :359) and the continuation of tolls were blamed. By means of street improvements the market place was enlarged to take in St. Nicholas' churchyard ⁽⁵⁰⁾ Claypath was utilised as an overflow from the Market Place ⁽⁵¹⁾ and new covered markets were built. ⁽⁵¹⁾ A second fortnightly Monday market, for cattle, was created under the 1851 Durham Market Company Act ⁽⁵³⁾ but this was rivalled by the Monday cattle market at Darlington ⁽⁵⁴⁾ and it failed. A separate scheme, in 1863, to move the Newcastle Fat Cattle market to Durham never came to fruition. ⁽⁵⁵⁾

In contrast the March and September Durham fairs kept their agricultural character up to the Great War. Primarily they were cattle fairs, though hiring of servants had been added in 1682 (Surtees 1840 iv:11), and a horse fair in 1840. ⁽⁵⁶⁾ The latter survived until March 1914, the September fair in that year being very poor on account of the wartime demand for horses. ⁽⁵⁷⁾

One night of the three day 1851 March cattle fair coincided with the census night thus distorting the population of the town declaring themselves to be employed in agriculture but at the same time illustrating the number of cattle drovers present at the fair. ⁽⁵⁸⁾ The employed population of the town included an agricultural element throughout the nineteenth century (Table 3.4) but this element was a minority,

rather than, as in the late sixteenth century, an economic interest of a large proportion of the population; illustrated by the inclusion of cattle in 30 of the 60 inventories for the City and suburbs in that period. (59)

The existence of large factories in the town and near the town in the nineteenth century has already been commented upon but these were not new creations of the nineteenth century but had an eighteenth century ancestry. Manley (1938:148) and Hughes (1940-1:126) dated the carpet factory to the late eighteenth century, the former citing the date 1780 and the latter the date 1792, but it is clear from the commentary given in the 1904 Report on Endowed Charities that although the existence of a woollen factory, later a carpet factory, was not continuous (60), each new venture was drawing upon charity funds dated from 1598. (61) Leases of the charity property in the mid-eighteenth century show that the factory was employing the poor (62) but that by the late eighteenth century it was a commercial venture. Eden in 1797 described it as being a major employer in the parishes of St.Nicholas and St.Margaret (vol.ii:152, 179), and Brayley and Britton suggested that it had employed several hundred persons (1808:v:72). (63)

The workers in this factory, in local paper mills and in the local coal pits were outside the jurisdiction of the guilds. This illustrates the point that although the forms of economic activity, the guilds and the market, could continue into the nineteenth century their activity and importance was not static. In the nineteenth century the market changed in character from an agricultural outlet to

a retailing outlet and the guilds changed to be trustees of property. But in previous centuries their role was not static either and changes in economic structure which became more apparent in the nineteenth century, and in particular factory organization, were germinating earlier.

5. Changes in Employment in Durham City during the nineteenth century

Even in the thirty years between 1841 and 1871 employment trends were emerging that are confirmed if the industrial structure of the 1841 workforce is compared to that in 1911. At mid-century it was a manufacturing workforce with strong service and dealing sectors (Table 3.1) but over the period 1841 to 1871 relative declines occurred in mining, manufacturing, industrial services and domestic services and relative increases occurred in building, transport, agriculture, dealing and the professions (Table 3.3).

Table 3.3 Occupational Structure of the Durham MB. workforce, males & females 1841 to 1871

Occupation (Booth 1886)	1841		1851		1861		1871	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
AG	301	6.82	480	7.88	316	4.95	614	10.82
M	239	5.25	170	2.79	316	4.95	242	4.26
B	227	4.99	465	7.63	603	9.45	566	9.97
MF	1619	35.59	2188	35.92	2103	32.95	1794	31.60
T	49	1.08	155	2.54	331	5.19	225	3.96
D	424	9.32	735	12.07	799	12.52	703	12.38
IS	310	6.82	325	5.34	270	4.23	327	5.76
PP	220	4.84	394	6.47	512	8.02	471	8.30
DS	1151	25.30	1180	19.37	1132	17.74	735	12.95
Total	4549	100.01	6092	100.01	6382	100.00	5677	100.00

Sources: HC.PP. 1844 xxvii.1.34-42, 1852-3 lxxxviii.2.792-797, 1863 liii.2.790-796, 1873 lxxi.1.534-540

The longer term trend cannot be appraised easily since the occupational data in the censuses from 1801 to 1831 is given in aggregate form and since between 1881 and 1901 the town was excluded, in the printed census, from detailed tables of occupations. In 1911 comparative information again appears but where in 1841 all occupied males under and over the age of 20 were cited, in 1911 only males over the age of ten were cited. But since in 1841 males under the age of 20 classified as in employment only amounted to 1.45% of the workforce and in 1851 the enumerators' books indicate that only four boys under the age of ten were employed (64) it is suggested that the data for 1841 and for 1911 can be compared (Table 3.4) Over these seventy years absolute and relative increases in the building, transport, dealing and professional sectors continued the trend seen between 1841 and 1871, in domestic services the trend of decline was continued and in manufacturing the absolute and relative decline continued a trend already apparent between 1851 and 1871. Only in agriculture and mining were new trends exhibited. In agriculture there had been fluctuating employment at mid-century but the long term trend was for decline in this employment category while in mining numbers had again fluctuated up to 1871 (Table 3.3) but by 1911 there had been a large absolute rise which made mining the largest male employment category.

The underlying influences on employment are more apparent for some categories than for others. In agriculture the fall in numbers appears to have postdated 1871. Two main influences may be inferred, firstly that there was

Table 3.4 Occupational Structure of the male workforce (65)
Durham MB. 1841 and 1911

Occupation (Booth 1886)	1841		1911	
	abs.	%	abs.	%
AG	297	11.08	112	2.09
M	185	6.90	1219	22.76
B	190	7.09	741	13.84
MF	1150	42.89	913	17.05
T	48	1.79	516	9.63
D	114	4.25	562	10.49
IS	294	10.97	536	10.01
PP	173	6.45	633	11.82
DS	230	8.58	126	2.35
Total	2681	100.00	5356	99.99

Sources: HC.PP. 1844 xxvii. 1. 34-42, 1911 census Co.Durham summary volume, 1914.

outward expansion of the urban area over greenfield sites in the second half of the century (Chapter 4 page 144) and, secondly, that there was control of the number and the quality of urban dairies after 1888. (66) Although numbers employed in agriculture appear to have risen between 1841 and 1851 and between 1861 and 1871 the increases were, in part, technical. This is illustrated by the dramatic fall in numbers between 1851 and 1861 (Table 3.3) for which no economic explanation can be offered.

As has already been mentioned, in 1851 the census night coincided with the Spring cattle fair so the numbers were swollen by temporary residents; drovers, farmers and farm hands. Between 1861 and 1871 the numerical change is based on changing descriptions of occupation since the number of farmers, graziers and agricultural labourers fell and the number of gardeners, who were market gardeners rather than

outdoor domestic servants (Appendix 3.1), also fell. It was amongst those termed dealers and relatives of farmers that increases occurred and these terms in other years with subtly different wording could have been included in employment categories other than agriculture. (67)

Trends in mining employment can be linked to periods of pit sinkings, expansion and contraction in the local part of the coalfield since virtually all miners were coal miners. (68) Employment in 1841 must relate to small local pits which had been sunk for local coal consumption rather than shipment. (69) Of these Elvet, Sidegate and Kepier pits were still working (Appendix 3.2). During the 1840's the 'seasale' coalfield, from which coal was shipped, expanded rapidly westwards from the lower Tyne and lower Wear valleys (Smailes 1935:206-7) as railways replaced waggonway transport⁽⁷⁰⁾, and in the vicinity of Durham City new pits, linked by rail to coaling ports, were sunk in 1841 at Framwellgate Moor (Green 1865-6:237) in 1842 at Houghall (Green 1865-6:239) and in 1849 at Old Durham⁽⁷¹⁾ (Appendix 3.2). The new pits were larger but their employees did not entirely figure in the 1851 employment figures of the town since they were peripheral and, to some extent, had their own housing which lay outside the municipal boundaries. (72) Other pits were opened in the 1850's and 1860's, Kepier Grange in 1856 and Durham Main in the 1860's (Appendix 3.2) and on the East side of the town more houses were built on Gilesgate Moor (Fig.45) but on the North side, on Framwellgate Moor, very few were built after the original terraces were built in the 1840's. (73) Hence the rise in mining employees in the town in 1861 may

be attributed to a proportion of the growing mining population of the neighbourhood residing in the town and being forced to make longer journeys to work.

This first generation of large coalpits were ceasing operation in the 1880's and 1890's; Houghall closed in 1886 and Old Durham in 1893 (Grant 1971 :40), while the older Keping pit at Glue Garth ceased in 1872 (Grant 1971 :37) and it is the decline in employment prior to these closures that appears to underlie the fall in mining workforce in 1871. Subsequently a new large pit was sunk at Aykley Heads, to the North of the town, in the 1880's (Appendix 3.2) and Durham Main came into full production thus contributing more to the rise in mining employment by 1911 (Table 3.4) than the municipal boundary extension in 1904. (74)

Decade by decade the census records a rise in building employment relative to the total workforce between 1841 and 1911, and an absolute rise in each decade except 1861 to 1871. Most of this increase was contributed by building construction workers (Table 4.10) but, as annual figures for these workers indicate, the increase was not as steady, as Tables 3.3 and 3.4 might suggest, but instead rose and fell with swings in building activity (Fig.37); a theme which will be elaborated in Chapter 5.

Railway construction underlies the trend in transport employment, although other factors; the decline in road transport and job descriptions and their classification, played a role. Between 1841 and 1911 the number of transport workers and their importance in the workforce rose between 1841 and 1861 and fell in the decade 1861 to 1871. Since most were men it can be suggested that numbers rose again

by 1911 (Tables 3.3, 3.4). The major increase between 1851 and 1861 is accounted for by railway workers, T.4, (Tables 3.5) and especially railway construction workers; labourers, platelayers and navvies being added to the workforce in 1861 and disappearing by 1871. ⁽⁷⁵⁾ This was offset by a long term decline in road conveyance as carting changed from casual employment in both local government ⁽⁷⁶⁾ and industry. ⁽⁷⁷⁾ Amongst carriers from Durham City, however, the decline was delayed until the 1870's. Fig. 14 illustrates how the great contraction in the number of journeys made each week and in the range of places served fell dramatically between 1870 and 1880. Changes in the other transport categories are beset by the question of how far workers were categorized as transport workers and how far as workers in manufacturing or dealing. This particularly applies to groups T1, warehousing, portering and messages, and T5, road conveyance where the inclusion of the type of firm, or the difference between regular and casual labour could influence the categorization of employment descriptions.

Table 3.5 Transport workers, Durham MB., 1841 to 1871

Year	T1*	T2	T3	T4	T5	Total	%workforce
1841	7	1	-	-	41	49	1.08
1851	16	44	-	24	71	155	2.54
1861	25	48	-	164	94	331	5.19
1871	11	43	-	89	82	225	5.77

*Booth's Classification; T1 storage, T2 sea, T3 inland navigation, T4 railways, T5 road conveyance

Sources : as Table 3.3

Employment in the professions and public services was rising between 1841 and 1911 (Table 3.4) mainly through increasing employment in local administration. Classification into the armed forces, the arts, law, education, medicine, the church and local administration, between 1841 and 1871, shows that the numbers were steady in medicine, steady after 1851 in law, since in 1841 the law total lacks law clerks who were classified merely as clerks, steady between 1861 and 1871 in the armed forces, fluctuating in the arts and education and rising in the church and local administration (Table 3.6).

Table 3.6 Occupational structure, 1841 to 1871, Durham MB.
of workforce employed in the professions and
public service

Category	Year			
	1841	1851	1861	1871
armed forces	12	25	39	38
arts	4	34	29	59
law	40	84	89	84
education	48	79	122	79
government	35	77	106	98
medicine	53	51	52	47
church	18	30	34	46

The fluctuating total in the category, 'arts', partly arises out of occupational descriptions. For example, in 1841 there were two newspapers yet no editor or other newspaper employees were listed in the census. It can also be attributed to a temporary population of showmen resident in 1851 for the duration of the Spring cattle fair and, in 1871, to the census including 36 University students since the census night fell five days after the end of Epiphany Term rather than mid-vacation as in previous and subsequent

census years. (78) It is a point of interest that each census, being held in vacation, fails to enumerate the University teaching staff. (79)

Increases in the armed forces reflect both the building of new barracks between 1841 and 1851 and the inclusion of retired army and navy personnel in the town while the rise in clerical men reflects both the building of new additional churches and chapels and the use of ancillary workers, urban missionaries, scripture readers and visitors.

Local government, however, provided the main increase in employment in the professional and public service category. New jobs were being created as the Corporation and the Local Board of Health extended their roles, a few jobs were created in the water company and the Durham poor law union while the police force, the prison staff and the post office were enlarged.

Overlapping with this category, and with employees in manufacturing, were those in Industrial Service, including both professional men, bankers, insurance agents and accountants and general labourers. The latter group dominated the category numerically but both in it, and in the professional section, no trend emerged over the period 1841 to 1871. Rather, numbers fluctuated census to census (Table 3.3) according to occupation descriptions given by the individual. The anomaly of law clerks being included under Industrial Services has already been mentioned and in the case of insurance agents, bankers and stockbrokers there is the strong possibility that in one census they would describe themselves as such while

in another they would term themselves 'magistrate'. The numbers of general labourers fluctuated from 244 in 1841 to 300 in 1851, to 239 in 1861 and to 301 in 1871 presumably according to whether the industry for which they were working was appended to the description 'labourer'. Only in the case of accountants was there a steady rise in numbers. This was a small group of two men in 1841 and only six men in 1871 but they were not usually men in public office so the trend is not distorted by the use of honorary titles and the group does show the tendency towards more professional services in the town.

Contrary to this rise in professional industrial services and in the professions as a whole was a fall in the numbers, and especially women, employed in domestic service (Table 3.3). Dividing this category into indoor servants, Booth's DS.1, outdoor servants such as grooms and gamekeepers, DS.2, and service trades such as laundries and hairdressers, DS.3, the last category showed a mid-century increase and then a decline (Table 3.7), indoor servants showed a steady decline while the numbers of outdoor servants fluctuated, a phenomenon which may be attributed to varying use of occupational descriptions since there could be confusion both with employment in transport and with employment in agriculture. It might be expected that as the numbers employed in the professions rose so the numbers employed in domestic service would rise. But the rise in the professions appears to have been offset by a decline in the town as a social centre with both the exodus of county families, who had had large numbers of servants, and the pruning of the clerical incomes of the

cathedral dignitaries. (80) In the years 1861 and 1871 the shift towards more professional families rather than property owners and gentry was reflected in the decline in numbers of indoor servants, DS 1, and the increase in domestic services, DS 3, including charwomen.

Table 3.7 Employment in Domestic Service, Durham MB.,
 1841 to 1871

Category	1841	1851	1861	1871
1	1022	938	849	554
2	38	7	49	12
3	91	235	234	169

Sources : as Table 3.3

The number employed in dealing rose between 1841 and 1911 (Table 3.4) but within dealing there was an absolute shift away from wholesale aspects such as dealing in corn and flour, D2, and from specialist retailing such as book-selling, D10, towards food, D5, drink, D7, and clothing, D4. There was also an increase in the unspecified category of dealing, D 13, which may be attributed to an increase in shop assistants and commercial travellers. The strongest relative increases within dealing were in food, drink, lodging, D 8, and those unspecified (Table 3.8).

Peak employment within these thirty years, in food, drink, clothing and lodging occurred either in 1851 or in 1861. In these decades the local coalfield was expanding, new pits were being sunk and the local population was rising. Between 1841 and 1851 the population of the City fell by -6.81% and between 1851 and 1861 merely rose by 6.82% but in contrast the population growth in Durham Union for these decades was 44.0% and 25.6% respectively (Table 2.6). In the

Table 3.8 Changes within employment in Dealing, Durham MB.,
1841 to 1871

Booth's Categories	1841		1871	
	abs.	%	abs.	%
D1	10	2.36	8	1.14
2	4	0.94	2	1.42
3	-	0.0	-	0.0
4	58	13.68	80	11.38
5	125	29.48	230	32.72
6	14	3.30	9	1.28
7	80	18.87	128	18.21
8	9	2.12	40	5.69
9	-	0.0	2	0.28
10	24	5.66	21	2.99
11	30	7.08	17	2.42
12	8	1.89	3	0.43
13	62	14.62	163	23.19
Total	424	100.00	703	100.01

Sources: HC.PP. 1844 xxvii. 34-42, 1873 lxxi.1.534 ff.

Booth's Categories see Appendix 3.1

1840's the town was certainly serving the surrounding pit villages as a retail centre since this is described in connexion with local grocers stocking gunpowder. (81) But after the mid-century this role appears to have declined. The decline was only slight in absolute terms (Table 3.3) but was stronger when compared to the continued rapid growth of the population of the surrounding area (Table 2.6). As has already been described, lack of convenient access by rail was blamed. (82)

Between 1841 and 1911 both the number of men employed in manufacturing and the importance of manufacturing in the male workforce fell (Table 3.4). Peak numbers occurred in

1851 and by 1871 the total workforce employed in manufacturing had fallen (Table 3.3). The largest group was in dress manufacture which employed 12.11% of the workforce in 1841, rose to 17.14% in 1851, then fell to 14.39% in 1861 and 12.74% in 1871. Woollens, MF18, and metal manufacture, MF4, employed smaller proportions of the workforce and their importance in the workforce were more constant (Table 3.9).

Table 3.9 Employment in woollens and metal manufacture,
Durham MB., 1841 to 1871

	1841		1851		1861		1871	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
MF4	126	2.77	107	1.76	184	2.88	188	3.31
MF18	144	3.17	241	3.96	291	4.56	222	3.91

The contrast with the structure of manufacturing employment at Gateshead in the period 1841 to 1871 was not in the importance of the largest manufacturing categories but in the much smaller scale of categories of lower numerical rank. Whereas the largest manufacturing category in both Durham and Gateshead in 1841, dress manufacture, employed respectively 34.03% and 34.14% of their manufacturing workforces, by the fourth category 68.52% of the Gateshead manufacturing workforce were accounted for but only 63.87% of Durham (Table 3.10). In 1871 the manufacturing workforce was two and a half times larger than that at Durham but whereas woollens, MF18, the third in rank size at Durham were represented by a single firm, glass manufacture, the third in rank at Gateshead, was represented by eight firms in 1873. (83)

Both towns had manufacturing specialization but the manufacturing base at Gateshead was broader; in 1871 machinery manufacture was the largest employment category within

manufacturing at Gateshead and in 1873 there were at least 16 firms, chemical manufacture, the fourth in rank, had at least eight firms. (84) In contrast the manufacturing categories in Durham were composed of single firms, as in carriage building, MF7, small numbers as in printing, MF30 where there were two firms, or firms employing small numbers of employees on a workshop scale.

Table 3.10 Comparison of manufacturing employment for Durham MB., and Gateshead (85) by size order, 1841 and 1871

1841				1871			
<u>Durham</u>		<u>Gateshead</u>		<u>Durham</u>		<u>Gateshead</u>	
Rank Order	Cumul- ative %	Rank Order	Cumul- ative %	Rank Order	Cumul- ative %	Rank Order	Cumul- ative %
MF23	34.03	MF4	34.14	MF23	40.30	MF4	33.13
MF13	49.19	MF23	49.60	MF18	52.68	MF1	51.11
MF18	56.08	MF7	60.12	MF4	63.16	MF23	68.40
MF4	63.87	MF31	68.52	MF15	68.23	MF7	76.52
MF31	69.61	MF15	72.69	MF30	72.30	MF9	82.88
MF14	73.87	MF1	76.53	MF14	76.14	MF13	86.96
MF15	77.58	MF13	80.37	MF26	78.76	MF26	88.23
MF16	80.61	MF5	85.23	MF31	81.33	MF30	89.51
MF10	83.08	MF12	87.39	MF1	83.78	MF15	90.69
MF30	85.49	MF26	89.48	MF13	86.12	MF14	91.85
MF5	87.83	MF20	91.49	MF10	88.18	MF20	93.00
MF26	90.06	MF25	93.24	MF27	90.13	MF27	94.08
MF20	91.72	MF3	94.95	MF16	91.86	MF3	94.98
MF27	93.27	MF27	96.05	MF29	93.37	MF25	95.85
MF25	94.44			MF3	94.54		
MF29	95.37			MF25	95.48		
Total	1619=100	2633=100		1794=100		4768=100	

Sources : HC. PP. 1844 xxvii.34-42, 1873 lxxi.1.534 ff.

Hobsbawm has seen the Industrial Revolution in terms of two phases; in the first the leading sector was textiles, in the second, from the 1840's, it was coal and

iron (1968:109). Durham City had a modern textile industry but its metal manufacture was at a workshop level of organization and the largest firm, Coulson's of Crossgate, moved out to Grange on Gilesgate Moor in 1866 (Anon.1894). In contrast, at Gateshead, iron manufacture was the largest employer within manufacturing both in 1851 and in 1871 and machinery manufacture was the second largest in the latter year (Table 3.10). Manufacturing at Durham can be seen in two main groups; there were manufactures for a local domestic market of drink, leather, baking, other food and dress and there were specialist industries, church organ building from 1872 (Kelly 1971:20, Elvin 1973), watchmaking, carriage building and carpet making.

The last, carpet manufacture at Henderson's, was the largest single employer in the town by mid-century and provides an example of increasing specialization. Its roots lie in an early eighteenth century parish workhouse to employ the poor, financed by a sixteenth century bequest ⁽⁸⁶⁾ and operating intermittently from at least 1740 ⁽⁸⁷⁾, though Surtees dated it to 1756 (Surtees 1840 iv:25). Such a venture was not unusual since Pollard has counted at least 150 such workhouse factories in the country as a whole (1965:192). What is unusual is the change in the workforce employed and in the goods produced in the Henderson period after 1814.

Traditional woollen products had been coarse camlets, a cloth of long wool hard spun with cotton or linen ⁽⁸⁸⁾ (Atkinson 1968:48), tammies, which were fine glazed worsted ⁽⁸⁹⁾ and waistcoat pieces (Brayley & Britton 1808:16).

The products of Henderson's immediate predecessor, Mr. Cooper⁽⁹⁰⁾ are not known but his predecessor, John Starforth, who failed in 1805 (Surtees 1840 iv : 25), produced carpets, tammies and wildbores, which were stout unglazed worsteds⁽⁹¹⁾ (Bailey 1810:293). Worsteds were being produced by five manufacturers in 1827 (Parson & White 1827:209) and this tradition continued into the 1830's with three firms producing such cloth⁽⁹²⁾ and into the 1850's in the case of Henderson's⁽⁹³⁾. Henderson's went on to specialize in carpet manufacture and in particular high quality carpets, Brussels and Wiltons, and this policy was continued into the twentieth century (Tattershall & Reed 1966:108).⁽⁹⁴⁾ This policy contrasted that of the Barnard Castle carpet manufacturers who did not produce for the quality market (Andrews 1898:291).

Increasing specialization is apparent from the origins of the workforce the Hendersons were employing. The original concept of the factory had been to employ the local poor⁽⁹⁵⁾ but by 1851 the workforce was being drawn, so far as places of birth indicate, from long distances (Fig.10) and the pattern was similar in 1871. Co. Durham supplied the largest number of workers but within the county the main places of origin, apart from Durham City, was the carpet weaving town of Barnard Castle. Large numbers were being drawn from Worcestershire, where the carpet weaving industry was located in the Kidderminster area (Tattershall & Reed 1966) and from the Shropshire towns of Bridgnorth and Bewdley. The proportion of carpet workers in Durham City compared to the population size of the county of origin was higher for Worcestershire than for any county except Co. Durham (Fig.10)

and that for Shropshire was higher than that for counties adjacent to Co. Durham; Northumberland, Cumberland or the North Riding of Yorkshire. It was also higher than for the woollen counties of Westmoreland and the West Riding of Yorkshire, represented by the towns of Kendal, Dewsbury and Leeds (Appendix 3.3).

Confinement traces of the children of carpet weavers in 1851 ⁽⁹⁶⁾ indicate that skilled workers were moving directly from other carpet producing towns to Durham City. Excluding carpet weavers with no children and those who had been born in Durham City, in 'Durham' with no other specification, in Scotland or in Ireland, for whom the descriptions of birth-place were by country and not by place, forty carpet weavers were scrutinised. Of these 27 had children who had been born either in their own place of origin or in Durham City and of the remainder only five had had children born in places which were not textile towns. All the latter can be accounted for by local men with families born within the North East of England. Of special interest are carpet weavers born in other carpet towns relatively close to Durham City or at a distance. Barnard Castle, in County Durham, had been the birthplace of 15 carpet weavers with children and of these 12 appear to have moved directly to Durham City and a similar picture emerges for the carpet weavers of far more distant origins in Worcestershire and Shropshire. Nine of the ten with children from these counties appear to have come directly to Durham City. ⁽⁹⁷⁾

6. Investment Patterns

The final aspect, investment, and the related final question, "why did the structure of the local economy change?", are perhaps the most important features in discussing the economy of the town. To restate a metaphor, investment is the watchspring while the employment structure and firms are the clockcase and cogs. Yet it is this very aspect that is most elusive, most fragmentary in local records. There are virtually no business records and those which are extant give few hints as to sources of capital, profits, reinvestment or productivity.

In the surrounding coalfield pits changed from individual lessees or owners in the older pits to joint stock companies in the larger sea-sale pits of the 1840's (Appendix 3.2). From this it may be inferred that the original capital was being drawn from a wider group of people and area and not only from the coal industry. The gas company in Durham City began as a private venture in 1823 (Parsons & White 1827:183) but was bought out by a joint-stock company, 'The City of Durham Consumers' Gases' in 1845. ⁽⁹⁸⁾ Its rival, again set up in 1845, 'The City of Durham Gas Company' ⁽⁹⁹⁾, never operated since the two companies amalgamated in the same year. ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ The City of Durham Gas Company was to have capital of £12,000 in £10 shares and was initially limited to residents ⁽¹⁰¹⁾ but the operative company from 1846 had £10,000 capital ⁽¹⁰²⁾; raised to £30,000 in 1873. ⁽¹⁰³⁾ Over how wide an area it attracted shareholders is unknown but it is known that the committees of both joint-stock companies in 1845 were composed of local townsmen (Appendix 3.7), many

of whom were on the Corporation in that year who were to be or who had been on the Corporation, or who were Local Improvement Commissioners (Appendix 3.7), and the directors in 1873 were similarly local men. Outside the coal industry and the service industries of gas, and water⁽¹⁰⁴⁾, however, firms were private family concerns or partnerships rather than joint-stock or limited companies.

So little is known concerning investment and linkages between industries that there is no means of telling whether the few pieces of evidence are typical or not. Two tenuous links between the coal industry and other local industry are known but it cannot be overstressed that they are tenuous. The first concerns the Crossgate Iron Foundry of William Coulson. He had been a pit sinker ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ who set up as an ironfounder then moved out to Grange as a specialist producer of mining machinery (Anon.1894) but the link is merely in his occupational history since nothing is known of his finance. The second concerns the Henderson carpet factory since the original capital for this came from charity funds based upon coal pits. ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ But the large coal owners of the district, including those resident in the town, such as Joseph Love (See Chapter 4 page 149), do not appear to have been investing in local industry.

The most detailed information concerning investment in the town is concerned with building. This cannot necessarily be used as an analogy for industrial investment since it has been argued by Lewis that building investment and industrial investment were counter cyclical (1965:87-8) but

as an example of investment it shows, as will be detailed in Chapter 4, that building investors in the town were a separate group from investors in coal and industry in the surrounding region.

7. Conclusion

Why industrial expansion should have lost impetus and why the town should have slid back towards commercial and professional service provision remains a mystery. The local economy can be described in terms of rapid early nineteenth century expansion, shown in population growth (Table 2.6), in housing stock growth (Table 4.20), and in the resultant workforce structure, at mid-century, which was orientated to manufacturing. But who was investing in this manufacturing, why did small firms in ropemaking (107), chemicals (108) and brickmaking (109) expire and why were textiles not followed by metal and machinery production to any large extent (110)? These are questions which remain open to speculation.

By 1911 the trend back towards a service town was clear (Table 3.4) and this trend was continued into this century so in 1939 the occupational structure of the insured population was strongly service orientated. At that date only 6.8% of the workforce of 4,233 were employed in manufacturing and this was exclusively in carpet manufacturing. In addition 9.0% were employed in building, 12.0% in coalmining and 1.3% at coke ovens. Apart from 9.9% unclassified and 1.0% in agriculture the remaining portion of the workforce 60.0% were employed in services; local government, distribution,

public works, the professions, hotels or laundries
(Sharp 1944:15).

But for the nineteenth century it is a mistake to project back the twentieth century employment structure as does Sylvester (1944:67). The history of its economy is more complex than retrospection could suggest and although the mechanism of change remains, unfortunately, unknown the change from a service town to a small manufacturing town and back to a service centre between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries is quite clear.

1. There are very few business records extant which relate to the town. Those which do exist:- D.CRO. D/Ma, the Mackay papers, and other small collections, DDPD. SR. Ferens, the Ferens papers, and other family papers and maps are not complete collections but merely small bundles of surviving papers.
2. This involved eight main sectors - agriculture, mining, building, manufacturing, industrial service, public service and professional and domestic service which were subdivided, and supplemented by propertied, indefinite and dependant sectors. The categories stated by Armstrong (1972) were modified (Appendix 3.1).
3. The standard Industrial Classification (Central Statistical Office 1968) differs from Booth's classification in two outstanding respects. Firstly, in details; it adds order IX, electrical engineering, it compresses Booth's categories into fewer orders, especially when dealing with professions and services and it regroups specific activities. For example brickmaking is grouped by Booth with mining and quarrying but the Standard Industrial Classification places it with pottery, glass and cement. Water supply is grouped by Booth with mining and quarrying but in the Standard Industrial Classification moves to join gas and electricity supply in order XXI. Some changes reflect changes in industrial raw materials. Booth allocates categories to glue and tallow, hair manufacture and to the separate branches of textiles. These are grouped in 1968. Secondly, there is a major difference in data analysis. Booth is working from the job description of the worker so may divide clerks, accountants, warehousemen and factory workers in one type of industry from each other. The Standard Industrial Classification, in contrast, works from the unit for gathering data, the workplace or firm so groups together workmen, managers and clerks in one type of industry. Therefore results drawn from the two classifications are not comparable and neither are studies based on Booth's classification with studies based on the Standard Industrial Classification such as Robson's (1969). Glaisyer et al. in their study of Worcester it must be noted, did use both for the 1931 census (1946).
4. 'ad hoc' classifications can be useful when there are great biases in the employment structure, as in mining villages. Such cases are exemplified by Smith's work on Crook and Billy Row (1977) and Sill's on Hetton-le-Hole (1974 : 131). Rowe used an 'ad hoc' classification in his study of North East England (1973), namely food and drink, services, shipbuilding, building, cloth manufacture, clothes and shoes, ironfounding, metal and engineering, horses and horse transport, coal, glass/pottery/chemicals, boatmen, agriculture, government service, labourers, teachers, domestic services, and railways.

5. D.CRO. M3/35, 36, 37 (PRO. HO. 107 2402) 1851 Census.
The Gateshead enumerators' books have more entries illegible, and more where details are not filled in than those of Durham MB. (Compare Tables 9.15 and 9.14 for heads of household in sharedhouses for which occupations are not stated). The Durham enumerators of 1851 appear to have been literate. A small number of odd surnames (Appendix 4.1) may be explained by illiterate householders or illegible writing on the household schedules.
The category 1S is not satisfactory.
6. Based on Armstrong 1974 Table 2.2 p.28 by amalgamating his data for occupied males and occupied females.
7. See page 64-8.
8. Gateshead and Gateshead Fell parishes.
9. "First lessons in Geography, in Question and Answer" by a Lady London. Ward & Co. nd. (MS. signature 1850) p.28 "Durham, famous for its mustard".
10. Lamentably illustrated by an incident in 1845 when a grocer's shop had its front blown out when the gunpowder the grocer kept for sale to local colliers exploded.
Fordyce 1867 iii:192.
11. See Sill (1974 Ch.6) for the example of Hetton-le-Hole, Co. Durham. The distribution of doctors also reflects this.

<u>Place</u>	<u>Doctors, 1894</u>	<u>Population, 1891</u>	<u>Ratio</u>
Durham	25	14,863	1 : 594
Stanhope	3	1,864*	1 : 621
Barnard Castle	6	4,341*	1 : 723
Bishop Auckland	12	10,527	1 : 877
Sunderland	73	131,015	1 : 1,794
S.Shields	30	78,391	1 : 2,613
Stockton	19	49,708	1 : 2,616
Gateshead	29	85,692	1 : 2,955
Consett	2	8,175	1 : 4,087
Brandon & Byshottles	2	14,239	1 : 7,119

Sources : Medical Directory 1894, 1891 printed census

* plus surrounding rural population

Note the adverse ratios in Consett and Brandon & Byshottles

12. An explosion of the boiler occurred 30th July 1835 killing 3 workers. Walker's (1855 : 54).
13. HC.PP. 1844 xxvii. 1. 34-42.
14. D.Adv. 28th Feb. 1840 no. 1330 p.1 col. 4.
15. Walker's Directory indicates no other branch of the woollen industry during the 1840's.
16. HC. PP. 1850 xlii 455-475.
It may possibly refer to Pease of Darlington.
The 1851 census indicates 241 males and females employed in wools and woollens but this may be a minimum figure excluding office staff and workers such as dyers. HC. PP. 1852-3 lxxxviii.2.792-7.
Earlier factory returns are not helpful. 1819 PP.HL. iii:389 lacks Co.Durham, 1839 PP.HC. xlii. 1:50-7 lists 79 employed in two mills.
17. D.CRO.M 18/29 (PRO. RG. 10 4966) South Bailey household No. 79.
18. Walker 1818 : 15-16 mentions the Starforth factory being flooded. This appears to have been the Abbey Mill.
D.CRO. EP/Du ML 1 June 17th 1799. The site in Back Lane dates from 1814. Endowed Charities, Administrative County of Durham ... Charity Commission 1904 vol. 1.
19. See above footnote 12.
DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 126 p.23r Commission on steam engines, 1823.
20. D.CRO. D/Ma 3,4.
21. D.CRO. M3/17 & 18 (PRO. HO. 107/239)
22. D.CRO. M3/17 & 18 (PRO. HO. 107/239). Known in cotton mills (Pollard 1965 : 57).
23. D.CRO. M3/17 & 18 (PRO. HO. 107/239), DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 142 pp.9-10 dyemill, dyehouse, weaving sheds, shearing sheds, wool sorters room, warehouse and showroom.
24. D.Adv. Fri. 28th Feb. 1840 no. 1330 p.1 col. 4.
25. D.Adv. Fri 23 June 1843 no. 1503 p.1 col.3.
This pit changed from the owner, or leasee, being the manager to employing a manager. 1815 Crawford was his own manager, D.Co. Adv. Sat. Dec. 2nd 1815 no. 65 p.3 col. 4, 1843 employing a manager D.Adv. Fri. 23rd June 1843 no. 1503 p.1 col. 3, 1908 a company, Elvet Colliery Company, Grant (1971 p.11 col. 3-5).
26. See chapter 5 fn. 156.

27. Chisman, an engine builder of Elvet Bridge, D.Adv. Jan 20 1843 no. 1481 p.3 vol. 5, firm began 1760 (Anon 1894 : 38) Coulson of Crossgate moved out to Grange 1866 was making mining machinery (Anon.1894 : 33). Iron foundries existed in Paradise Lane, Mitchell Street and Castle Chare, OS. Durham xxvii.1, 1856 and in Atherton Street (The Industrial Archaeology Group for the North East - Bulletin 1. nd).
28. Walker's 1851, 1871 and 1891.
29. D.Adv. 18 April 1851 no. 1911 p.7 col. 5. Dividend declared on Shincliffe Mill.
30. HC. PP. 1844 xxvii. 1. 34-42, 1852-3 lxxxviii.2.792-7, 1863 liii.2.790-6, 1873 lxxi.1.534 ff.
31. Foster cites 4,000 workers out of 26,000.
32. Appendix 3.4. It is impossible to divide out employees of the various pits in the vicinity. Foster cites mills of over 100 employees (1974 : 80) but even 50 is large in relation to a personal relationship between employer and employee. Briggs (1950 : 69) sees firms of 6 to 30 workers characteristic of Birmingham.
33. Appendix 3.5 lists the guilds
D.CRO.M3/17 & 18 (PRO. HO. 107/239), the 1851 enumerators' books list the following apprentices :-
- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Barkers & Tanners | = | 1 tanner |
| Carpenters | = | 1 carpenter, 15 joiners, 2 coopers |
| Mercers | = | 9 grocers, 1 ironmonger |
| Cordwainers | = | 4 cordwainers, 12 shoemakers,
1 bootmaker |
| Barber surgeons | = | 5 ropers |
| Butchers | = | 3 butchers |
| Goldsmiths | = | 9 painters, 4 plumbers |
| Drapers | = | 21 tailors |
| Curriers | = | 8 curriers, 1 tallow chandler |
| Masons | = | 19 masons, 2 slaters |
| Smiths | = | 1 smith, 1 blacksmith |
| Saddlers | = | 2 saddlers, 3 upholsterers |
- No weavers, skinners, fullers or dyers
- Their age structure was:- 11 yrs. 3; 12 yrs. 6; 13 yrs. 11; 14 yrs. 29; 15 yrs. 33; 16 yrs. 29; 17 yrs. 41; 18 yrs. 19; 19 yr. 21; 20 yrs. 15; 21 yrs. 1; 22 yrs. 5.
- Non-craft 'apprentices' were baker 2, barber 1, bookbinder 1, bonnet maker 1, brass founder 1, builder 1, cabinet maker 1, carpet weaver 1, carver and guilder 1,

cartwright 1, chainmaker 2, chemist 6, coachmaker 7, coachpainter 2, dressmaker 5, druggist 2, farmer 1, farrier 1, 'foundry' 2, gardener 1, hairdresser 1, harness maker 1, ironmoulder 1, miller 4, moulder 1, paper maker 1, plasterer 2, pipe maker 2, printer 8, straw bonnet maker 1, surgeon 1, tinner 3, watchmaker 1, whitesmith 10, not known 8.

34. 5 & 6 Wm. IV cap. 76 An Act to provide for the Regulation of Municipal Corporations in England and Wales.
35. DDPD. SR. DR. Framwellgate Tithe Award, 1838, DDPD. SR. OS. Book of Reference No. 5 Easington Ward, Du. LC. Registers of Persons Entitled to Vote. In 1850 the Corporation held the freehold of the Sands but the freemen held the herbage DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p.45, Colgrave (1946)
36. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 2 9/5.
37. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 p.19 Lists apple carts, stalls for cheese and bacon, butchers, fish, fruit, linen, oatmeal, coopers, leather, potters, spice, clothiers and show people and hawkers.
38. D.Adv. Fri. June 1st 1849 no. 1813 p. 4 col. 3.
39. The period when they are listed in Walker's Directory.
40. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 2 8/2/1, 8/2/2, 1825. Also see Appendix 3.6.
41. D.Adv. Fri. 5th Jan. 1844 no. 1531 p.1 col. 2.
42. Sunderland changed in 1820 DDPD. SR. D.City Box 50 8/1/1, 8/1/5. Also see Appendix 3.6.
43. Gibby (1943 : 428-9) suggests that there was opposition from Durham Observatory in 1847 to the Leeds and Thirsk Railway. Again, Manley (1938 : 153) suggests that there was Dean and Chapter opposition in 1843. Such comments must have had a minor effect at the time since railway companies gained compulsory purchase powers (Kellett 1969a : 26). Also other landowners were anxious to get railways, an example was Russell, the coalowner, in 1851, D. Adv. Fri. March 28 1851 p.5 col. 1-2, Fri. April 18 1851 no. 1911 p.1 col.5, in the case of a plan to abandon the Auckland branch of the York, Newcastle and Berwick Railway. Local lines to Durham were delayed by the confusion at the fall of George Hudson in 1847 (Stephen & Lee 1921-2 : 145-7).
44. 1828 approached Clarence Railway, DDPD. SR. D.City Box 2 9/6, 1836 petition to Parliament in favour of the Great Northern Railway Bill, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 p.11-13, 1842 petition concerning the Darlington and Newcastle branch to Gilesgate DDPD. SR. vol. 6 p.152-3, 1846 petition to Parliament concerning the

Bishop Auckland branch DDPD. SR. vol. 6 p.252, 1849 letter to the shareholders of the Newcastle and Berwick Railway recommending the election of a Durham resident as a director DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p. 4-5, 1852 for the Bishop Auckland line DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p. 123, 1853 against the amalgamation of the York, Newcastle and Berwick and the York, N. Midland and Leeds Railway Cos. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p.162-3, 1854 for the Bishop Auckland line DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p.207-210, 1862 petition for the Team Valley line DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p.428-9.

45. D.Adv. Fri. April 19th 1844 no. 1546 p.2 col. 5 recorded its opening.
46. Gibby (1943 : 429).
47. D. Adv. Fri. March 12 1847 no. 1697 p.3 col. 2. Earlier it had been suggested that there should be cheap fares to the market for the working classes of the rural and colliery districts D. Adv. Fri. Dec. 13 1844 no. 1580 p.1 col. 2.
48. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 p.295 25 Feb. 1847, D. Adv. Fri. March 12 1847 no. 1697 p.3 col. 3.
49. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p. 406-7, 429.
50. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 pp.115-122, 125, 126-7.
51. 1808 DDPD. SR. D.City Box 2 7/3, 1826 DDPD. SR. D.City Box 2 9/5.
52. Idea raised in 1846 DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6, p.251, Architect's report p. 349. These were called 'The New Markets', Walker's Directory and Almanack.
53. 14 Vic. cap. 16 The Durham Market Company's Act, 1851. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 177 describes it as fortnightly, 19th Oct. 1857.
54. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 50/527 Petition from butchers June 1868.
55. Walker's 1874 p.39-42. Obituary for George Robson.
56. Walker's 1859 p.29.
57. Walker's 1915 p.42, p.57.
58. This is footnoted in the printed census, 1851. There were 25 drovers, 27 cattle dealers and 31 horse dealers enumerated in the town on census night. To these may be added some of the 68 farmers and 5 farmers' sons, 5 performers, 71 hawkers and 80 butchers.
59. DDPD. SR. D. Probate. Inventories of persons resident in Durham City and suburbs, 1540 to 1599. See also Chapter 5 footnotes 165, 166 and 167.

60. Charity Commission. Endowed Charities, Administrative County of Durham ... 1904 i : 281. One break is mentioned by Brayley & Britton (1808 : 72).
61. Charity Commission 1904 op. cit. i : 277.
62. D. CRO.Q/S/OB 7 p.19-20 1745, Charity Commission 1904i : 278 commenting on 1760.
63. Evidence of this in the parish registers has been commented upon in Chapter 2 footnotes 78 and 79.
64. D.CRO.M3/17 and 18.
65. 1841 males over 20 years, 1911 males over 10 years. There was not a lot of child employment in the Northern coalfield although the 1842 Royal Commission on the Employment of Children in Mines records some. HL. PP.1842 xx The early use of furnaces for ventilation tended to replace child trappers (Atkinson 1966 : 10) but there were juniors at Elvet, Framwellgate, Houghall and Old Durham in 1874. D. CRO. Durham Coal Owners' Association. Wages and Trade Customs, 1874.
66. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 pp.207, 208.
67. Farm servant, AG1, could be a hind or a domestic servant, dairykeeper, AG1, could be grouped with cowkeeper as D5.
68. Mining employees, Durham MB.

	Total	Lead	Ironstone	Other (excluding coal)
1841	239	0	0	0
1851	170	1	0	0
1861	316	2	1	1
1871	242	0	0	0

Sources as Table 3.3

69. Mr. Flintoff's pit in Charleys was selling coal to the Dean and Chapter of Durham and to the inhabitants of South Bailey in 1785. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Minutes 12th Feb. 1785 p. 604. Local pits were swiftly sunk after moorland enclosure. Those at Carrville were described two years after the enclosure of Gilesgate Moor. Hughes E ed. The Diaries of James Losh vol. 1 1811-1823 SS. 171 1956 p.79. 1818 2 July "In the evening Celia, Robert and I drove to Carrville, a place I had not seen for 15 years. It is much changed for the worse owing to collieries..." Small pits were filled in. An example was those on Durham Banks in 1744. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Minutes. 16 Nov. 1744.

70. The resulting network of railways was strongly orientated East to West as feeder lines into the coalfield.
DDPD. SR. search room. Map : Durham 1879 Kelly & Co.
Post Office Directory Offices, London. $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles/1 inch.
71. Walker's 1871 p.27.
72. Grant's valuable monograph (1973) just discusses housing in the town. New Durham was built 1836-7 by Whitwell Colliery, the pit being sunk in 1836. Fordyce i 1857 p.401. Bell's Ville was built by Messrs. Bell & Co., Shincliffe Colliery DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 161 p.149-151.
73. OS. Durham XX. 13, 1856, 1896.
74. GEE (1928 : 4) VCH iii.
75. Employees in railway transport, T4
- | | |
|------|--|
| 1841 | none |
| 1851 | 5 engine drivers, 8 railway workers, 11 'other' |
| 1861 | 10 engine drivers, 1 'other', 8 railway officials, 72 railway labourers, 19 railway servants, 1 railway police, 19 platelayers, 34 navvies |
| 1871 | 4 engine drivers, 11 railway officials, 19 railway attendants, 55 railway labourers |
- This excluded others enumerated in Langley Moor township.
76. Estimates for General District Rates indicate cartage as by contract for different jobs. For example the estimate for 1st July 1851 to 30th Sept. 1851 listed cartage of manure, cartage of whinstone, and cartage of water for the streets as separate items. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44. See also frontis to each ratebook, DDPD. SR. D.City vols. 137, 140, 142, 148.
77. D.CRO. D/Ma 4.
78. Du. LC. Durham University Calendar, 1871, Epiphany Term ended 28th March and Easter Term began 22nd April.
- | <u>Year</u> | <u>Census night</u> | <u>Easter Vacation</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 1851 | 30th - 31st March | 19th March - 26th April |
| 1861 | 7th - 8th April | 20th March - 20th April |
| 1871 | 2nd - 3rd April | 28th March - 22nd April |
| 1881 | 3rd - 4th April | 22nd March - 30th April |
| 1891 | 5th - 6th April | 16th March - 25th April |
| 1901 | | nk. - 27th April |
| 1911 | 2nd - 3rd April | 21st March - 28th April |
79. University calendars up to the 1880's give Oxford and Cambridge dates of term.
80. See Chapter 8 footnote 22.

81. See above, footnote 10.
82. See above, footnote 47.
83. Post Office Directory of Durham and Northumberland 1873.
p.72-85.
84. See above, footnote 83.
85. 1841 Gateshead and Gateshead Fell parish. 1871
Gateshead Borough.
86. Charity Commission. Endowed Charities, Administrative County
of Durham, 1904 vol.1.
87. D.CRO.Q/S/OB 7 pp.19-21 16th January 1744/5. 1737
workhouse built in Back Lane, 1740 lent money.
88. Oxford English Dictionary.
89. Oxford English Dictionary.
90. Bailey (1810 : 293) He failed 1808.
91. Oxford English Dictionary.
92. Henderson's, Blackett & Gainford of Framwellgate,
Mr. Moore of Milburngate (Surtees 1840 iv : 25). Pigot
& Co. National Commercial Directory. Manchester 1834
p.150 list two; Blackett & Co. and Henderson & Co.
93. Walker's Directory 1855 p.54.
94. D.CRO.D/Ma 9 "Lyttelton Times" May 1st 1882. Exhibiting
Brussels, Royal Wiltons and Kidderminsters. In 1851
they exhibited at the Great Exhibition. D. Adv. Fri.
March 28th 1851 no. 1908 p.5 col. 3.
95. Charity Commission. Endowed Charities, Administrative
County of Durham, 1904. vol. i p.281.
96. Using this specific description and excluding dyers, factory
hands and casual labourers who may have been employed
by Hendersons. See also page 456.
97. These moves may have been in response to newspaper
advertisements, but this is conjecture. No agents are
known to have operated for Hendersons. The Kidderminster
newspapers were not checked for advertisements since they
are unindexed (personal communication, Birmingham
Central Reference Library).
98. D. Adv. 7th Nov. 1845 no. 1627 p.3 col. 5.
99. D. Adv. 17th Oct. 1845 no. 1624 p.3 col. 4.
100. D. Adv. 14th Nov. 1845 no. 1628 p. 3 col. 5.

101. See above, footnote 99.
102. Walker's 1866 p.29.
103. 36 & 37 Vic. An Act for Incorporating and Conferring Powers on the City of Durham Gas Company DDPD. SR. D. City Box 53. 5.
104. Appendix 3.2 on coal mines
See above, footnotes 98, 99 and 100 on gas works
Clark (1849 sec. 72) on water works.
105. Sunday Times Magazine June 5th 1977 pp.34-5, 36.
Photograph of the rescue team at Hartley Colliery, North Shields, January 1862 from the Royal Collection, Windsor. Caption "W. Coulson, master sinker, and four of his men".
Walker's 1857 p.32. In 1838 the Northern Coal Mining Co. began to sink a pit at Framwellgate Moor. William Coulson master sinker.
106. Charity Commission. Endowed Charities, Administrative County of Durham, 1904 vol. i.
107. OS. Durham xxvii. 1856 1st ed. 25 inch coverage shows ropewalks and ropemakers are enumerated in 1851. D.CRO. M3/17 & 18. (PRO. H0.107/239).
108. In 1851 (HC.PP. 1852-3 lxxxviii.2) and 1861 (HC.PP.1863 liii.2) no people occupied in chemical manufacture were listed but in 1871 (HC.PP.1873 lxxi.1) 3 dye manufacturers and 2 soap boilers were enumerated.
109. Walker's lists the following numbers of brickmaking firms for sample years: 1850 3, 1855 4, 1860 3, 1865 4, 1870 2. The format then changes until 1888. From 1888 to 1910 none are listed. The census of 1851 (HC.PP. 1852-3 lxxxviii.2) lists 16 brickmakers and 5 earthenware makers, the census of 1861 (HC. PP. 1863 liii.2) lists 27 brickmakers and 3 earthenware makers. The census of 1871 (HC.PP. 1873 lxxi.1) lists no brickmakers in the town and only 2 earthenware makers.
110. See above, footnote 27.

CHAPTER FOUR

CHARACTERISTICS OF NINETEENTH CENTURY BUILDING

CHARACTERISTICS OF NINETEENTH CENTURY BUILDING

1. Introduction : Approaches and Themes

The study of nineteenth century building in Britain has been characterized by two approaches; the morphological approach and the economic approach, both of which have been utilised at a range of scales of study and for a variety of specific questions. Scales of study within the morphological approach can be illustrated by Beresford's analysis of a single street in Leeds, Prosperity Street (1961), Ward's work on the entire townscape of Leeds (1960, 1962), Tarn's work on working class housing (1971) and Jones's brief comments on the character of townscapes inherited from the nineteenth century (1966:56). Many of the presentations have been descriptive, whether stemming from architectural interest, as did Olsen's study of London buildings (1976), or when stemming from economic history, as the essays in Chapman's collection of studies on working class housing illustrate (1971) and the essays on middle class housing edited by Simpson and Lloyd (1977). Even as descriptions they have not necessarily stressed the unique town but have served to illustrate local and regional diversity in housing types and to question assumptions about housing standards. Ward's study of Leeds demonstrated relationships between the built fabric and property rights (1960, 1962) which were subsequently verified in the case of Bradford (Mortimore 1963, 1969) and which have since become basic assumptions in townscape analysis. Again working from specific townscapes to more general applications the outcome of Conzen's work (1958,

1960, 1960b, 1966, 1968) has been a precise nomenclature for classifying features within townscapes.

In the morphological approach precise descriptions can be made as both Conzen's work has illustrated and the analysis of Kingston-upon-Hull by Forster (1968), and comparisons can be made between towns. The weakness of the approach is that it deals with the fabric as evidence so can only deal with the completed fabric. This excludes analysis of the process of building, why buildings appear where they do and why they take their specific form. The morphological approach can deal with the questions 'what', 'where' and 'when' but can only treat the questions 'why' and 'how' by inference to studies within the economic approach. Jones (1969) made such an inference by relating his morphological study of housing in the South Wales coalfield to an analysis by Richards (1956) which dealt with the periods when housing was being built in that region. Similarly Forster, in his study of Kingston-upon-Hull (1972), followed a detailed statistical analysis of the fabric of the town with a conclusion interpolating the economic factors influencing the resultant townscape while Davies, studying changing land use in a group of towns in South Wales (1968) and Solomon, working on houses in Hobart, Tasmania (1966) had, again, arguments which moved from morphology to interpretation. In other words townscape is of interest in itself but ultimately the analysis of townscapes raises questions as to why townscapes should take their visible form, questions which point towards analysis of investment and decision making within the economic approach.

In the economic approach, as illustrated by the

work of Gaskell on the role of Co-operative Societies in housebuilding (1971), in his study of the growth of a number of towns in Northern England (1974) and on a wider scale in Weber's study of building in Britain between 1838 and 1950 (1955), 'the building' is not an artefact with a classificatory value dictated by its age, style or function but is the outcome of an investment decision within the context of local, regional and national economies. Such decisions have temporal relationships with other investment opportunities (Weber 1955, Richards & Lewis 1956, Saul 1962, Habakkuk 1962) though the details of such relationships, both between housing investment and industrial development and between local housing investment and international investment, have been queried on account of inferences made as to the nature of the land and capital markets (Daunton 1977:90). This approach is no less inferential than the morphological approach since the links between descriptions of temporal trends, the working of the capital market and the decision-maker has been investigated to a very limited extent. Studies of individual builders (Beresford 1974) or groups of builders such as those operating in London (Dyos 1968) still rely on inference through sheer dearth of archives relating to building firms while studies of the land market and its operation (Anderson 1969, Thompson 1957) hint at constraints and an imperfect market.

The morphological approach has been more widely used by geographers analysing nineteenth century townscapes than has the economic approach. In part, this must be attributed to the essentially spatial nature of the morph-

ological approach in contrast to the temporally inclined economic approach. Part must be attributed to the strong position of the morphological approach in urban geography as a whole. Dickinson's statement as to the nature of urban geography (1948) was morphological, as has been the work of Smailes (1953, 1955) and Carter (1965 : xvii, 1972). In the specific case of urban building the morphological approach has remained important as in the work of Whitehand on land use belts around cities (1967), or Openshaw (1969, 1976) and Robson (1969, 1973) on the nature of the buildings, despite contrasts in the methods used by these authors to describe the townscape.

In the context of certain conditions of data availability, namely where the townscape forms the most complete record of the urban past, since the documentary evidence is fragmentary, the use of inference from the townscape has value. Without subjecting the townscape to rigorous analysis, a procedure carried to great effect at Southampton where Burgess has illustrated phases and location of early urban development (1963) and at St. Andrews where Brooks and Whittington (1977) have postulated the medieval growth phases of the town from modern maps and a view of c.1580, no comment could be made on urban development. Southampton again provides an example since Platt, using medieval documentation for that town, arrived at a scholarly social and economic description virtually devoid of consideration of the fabric of the town (1973). In many cases documentary evidence such as deeds have had to be used in relation to the modern or nineteenth century surveyed town plan; classic examples being Salter's

study of Oxford (1960-9), Urry's study of Canterbury (1967) and Conzen's work on Alnwick (1960), with later writers using the same blend of evidence, an example being Langton's study of Gloucester (1977). But in countless towns during the nineteenth century ⁽¹⁾ the townscape does not form the sole or major type of evidence on urban growth so should be viewed as supplementary evidence. In many cases the sheer volume of documentary material which exists and to which detailed questions of 'when' and 'where' can be addressed and the question 'how', limits the value of the townscape as a source, though the townscape may still impart detail absent from documentary sources.

Durham City has such detailed documentary material for the nineteenth century for, despite there being no building register until 1900, the town has a record of building applications and certificates for completed buildings amongst the local authority files ⁽²⁾ These files take the form of both loose correspondence, a formal record of letters dispatched and minutes of the Local Board of Health, later the Urban Sanitary District, and sub-committees, all of which can be supplemented by the General District Ratebooks ⁽³⁾ and Ordnance Survey plans. The documentary evidence is of sufficient quality to support the question 'how' and to raise the question 'why' rather than just the questions which arise within the morphological approach; 'what' and 'when'. Since the process of building underlies the outcome of what was built and in which period an economic approach has been adopted but this has then been related to the resultant building stock itself.

The questions to be asked are firstly, whether the City exhibits the same types of temporal trends in building investment as are found in larger cities and the country as a whole, and secondly whether the same inferences concerning decision making can be drawn from general trends in investment as have been postulated in previous studies. These trends and inferences will be discussed as each theme is introduced. Thirdly, how far was building in Durham City, a small and slowly growing town, part of regional and national nineteenth century investment patterns and, a question raised in Chapter 5, how important was the contribution of nineteenth century building activity to the building stock of the town?

2. The Building Cycle for Durham City, 1850 to 1915

Both on a national scale and from specific town examples it has been illustrated that building in the nineteenth century was cyclical. Weber, using evidence from thirty-four towns (1955) illustrated the peaks and troughs in building activity which had been found by Cairncross (1953), great booms occurring in the 1870's and 1890's (Weber 1955 : 112-3, 121). Habakkuk has argued that these late nineteenth century cycles were national in dimensions while early nineteenth century building activity exhibited local cycles (1962:201-2). This view has already to some extent been borne out by local and regional studies such as those by Richards (1956) and Richards and Lewis on South Wales (1956), Kenwood on North Eastern England (1962, 1963) and Pritchard on Leicester (1976:117) for although these, and Lewis's synthesis for Great Britain as a whole (1965), indicate cycles, the early and middle parts of the nineteenth century

exhibit local variation in timing. For the late 1820's Lewis postulates a building trough followed by a boom between 1832 and 1843 but Treble, from Liverpool evidence (1971:170), suggests a boom between 1827 and 1832. Other examples reinforce this picture of early nineteenth century diversity, for while Lewis suggests a wartime trough in activity between 1799 and 1816, Beresford, quoting Rimmer, suggests a burst of activity in Leeds between 1800 and 1805 in the building of cottages (1971:104) and while Ward indicates a trough at Bristol after 1793 (1970:182), at Nottingham the 1790's saw a building boom (Chapman 1971:143). Weber himself suggests local variation in timing in the second half of the century between Liverpool, London and Great Britain as a whole (1955:112-3), the London booms occurring slightly earlier. But, with the exception of Glasgow which had a peak between 1868 and 1877 followed by a severe trough (Butt 1971:72), these local chronological variations appear to have been lags rather than independent local cycles. Butt attributes the Glasgow trough, beginning in the mid 1870's and continuing in the 1880's, to a crisis in confidence compounded by the failure of the City of Glasgow bank in 1878 (1971:61), in other words it was a local circumstance and not a local cycle which underlay the disparity.

Why should there have been building cycles and why should local cycles have become increasingly part of national cycles? It has been postulated that building investment drew on the same capital market as other investment opportunities and that it tended to be counter cyclical to industrial investment, hence a peak occurred in Manchester in 1863 despite

the Cotton Famine (Lewis 1965 : 87-8). The brick tax used by Shannon to indicate building (1934) is therefore poor as a source since it groups domestic and industrial use of bricks and includes railway construction (Cairncross & Weber 1956 : 323). It has also been postulated that building investment in Britain was related in cycles to those in North America (Habakkuk 1962), that not only was national investment becoming integrated but also international investment. These hypotheses will be discussed further after examination of the specific case of Durham City building in the nineteenth century. The question is whether Durham City building exhibited a cycle of booms and troughs, and if such was the case, whether the cycle was in phase with the national cycle outlined by Weber and the regional cycle for North Eastern England outlined by Kenwood for the second half of the nineteenth century (1963), or whether it was purely a local cycle, more typical of the early nineteenth century.

Kenwood, in considering the North East of England, did not include in his sample of towns and districts the records of building in Durham City since the data was not in a readily available source. His study was weighted to the towns of Middlesbrough, Sunderland, Newcastle and Hartlepool with rural districts being included in the analysis after 1875 and Durham City after 1901 (Kenwood 1963 : 115-6, 126), so it can, therefore, be used as an independent control on the Durham City building data. The data available for Durham City allowed the number of applications to be determined monthly and the number of building applications to be seen, in addition to the number of plans. This is important since

the plans contained a varying number of buildings. Although Kenwood excluded the use of seemingly eclectic source material it was clear, after matching the surveyor's correspondence and notes to the minutes of the Local Board of Health, the Urban Sanitary District and the committees of each, that the minutes were an accurate source of evidence concerning building. For the period 1849 to 1914 all building applications and all recommendations to certify completed buildings as fit for habitation were dealt with by the full Local Board of Health and, later, the Urban Sanitary District. Plans were considered in committee after 1880 but the recommendations of the Finance and General Purposes Committee were then brought before the full board.

Analysis of building applications for the City indicated a characteristic peak and trough cycle for the period 1850 to 1915 (Fig. 32). Peaks occurred in 1860, 1869, 1876, 1891, 1897, 1899 and 1906 with major peaks in 1876, 1897 and 1899; a chronology which corresponds with the peaks suggested by Kenwood for the region and with the peaks suggested by Weber for Great Britain as a whole (1955:112-3). This correspondence is despite Kenwood's and Weber's aggregation of places with apparently contrasting local economies, in terms of employment structure. The peaks in the Durham cycle would be sharper if developments in the immediate vicinity of the city were included, for during the 1870's building was conducted on Chapman and Forster's estate, the main street of which was the Avenue (Fig. 39) and in the first decade of the twentieth century Neville's Cross was being developed as a residential suburb on the evidence of

the local directory ⁽⁴⁾ together with the Ordnance Survey plans and present fabric. Both these areas were outside the municipal boundary (Fig. 48) but were in Durham Rural Sanitary District after its inception in 1875 so that building applications should be recorded in detail in the files of the Rural Sanitary District. These records, however, do not appear to be extant at the present time despite their having been used by Kenwood. ⁽⁵⁾ Morphological evidence from the comparison of the three editions of the twenty five inch Ordnance Survey plans of 1856, 1896 and 1919 can establish the extent of building in these suburbs at these dates and the development in the Avenue can be dated more precisely from a plan of building proposals, dated 1873, ⁽⁶⁾ and from discussion between Chapman and Forster and the Durham Local Board of Health as to the drainage of these streets. ⁽⁷⁾ The evidence was not, however, of a comparable quality to the area covered by the Durham City Local Board of Health for which there was monthly, and therefore annual, information as to building proposals. The only possible source to elucidate building for these suburbs on an annual basis, the annual and local 'Walker's Durham Directory and Almanac' does not appear to have kept up to date on an annual basis in its inclusion of new houses outside the municipal boundary, although within the boundary it does indicate piecemeal development along new streets such as Western Hill and Sutton Street. ⁽⁸⁾ In the case of suburbs 'Walker's' tended to update its street directory in specific years. ⁽⁹⁾ The urban area was underbounded after the 1860's (Fig. 48) and it would be more meaningful to include both the buildings

outside the boundary and those within in considering the chronology of building. Unfortunately the quality of the evidence for the surrounding area precludes this but the analysis of the chronology of building within the municipal area is not invalidated since developments in this area appear to have been in chronological sequence with developments in the immediately adjacent area. Crossgate chapelry saw the most rapid rise in the number of inhabited houses outside the Municipal Boundary in the 1870's. In 1861 there were 44 such houses, in 1871 there were 62 and in 1881 153.⁽¹⁰⁾

Between 1801 and 1901 the total housing stock, inhabited and uninhabited houses, stated by the census, showed a 157.31% increase from the 1,054 'houses' in Durham Municipal Borough in 1801. Most of this increase occurred in the period 1801 to 1841 when the increase over the 1801 housing stock was 125.14% so the investment patterns under analysis for the period 1850 to 1915, for which there are local authority records, are very much the tail-end of urban housing stock expansion. But the increase in housing stock for the first half of the century may be slightly exaggerated since the term 'house' was not necessarily standard between enumerators and from census to census. The housing stock, including both inhabited and uninhabited housing actually fell between 1801 and 1811 from 1,054 houses to 956 houses but subsequently rose to 1,187 houses in 1821 and 1318 houses in 1831. There is no evidence to suggest that the numerical fall in housing stock was due to demolition but rather it appears to have been the outcome of an imprecise use of the term 'house' since the housing stock total fell again in 1851 when the usage of the

term 'house' was defined as being a separate building,⁽¹¹⁾ a definition which remained unaltered until 1911 (Lucas 1967:259). In 1841 the housing stock of the City totalled 2,373 houses, meaning buildings or dwellings, but in 1851 it totalled 1,828 houses, meaning buildings.

The importance of these semantics is that buildings subdivided into dwellings occurred in England⁽¹²⁾ but were not typical except in the North East of England (Mess 1928:35). The tradition of a dwelling as a separate building contrasted the traditional urban style of dwelling in Scotland which tended to be buildings subdivided into dwellings (Jones 1975 : fn.15).⁽¹³⁾ In Scotland the census enumeration of houses was clarified in 1861 (Drake 1972:10) but the North East of England with its tradition of multiple-occupancy in buildings, small dwellings and overcrowding (Mess 1928: 75-8, Hole 1965 : 536), was subsumed under a census enumeration for England designed for dwellings as single buildings. In other areas the house enumeration only became inaccurate through the inclusion of business premises (Lucas 1958:258-9) or in areas of tenements or back-to-back houses (Tillott 1972:94) but in the North East prior to 1851 there is no method of gauging how each enumerator defined 'a house', whether he took the dwelling or the building and after 1851 the enumeration is not clarified by an inappropriate definition of the term 'house'. The tenement, or dwelling in a subdivided house, was common in Durham City as descriptions of property in the ratebooks indicate (Fig. 47). The census can only be taken as a crude indication of changes in the housing stock decade to decade but its pointing towards slackening building activity

in the second half of the nineteenth century cannot be denied and it is within this general context of slackening activity that the peaks in building applications between 1850 and 1915 must be set.

That building in Durham City between 1850 and 1915 was not evenly spaced over the years is quite clear from Figure 32, the distribution was a cycle with peaks and troughs which corresponded to the regional timing of peaks and troughs. The troughs in the City were not offset by building in suburban areas outside the boundary since from the evidence available the periods of building in these suburbs corresponded to major building periods in the municipal area. Why such marked temporal variation in activity should have occurred must now be considered.

3. Relationships between Economic Indicators and the Building Cycle in Durham City

Temporal trends in the number of building applications, whether at a national, regional, or local scale of analysis, have been explained within the economic approach in terms of the degree to which the building applications are synchronous with, or inverse to, temporal trends in other economic indicators. Richards and Lewis, writing about South Wales, related the building cycle to coal output (1956), while Parry Lewis commented on the relationship between the national building cycle and the bank rate (Lewis 1965:109), and Habakkuk stressed the relationship between the national building cycle and the trade cycle (1962). All these inferential explanations describing coincident trends, inverse trends and lags between

the building cycle and a whole host of economic indicators have been neatly summarized by Thomas who has stressed the interplay between population migration and capital investment not only within a country such as Britain, but between late nineteenth century and early twentieth century Britain and countries where there was heavy British investment, in particular the USA.(1972).

Thomas argued that population growth was critical for certain capital formation, that non-agricultural building and railway construction, for example, were "population sensitive" and that migration was critical in population growth (1972:4). After commenting on the strong investment ties between Britain and the USA. after the mid-nineteenth century he illustrated the links between population, capital formation, capital export, and building; Great Britain and the United States being in inverse cycle to each other. According to his thesis when Britain had a building boom it was coincident with rural-urban migration and capital formation while in the USA. there would be a building trough. Conversely when Britain had a building trough it also had a period of capital export and emigration while the USA. had capital formation, immigration and a building boom (1972:4, 66 - 7). Thomas allowed for the influence of other factors including the interest rate, income levels, house quality and demolition (1972:41) but his thesis was population centred. Yet at no time did he discuss the mechanisms of building, other investment or migration. His discussion illustrated synchronous relationships between economic indicators which he assumed to be relevant 'a priori'.

How does the building cycle of Durham City relate to these indicators? Firstly it must be borne in mind that the local building cycle (Fig. 32) was coincident with that devised by Thomas for England and Wales from the Inhabited House Duty returns (1972:23). This local coincidence does not appear to have been expected by Thomas since he commented that local studies would show more variety (1972:32). Secondly, Thomas has been criticised on the grounds of a lack of correspondence between his general data trends and regional circumstances, even in the case of South Wales which he took as a case example. Daunton has illustrated that the South Wales coalfield was most certainly export orientated but that Atlantic linkages cannot be automatically inferred since the exports were not orientated towards North America (1974:282). Durham City was situated on a coalfield which in the first half of the nineteenth century was largely home market orientated, between 91 and 98% of annual shipments between 1801 and 1828 being shipped coastwise (Mitchell & Deane 1971:110 - 111), and which in the vicinity of Durham City was land-sale for the local market (Wood, Taylor et al. 1863:30). In the second half of the nineteenth century the coalfield was becoming more export orientated (Smailes 1935:205). The circumstances and overall building cycle support the inferential explanation offered by Thomas but the building cycle must be compared to each economic indicator which has been discussed by previous writers.

Comparisons will be made between the trend of building for institutional buildings, commented upon by Whitehand (1967), coal output for the Northern coalfield,

as commented on by Richard and Lewis in their analysis of South Wales (1956:297), the bank rate since this was mentioned by Lewis (1965:90 - 1), Thomas (1972:41) and Richards (1956:16), population growth which Thomas stressed (1972:34) and railway investment which Thomas saw to be synchronous with domestic building (1972:66).

Institutional buildings have been suggested by Whitehand to exhibit an inverse cycle to domestic building (1967:223, 1976). This view infers that the investment source for all buildings was unitary and that there was a market response during a domestic building slump by which land and investment was channelled into institutional uses, such as schools, libraries and churches or into open-ground uses such as graveyards and playing fields. Homan and Rowley challenged this view using specific data from Sheffield (1976) and Dyos and Reeder have commented that the money market should be viewed as specialist (1973:377). The challenge by Homan and Rowley appears to be supported both by the specific data from Durham City and general consideration of how institutions were formed and financed in the nineteenth century and, how land sales were conducted.

The cycle of building for dwellings in Durham City between 1850 and 1915, and that for other buildings (Fig.32), shows neither the same temporal cycle nor an inverse pattern, but the total number of institutional buildings for which applications were made was so small as to eliminate the detection of any cycle. Significantly a large proportion of these institutional buildings were erected on land belonging to the Dean and Chapter of Durham (Fig. 40) so their location

should not be explained in terms of a building trough during the outward expansion of the urban area but rather in terms of Church estates which, having being built up piecemeal during the Middle Ages ⁽¹³⁾ in the closes between the urban gardens and the moors, were, during the nineteenth century, made over for institutional purposes .⁽¹⁴⁾ Applicants for the building of institutional premises were a distinct group from those applying for dwellings ⁽¹⁵⁾ which again suggests that Whitehand's inferences are not useful.

The building of a church or chapel was frequently integral to the planning of an urban residential development in the nineteenth century; the inclusion of such an institution adding tone to a new area. In Sheffield Tarn dates the chapel and church building boom to the 1860's which he suggests was contemporary to the building of suburbs to the West of the town (1977:187-8). In Sheffield, therefore, church building was contemporary with house building and not counter-cyclical. This may be taken as a general circumstance since in many cases the developer set aside land or built a church, indeed Edwards comments that the Park Estate in Nottingham was unusual since the Duke of Newcastle did not do this (1977:162). Other institutions in Durham, such as the Public Baths and Wash-houses, were financed by the Local Board of Health under the provisions of specific statute law and loans from the Public Works Loan Commission,⁽¹⁶⁾ the prison was rebuilt by means of County Rate⁽¹⁷⁾ so only in the case of institutions built by private subscription as were the Diocesan Training College in 1841,⁽¹⁸⁾ the Register Office on Palace Green in 1821,⁽¹⁹⁾ Durham Infirmary ⁽²⁰⁾

and the Blue Coat School on Claypath in 1812⁽²¹⁾, could there possibly have been redirection of funds from housing to institutions but even in the case of these subscriptions the link is tenuous. Firstly, building by subscription tended to be typical of the early nineteenth century, and secondly, subscriptions were from a large number of small donators who had no profit motive in their giving.

Coal output from the Northern coalfield shows little relationship to the Durham City building cycle (Fig. 33) since the building cycle consisted of two peaks, 1876 and 1897 with 1899 together with intervening troughs while coal output (Mitchell & Deane 1962:115) displayed increasing production between 1854 and 1915, peaks and troughs being of minor significance. The coal output figures for the Northumberland and Durham coalfield, however, summarize sub-regions of the coalfield which had their own timing in expansion and contraction. In the early part of the century large pits were concentrated in the lower Tyne and lower Wear valleys but in the 1840's large pits were sunk in the middle Wear Valley, including the Durham City area. After 1820 (Kenwood 1962:83) but especially in the later nineteenth century and early twentieth century the Eastern coalfield, the concealed Durham coalfield, was developed (Smailes 1935:208 - 9). Yet even in terms of coalfield development in the vicinity of Durham City there was little correspondence between the inception of the local pits and the building cycle since a large number of pits were sunk in the 1840's and 1850's (Appendix 3.2) and were coming into production in the 1850's and 1860's but there was no building

boom in the borough either in the 1850's or the 1860's (Fig. 32). There is, in addition, no evidence of direct building either by coal companies or by others as specifically colliery housing and there is no evidence of investment moving from the coal industry into building.

The bank rate and building applications appeared to be inversely related on the evidence of a comparison between the annual building applications and a nine month running mean formed from the bank rates on the first day of each month between January 1850 and July 1914 (Fig.35). Indeed, between January 1850 and December 1899, 83.93% of applications were made when the bank rate was below 5%. (22) However, this relationship was not so clear when the bank rates were weighted according to their frequency of occurrence (Fig. 34) and it was clear from the general trends, illustrated in Figure 35, that low bank rates were necessary but not sufficient to explain either the timing or the strength of the building booms. Not all periods which saw a fall in the bank rate experienced a building boom and the boom years were not characterised by particularly low bank rates. In a local context this raises questions as to the nature of the building applicants and whether they indeed lacked capital, were borrowing and were executing building applications with haste.

Population growth in the town for the late nineteenth century was highest in the decade 1891 to 1901 when it was 7.97%. This was contemporary with the building boom

of 1897 and 1899 and antedated the boundary changes of 1904. But the sharper building application boom of 1876 was not reflected in the population increase between 1871 and 1881 which was only 3.65% which, although stronger than the 1860's and 1880's, was less marked than that of the 1890's and 1900's (Table 2.6). In addition there was net outward migration through most of the later nineteenth century (Appendix 2.7). In comparison the City together with its adjoining area, the Durham Poor Law Union, had the most rapid growth in the 1870's when the population rose 32.9%, but again this was not reflected in both building cycle peaks since in the 1890's population growth over the decade was a mere 1.9% (Table 2.6) with net outward migration (Appendix 2.7). No constant relationship between building application levels and population growth is apparent, despite Thomas' hypothesis that periods of residential construction in Britain would be characterised by population migration to towns and that periods of residential building decline would be characterised by overseas emigration (1972:4). Instead, the 1876 boom and the 1897 and 1899 boom in Durham City appear to have had different population growth characteristics.

Railway investment, like building, was seen by Thomas to be "population-sensitive". In the North East of England in the second half of the nineteenth century railway investment was dominated by the North Eastern Railway Company. The movement from small railway companies to large dated from the 1840's when the smaller companies in County Durham had been bought out by George Hudson (Lambert 1934:131, 142). This was followed by the amalgamation

of the York & North Midland Railway, the Leeds Northern Railway and the York, Newcastle & Berwick Railway in 1854 which left the new North Eastern Railway Company with a virtual monopoly in the region (Irving 1976:13). Irving's analysis of the finances of the North Eastern railway illustrates firstly that it was dominated by mineral traffic and secondly, that the greatest increases in paid-up capital were in the five year periods 1870 to 1875, 1875 to 1880, 1890 to 1895 and 1900 to 1905 (1976:140). The 1876 local building boom was therefore synchronous with rising railway investment but the 1897 to 1899 boom postdated railway investment increases in that decade and the early twentieth century was counter-cyclical, being a local building trough.

It must be concluded, therefore, that even if synchronous trends are detectable at a national scale, the local evidence by no means bears this out, and that this failure not only applies to railway investment trends but also to the other four economic indicators, institutional building, coal output, the bank rate and population growth.

4. The Character of the Building Process

Correlations between temporal trends in the building cycle and those in other economic indicators depend on assumptions concerning the process of building. In particular the assumptions relate to building finance, that building applicants were borrowing money capital and were building at speed, as described by Dyos & Reeder (1973:376-8). Since there is a dearth of surviving papers relating to building firms (Dyos 1968:641) it can only be inferred that

such was the case. Contemporary comment by Gwynn in 1901, described the process of building in terms of small men, lacking capital, borrowing money and building at speed (Chapman 1971:34 - 5) but it is by no means certain whether this was the general mode of building. Certainly studies of individual towns have confirmed the small scale activity of each builder, whether in London (Dyos 1968:659), or the smaller town of Bolton (Dingsdale 1967:36) and this scale of activity was confirmed for Durham City (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Application totals and certificate of completed building totals for each applicant, Durham M.B. 1850 to 1915.

	Applications/Applicant		Certificates/Applicant	
	Total	% Applicants	Total	% Applicants
1	347	64.14	77	48.73
less than 5	498	92.05	131	82.91
less than 10	532	98.34	148	93.67
10 and over	9	1.66	10	6.33
Total applicants	541	100.00	158	100.00

Speculative building cannot be assumed 'a priori' for although Kenwood has assumed, for the North East as a whole, that the interval between the submission of the plan and the commencement of building tended to be rapid, being about six months, and that about 85% of plans submitted were enacted, on the basis of a study of West Hartlepool (1963:116). Matthews, discussing the value of a General Building Act in 1877, made it quite clear that in commenting on speculative building he was commenting about London and large towns (1877-8:278). In Durham City there was an

enormous discrepancy between the number of applications to build and the number of certificates issued to allow habitation of completed dwellings (Fig.36). The certificates were issued after 1859 ⁽²³⁾ and survive both as duplicate copies ⁽²⁴⁾ and as lists in the same minute books as the applications so the discrepancy cannot be attributed to disparate rates of survival between the two types of data. The conclusion to be drawn concerning the Durham City applications and certificates is that the zeal to build was not identical to the power to build.

The aggregate series of applications and certificates for Durham City suggests longer intervals between building application and completion than Kenwood suggested. The application peak of 1857 was followed by a certificate peak five years later and the application peaks of 1868, 1870, 1882 and 1889 had certificate peaks two years later (Fig. 36). By matching each application to its certificate, for the period 1859 to 1899, on the basis of the full name of the applicant, this longer building interval was confirmed.

Since Durham City was a small town of 13,188 persons in 1851 and 17,550 in 1911 ⁽²⁵⁾ it was possible to match applications to certificates by nominal linkage of the applicants. This method used the surname and Christian name, or names, of each applicant, together with any incidental information such as the place of abode and date of decease (Appendix 4.1). Assumptions made to distinguish between, or link together, John Smith in one reference to John Smith in another reference were essentially those

outlined by Wrigley in his discussion of intuitive methods of nominal linkage (1973:2), and were facilitated in the set of applicants by the City having relatively few duplicate names (Appendix 4.1). Not only could this linkage of persons be utilised to evaluate building intervals but also to assess the building activity of each applicant, and, by matching, the information on building to the censuses of 1851 and 1871 and to the annual Walker's Directory, to add information as to occupation, and by matching to the ratebooks of 1850, 1860, 1870 and, 1880, to discover the acquisition and disposal of property patterns for each participant.

The interval between the application being submitted and the building being completed emerged as having a range between one month and 228 months. But a proportion of applications were not traced since they appear to have changed applicant between the initial application and certificate. This was unavoidable since details stated on the location of building sites were not consistent enough to be used as a basis for identifying properties, but it biases the analysis against identifying rapid building and selling of incomplete dwellings by 'jobbing builders'. Of the 223 buildings traced, 72.65% were completed within twelve months but only 31.39% within six months (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Building intervals, Durham M.B., 1859 to 1899 (26)

	Months since application *				
	<u>1-6</u>	<u>7-12</u>	<u>13-24</u>	<u>25+</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total Certificates	70	92	36	25	223
%	31.39	41.26	16.14	11.21	100.00
Cumulative %	31.39	72.65	88.79	100.00	
* To nearest whole month					

Although the building projects which were executed in shorter building intervals tended to have a low maximum bank rate within that building interval (Appendix 4.2), the majority of projects had a range of bank rate levels within their building interval. Without business records of the applicants it is impossible to comment further on the relationship. Stronger patterns emerged by decade, by season and by the type of person making the application.

The decade 1870 to 1879 saw both the largest building application peak and the lowest average building interval, 11.07 months, but although the decades immediately preceding and succeeding which were slacker in terms of building applications and had longer average building intervals, these averages were not greatly in excess of that for the 1870's. The range in average building intervals for the four decades between 1860 and 1899 was 11.07 to 15.32 months and the average building interval for plans submitted between 1890 and 1899 was longer than that of the decade 1880 to 1889 despite the 1890's having included an application peak and the 1880's an application trough (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Building intervals by decade, Durham M.B.,
 1859 - 1899

<u>Decade</u>	<u>Total Certificates</u>	<u>Average building interval (months)</u>
1860 - 9 *	91	15.32
1870 - 9	82	11.07
1880 - 9	36	12.00
1890 - 9 +	14	13.14
Total	223	13.12

* Includes 19 applications made 1850 - 59, certified 1860-9

+ Includes one application in 1902

During the decades 1860 to 1869 and 1870 to 1879 the average building interval for applicants making a single application corresponded closely with the average building interval for all applicants but thereafter these two averages diverged and there was a reduction in the number of applicants who only made a single application. Since the number of instances for applicants making a single application was small, totalling over the four decades a mere 53 certified plans, the divergence cannot be stressed, but in the 1880's the single plan applicants had a much shorter average building interval and in the 1890's a much longer one (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4 Building intervals by decade, Durham M.B., 1859 to 1899 comparing applicants making a single application with all applicants.

Decade	Total	Single applicants		All applicants	
		Average building interval (months)	Range (months)	Average building interval (months)	
1859 - 69	25	15.44	1-137	15.32	
1870 - 79	14	11.07	3-27	11.07	
1880 - 89	9	6.44	1-13	12.00	
1890 - 99	5	23.20	5-36	13.14	
Total	53	13.26	1-137	13.12	

Over the four decades the applicants making a single application had a longer average building interval than any other group of applicants (Table 4.5) which confirms the impression given by Table 4.4 that building applicants were not a homogeneous set of people but that the activity of the applicants with the least activity was not identical to that of more active applicants. Building activity was

on a small scale but even within this small scale activity there were contrasts so it cannot be assumed from the presence of small scale activity that all building was by jobbing builders.

Table 4.5 Comparison of building intervals, Durham M.B., 1859 to 1899, by activity of applicant

<u>Applications/ Applicant</u>	<u>Total</u>	(months)			<u>Cumulative Average</u>
		<u>Range</u>	<u>Average</u>		
1	55	3 - 137	13.26		13.26
2	42	4 - 32	10.00		11.38
3	33	1 - 49	10.91		11.26
4	4	1 - 17	8.50		11.18
5	31	4 - 228	19.10		12.63
6	4	2 - 29	11.50		12.61
7	15	3 - 18	8.07		12.25
8	6	5 - 16	10.67		12.20
9	7	8 - 56	18.71		12.42
10	4	6 - 9	7.25		12.32
12	6	1 - 41	11.80		12.31
13	13	13 - 40	18.31		12.66
19	3	8 - 16	13.00		12.89

Within each year there was a seasonal rhythm in the number of applications made with a sharp peak in applications occurring in Spring followed by a steady decline towards a Winter nadir (Table 4.6). Such seasonality is typical for building in the nineteenth century and has been illustrated at Merthyr Tydfil by Richards (1956:160). Those applications which were submitted in January were not taking advantage of low bank rates since in the period January 1850 to December 1899 83.93% of all applications

were made when the bank rate was below 5% but amongst the January applications 63.83% were submitted when the bank rate was so low.

Table 4.6 Distribution of building applications for Durham M.B. by month, January 1850 to December 1899, inclusive

Month	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Total	46	72	107	140	120	104	122	96	84	83	63	66

The time it took buildings to be completed was lengthened by two months if the building interval included the months of December and January. Over the period 1859 to 1899, for which there are building completion certificates, buildings which were completed within ten months excluding December and January had an average building interval of 5.30 months and a minimum of one month while buildings which were completed within ten months including December and January had an average building interval of 7.36 months and a minimum of three months (Table 4.7). There was no difference in building intervals for buildings completed within ten months between applicants making a single application and those making ten or more.

Table 4.7 Building intervals for buildings completed within ten months, Durham M.B., 1859 to 1899

	Total Buildings	months		Applications/ Applicant	
		Average	Range	1	10 and over
Including Jan.& Dec.	69	7.36	3-10	8.00	8.00
Excluding Jan.& Dec.	56	5.30	1-10	5.79	5.67
Total	125	6.44	1-10	30	9

Dyos and Reeder have stressed the mortgage deed as the means by which investment was channelled into building (1973:379) while Gaskell, from a study of Northern industrial towns has pointed out the importance of building societies (1972:65) which stemmed from ideas of self-help rather than speculation. In addition there were the Freehold Land societies which swung from franchise extension aims to act as building clubs (Chapman & Bartlett 1971:240) and, after 1862, the Co-operative Societies which first leased houses to members later advanced mortgages (Gaskell 1971:6, Readshaw 1910:194).

Detail as to the channelling of investment into building through solicitors remains obscure in the case of Durham City but more is known of the local building societies. Five building societies are known to have been operating in Durham City in the 1840's and 1850's. The earliest four were terminating societies with shares of either £100 or £120 and a subscription of ten shillings per month,⁽²⁷⁾ the fifth, the City and County of Durham Permanent Building Society was a permanent society.⁽²⁸⁾ In addition the Durham press contained advertisements for building societies in other towns in the county.⁽²⁹⁾ Each stated as its objective the provision of investment opportunities for tradesmen.

The addresses in the registers of subscribers to the permanent building society ⁽³⁰⁾ indicate a membership which was local to, but not confined within the City. In the financial year 1866 to 1867 32 members had addresses within the City, 89 had addresses within the rest of the

county and one had a Newcastle address.⁽³¹⁾ This membership reached a peak in 1876, at the peak of the building boom, whereas between April 1866 and March 1867 there were 122 subscribers. In the same period between 1876 and 1877 the number had risen to 205. This rise in membership was not reflected in the 1897 and 1899 boom for in the financial year 1897 to 1898 the membership had fallen to 163.⁽³²⁾ Unfortunately, damage to the ledgers precluded comparison with the membership figures in 1886 to 1887, 1875 and 1876 and 1896 to 1897, so the investment trend immediately before the sharp booms in building application cannot be elucidated.

The subscribers to the permanent building society were largely distinct from building applicants in the City, and during the 1876 boom the proportion of applicants who were also subscribers actually fell. On the evidence of the full name and addresses of both subscribers and applicants, in 1866 only one out of the 21 applicants was clearly a member of the society and in 1876 only one out of 53 applicants. In all, for the period 1850 to 1880, only ten subscribers appear among the 249 applicants (Appendix 4.3), but this may underestimate the proportion who were subscribers since it takes no account of inheritance or other property transfers between relatives ⁽³³⁾ and was based upon sample years from the building society ledgers since these were damaged.

The local building application cycle in the 1860's and 1870's was mirrored in the number of subscribers to the local permanent building society. Subscriptions were being drawn from the region rather from the City alone but since

the ledgers listing mortgages granted by the society do not appear to be extant it is impossible to comment on the outlay of the society either by year or by location or how far the subscribers were saving for their own mortgages or investing for mortgages to be taken out by others.

Consideration of the process of building in Durham City has not answered questions but has suggested that building should not be viewed only as rapid investment-speculative building. The speed with which buildings were completed varied (Table 4.2) and the applicants were not a unitary group in terms of the speed with which they built (Table 4.5). It is the type of applicant and the relationship between applicants and the building cycle that must now be considered.

5. Building Participants

For convenience of analysis, the building participants will be subdivided into landowners, developers, building applicants, builders and subsequent owners of property, but this organisation does not imply an acceptance of Pritchard's view that there was a growing specialisation into landlord, developer and builder over the nineteenth century (1976 : 69,70). Pritchard's conclusion, based on a study of Leicester, will be evaluated when discussing the role of the developers. Three questions emerge; firstly, who were the people involved in building, since little is known about building construction at the level of the individual participant (Chalkin 1974 : ix), secondly, are conclusions drawn about the role of estates, the structure

of the building trade and the role of developers which have been based upon studies of larger and usually leasehold towns pertinent to a smaller and freehold town and, thirdly, do the actions of the mass of building participants illuminate the timing and strength of the local building cycle?

Landowners

County Durham was, in the landownership returns of 1873 a county of large estates.⁽³⁴⁾ Thompson has indicated, on the basis of these returns, that 28% of the cultivated area of the county was in estates of over 100,000 acres, compared to an English average of 24% (1963 : 32) and a further 37% was contained in estates of between 1,000 and 100,000 acres (1963 : 113,114). Since the mode for English counties was that between 30 and 39% of the cultivated area lay in estates of less than 1,000 acres, Co. Durham can be seen to have been typical for England at this date in its landownership structure.⁽³⁵⁾

Within the townships of the City and suburbs the landownership in the early nineteenth century was dominated by small owners. The tithe awards for the townships of Crossgate, Elvet, Framwellgate, Gilesgate and Magdalene Place, dating from 1838 to 1852⁽³⁶⁾ are the most comprehensive source but are not totally satisfactory since they exclude the urban parishes of St. Nicholas, St. Mary-the-Less, St. Mary-le-Bow and the Castle and Cathedral precincts. They also exclude tithe free houseplots in the townships of Framwellgate and Gilesgate and all the houseplots in Crossgate and Elvet. In Framwellgate, areas which were tithe free by prescription were included but in Elvet such

areas were excluded. The awards indicate that 70.2% of the 7,686 owners had less than ten acres and that 80.0% of the owners had land in a single township. Only 20 owners had more than 50 acres, none owned land in all five townships, and even when Magdalene Place is excluded from the analysis on the basis of its small size, its area being a mere 25 acres, 1 rood and 27 perches,⁽³⁷⁾ only two landowners had land in the remaining four townships.

The local structure of landownership, as indicated by the tithe awards, was, however, similar for that in the county as a whole in 1873 since in terms of area owned the large landowners were dominant (Appendix 4.6). In the five townships only twenty landowners had more than 50 acres of land but these owned at least 82.3% of land included in the tithe awards and a higher proportion when the tithe free land in Elvet township, which was largely Dean and Chapter property, is considered.⁽³⁸⁾ The two largest landowners in the five townships were the coalowner William Russell with 1,221 acres and 35 perches and the Marquis of Londonderry with 898 acres, three roods, one perch. The Bishop of Durham, in right of his see had nearly 89 acres and the Dean and Chapter of Durham over 69 acres. The Dean and Chapter ownership is under recorded in two respects since their tithe free property was not listed and since, by this period they had made over lands to the new University of Durham, founded in 1832⁽³⁹⁾ which itself had over 221 acres in the five townships.

There were few fictional or fiduciary landowners; those holding land in right of their office or in trust

(Denman & Prodano 1972) such as the Bishop of Durham, the University of Durham and the Freemen of the City. They totalled 18 landowners ⁽⁴⁰⁾ but they owned 9.3% of the land area contained in the tithe awards, and this proportion of the land in the townships was not readily available for sale for building or for long term disposal by lease for building. Such fictional or fiduciary owners were legally limited in their use and disposal of property.

Land of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, one such fictional owner, formed a broken rim around the burgage plots of the City and suburbs (Fig. 40). Their estate had been inherited from the pre-Reformation Prior and Convent of Durham ⁽⁴¹⁾ who had acquired property piecemeal as is reflected in the cartularies ⁽⁴²⁾ and as has been described by Lomas (1973). Much of this property was located in Elvet and the Old Borough where they had lordship. Their acquisitions had involved both burgages and inby land, the enclosed lands of the townships which lay in closes between the houseplots and the moorland and which were separated by driftways or cattletracks leading out onto the moors (Fig. 31). In addition the Dean and Chapter had been allocated new enclosures on the moors under the terms of the Parliamentary enclosures. ⁽⁴³⁾ Between the sixteenth century and the late eighteenth century the Dean and Chapter of Durham was limited as to the length of leases it could grant, the longest leases being 21 years, ⁽⁴⁴⁾ These were much shorter than those granted by secular landowners for the purposes of building. A short building

lease was normally between 99 years and 120 years and anything less than forty years, or three lives with the possibility of renewal, was considered too short to make a satisfactory return (Chalkin 1974 : 61,70). The limits on the church, regarding the disposal of its property, were much the same as those on an entailed estate, where the particular landowner was restricted from alienating the property for more than a generation.

Between the sixteenth century and the late eighteenth century the Dean and Chapter town properties did not have their curtilages infilled with newer buildings. The sketch maps of each building as contained in the late eighteenth century Woodifield Survey⁽⁴⁵⁾ indicate buildings merely along the street frontage with outbuildings behind which is in contrast to properties in secular ownership. A backhouse is known in St. Nicholas parish as early as the sixteenth century,⁽⁴⁶⁾ the more extensive yard property off Claypath has been dated to the late eighteenth century,⁽⁴⁷⁾ and even in the more outlying district of Elvet the abuttals contained in the Enclosure Award of 1773 describe some properties which clearly have property to their rear.⁽⁴⁸⁾

Changes in the management of church property came firstly with provisions to redeem the Land Tax⁽⁴⁹⁾ and later with powers to dispose of property for charitable purposes.⁽⁵⁰⁾ Hence in a ring around the town kernel of Durham, in former closes and on former Chapter lands were sited a large number of Durham's institutional

buildings of the County Prison, the County Penitentiary, the Diocesan Training School, later Bede College, the Female Diocesan Training School, later St. Hild's College and the new buildings of Durham School (Fig. 40). In addition the new graveyard on Elvet Hill, serving the Peninsular parishes and extra-parochial places was on Chapter land. (51)

Such a strong relationship between the location of institutions in the town and the Dean and Chapter suggests that their location cannot be explained satisfactorily by the theoretical land value gradient outward from the town centre. The link between land use, population densities and theoretical land values was originally based on case studies in the USA. (Berry and Horton 1970 : 297-9) and has been elaborated using USA urban data (Newling 1966, 1969) but such cities lack the complexities of fictional and fiduciary landownership as are found in certain English towns, including Durham City. Therefore, despite the adoption of the concept of land value gradient in British work and notably Whitehand's on fringe-belt development (1978), it is not accepted as satisfactory for this case study town. Whether it is generally valid has yet to be seen since a study of fictional and fiduciary landownership and its relationship with subsequent land use in a large number of towns has yet to be compiled.

Limitations on the disposal of property were not unique to ecclesiastical estates, as Habukkuk has pointed out in his discussion of the rise on entail which concerned secular estates from the seventeenth century

(1940 : 6-8). Disposal of the Londonderry estate, the major landowner in Gilesgate, was curtailed by the marriage settlement of the heiress Frances Anne Vane-Tempest when she married Charles Stewart, the later Londonderry in 1819 ⁽⁵²⁾ but the estate did make over a small amount of land for institutional purposes. In 1838 lands were made over to the Poor Law Guardians of the Durham Union for the purposes of building a workhouse, ⁽⁵³⁾ and other lands went to the Churchwardens of St. Giles for a graveyard extension ⁽⁵⁴⁾ and to Durham Urban Sanitary District for a hospital. ⁽⁵⁵⁾ Together with the fiduciary and fictional owners the Londonderry estate owned an appreciable proportion of the area in the townships of the city amounting to some 21.0% of the area covered by the tithe awards.

Most of this fifth of the townships never came on the land market for building so the tiny amount of Dean and Chapter land which was built on was exceptional. This amounted to the Somerville estate in Crossgate township which the Chapter themselves contracted for ⁽⁵⁶⁾ and the streets of Sutton Street and Back Sutton Street, in the same township, which were built by a variety of builders. ⁽⁵⁷⁾ The latter had been sold for the purpose of building the Bishop Auckland Branch of the North Eastern Railway and after the railway had been opened in 1857 ⁽⁵⁸⁾ the spare land south of the viaduct was built upon; the railway contractor Mr. Cail ⁽⁵⁹⁾ remaining responsible for the roads and overall layout of the properties. ⁽⁶⁰⁾

How the local land market operated for other land

is largely obscure since there are virtually no documents indicating firstly, the price of land and, secondly, the mechanism of introducing buyer and seller. The advertisements in the 'Durham Advertiser' in each weekly issue between January 1840 and January 1850 showed a total lack of land sale advertisements for the local area although house leases were occasionally displayed.⁽⁶¹⁾ Such a dearth suggests that land transfers were indeed being conducted personally, a mechanism stressed by Thompson (1957 : 38,40), for property was certainly changing hands, as can be seen by comparing the Tithe Award plans with the Ordnance Survey Books of Reference ⁽⁶²⁾ or even the specific fields in a very limited area such as the Avenue (Fig. 39). The sole land sale document which appears extant, a sale of freehold and leasehold land in Sidegate, amongst the Dixon-Johnson papers, ⁽⁶³⁾ indicates that the freehold land cost £318.16s.5d. per acre in 1855. This included unspecified solicitor's fees. A small piece of ground purchased by the Local Board of Health for road widening in 1858 cost £2.16s.0d. per square yard. ⁽⁶⁴⁾

Despite four fifths of the land in the townships, outside the burgage plots, being in the ownership of individuals, who were mainly small landowners, and despite the seasonal common grazings being extinguished by the various Enclosure Acts in the late eighteenth century,⁽⁶⁵⁾ the first half of the nineteenth century did not see much expansion in the built up area of the town. Yet these fifty years saw a population increase of 57.1% from 7,530 in 1801 to 13,188 in 1851 and a housing stock increase of

769 houses or 73.0%. New housing was built in the gardens behind the old streets either as yard property with access by foot as in Chapel Passage off Old Elvet, built in the 1820's⁽⁶⁶⁾ or as street such as Leazes Place off Claypath, built in the same decade.⁽⁶⁷⁾ Property on the main street was rebuilt and the Great North Gate, demolished in 1820 (Gee 1928 : 51) was replaced by Queen's Court. Greenfield sites were developed in the case of Pit Row on Church Street Head, later called Anchorage Terrace, (Fig. 44) and with more outlying colliery housing on Gilesgate Moor, beginning with New Durham in 1836-7 (Fordyce 1857 : 401) (Fig. 45) and at Framwellgate Moor, with villas on Elvet Moor and with the new street of New North Road. The latter, and its townward extension King Street, was built as a turnpike road along the Mill Burn valley between the gardens of Crossgate North row and Allergate to the South and the closes and gardens of Framwellgate and Millburngate to the North, in order to improve access to the town from the North and West. (Fig. 20) Even in the 1840's new streets were still being sited in garden plots off the old streets; Magdalene Street, North of Gilesgate⁽⁶⁸⁾ and Neville Street between Crossgate and New North Road⁽⁶⁹⁾ dating from this period. Other houses were built as encroachments on the streets and two such developments were investigated by the local Improvement Commission, Wardell's Buildings in Allergate being one and Peele's Buildings in Hallgarth Street, now Numbers 21 to 32, being the other.⁽⁷⁰⁾ There was also some building and attempts to build on the Sands, a common

grazing in St. Nicholas' parish (Fig. 20) adjacent to the carpet factory. (71)

It is striking that the last common grazing rights on the closes were extinguished in 1822 when the enclosure of Gilesgate was completed (72) yet so very little was built outside the area of the burgage plots until the second half of the nineteenth century. Unlike Nottingham where the town was encircled by its grazings until 1845 (Hoskins 1955 : 221) there was no such tight legal constraint on the outward expansion of Durham. At the time it was perceived that the town was growing outwards since the Commission inquiring into Municipal Boundaries discovered that the municipal boundary was delimited by the built up area and moved outwards as the built up area increased (73) but such perception of outward growth helps to emphasise the absolute lack of outward^{growth}/previous to the early nineteenth century. Compared to other towns, and not just mushrooming towns such as Manchester, but also more slowly growing towns such as Lincoln, Exeter and Oxford, outward growth of Durham MB. over the whole of the nineteenth century was slight (Fig. 2); over the first half of the nineteenth century it was paltry.

Was infill of the curtilages of the burgage plots in any town a normal precursor to building on the surrounding green fields? At Nottingham this was certainly the case but at Nottingham, as at Cambridge (Lobel 1975 Cambridge : 19), legal constraints prevented development on the town fields. More interesting are the comments by Beresford on Leeds where yard properties and small plots were developed in the

later eighteenth century (1971 : 98-9). Similarly, at Liverpool there was a large eighteenth century population rise and Taylor has shown how yard infill was a phenomenon at that century. He attributed this pattern of development to there having been relatively few landowners (1970 : 70). At Bristol the eighteenth century population increase was contemporary with the development of new suburbs (Lobel & Carus-Wilson 1975 : 22,23) but at Glasgow the outer expansion did not come until the mid-eighteenth century (Kellett 1969 : 11) and at Reading until the early nineteenth century and especially after 1830 (Slade 1969 : fn.7). Hereford (Lobel 1969 Hereford : 10). Gloucester (Lobel 1969 Gloucester : 14) and Caernarvon (Carter 1969 : 7) saw outward expansion in the early nineteenth century in the period when their populations were increasing but at Norwich the increase of population between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries was not reflected in outward expansion and Campbell speculates that it was accommodated by denser building (1975 : 21,19).

It appears that outward expansion either followed the congestion of the burgage curtilages as at Liverpool, or was for villas and only later for cottages as at Leeds (Beresford 1971 : 99, 101), or eventually occurred as the normal mode of building in the nineteenth century despite there being burgage plots still available for building. The freedom of towns to expand over their surrounding fields appears to have been important but so too was the timing and rapidity of population growth. Durham City had an eighteenth century population rise followed by a more rapid

increase in the early nineteenth century (Tables 2.4,2.6) but although these increases were rapid in relative terms the absolute increase was moderate in contrast to towns such as Liverpool, Leeds or Glasgow.

There appears never to have been a great pressure of demand for building land, in contrast to Nottingham, and indeed many developments on greenfield sites took decades to complete and other building proposals were never enacted, such as a scheme on Potter's Bank in Crossgate township.⁽⁷⁴⁾ So despite possible constraint arising out of the proportion of land in fictional or fiduciary ownership, or owned by the Londonderry estate, building does not appear to have been constrained since not even land in individual ownership was developed until the second half of the nineteenth century. There is no evidence, therefore, of landowners influencing the building cycle through constraint of land sales and release of land for building.

Developers

It is clear that in some building developments in Durham City the applicants for the plan to lay out the streets and building plots were not necessarily the same individuals as either the landowner or the applicants for the buildings. Sutton Street, on North Eastern Railway Company land, previously mentioned in connexion with it having been former Dean and Chapter land,⁽⁷⁵⁾ was submitted as a 'block plan' for the street layout by the railway contractor Mr. Cail in 1854⁽⁷⁶⁾ but building plans were submitted by other individuals.⁽⁷⁷⁾ Similarly, but

at a later date, a Mrs. Kipling submitted a plan for two streets on Constitution Hill, Gilesgate, in 1909, but applications for villas were made by a W. Smith and a Mr. Bottomley. (78) Two questions must be asked, the first concerning the nature of the local building development process compared to elsewhere and the second concerning the relationship between the actions of the developers and trends in the local building cycle.

Pritchard has suggested that there was growing specialization during the nineteenth century between landowners, developers and builders, but his conclusions for the specific town of Leicester (1976 : 69,70) do not appear to be borne out in the specific, and again freehold, town of Durham. If the contemporary nineteenth century term, 'estate', may be used for each area submitted as a 'block plan' to the Local Board of Health after August 1849 and later the Urban Sanitary District Council, (79) variety emerges between the estates in the way in which they were submitted as plans. In some the developer was also the building applicant, in others the two were distinct and it appears that the variety between estates in any one decade was as great as any trend over time (Appendix 4.7).

During the 1850's the Palmer family, described as masons and publicans, made all the applications to build on their estate to the west of North Road (80) as did Robert Renny on his estate in Ellis Leazes, Gilesgate (81) but in 1861 the building applicants for the Palmer estate diversified (82) and from 1874 other building applicants submitted plans for Ellis Leazes. (83) In contrast, in

Sidegate, the block plan of 1854⁽⁸⁴⁾ was followed by a great variety of building applicants who did not include the developer and landowner, Francis Dixon Johnson.⁽⁸⁵⁾ Only in 1897 did the Dixon Johnson family make any application to build.⁽⁸⁶⁾ During the 1860's the building applicants for the Cail estate were distinct from the developer and in the 1870's this was again the case. In the same decade Pellaw Leazes, Gilesgate, had both block plan submissions and building plan submissions from Frederick Morgan⁽⁸⁷⁾ and the Durham Co-operative Society developed and built New Street, Mitchell Street, Atherton Street and Co-operative Terrace.⁽⁸⁸⁾ In the 1880's Hugh Race both submitted the block plan and building plans for Wanless Terrace,⁽⁸⁹⁾ and in the next decade Stockton Road was developed by a number of individuals and built by a number of others.⁽⁹⁰⁾ No temporal trend may be distinguished nor a difference by size of estate since the largest were the Cail estate and the Co-operative Society estate and the smallest Wanless Terrace, Constitution Hill and the Palmer estate.

In many cases it is impossible to ascertain whether the developer was also the landowner at the time of the estate's inception. Landownership can only be inferred for estates begun in the 1850's since they follow the only full cadastral survey for the town, the Tithe Survey was made in the previous decade.⁽⁹¹⁾ Unfortunately, the ratebooks do not describe land location in enough detail to utilise their entries,⁽⁹²⁾ so for subsequent decades the inference as to ownership becomes too tenuous. At Leeds, Ward used the Tithe Survey as a base from which to view the morphology of urban growth even into the twentieth century

(1960, 1962) but the object of his analysis was different as he was not concerned with the mechanism of building and the role of landlords in comparison to developers.

Four estates were begun in the 1850's and two, that in Sidegate and that in Ellis Leazes were owned, at the time of the Tithe Survey, by the future developer. (93) The Palmer estate in Framwellgate was owned by a different individual, Thomas Wilkinson (94) but this does not rule out the possibility of a land sale at an intervening date since this occurred in the case of the fourth estate, the Cail estate. (95)

The large landowners were not developers in Durham City itself though in many cases they were developers on other parts of their estates. New Durham, a pit village on Gilesgate Moor, and plans to rebuild property in Gilesgate (96) were the only local building activities of the Londonderry estate although they were developing elsewhere and notably at Seaham Harbour (Hughes 1965, Burgess 1961 : 160-182). Other large landowners in the townships, the Russells and the Salvins (Appendix 4.6), made no applications concerning building at all and neither did either the fictional or fiduciary owners, or landowners such as George Townsend Fox, who were local residents and large landowners in the county as a whole. (97) The same was true of both the local pitowners, Joseph Love, Dixon and Thwaites and, again, the Russells and the Londonderrys and the local industrialists the ironfounder and engineer William Coulson and the carpet manufacturers, the Hendersons.

It must be stressed, however, that the pitowners

Love, Thwaites and Russell were involved in building in other parts of the coalfield. Joseph Love was directly involved in building in Willington, Co. Durham, since he conveyed property in 1847 to the Brayshay family of Durham⁽⁹⁸⁾ then repurchased it in 1858⁽⁹⁹⁾ and conveyed property in 1847 to a Sacriston cokeburner⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ only to lease it from the purchasor.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ He was a lessee, with others including Thwaites, of property on the Russell estate in West Park in Brancepeth, on which was built workmen's houses.⁽¹⁰²⁾ Other papers indicate that Love loaned money to a building society in 1854 for building in Monkwearmouth⁽¹⁰³⁾ and that he was dealing in land in Coxhoe in the 1840's, as an owner of the West Hetton Colliery Company,⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ and at Willington in the 1870's.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾

In some respects, therefore, the City was integrated with the regional economy. The City and County of Durham Permanent Benefit Building Society were mortgaging property elsewhere in the county, since a series of papers relating to Willington are extant for the 1860's⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ with the building contractor also taking out mortgages with three building societies in Newcastle and Sunderland.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ In other respects it was distinct from the surrounding area since its building was not contributed to by industrialists in the region, despite men such as Love and Thwaites being local residents.

Since building plots were taken up slowly, and estates commenced in the 1850's, such as the Cail estate, were still being developed at the end of the century; most estates had a succession of developers submitting

altered block plans. Ellis Leazes was planned by Robert Renny, a cartman, but William Ainsley, a builder and later Brewers and Clark became the developers in 1904 and 1911 respectively. (108) Pellaw Leazes was first submitted by Frederick Morgan in 1875 and was altered by him in 1878 and 1882 but the estate was then added to by E. Ainsley in 1901 and Mrs. Kipling in 1909. (109) Sidegate was originally submitted by Francis Dixon Johnson, the landowner in 1854, but forty years later the developers were G.C. Dixon Johnston in 1897, Plummer and Burrell, architects, in 1897 and R. Barrass in 1900. (110) The smaller estates, Palmers and Providence Row were more quickly completed and did not gain new developers as the years progressed and similarly, the larger Avenue estate kept its original developers, the builder John Forster and the grocer John Brewster Chapman. (111)

The occupations of these developers shows that most were local men and small men. The two exceptions were Hugh Race of Bishop Auckland (112) and Richard Cail the railway contractor. But even Cail had been resident in Durham, he was living in Elvet Villa in 1856 when the Local Board of Health were discussing the layout of the streets (113) though by 1860 he was again resident in Newcastle (114) where he had been a joiner and builder (115) previous to being a railway contractor.

How did the activities of these developers relate to the local building cycle? It is notable that with the one exception, a block plan for Sidegate in 1897, (116) the submission of block plans occurred during slack building

years and not during building booms. During the 1850's block plans were submitted and passed by the Local Board of Health for Ellis Leazes in 1853, Cail's estate and Sidegate in 1854 and Palmer's estate in 1858. But by 1856 the Ordnance Survey plan indicates that building had not commenced on the Cail estate (Fig. 41) and building plan submissions commenced in 1862. (117) In Ellis Leazes the first indication of building is contained in a report on illegal building in 1869 (118) but building in Sidegate was earlier, commencing in 1855. (119)

In later decades building followed the block plans more closely but again the dates for block plans were slack building years. The block plan for Pellaw Leazes was submitted in 1875 (120) just prior to the boom year of 1876 in the town as a whole (Fig. 32) but, surprisingly, building plans were submitted on this particular estate from 1877 (121) and Church Street Head was submitted as a block plan in 1889 and building plans were submitted from 1891. (122) In Providence Row, where the developer also submitted the building plans, building commenced in 1882 in the same year as the block plan was submitted. (123) Building booms, therefore, did not occur immediately after new streets were laid out. Instead the booms took up building sites which were already available and which, in many cases, had been available for some years.

Building Applicants

Building applicants could be either the owner of the projected building or the completed building, or could be the builder in his own right, or could be the

builder on behalf of the owner. All these types of applicant can be illustrated from the Durham City building applications for plans and certificates, but the majority, on the evidence of nominal linkage, were owners (Appendix 4.3) . (124) Studies of nineteenth century building have tended to consider building applicants on two levels; either in the aggregate, in terms of the number of houses built or as individuals. The former is by far the most common approach and can be illustrated by numerous case studies amongst which are Butt's study of Glasgow (1971), Treble's of Liverpool (1971) and Dedman's of Southampton (1977), to name but three, while the study of the activities of Richard Paley in Leeds in the 1820's (Beresford 1974) is a rare case of a detailed examination of an individual builder.

Richards, in discussing the finance of house building in the South Wales coalfield, divided the 'house suppliers' into nine categories; owner occupiers, investors, building clubs, speculative builders, building companies, colliery companies, building societies, local authorities and 'others', but his categories appear to have been intuitive since his evidence only covered a small number of specific examples (1956 : 187-205). Gaskell commented upon the role of both builders and small investors, who in the Pennine towns were often tradesmen (Gaskell 1974 : 15,16) but did not disaggregate the applicants in detail, and though Dingsdale's study of Bolton (1967) did attempt to do this with regard to the scale of activity of each applicant it remains to be seen whether building applicants

divided into sub-groups with different policies as to submitting applications and disposing of property, whether different groups applied in different years and whether the same applicants were applying in building boom years as in periods of slump.

On the evidence of nominal linkage the majority of applicants for plans were private individuals rather than companies or other bodies. The largest single occupation group were those involved in industry, who formed 34.75% of applicants, followed by shopkeepers who formed 11.65% of applicants. Persons in the building trade formed 9.98% of the total (Table 4.8). A large proportion proved impossible to trace as to occupation but this group was swollen by female applicants who were usually referred to in the records by their surname and title alone and who therefore proved difficult to identify (Appendix 4.3). Most applicants were referred to by name alone except in cases of common local names when the address of the applicant was also stated ⁽¹²⁵⁾ and in a small number of cases where an address outside the town was given. ⁽¹²⁶⁾ From this it can be inferred that the majority of applicants were local residents who were known to the local authority since there never appears to have been any problem of ambiguity to the local authority arising from the practice of merely noting the name of the applicant.

Table 4.8 Occupations of building plan applicants
Durham MB., 1850 to 1915

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
Untraceable	191	35.31
Industrial	188	34.75
Shopkeepers	63	11.65
Building	54	9.98
Innkeeping	27	4.99
Gentry & Professional	18	3.33
	<u>541</u>	<u>100.01</u>

Table 4.1 illustrates how the scale of activity of each builder was small and as such was comparable to the scale of activity of builders in London (Dyos 1968), or Manchester and Bradford, where Gaskell estimates that 68% and 88% of builders, respectively, in the 1860's and 1870's only built on one site (1974 : 16-17). Applications tended to contain small numbers of dwellings and again this scale of application was similar to other towns. In Leicester Pritchard found that in the sample year of 1870 75.2% of applications contained four dwellings or less and quoted a study by Potts on Leicester for the years 1850 to 1900 that 70% of applications were for less than five dwellings (Pritchard 1976 : 39). At Durham, for the years 1850 to 1915, the proportion was similar since 73.7% of applications contained less than five dwellings (Table 4.9).

Only a small role was played in house building by applicants who were not private individuals. The largest such applicant, the Durham Co-operative Society was active

Table 4.9 Number of dwellings included in each building application, Durham MB., 1850 to 1915, by decade

		Dwellings/Application						
Decade	nk*	1	2	3	4	5	5+	average
1850-9	34	65	10	4	2	1	3	1.86
1860-9	5	105	33	3	5	1	3	1.49
1870-9	10	123	34	12	20	2	25	2.85
1880-9	1	55	7	2	4	3	3	2.20
1890-9	1	36	15	6	8	2	16	6.42
1900-9	5	42	24	11	6	3	9	3.67
1910-15	0	17	5	2	2	1	7	4.62

* Applications which lacked details, number of dwelling not known

from the 1870's since before this date, like other co-operative societies, it had had uncertain property rights. From 1862 co-operative societies could legally hold dwellings and lease them to members and from 1871 they could buy and sell dwellings and own more than one acre of land (Gaskell 1971 : 6). By 1907 Readshaw estimated that 413 societies had taken advantage of their right to build houses (1910); Durham Co-operative Society having the modest tenancy of property in Claypath⁽¹²⁷⁾ and by 1870, six houses in that street⁽¹²⁸⁾ but going on to build in Castle Chare,⁽¹²⁹⁾ Atherton Street,⁽¹³⁰⁾ Atherton Street East,⁽¹³¹⁾ New Street,⁽¹³²⁾ and Allergate Terrace⁽¹³³⁾ amounting in all to 121 dwellings. The houses were unspectacular in design being tunnel back terrace housing; those in Castle Chare had front gardens⁽¹³⁴⁾ but the rest fronted the street, those in Atherton Street had upper bay windows while

those in Allergate Terrace were Tyneside flats.

Philanthropic bodies were scarcely active. The Bishop of Durham rebuilt the almshouses on Palace Green in order to replace the seventeenth century almshouses, used by the University as lecture rooms. (135) Durham Mendicity Society contributed a single dwelling in Sadler Street (136) and Durham Diocese took no action beyond commenting on the state of housing in the county as a whole in 1909. (137) Local authority housing was built only after the Great War. (138) In London Tarn's work has emphasised the role of philanthropic bodies in advancing the design of working class dwellings (1971, 1973) but this role is totally absent in Durham City.

The Durham Freehold Land Society, as in other boroughs, began as a society to increase the electorate through property ownership (Chapman & Bartlett 1971 : 240) but contracted to the narrower objectives of a building society. From eclectic sources it appears to have acquired two closes on Western Hill in Framwellgate township between 1838 and 1856 (139) and to have laid out uniform sized plots in two streets. The piecemeal nature of the building is illustrated on the Ordnance plans of 1856 and 1896 (Fig. 41), the outcome being a long street of large terraced houses of uniform frontage width in Albert Street and a row of larger terraced houses with gardens facing North Road, whose architectural details varied but whose rateable value was within a relatively small range compared to the town as a whole. In 1919, when these houses first appear in the ratebook, having

been cunningly sited inside the boundary of the Parliamentary Borough but outside the Municipal Borough until the boundary changes of 1904 included them (Fig. 41), the rateable value of the Western Hill area ranged from £5 to £84. Excluding the older Fieldhouse Cottages, the range contracted to between £15 and £84 ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ and the modal rateable value fell between £25 and £29 compared to a modal rateable value for the borough as a whole, at that date, of between £5 and £9. In many respects the traits of these houses were similar to Freehold Land Society houses elsewhere since, as at Birmingham (Chapman & Bartlett 1971 : 243), Didsbury, Manchester (Million 1969 : 130) and Cardiff (Daunton 1977 : 81) they were heterogeneous in design, but on homogeneous plots, and were subsequently occupied by households which may loosely be termed 'middle-class'. At Durham the rateable values of the houses were much lower than at Cardiff where Daunton has suggested their values were upwards of £150 (1977 : 81) but in general the rateable values were higher in Cardiff than in Durham. They were still comparable to Daunton's intuitive suggestion that the rateable values of middle-class houses tended to begin at £20 and those of professionals and merchants to begin at £35 (1977 : 106).

Unlike the surrounding coalfield area where it was usual for coal companies to provide housing, or an allowance in lieu of housing for pit employees (Mess 1928 : 82), the pits immediately adjacent to the town lacked pit housing. The 1850 ratebook ⁽¹⁴¹⁾ indicates that Dixon and Thwaites of Kepier Pit only owned two

dwellings and John Thwaites a further eight dwellings , while at Elvet Pit there was again no pit housing although Thomas Crawford was the middleman for Pit Row. (142) This was similarly the situation in the 1870's, again in contrast to the coalfield as a whole. (143) But on the coalfield in the early nineteenth century the provision of housing appears to have been common but not ubiquitous. (144) Some housing may have been built out of necessity when pits were sunk at some distance to existing settlements; in other cases the pits were adjacent to existing small villages whose housing stock was supplemented by the colliery company, as at Hetton-le-Hole (Sill 1974 : 31-4). Around Durham City the more outlying pits on Gilesgate Moor, Framwellgate Moor and Langley Moor had colliery housing but those closer to the town had no housing of their own; their workforce living in the town itself (Grant 1972 : 51). This situation was not unique since it also occurred at Gateshead (145) and it parallels the provision of agricultural housing which tended to be provided by the employer in the North East, but which was not provided for agricultural labourers living in Durham City itself. (146)

Other large employers were similarly neither building applicants nor subsequent owners of large numbers of houses. The largest single employer at mid-century, the carpet-manufacturing Henderson brothers owned a mere seven dwellings in 1850, including the residence of one brother. (147) By 1860 they owned dwellings in Freeman's Place adjacent to their factory but these were acquired and not built by them. (148) Their workforce was resident

close by in both 1850-1 and 1870-1 but was largely housed in rented, privately owned dwellings (Fig. 46). The North East Railway Company built dwellings adjacent to its stations in Framwellgate and Elvet ⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ and acquired those already built at Gilesgate station. ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ Its largest ventures were in 1876 when it proposed to build 16 houses in John Street and two in Castle Chare but the plans were rejected by the Urban Sanitary Authority. ⁽¹⁵¹⁾ Other employers contributed even fewer applicants, the largest being Durham Gas Company who built nine cottages in Framwellgate between 1903 and 1914, ⁽¹⁵²⁾ the Weardale and Shildon Water Company who built two houses on North Road in 1901 ⁽¹⁵³⁾ and James Seyburn, a coachbuilder, who built the terrace, Seyburn's Buildings, in New Elvet in 1892. ⁽¹⁵⁴⁾

Builders

Amongst the applicants the builders form merely a subgroup (Table 4.8) but a subgroup which was intimately related to the building cycle and for whom evidence is extant as to their employees and the duration of their existence as businesses. In larger towns, London (Dyos 1968 : 658, 660) and Cardiff (Daunton 1974 : 285) there was a trend towards larger building firms over the century, but was this a trend specific to larger towns? What was the structure of the local building industry and, secondly, how did it alter in relation to the building cycle, since Professor Dyos has noted that it was in the London building slump of the 1870's that small firms were eliminated (1968 : 660).

From the 1851 and 1871 enumerators' books it appears that firms were small but that there was a trend to larger firms. But since not all persons listed as being in the construction industry by 'Walker's Directory' of those years ⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ declared employees in the census this comment must remain tentative. Only 12 building employers in 1851 numbered their employees and only 13 in 1871. Amongst these, in 1851, only three employed more than ten men and boys and none employed more than thirty ⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ while in 1871 five employed more than ten men and boys and amongst these three employed more than 50. The largest employer in 1871, Charles Gradon, employed 94 men and ten boys so local scale was much smaller than London where in 1851 57 employed more than 50 men and three of these employed more than 350 men (Dyos 1968 : 652). Numbers of employees may have fluctuated seasonally but as the census was taken in Spring ⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ it seems reasonable, by comparison to the seasonal distribution of building applications (Table 4.6) to accept the employee figures since by the census dates the Winter building lull had passed. A large proportion of the building workforce enumerated in the 1851 census had been born in the county or City of Durham. The workforce totalled 447 of which 32.53% had been born in the town, 15.66% in the county and a further 24.7% in 'Durham' which could indicate either the county or the town. No trace appears of the tramping artisans whose movements have been outlined by Hobsbawm (1964 : 43-4) since the remainder were men with families or boys in families.

Between 1841 and 1871 the number of persons

employed in building construction, Booth's category B2, rose both absolutely and as a proportion of the occupied population (Table 4.10). This trend continued into the early twentieth century since in the 1911 census 741 males over 20 years of age, or 13.84% of the occupied population were engaged in building construction (Table 3.4).

Table 4.10 Workforce in Building Construction,
 Durham City, 1841 to 1871

	1841	1851	1861	1871
Persons in building construction	209	447	582	550
Occupied population	4549	6092	6382	5677
% in building construction	4.59	7.34	9.12	9.69

Sources: HC.PP. 1844 XXV11.1 34-42, 1852-3 LXXXV11.2.792-7,
1863 L111.2. 790-6, 1873 LCC1.1. 534 ff.

In the second half of the nineteenth century there was a decline in the number of building firms listed in 'Walker's' (Table 4.11), an increase in size amongst the largest firms and the end of firms which combined building with another activity. In the 'Walker's Directory' they were described as builders and shopkeepers or publicans, undertakers, surveyors or timber merchants. In 1849 such part-time building firms formed 10.42% of the 48 firms listed in the City, this rose to 12.12% of the 33 firms commencing between 1850 and 1859, fell to 2.78% of the 36 firms commencing between 1860 and 1869 then disappeared from amongst subsequent new firms. (158)

Table 4.11 Building Firms, Durham City, 1850 to 1910

Sample Year	Builders, Joiners & Masons	Slater, Plumbers, Plasterers & Brickmakers
1850	39	17
1860	28	17
1870	31	13
1880	nk.	nk.
1890	22	12
1900	25	12
1910	18	11

nk. = not known

Source : 'Walker's Durham Directory and Almanac'

It must be accepted that to some extent the number of employees in the Durham City building industry was independent of the timing of local building since at least in the case of one builder, George Moody, who operated as a joiner and builder up to 1879 and who was already in business by 1849,⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ the projects undertaken were sited all over England since he specialized in church restoration.⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ But if this can be assumed to be the exception rather than the rule and if it can be assumed that local firms were engaged in local building in the main, did fluctuations in the number of employees precede local, and regional peak building application years? Were the peaks preceded by a build up in confidence amongst building firms as indicated by number of employees?

The peak application year of 1876 differed from those of 1897 and 1899 in that it was preceded by a decline

in the number of employees between 1870 and 1874 (Fig.37). Before the 1897 and 1899 application peak there was an increase in the number of employees from at least 1888 which probably arises from the building peak developing from the mid 1890's in the region as a whole (Kenwood 1961 : 127). (161) Small application peaks in 1858 and the late 1860's coincided with increases in the number of building employees but as a whole the numbers of employees listed in 'Walker's Directory' varied year to year and with the exception of the 1890's no build up in the strength of the building trade antecedent to a building application boom can be postulated.

The number of years each building firm was in operation varied in two respects. Firstly, as Professor Dyos discovered in London, there was a relationship between the building cycle and the life expectancy of firms. But this relationship was not identical to that postulated by Dyos since small London firms tended to have been extinguished by the local 1870's building slump while in Durham City the slack period of the 1850's and 1860's and first decade of the twentieth century saw a high rate of demise among new building firms (Table 4.12). The exception was the slack period of the 1880's when new firms were more persistent. This may again reflect the sign, already noted in the case of building employees, that the 1890's boom was preceded by a slow build up in activity in the region. Firms founded in the 1870's and 1890's, decades which included building application booms, contrasted each other in terms of life expectancy. Those

formed in the 1870's had a high proportion of very short lifespans but a low proportion failing between five and ten years later. Those formed in the 1890's had a high proportion failing within five years and a very high proportion, 85.0%, failing within ten years.

Table 4.12 Duration of Building Firms, Durham City,
1849 to 1909

<u>Period</u>	<u>Total founded</u>	<u>Life span in years</u>	
		<u>Less than 5</u>	<u>Less than 10</u>
		<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
1849	48*	33.33	45.83
1850-9	33	57.58	72.73
1860-9	36	50.00	72.22
1870-9	13	53.85	53.85
1880-9	10	12.50	25.00
1890-9	27	55.00	85.00
1900-9	26	73.69	89.47 +

* In existence in 1849

+ % failed by 1914

Based on Appendix 4.5

The second variation in the lifespan of each firm was that the oldest established firms tended to survive the longest even despite probable underestimation of the lifespan of each firm by treating firms continued by sons as separate firms. In a situation where there was a lack of business records it was impossible to assess how the assets of a firm were transmitted within a family, still less between partners. (162)

Sub-groups amongst the Building Applicants

Conditions for building were not homogeneous, even in this single town, over the decades or over the area of the town. Did the applicants divide between those who applied to build on the remaining open ground in the area of the old town, 'the kernel', (163) and those who applied to build on greenfield sites? Did they divide by decade, and by the booms and slack periods in the local building cycle? Also were the long term aims of the applicants varied, were some building to become landlord of rented property and were others rapidly disposing of the new property?

In the period 1850 to 1915 there was a clear division between applicants concerned with greenfield sites and those concerned with kernel sites. Of the 541 applicants a maximum of 12 made applications concerning both types of area but of these six may or may not have been involved in both since the site was not described in sufficient detail. Occupational groups among the participants did not divide according to type of site except that professional builders were applying more for greenfield sites and shopkeepers and professional men, including gentry and clerics were applying more for kernel sites (Table 4.13).

The more active applicants were more concerned with greenfield sites. Of the 41 applicants who made more than five applications, 21 made applications for greenfield sites, 13 for kernel sites and seven for both types

of area. Those active in the kernel area tended not to be private persons but were the Durham Gas Company, the Dean and Chapter and the University. The exception was Messrs. Henderson, the carpet manufacturers. Five of the remaining nine applicants were only building in specific streets within the kernel area; Chapel Passage, Framwellgate Water-side, Grape Lane, Hallgarth Street, Lumsden's Buildings off Crossgate, Magdalene Street and Neville Street. Another, Joseph Johnson, and later the executors of his will, were building throughout the old town area but were specifically applying to build public houses.

Table 4.13 Building Sites in Building Applications,
Durham MB., 1850 to 1915, in relation to
Occupations of Building Applicants.

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Building Site</u>			
	<u>Kernel</u>	<u>Greenfield</u>	<u>Mixture</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
Building	18	36	-	-
Clerical	3	-	-	-
Gentry	7	6	-	-
Innkeeper	15	10	2	-
Iron Mf.	8	4	1	-
Professional	19	11	1	-
Shopkeeper	58	20	4	1
Other	77	52	3	1
Unknown	96	83	1	4
Total	<u>301</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>

Among the applicants for greenfield sites ten of the 21 large applicants were professional builders, four were entrepreneurs, two were shopkeepers, two could not be

traced and the remaining two were the Durham Co-operative Society and the North Eastern Railway Company. So both among all applicants and the larger applicants the greenfield sites contrasted the kernel in being more the province of professional builders. Kernel sites were being proposed more by private individuals whose activity was limited to a small number of applications while greenfield sites were being proposed to a greater extent by professional builders and those who made a greater number of applications.

Boom year sites were mostly greenfield developments on which some building had already commenced. These were, in 1876, 1897 and 1899, Gilesgate Moor, Sidegate, Castle Chare, Ellis Leazes and the Cail estate. Only Mavin Street, off Hallgarth Street, and Framwellgate Waterside were both kernel sites and new proposals in boom years.

The balance of occupational groups making applications did not shift between building boom years, 1876 and 1897 and other slacker sample years 1866 and 1886 (Table 4.14) except in the importance of professional builders among the applicants in the 1897 boom. This may indicate, despite the small numbers under discussion, firstly, a contrast between the two major booms of 1876 and 1897 to 1899 and, secondly, a growing professionalisation in building.

A characteristic which divided the boom years of 1876 and 1897 from the sample slack year 1886 was that a large proportion of applicants in the boom years only applied in that year. In 1876 45.8% of applicants only proposed building plans in that year, in 1897 41.7% were unique to

that year while in 1886 the proportion was only 16.7%. But in 1866 40.0% of applicants only applied in that year so the contrast between boom years and slack years is not neatly and generally discernable. The boom years and sample slack years were very similar in terms of the proportion of applicants who were untraceable (Table 4.14), and since tracing an individual is an indicator of local residence applicants from elsewhere do not appear to have been any more important in the boom years than in the slack years.

Table 4.14 Occupations of Building Applicants,
Durham MB. for sample years 1866 to 1897

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>1866</u>		<u>1876</u>		<u>1886</u>		<u>1897</u>	
	<u>abs.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>abs.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>abs.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>abs.</u>	<u>%</u>
Gentry & Professional	1	5.00	9	18.75	3	30.00	2	16.67
Building	5	25.00	7	14.58	2	20.00	5	41.67
Innkeepers	2	10.00	2	4.17	0	0.00	2	16.67
Shopkeepers	4	20.00	12	25.00	2	20.00	0	0.00
Other	2	10.00	3	6.25	0.	0.00	0	0.00
Untraceable	6	30.00	15	31.25	3	30.00	3	25.00
Total	20	100.00	48	100.00	10	100.00	12	100.01

Source : Appendix 4.3

Even more characteristic of the boom years 1876, 1897 and 1899 was the large size of applications in terms of the number of dwellings proposed (Table 4.15). Over the period 1850 to 1915 a single dwelling was the modal size of application (Table 4.9) but in the years 1876, 1897 and 1899 the total number of new dwellings proposed was largely made up from applications containing more than five

dwellings, the proportions being 76.1%, 90.2% and 86.9% respectively. In contrast, in 1866 only 23.1% of dwellings proposed were contained in large applications while in 1856 and 1886 there were no large applications. Not only were there more large applications in these boom years but a small number of applicants dominated the number of dwellings proposed since there was a slighter increase in small applications. In 1876 76.1% of dwellings applied for were contributed by 11 applicants, in 1897 the proportion was as high as 90.2% of dwellings being contributed by two applicants and in 1899 87.0% by one applicant. The dominant applicant in 1899 only applied in that year while both the important applicants in 1897 were builders and architects. Richards, investigating building in the South Wales coalfield, suggested that an increasing proportion of dwellings were contributed by large applicants in the period 1850 to 1914 (1956 : 220) but there was no such overall trend in Durham City. Rather this was a characteristic of the years which had a boom in the number of building applications and the contrast was not so much between the 1850's and the turn of the twentieth century as between boom years and slack years.

Table 4.15 Scale of applications, sample building boom and slack years, Durham MB.

Year	nk*	Dwellings/Application					
		1	2	3	4	5	5+
1856	(2)	7	4	-	4	-	-
1866	-	11	4	-	-	5	6
1876	(3)	31	12	12	16	5	242
1886	-	3	4	-	4	-	-
1897	-	6	2	3	-	5	147
1899	-	2	6	3	12	-	153

* nk = not known, number of such applications indicated in brackets.

The applicants varied in their subsequent actions concerning newly constructed dwellings (Appendix 4.3). For the period 1859 to 1895, inclusive, the period for which both building applications and certificates of building completion are extant, only 87 of the 250 participants had an equal number of dwelling applications and certificates but the proportion was higher among participants in the kernel area (Table 4.16).

Table 4.16 Balance between dwelling applications and certificates for each participant, Durham MB., 1859 to 1895 inclusive

Balance of Applications and Certificates

Area	<u>Excess Applications</u>		<u>Equal</u>		<u>Excess Certificates</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
Kernel	66	51.2	52	40.3	11	8.5	129	51.6
Greenfield	64	54.7	35	29.9	18	15.4	117	46.8
Mixture	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.6
Total	134	53.6	87	34.8	29	11.6	250	100.0

Imbalance between the number of dwelling applications and certificates was greater in the case of large applicants on greenfield sites than on kernel sites (Table 4.17).

Table 4.17 Participants with an excess of five or more dwelling applications or certificates, Durham MB., 1859 to 1895 inclusive

		<u>Excess Applications</u>			<u>Excess Certificates</u>	
Area	5+	10+	50+	100+	5+	10+
Kernel	3	1	0	0	0	0
Green field	7	6	1	2	2	1
Mixture	1	2	2	0	0	0

For each participant his actions can be described according to the number of applications made in a decade and the number of dwellings owned at the end of the decade, as shown by the General District Ratebooks.⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ Seven possibilities emerge, that in the decade the participant is not active, or does not build but acquires property, or builds and acquires, or builds and retains what is built, or builds but disposes of part, or builds and disposes of all, or does not build but disposes of property. When the actions of each participant between 1850 and 1915 (Appendix 4.3) are grouped by decade subtle variations emerge (Table 4.18). In the 1850's the low number of building applications was also reflected by a slack property transfer situation while in the 1860's more participants were active in some way and more were retaining dwellings after completion than in the 1870's.

Table 4.18 Building and ownership activity by participants, Durham MB., 1850 to 1879 by decade

<u>Activity</u>	<u>1850-9</u>	<u>1860-9</u>	<u>1870-9</u>
no action	128	88	60
acquiring	43	51	60
building & acquiring	14	24	20
building & owning	8	15	8
building & part disposing	6	12	12
building & disposing	21	35	31
disposing	29	24	58
	249	249	249

Amongst the 45 participants who owned property in all four ratebooks between 1850 and 1880 a similar pattern by decade emerges. In the 1870's no participant was making an application and still owning that property in the subsequent ratebook but again the differences between the decades were subtle (Table 4.19). It was among the applicants making more than five applications that differences by decade were clearer. Between 1850 and 1859 four of the five large applicants were building to sell, in the next decade only two out of ten large applicants were doing so while in the 1870's this was the policy of seven out of the 20 large applicants.

Table 4.19 Building and ownership activity by participants who owned property in the period 1850 to 1880

Activity	<u>1850-9</u>	<u>1860-9</u>	<u>1870-9</u>
no action	8	12	10
acquiring	8	12	11
building & acquiring	5	8	3
building & owning	2	1	0
building & part disposing	2	3	1
building & disposing	5	3	6
disposing	15	6	14

No applicants in 1876 were building and still owning that property in 1880 and of the three applicants only active in that year, two were building and then disposing of all they had built which suggests that they were short term speculators. Two applicants were building and acquiring

more property but one, a grocer, had been acquiring property over at least the previous two decades. In contrast only five of the 13 applicants in 1875 had disposed of these properties by 1880 and in 1865, during a slack building period, one out of 9 applicants built to rent while only two built and had disposed of the dwellings by 1870.

6. Conclusion

Three questions were raised concerning the nature of building in Durham City. Firstly, did the town exhibit a temporal trend in building applications that elsewhere has been termed a 'building cycle', secondly, are inferences made in other studies of late nineteenth century building cycles pertinent to this local study and, thirdly, a question arising from the previous two questions, how far was building investment in the town integrated within the regional and national economies? There is no doubt as to the outcome of the first question since it is clear that there was a local building cycle with two great application booms in 1876 and 1897 and 1899 but the outcome of the other two questions is rather more complex.

The mode of building in the town was much as elsewhere in the same period. In several respects it confirms conclusions from other case studies since the building industry was organised in small firms though there was a tendency for these to become larger and more professional. Also, building applicants were, for the most part, small scale participants (Table 4.1). In other respects conclusions drawn concerning building in Durham City are at variance with assumptions used elsewhere but there is no

reason to suppose that these findings reflect a difference between small towns and large towns. Instead it should be noted that it is a difference in both conclusions arising from analysis and assumptions used for analysis. In Durham City the applicants were not necessarily speculative builders (Table 4.8), they did not necessarily execute all the applications they made (Fig. 36) and the speed with which they acted varied both by decade and according to their activity as applicants (Table 4.4).

Both applicants and developers were, in the main, local residents and with the important exception of Durham Co-operative Society they were private individuals. Their policy varied decade to decade and only one applicant had a consistent policy between 1850 and 1880.⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ In boom decades there were subtle shifts away from building to rent but more important were the shifts to large scale applications by a limited number of participants. The scale of building application in the town was small and the boom years were dominated by a handful of men. Unfortunately these men appear to have left no extant personal papers so, as in aggregate studies of building cycles, the reasoning behind their building applications remains in the realms of inference.

Inferences propounded in other studies of local, regional and national building cycles do not appear to clarify the question as to how the timing of the cycle arose. Coal output, the bank rate, railway investment and population growth all fail to show a clear relationship to the rise and fall in the number of building applications. Yet it cannot

be denied that the local building cycle was synchronous with the regional building cycle outlined by Kenwood (1963) which suggests that building investment in the town was integrated with the regional economy in the second half of the nineteenth century. This was not a simple relationship with investment in coal and railways but then, firstly, the big industrialists of the region were not directly involved in building in the town and, secondly, the few family business papers which are extant, and which relate to the investments of the Love family, show a complex pattern shifting from place to place over the decades.⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ It is important to note that building societies, as one aspect of building finance hint, through their membership and advertisements, at building capital being drawn in and redistributed over the county.

Compared to other towns in the county the growth in the housing stock of Durham City both between 1801 and 1851 and between 1851 and 1901 was poor. Between 1801 and 1851 it lagged behind all but Gateshead and between 1851 and 1901 it lagged behind all but Barnard Castle (Table 4.20).

Table 4.20 Housing stock *growth in nine towns of
Co. Durham 1801 to 1851 and 1851 to 1901

<u>Town</u>	<u>% Growth 1801-51</u>	<u>% Growth 1851-1901</u>
Barnard Castle	123.0	39.0
Bishop Auckland	139.0	61.0
Chester-le-Street	76.0	397.0
Darlington	131.0	343.0
Durham City	73.0	48.0
Gateshead	68.0	308.0
Hartlepool **	550.0	160.0
Stockton	295.0	375.0
Sunderland	173.0	260.0

* Inhabited and uninhabited houses ** Excluding West
Hartlepool

Sources : Printed census volumes 1801, 1851, 1901

At Durham City it was the small industrialists and shopkeepers who were the main applicants, it was local men who were applicants and developers and it was the land of small landowners which was developed as greenfield building sites. The local large landowners were active in building elsewhere on their estates and large industrialists, if resident like Joseph Love, were investing elsewhere. It may be inferred, from the synchronous nature of the local building cycle, that there were links in capital investment between the town and the rest of North East England but it appears that such links must have been through small scale investors. Compared to the rest of the Northern coalfield area in the second half of the nineteenth century Durham City appears to have been an investment backwater.

1. Lewis comments that Weber (1955) compiled data for 34 towns, Richards (1956) for 32 towns in South Wales, Lewis himself had collected data for 39 towns in the Manchester conurbation, Kenwood for 51 local authorities in North East England (1962, 1963) and Saul for over 100 authorities (1962) (Lewis 1965 : 301-2).
2. DDPD.SR.D.City Vols. 158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 177, 178 & 179.
Boxes 43/3, 43/5, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51/1, 51/2
Bylund Lodge, undeposited Building Registers 1900-1909, 1909-1927
All tables in Chapter 4 are based on these sources unless otherwise stated.
3. DDPD. SR. D.City vols. 137, 140, 142, 148 & 1919 Ratebook (1970 deposit).
4. Neville's Cross appears in Walker's Directory after 1900 Norton (1950) asks a) was the firm local, b) was there a series, c) how was the data collected, d) what was the aim, e) what was the printing lapse, f) when was it revised. I found it to be local, annual, revised annually as to Corporation and lists.
5. It cannot be assumed that these no longer exist but their whereabouts subsequent to local government reorganization is uncertain.
6. DDPD. PK. Sutton Site deposit (1975) temporarily at Prior's Kitchen instead of South Road.
7. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 p.337 1 Dec. 1880, p. 344 5 Jan 1881. vol. 165 p.82 3 March 1886.
8. Walker's Directory does indicate some sites vacant. In addition the sequence of names indicates infill of the terraces despite the streets not being numbered in the early years.
9. In Walker's Directory all Gilesgate Moor appears in 1888 despite it having been built over a number of decades (Fig. 45) and Neville's Cross appears between 1900 and 1905.
10. Printed census volumes 1861, 1871 and 1881.
11. 1851 Census. Forms and Instructions p.34
Comments on this are made by Lucas (1958)
12. 1831 Census vol. 1 p.246 fn. case of St. Stephen, Herts.
where each tenement was returned as a house.
- 13a. A typical view is given by PP. 1908 cvii Board of Trade. Cost of Living of the Working Classes p.xx "There is little in common between working-class houses in Scotland and those in England". In England typically a cottage of 3,4 or 5 rooms, in Scotland a flat of 1,2 or 3 rooms.

- 13b. DDPD. PK. Mag. Rep., Cart. II and Cart. IV.
14. See Fig. 29. The Cathedrals Act of 1840, 3 & 4 Vic. cap. cxiii altered the management of the estates but some changes had come earlier. Miss M. McCollum has noted the activities of Bishop Barrington at the beginning of the century. The statute 41 Geo. III cap. cxx. An Act for the Establishment of Schools for the Education of Poor Children, in the County Palatine of Durham, 1801, is one aspect of this movement.
15. Sources as in fn. 2 supra.
16. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 134 p.320, loan 1855 to be paid back by 1875.
17. Parson W. and White W. (1827) vol. 1 p.184.
18. Walker's 1862 p.27.
19. Walker's 1852 p.33.
20. D.CRO. D.Adv. Fri 12 March 1841 no. 1384 p.3 col. 2. Parson & White vol. 1 1827 p.178.
21. Parson & White 1827 vol. 1 p.177.
22. 5% is important since Tarn indicates that even philanthropic bodies expected a 5% return on their investments (1973).
23. DDPD. SR. D.City vols. 162, 163, 164, 165.
24. DDPD. SR. D.City Boxes 48, 51/2, vols. 178, 179 form duplicates to volumes 162, 163 and 164.
25. Printed census volumes 1851, 1911.
26. Where one application resulted in more than one certificate each certificate was counted as a separate entry so the data is not synonymous with the number of dwellings.
27. D. CRO. D.Adv. Fri Jan 22 1841 no. 1377 p.1 col. 1 'Durham Friendly Building Society', reference to earlier societies.
Fri Jan 6 1843 no. 1479 p.1 col. 1 'Borough of Durham Building Society'
Fri March 13 1846 no. 1645 p.3 col. 4 'Durham Equitable Building Society'.
28. D.CRO. D.Adv. Fri March 28 1851 no. 1908 p.1 col. 1.
29. D.CRO. D.Adv. Fri Feb. 10 1843 no. 1484 p 1. col.2 'Darlington Building Society'
Interlinks are also shown by the papers of a Willington building contractor among the Ferens collection, deposited by a firm of Durham solicitors.
DDPD. SR. Ferens

<u>Catalogue No.</u>	<u>Building Society</u>	<u>Place of Society</u>	<u>Address of Solicitor</u>
SGD 51/33	10th Universal Benefit	Sunderland	Sunderland
SGD 51/34	City & Co. of Durham Permanent	Durham	Durham
SGD 51/35	Alliance Benefit	Newcastle	Newcastle
SGD 51/36	City & Co. of Durham Permanent	Durham	Durham
SGD 51/37	" "	Durham	Durham
SGD 51/38	16th Universal Benefit	Sunderland	Sunderland

All concerning property in Willington, Co.Durham.

30. D.CRO. D/DCB Subscription Book No. 4, Subscription Book 1875-1882 f. 9r. ff., Ledger 1868-89.

31. D.CRO.D/DCB Subscription Book No.4.

32. The same inferences were made for Nominal Linkage as in Appendix 4.1. The analysis was based on surname, Christian name and address.

33. Excluded from the total are the following cases which may indicate intricate family arrangements.

Applicants 1876

Membership 1876-7

Mrs.Jane Wardropper
58 Gilesgate

Three Wardroppers, none called
58 Gilesgate Jane,

John Oswald
93a Gilesgate

Robert Oswald
Claypath

Sources : DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 UDC. Minutes
D. CRO. D/DCB City and County of Durham Building
Society. Subscription Book 1875-1882.

34. HC. PP. 1873 Return of Owners of Lands and Heritages Thompson (1963 : 113, 114, 117) quoting the Parliamentary returns and Sanford and Townsend, 1865, gives the ownership of the cultivated area of Co. Durham as :-

28% in estates	100,000 acres +
24%	1,000- 100,000 acres
13%	300 - 1,000 acres
35%	less than 300 acres

35. % of cultivated area in each county owner in estates of less than 1,000 acres

- 0 - 10% Rutland, Northumberland
- 10 - 20 Dorset, Hampshire, Norfolk, Wiltshire
- 20 - 30 Berks., Bucks., Cheshire, Derbys., Heres., Herts., Hunts., Notts., N.hants., Oxfords., Salop, Staffs., Sussex.
- 30 - 40 Beds. Cornwall, Devon, Co. Durham, Essex, Glos., Kent, Lancs., Leics., Lincs., Somerset, Suffolk, Warwicks, Worcs.
- 40 - 50 Cumberland, Surrey, Westmorland.
- 50 - 60 Cambs., Yorks.

Source : Thompson 1963.

36. DDPD. SR. DR. Crossgate Tithe 28 Dec. 1838
 Elvet Tithe 31 Dec. 1838
 Framwellgate Tithe 25 June 1839
 St. Giles Tithe 14 March 1846
 Magdalen Close Tithe 30 July 1852

37. DDPD. SR. DR. Magdalene Place, Tithe Award 1852.

38. DDPD. SR. DR. Elvet Tithe Award 1838, DDPD. SR. HC. Miscell. 15 Plans of farms belonging to the Deanery of Durham. This is very similar to DDPD. SR. Mawson 7/3. DDPD. Pk. D. & C.D. Plan of Corps Lands in Elvet and Crossgate, 1839-1841, DDPD. PK. D.& CD.Church Comm. 13665/5 'Plan of the Township of Shincliffe...' by T. Mowbray 1793. See also Fig. 29.

39. Sources as fn. 36, supra. Also University of Durham, Surveyor's Department, University Terrier.

40. Using the terms 'fictional' and 'fiduciary' as used by Denman and Prodano (1972) these were:-

3 executors of Wills	1 Freemen of the City of Durham
1 trustees	1 Durham Corporation
8 church officials	1 University of Durham
the Bishop	1 Durham Paving Commission
the Dean & Chapter	1 Guardians of the Poor,
rectors	Durham Union
a perpetual curate	1 Railway company
churchwardens	

41. Willis (1727 : 222-234) Patent 33 Hen VIII 1541
PRO SC 11-987 Valor of the Property of the Church of
Durham DDPD. PK. copy. Surtees Soc. 143 pp. 15-17.
Valor Ecclesiasticus vol. V London 1825 p.301
D. Markham The Dean and Chapter of Durham, paper to
Durham County Local History Society 16 March 1976.
42. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Mag. Rep., Cart II, Cart. IV.
43. DDPD. SR. HC. Framwellgate Enclosure, Crossgate Enclosure
Award, DDPD. PK. D. & CD. Register 51 ff 1-69, copy of
Gilesgate Enclosure Award, DDPD. SR, Elvet Enclosure
Award, DDPD. PK.
44. Mr. P. Mussett, Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic,
Durham, MSS 'Stall Estates' and 'Notes on the system of
Church leases in the post-Reformation period (1974)
Also Marcombe (1973 : 141) comment.
45. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Woodfield Survey vol. 1 & 2 Dating
is difficult since there are two series but the dates
of the leases and dates of sale point to the very end
of the 18th century.
46. DDPD. SR. D. Probate Jhone Buckle 1584 No. 15, fletcher,
St. Nicholas, will includes "a stephouse on the backside".
47. D.S.St. 720/L Provisional List of Buildings of Architectural
or Historic Interest. July 1947. Revised Feb. 1949.
48. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Elvet Enclosure, 1773.
49. Mr. P. Mussell, Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic,
Durham, MS. referring to 1798 scheme 38 Geo. III c. 60.
50. For example 14 & 15 Vic. cap. 23 An Act to amend the Acts
for the granting of sites for schools.
51. See Fig. 29. They also presented land to St. Margaret's as
a graveyard extension, D.CRO. D. Adv. Fri. 26 April
1844 no. 1547 p.2 col. 7. Dean & Chapter Minutes.
Transcripts vol. III p.962, 28th Sept. 1843 also records
this and an addition to St. Oswald's graveyard.
52. D.CRO. The Londonderry Papers (1969) pp. 4, 5, 84, The
Dictionary of National Biography vol. xviii p. 1167.
53. D.CRO.D/Lo/E 145.
54. Fordyce 1857 vol. 1 p.208, Walker's 1859 p.29.
55. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 43/5 p.227, 24th July 1895, D.CRO.
M1/41 D. Adv. Fri. Nov 7, 1884 no. 3838 p.7 col. 6.
56. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Tender, John Carrick, Waddington Street
to T. Gradon ... 18th July 1892, & Bill of Quantities,
July 1892.
57. See Appendix 4.7.

58. Boyle (1892) pp.81 ff., Gee (1928) p.4.
In 1853 Rev. William C. King wrote to the LBH in connexion with the state of a footpath on his land between Castle Chare and Crossgate Head. He reminded the board that "The York, Newcastle and Berwick Railway has for nearly three years kept me under notice to sell the property ..." DDPD. SR. D.City Box 45 16 Feb. 1853.
59. Not all the land was built upon. The North Eastern Railway Co. was the owner of Paradise Gardens, South of Claypath (Fig. 20) in 1860, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 140 p. 121r.
60. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.524-5, 1 Aug. 1860, vol. 161 p.168. Hence when the builder James Sutton encroached on the highway the LBH.wrote to Mr. Cail.
61. D. CRO.D.Adv. January 1840 to January 1850, weekly.
62. DDPD. SR. HC. Book of Reference, First edition 25" OS. No. 5 Easington Ward.
63. DDPD. SR. Dixon - Johnson 7/4. Sale of land by John Spink. 1855. This is £0.07/sq. yard which is cheaper than land in closes in Nottingham in the 1760's (Chalkin 1974 : 141)
Durham was a freehold town, as was much of the county HC PP. 1889 xv : 8.
64. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 1 Dec. 1858 pp. 450-1
There are few examples from other towns of freehold land values but Chalkin (1974 : 143) cites land at Portsea in 1806 at 6/2½d per sq. yard. The Durham figure is so high as to be suspect as a figure incorporating both the inconvenience of the property owner and the anxiety of the Local Board of Health to widen a street while a property was being rebuilt.
65. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Elvet Enclosure 1773.
" D.& C.D. Register 51 ff. 1-69 Crossgate Enclosure, 1770
DDPD. SR. HC. M5 f. 131r ff Framwellgate and Witton Gilbert Enclosure, 1809
" negative copy of PRO. Gilesgate Enclosure, 1817.
66. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35 2/8 1 April 1847 Committee Report on Wesley Chapel Passage. Majority considered it was a public passage and "has been so between 20 and 30 years".
67. Wood's Map of Durham, 1820 gives a 'terminus post quem'.
Copy DDPD. SR. search room.
68. DDPD. SR. vol. 160 12 Nov. 1849. Geo. Moody, builder, forbidden to proceed with building two houses in Magdalene Street. Not listed as a street by F. White & Co. (1847) p.495 See Fig. 20. Described as "lately built" Fordyce 1857 vol. 1 p.355.

69. Listed by F. White & Co. (1847) p.495
Through street by 2 Dec. 1851 DDPD. SR. Box 44, but
not all built Box 44 7 Jan. 1852
70. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.49 2 May 1843, p.51-2
6 June 1843.
71. D.CRO.MB/Du 9-49, Corporation leases.
72. DDPD. SR. negative copy of PRO. Gilesgate 1817. Labelled
'1820'.
73. D.S.St. Local Collection 1831 Local Government Boundary
Commission Report. p.157.
74. D.CRO. D.Co. Adv. Fri April 23 1841 no. 1390 p.1 col. 4.
75. See fn. 58.
76. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 4 Jan. 1854 pp.210-211,
20 Jan 1854 pp.213-214.
77. Appendix 4.7.
78. Bylund Lodge, undeposited Building Register No.224
Oct. 1909, No.232 Dec. 1909, No.236 Feb. 1910.
79. The term 'estate' has no implication of size.
80. Appendix 4.7.
81. Appendix 4.7.
82. Appendix 4.7.
83. Appendix 4.7.
84. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 6 Dec. 1854.
85. Fewster JM. 'Lists of the Dixon-Johnson Papers' DDPD. SR.
1972 cites property in Ryhope, Hamsterley, Lynesack,
West Auckland, Newcastle and Durham.Walker's 1855 p.55
lists him as gentry, resident at Aykley Heads.
86. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 167 p.159.
87. Appendix 4.7.
88. Appendix 4.7.
89. Appendix 4.7.
90. Appendix 4.7.
91. The dates of the tithe surveys ranged from 1838, for
Crossgate, Elvet and Framwellgate, to 1846 for Gilesgate
and 1851 for Magdalene Place DDPD. SR. DR.

92. They give the street but not the exact location. This can only be inferred from known buildings, a method used by Holmes (1973).
93. DDPD. SR. DR. Tithe Framwellgate Nos. 495 to 500 inclusive in schedule
Tithe St. Giles No.2.
94. DDPD. SR. DR. Tithe Framwellgate No. 519
- 95.. DDPD. SR. DR. Tithe Crossgate Nos. 20, 21, 106.
See fn. 58 and Fig. 39.
96. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 p.147, 148, 6th July 1887.
97. HCPP. 1873 Return of Owners of Lands and Heritages (Co. Durham) Total 1,050a.3r.25p.
98. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/28 Conveyance 13 May 1847 through Durham solicitors, Ward & Ward.
99. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/31 Conveyance 23 March 1858, through Durham solicitor, Thompson.
100. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/29 Conveyance 15 Nov. 1849, through Durham solicitor, Story.
101. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/30 Counterpart lease 20 April, 1848, through Durham solicitor, Ward & Story.
102. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/5 22 March 1843.
103. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/24 13 May 1854.
104. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/2 14 May 1842 release by Love
51/3 4 Jan 1849 assignment to Love
105. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/40 7 May 1872.
106. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/32, 34, 36, 37.
See fn. 29.
107. DDPD. SR. Ferens SGD. 51/33, 35, 38. Also see fn. 29.
108. Appendix 4.7.
109. Appendix 4.7.
110. Although the name is spelt both as Dixon Johnson and Dixon Johnston this is the same family.
111. DDPD. PK. Sutton Site deposit (1975) temporarily at Prior's Kitchen instead of South Road. John Brewster Chapman does not appear in Walker's Directory since he was resident outside the municipal boundary. He was, however, on the Corporation in 1869 (Appendix 7.4) and his occupation is known from this and from correspondence with the Durham LBH. from his business address.
DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44 29 May 1852.

112. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 p.456.
113. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.317.
114. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 161. p.168.
115. Richard White 'General Directory' Sheffield, (1847) p.33 lists him as resident in Newcastle at 36, Northumberland Street and 53, Percy Street.
116. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 167 p.193-4.
117. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.597-597b.
118. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 p.301-2.
119. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.285-6.
120. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 p.620b.
Revised vol. 164 p.103 4 July 1877, & p.423 1 March 1882.
121. DDPD. SR. D. City vol. 164 p.100 - four dwellings, rejected by UDC.
122. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 p.274, 276, 348.
123. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 p.456, 461, 462, 471.
124. See fn. 2, supra, for sources. See Appendix 4.1 for notes on nominal linkage.
125. John Forster, builder, was also described as being of North Road. See Appendix 4.1 for name repeats.
126. Between 1850 and 1915 these were:-

Thomas Crone	Belmont Colliery, Mason, D.City Box 44 12 July 1852
Mr. Cail	Newcastle-upon-Tyne, contractor, D.City vol. 162 pp.210-1, 1854
"	Elvet Villa D.City vol. 162 p.317, 1856
"	Newcastle D. City vol. 161 p.168, 1860
Hugh Race	Bishop Auckland D.City vol. 164 p.456, 1882
Thomas Forster	Eden Villa, Giles gate Moor, D.City vol.165 p.160, 1887
127. Walker's Directory. See Chapter 8 fn. 50.
128. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 142.
129. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 p.76 6 Dec. 1876. They already owned the land by the Nov. vol. 164 p.74.
130. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164, Box 43/5/136 25 June 1894,
Bylund Lodge undeposited Building Register No.55 Feb.1903.

131. Bylund Lodge undeposited Building Register No. 107 July 1905, No. 149.
132. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 pp.449, 455, 517, 1892-3, vol. 168 p.230 5 June 1901.
133. Bylund Lodge undeposited Building Register No. 28, Aug. 1901.
134. Gibby and Edis Collections of photographs, access by kind permission Dr. CW.Gibby and the Keeper of Science Books, Durham University.
135. Gee (1928 : 142).
136. Appendix 4.3
137. D.CRO.EP/Ham 31 Report of the Social Services Committee of the Durham Diocesan Conference. Home Life in the County of Durham.
138. The idea was resisted in the 1890's, D.Adv. Fri Aug. 8, 1890, no. 4100 p.7 col. 5 despite the housing of the working class being considered a problem, D. Adv. Fri. Oct.4, 1889, no. 4057 p.7 col. 3
This was a contrast to London.Steffel (1976)
139. DDPD. SR. DR. Framwellgate Tithe 1838, OS 25" survey, 1st ed. 1856 Durham xxvii.1.
140. DDPD. SR. 1919 Ratebook. Surveyor's deposit 1970.
141. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 137 General District Ratebook.
142. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 137, D.CRO.M3/17 & 18 (PRO.HO.107/239) St.Oswald's lle, 1851 census enumerators' books.
143. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 142 General District Ratebook
No coalowner had more than 10 rateable units.
Durham Coal Owners' Association. Wages and Trade Customs, 1874. Newcastle 1875.
144. There is evidence for pit employees paying rent
Atkinson F (1966) p.42
D.CRO. D/X 115/6 An Account of the Sums received for Rents from the Workmen of Pontop Colliery in the year 1824.
HC. PP. 1842 xxvi pp.409 ff. that in the coal district of Co. Durham approximately 1/13 of income spent on rent
But it is clear that it was more usual for housing to be provided
HL. PP. 1842 xx RC. on Employment of Children in Mines pp. 135-6, 145, 149-150, 164.
145. D.CRO.M3/35, 36, 37 (PRO. HO. 107 2402) Gateshead enumerators' books, 1851.

146. Razzell, PE. & Wainwright, RW. (1973) The Victorian Working Class. Selections from letters to the Morning Chronicle. Letters xxiv, xxvi, xxvii, especially pp.60-1.
147. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 137.
148. John Henderson only made a single application between 1850 and 1880. Appendix 4.3.
149. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 p.422 11 Jan. 1871.
150. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 137.
D.CRO. D.Adv. Fri 19 April 1844 no. 1546 p.2 col. 5,
D.CRO.(B.Dur. DCR) The Early Development of the Railways of the City of Durham.
151. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 p.54 7 June 1876.
152. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 168 3 June 1903 p.579.
Bylund Lodge undeposited Building Register No. 312
March 1914.
153. See Appendix 4.3.
154. An Illustrated Account of Durham and District. WT. Pike & Co. Brighton nd. (1894?) pp. 21-3.
DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 p.428 6 April 1892, p.462
Oct. 1892.
155. Walker's had a two part format, listing names under the building trades and names and occupations under the street directory.
156. D.CRO.M3/17 & 18 (PRO. HO. 107/239) 1851 census enumerators' books, M 18/27 to 30 (PRO. RG. 10 4962 to 4968) 1871 census enumerators' books.
- 157 Census dates were March 30/31st 1851, April 7/8th 1861 and April 3/4th 1871. Printed census volumes.
158. Part time building firms, Durham City, 1849 to 1914, by decade

<u>Commencing</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% Part Time</u>
by 1849	48	10.4
1850-9	33	12.1
1860-9	36	2.8
1870-9	13	0
1880-9	10	0
1890-9	27	0
1900-9	26	0
1910-4	4	0

Source : Walker's Durham Directory and Almanac, 1849 to 1914, annual. nb. the census of 1851 also indicates joint occupations.

159. Walker's Durham Directory 1849 to 1914, annual.
160. Walker's Durham Directory 1880 pp.43-4.
161. Unfortunately Walker's changed format and from 1846 to 1849 was alphabetical and from 1875 to 1887 inclusive was alphabetical and a street directory, not a trade directory.
162. John Shepherd was within and was the inheritor of the building concern of Ralph Sanderson. An Illustrated Account of Durham and District. WT. Pike & Co. Brighton nd. (1894?) p.45.
Ralph Sanderson operated from 1863 to 1889 Walker's Directory, annual.
John Shepherd operated from 1891 to 1914 Walker's Directory, annual.
163. Term of Conzen (1960a : 11) See Fig. 20.
164. DDPD. SR. D.City vols. 137, 140, 142, 148.
Then a break in the series until 1919.
165. Appendix 4.3.
166. cf. fns. 98 to 107.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE COMPOSITION OF THE TOWNSCAPE

THE COMPOSITION OF THE TOWNSCAPE

1. Introduction

Durham City was described in the mid-nineteenth century as being an historic city together with cities such as Winchester, Chester, Cambridge, Salisbury, Oxford and York (Kohl 1844). The phrase may have implied an association with historic events and buildings such as cathedrals and castles or it may have involved a perception of different qualities of economy, social life and townscape which contrasted with those to be found in new towns of the nineteenth century or towns undergoing rapid growth. Certainly guide books to Co. Durham in the eighteenth and nineteenth century stress, for Durham City, historic associations and a small group of historic buildings; the castle, the cathedral and the churches, while for other towns they describe the appearance of the streets and local occupations.⁽¹⁾ Most of the town is rarely mentioned both in these guides and in later academic comment, including that by Beresford and St. Joseph (1958 : 183).

It has already been commented in the previous chapter that up to the mid-nineteenth century the majority of new building was conducted on sites within the old town and only later were greenfield sites used and that additions to the housing stock in the nineteenth century were moderate compared to other towns in the county (Table 4.20). Building was being enacted within a framework of pre-existing property ownership patterns and the old town area remained strong in terms of the area extent of the built-up area even in the

early twentieth century (Fig. 2). Three questions emerge; firstly, how old was the townscape in the nineteenth century, secondly, how different was nineteenth century development to that of earlier centuries and, thirdly, how important was the nineteenth century in terms of the housing stock of the town?

In contrast to the approach adopted while examining nineteenth century building the approach to townscape is here to begin with the townscape itself and to use the morphological approach. The quality of the evidence partly dictates this; the townscape being the fullest source of evidence, but partly it is in order to link two contrasting approaches, the economic and the morphological. Too often studies of townscape evolution have concerned periods before the nineteenth century, as do studies in the volumes of the 'Atlas of Historic Towns' (Lobel 1969, 1975) while studies of nineteenth century towns have concentrated on social, political and economic questions, on aggregate building trends or specific types of housing. Studies of nineteenth century towns which do make reference to earlier townscapes, and especially to earlier property ownership units, have tended to use nineteenth century evidence including the Ordnance Survey Plans. Beresford illustrates medieval burgrave plots from such maps (1961, 1967) as do others including Carter, in his study of Aberystwyth (1958) and the studies in the 'Atlas of Historic Towns' (Lobel 1969, 1975). By such use of evidence the question of continuity and change in townscape is confused since the possibility of change even in burgrave plot dimensions is ignored.

What is meant by the term 'townscape'? The townscape must stem from the sum of the character of all buildings, the dimensions of all property units on which buildings may stand or which may be used for other purposes, all streets, and the arrangement of these components; buildings, plots and streets. Carter allows for both objective and subjective appraisals of townscape (1972 : 133) but this analysis will follow Dickinson's view that subjectivity is for the artist and that the geographer aims to be objective (1939 : 2). Fleure stressed relict features such as castles in his classification of towns (1920) and it is such features which are emphasised in descriptions of 'historic towns' but later workers on urban morphology have pointed out that such features may be associated merely with constraint on later development. At Alnwick Conzen pointed out that the town walls were associated with such constraint (1960 : 40) and at Halifax, Nova Scotia, Watson pointed out similar associations with public buildings (1959 : 125). In both cases it may be inferred that the constraint arises through property rights.

The idea of studying an entire townscape is not new and indeed any such study of Durham City must be acknowledged as being indebted to the studies of Professor Conzen. He, on the basis of a number of townscape analysis studies, including Whitby, Alnwick and Newcastle (1958, 1960a, 1960b, 1966, 1968), has evolved a detailed nomenclature for describing townscape. This picks out components and suggests relative degrees of stability between plan elements. On his suggestion the town plan must be divided into an old

'kernel', a term already used, and later 'accretions'. Within the kernel the street plan tends to be the oldest component, then the plots and then the fabric. His work outdates previous work on urban morphology since earlier writers tended to classify townscapes on the basis of a single component, whether physical setting as stressed by Savage (1952) and by Leighley in his study of Baltic towns (1939), or relict features as stressed by Fleure (1920). Earlier writers also tended to assume stability of townplan. This is noticeable in Dickinson's study of East Anglian towns (1934) and in Hope's study of Ludlow (1909) where Conzen himself reinterpreted the townplan in terms of phases of medieval growth (1966, 1968).

When studying the morphology of a settlement urban studies parallel rural studies, despite scale differences. In rural studies the older emphasis was, as in urban studies, on 'cultural dominants'. Scottish settlements were described as the 'ferm-toun', the 'kirk-toun', the 'mill-toun' or the 'castle-toun' (Turner 1968 : 226-9) while by analogy with work on English village morphology they could be described, on the basis of their overall measurement relationships, as having regular or irregular plans, and then according to their shape they could be described as being strung along a street or agglomerated. The case study work of Sheppard on Wheldrake in Yorkshire (1976) and other Yorkshire villages (1974) and the work of Roberts on villages in Co. Durham (1972) and in Northern England (1977) illustrate how classifications of rural settlement types may be made using the analysis of street, plot and building patterns and it is

these methods which will also be used in the urban context of Durham City.

Such methods have been used by a variety of workers on rural settlements including Allerston, working on villages in the Vale of Pickering (1970) and Charnley, investigating some villages in Westmorland (1974). They have also been used in the urban context by others following the example of Conzen. Whitehand and Alauddin have discussed the plans of Scottish burghs (1969), Brooks and Whittington have studied St. Andrews (1977), Laithwaite the fabric of the town of Burford (1973 : 90) and Rodwell, and others, the town plans of Oxfordshire (1975). Yet the question of the character of the townscape of nineteenth century towns and continuity in old towns has been ignored. Davies' study of fabric for towns in South Wales is an exception (1968) but it discusses nineteenth century new towns. Other studies have selected themes of continuity and change. Changes in the land surface have been illustrated from Oxford (Rodwell 1975 : 21), remodelling of older fabric from studies of Chester, Winchelsea and Southampton (Faulkner 1966), King's Lynn (Pantin 1962 - 3a, 1962 - 3b) and Hereford (Tonkin 1964), while from Leeds Ward illustrated the influence of ownership patterns on subsequent urban development (1960). His themes were reiterated at Bradford by Mortimore (1963) and at Hampstead by Thompson (1974 : ix-x).

Evaluating the evidence for continuity and change in the entire townscape of an old town is a major problem.

The danger is of assumed continuity whether the retrogressive approach is used or the retrospective approach. Other writers have stressed the division between these approaches and the difference in aim between their usage (Gulley 1961, Leontief 1963, Baker 1968) but the retrogressive approach may be viewed as a chain of retrospective studies linked in a time series and in Newcomb's terminology both approaches are narrative (1969). Again, it must be stressed, both approaches are biased to perceived continuity.

The dangers of assuming continuity have been brought to light in rural studies. For example, it is necessary to distinguish between the community, the settlement site and the settlement form. That a place is documented by name can no longer justify the projection back in time of its earliest mapped form without supplementary documentary evidence. Settlements are known to have moved their sites as at Maxey, Northamptonshire (Addyman 1964 : 21) or at Longham, Norfolk (Wade-Martins 1975). Others appear to have been replanned, at least in Northern England (Roberts 1971, 1972, Sheppard 1976).

Urban studies have not yet illuminated the dangers of assumed continuity to such an extent. But it is no longer assumed from the evidence of post medieval descriptions that medieval towns were necessarily composed of narrow streets or that they were dirty (Mears 1923 : 21, Burke 1975 : 14). Examples illustrate changes in town plans. The medieval street plan at Winchester imitated the Roman layout without replicating it (Platt 1976 : 20) and, again

in Winchester, two eleventh century rentals show both venvells and property units could alter (Biddle 1976b, 1970b).

Similar changes have been noted in Norwich (Carter 1974).

In the few towns where very detailed evidence is extant the townscape can be built up like a jig-saw puzzle as the work of Salter on Oxford (Pantin 1960-1969), or Urry on Canterbury (1967), illustrates. In the majority of towns where evidence is more eclectic the possibility of change, even in those components which Conzen recognized as relatively stable, must be recognized.

The use of anachronistic evidence for townscape analysis has not been dismissed in the case of Durham City. Ordnance Survey plans are often the earliest evidence for urban property units since the Speed maps of the seventeenth century (Fordham 1929, Skelton 1952) and the Wood maps of the early nineteenth century ⁽²⁾ do not show such details. Tithe plans of the early nineteenth century cover some towns and show property boundaries but vary from town to town and parish to parish within towns. ⁽³⁾ But nineteenth century plans only show a developed medieval plan so are ancillary evidence to cadastral and archaeological evidence even at a fossilized town such as New Winchelsea (Beresford 1967, Chambers 1938). At Durham the Ordnance plans are particularly fine since they include a 10 foot survey of the 1850's ⁽⁴⁾ but these are supplementary to the evidence of property deeds and archaeological findings. The latter two categories of evidence vary in coverage and detail so it is impossible to exclude the possibility of bias towards perceived continuity. But the danger is explicitly recognized and the use of retrogressive analysis is explicitly stated where appropriate.

2. The street plan

Inheritance in the street plan in the mid-nineteenth century

appears to have been strong. There can be no doubt that the street plan recorded on the first edition Ordnance Survey plans of 1856 is essentially that recorded on the earliest extant map of the whole town, the late sixteenth century map by Schwytzer. ⁽⁵⁾ Dobson has suggested that there was change between the 1611 Speed map and the present day in the case of the Market Place which, he argues, was shown as being larger in the seventeenth century (1973 : 38). But, by using fixed points, a method used for rural settlement plan analysis (Charnley 1974), indicated in Figure 15, which are buildings of that period which still stand or which were standing when the first Ordnance Survey plan was compiled such as the corner shop between Silver Street and Sadler Street, and Sir John Duck's house in Silver Street ⁽⁶⁾ it can be concluded that it is the angles portrayed on Speed's map which are distorted (Fig. 15). Price has suggested that this is a feature common to early maps (1955 : 5) so the conclusion that cartographic accuracy has changed is to be preferred to Dobson's conclusion of street frontage movement.

Between the Schwytzer map and the Ordnance plans lie a series of maps of the city, some of which were derived from Schwytzer such as the Speed map of 1611 (Skelton 1952) and others which were independent surveys (Manley 1931, Turner 1954). All show the same main streets though they differ in their portrayal of the back lanes (Fig. 15); the pattern being one of streets radiating out from the

Market Place. Hegge described this arrangement in the early seventeenth century :

"I may liken the form of this Bishopric to the letter Δ and Durham to be a crab; supposing the city for a belly and the suburbs for the claws. " (7)

and his description was copied both later in the seventeenth century (Legg 1904:25)⁽⁸⁾ and in eighteenth century guide-books (Russell 1769). Such image borrowing can be justified since the town did not expand outwards as did towns such as Liverpool (Harley 1970:12-13)(Fig.2).

But what can be inferred concerning the street plan before the late sixteenth century? Only fragments of the town plan are recorded in medieval maps ⁽⁹⁾ and documentation, principally in the form of property deeds, was not concerned with the age or evolution of the street plan. Two modes of inquiry are possible, analogy to other towns, and retrogressive inference.

Medieval Town Planning is not documented for Durham City but it may be inferred from two attributes. Firstly, there is general agreement that it has charters indicating urban status and burgage tenure, (Dodds 1915, Beresford 1967: 430-4, Offler 1968, Beresford & Finberg 1973:41) and, secondly, there are regular elements in the town plan in terms of straight streets which were seen as significant by Beresford (1961:12-13), and plot shapes described in a rural settlement context by Roberts (1972).

Amongst studies of the towns of England it was once orthodoxy to regard founded towns as unusual (Hoskins

1952:488) and 'organic towns' as more usual (Tarn 1963:246, Hiorns 1965:137) but the work of Beresford pointed to the great number of founded towns (1959, 1967) and the orthodox view has swung to regarding the planned town as the norm (Aston & Rowley 1974:97). Even more recently Biddle has argued, from archaeological evidence at Winchester, Lydford and Southampton that not only were there post-Conquest planned towns, as illustrated by Beresford, but that there was a longer tradition going back before the Conquest (1976b:31). Yet not all town plan elements may be seen as planned, since Aston and Rowley allow for later organic growth onto a planned layout and a few towns do appear to have been upgraded small settlements such as Tregaron (Jones 1950).

Regular town plans with straight streets and plots arranged in grids or as a herringbone (Fig. 17) occur all over Western Europe in the context of deliberate town creation (Smith 1967:297). Beresford drew this point by extending his study from England to English parts of Wales and France (1967) but others have illustrated them in Scotland (Whitehand & Alauddin 1969), in the Netherlands (Lambert 1971:140-1, 152), in Portugal (Gaspar 1969:207-214), in Poland, at Cracow (Dziewonski 1943:32), in South Bohemia (Morris 1972:97-101), and in Germany (Dickinson 1945:75, Koebner 1966:67,83) including East Prussia (Conzen 1945). They appear to be analogous to regular plans in founded and refounded rural settlements whether in Germany (Mayhew 1973:50-84), as pointed out by Roberts (1970:242), or in Northern England (Roberts 1972:37), despite scale differences

between rural house plots and urban house plots.

The actual laying out of towns is known in very few cases such as Stratford-upon-Avon (Carus-Wilson 1965) or Rhuddlan and Salisbury (Beresford 1967:37, 506) where there are regular street and plot layouts (Fig. 17). It is only by inference with such cases that the combination of urban charters and a regular layout in other towns is judged to be the outcome of deliberate planning. But since plans with plots either on a grid or on a street, or streets, can be distinguished from irregular plans, as at Tregaron, the inference seems reasonable. In addition plans may be seen to group into related categories, firstly with reference to streets from single street into the expanded forms of multiple street and grid, and secondly with reference to plot-size from the large plots at Gateshead, Co.Durham, described in an early twelfth century charter as a forest vill gaining urban status (Dodds 1915:92) to the smaller ones at Durham and the even smaller plot size at Queenborough, Kent, founded in 1368 (Beresford 1967:457, Beresford 1973:82)(Fig. 17).

Beresford (1967:432-3) shows the foundation of Durham to be obscure but since his work does not emphasise town foundation in the Anglo-Saxon period which Biddle stresses as being part of the same process (1976b.) does the conclusion that Durham was a twelfth century foundation, on the evidence of its first charter, stand? Also, how can the multiple street layout at Durham in the sixteenth century be explained?

The 'crab' street pattern has been described as

the outcome of ribbon development (Dobson 1973:38-9), as a 'bourg and faubourg' either explicitly (Sylvester 1944:68, Conzen 1949:79) or implicitly, by ignoring the suburbs (Aston & Rowley 1974:112), or as the successor to a group of immediately adjacent settlements. Multiple plans, comparable to that at Durham, have been illustrated but not explained for medieval founded towns in Scotland (Whitehand & Alauddin 1969), and illustrated at Nottingham (Butler 1976:46), Coventry (Lancaster 1975), Alnwick (Conzen 1960) and King's Lynn (Hoskins 1972:92-5) in which cases they appear to relate to the existence of more than one lord. At Alnwick, Conzen suggested Canongate to be the creation of Alnwick Abbey (1960:44), while at King's Lynn the bishop was succeeded by the king and at Coventry there was tripartite lordly division between the earl, and prior and the bishop (Fig. 19). Amongst the Beresford and Finberg list of medieval town charters (1973) other immediately adjacent boroughs are apparent. In Devon alone are the Nova Villa and Newton Bushel parts of Newton Abbot, the Kingsbridge and Dodbrooke parts of Kingsbridge (Beresford 1976:406), Totnes with Berry Pomeroy, Lostwithiel with Penkneth and Barnstaple with Newton (Butler 1976:46).

Certainly in the nineteenth century the municipal title of Durham, 'the Borough of Durham and Framwellgate',⁽¹⁰⁾, displayed awareness of a complex urban identity. Butler's analysis accepted a multiple urban form but his explanation offered nothing beyond process-less determinism that suburban growth and the confined peninsula site caused the additions of Elvet and St. Giles (1976:46). This must be

rejected as unhistorical. Instead questions point to the charters listed by Beresford (1967:430-4) and Ballard (1913:91,97,171,192), their relationship to both the area known as Durham City 'sensu stricto' and the areas termed 'suburbs'. One aspect of complexity is raised by Miss Dodds' indication that Elvet and Gilesgate had origins separate to those of Durham City (1915) while another is raised by the fluid state of opinion on pre-Conquest town plans; that some appear to have regular plans while others such as Thetford (Davison 1967) or even the same towns in an earlier period as at Southampton (Burgess 1963) were a loose group of nuclei which later coalesced to form a single town in name and administration.

There is some confusion amongst the charters relating to the City and suburbs of Durham ⁽¹¹⁾ which arises from imprecise dating, loss and forgery, a situation common for the documentation of ecclesiastical boroughs (Trenholme 1927). But despite such problems it is still possible to draw some conclusions concerning the relationship between the charters and the later street plan.

The charters referred to distinct parts of the city and suburbs in the case of Durham City itself, and the suburbs of Elvet, while the administrative structures of the other suburbs suggest that they too were distinct urban entities. For Durham City the earliest charter, by Bishop Pudsey, is undated ⁽¹²⁾ except by the years of his episcopate between 1153 and 1194/5 (Le Neve and Hardy 1854:280-294). Ballard (1913:25) and Beresford and Finberg (1973:105) made no attempt to date it more precisely

but Dodds, for no apparent reason, suggested that it was confirmed by Pope Alexander III in the year 1179 (1915:91) and this date was accepted by Todd for the Pudsey charter itself (1931:186) and by official guides to the town. (13) It is important, however, to note that there is evidence for urban status at Durham prior to this charter. In 1130 the Pipe Rolls, relating to the years between the death of Bishop Flambard in 1128 and the appointment of Bishop Rufus in 1133, show the burgesses to have been excused a fine (Dodds 1915:89, Beresford and Finburg 1973:105) and in the 1140's, again prior to the Pudsey episcopate, Simeon mentions the market place in connexion with a Scottish raid (Dodds 1915:85).

For the suburb of Elvet, to the south east of the City of Durham (Fig.20), a series of forged charters exists which support the rights of the Benedictine Priory of Durham. One purported charter of Bishop St. Calais, bishop between 1080 and 1095/6, contained in the 'Liber Vitae' (Offler 1968:8) (14) mentions

"Eluet, ut ubi XL^{ta} mercatorum domos monachi
ad usum proprium habeant..."

Beresford dates this no closer than the dates of the episcopate (1967:433), but Beresford and Finberg (1973) date this, and other forgeries listed by Offler (1968 21,27), to the years 1188 to 1219. In this they follow Dodds who suggested that they dated from the Priorate of Bertram between 1189 and 1208 (1915:103). The urban status of the suburb is not substantiated by these charters but by independent evidence since it was included in a 1306

royal tax on moveables as a borough together with Sunderland, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Durham Old Borough, Durham St. Giles, Sadberge, Hartlepool, Darlington, Stockton, Barnard Castle and Gateshead (Fraser 1957:81). It had no proper charter, no wall and the holding of a market and fair is undocumented yet it was termed 'The New Borough of Durham' in the middle ages⁽¹⁵⁾, and up to 1793 in the court rolls.⁽¹⁶⁾ Even in the 1831 census the 'Borough of Elvet' was listed.⁽¹⁷⁾

Scammell has argued that the forgeries reflect a desire to make secure an actual twelfth century situation for which there was no formal and written agreement (1956:153) and this view was extended by Offler who suggested that the forgeries may reflect an eleventh century situation (1968). Elvet would appear to be emerging at an early date as a settlement with some form of urban status, and as early as the formal chartering of Durham City.

The Old Borough, to the west of the River Wear (Fig. 20), again lay in an area claimed by Durham Priory (Offler 1968:57,61). Its background is even more shadowy than that of Elvet since its name suggests that it antedates Elvet (Beresford 1967:433) and indeed its chapelry church, a daughter church of St. Oswald's in Elvet, has a Romanesque South arcade (Pevsner 1953:125). Its urban status is only shown by its having a separate jury in 1242-3 (Beresford 1967:433). It appears to have exercised no functions as a borough but it had a court up to 1794.⁽¹⁸⁾

Snape has suggested ⁽¹⁹⁾ that it mirrors Elvet

in that the supposed period of its foundation saw property disagreements between the bishop and the priory. In the early twelfth century there was a struggle between Bishop Flambard and the priory concerning land on the west bank of the Wear and the bishop built Framwellgate Bridge to link Durham City to the West Bank. Half a century later the struggle was between Bishop Pudsey and the priory (Scammell 1956:154), with the bishop building Elvet Bridge to link Durham City on the South East side (Longstaffe 1862-8, Scammell 1956:11).

Gilesgate was termed a 'vicus' and not a borough in a charter of Bishop Pudsey though the same charter granted free burgage⁽²⁰⁾, it had a separate jury in 1242-3 (Beresford 1967:433), and the 1306 tax on moveables listed it as a borough (Fraser 1957:81). The original earlier deeds have been lost but Offler accepts a fourteenth century copy of a notification of Bishop Flambard in 1112 as reliable (1968:64-6). Certainly the settlement was connected to the Hospital of St. Giles which had been founded by Bishop Flambard (Meade 1968:45). Its parish church, originally the hospital church, was Romanesque (Pevsner 1953:124), and the hospital was in existence in the 1140's when it figured in a dispute between Bishop St. Barbara and William Cumin (Barmby 1896:xviii). Bishop Pudsey refounded the hospital and relocated it at Kepier (Scammell 1956:108) and appears to have confirmed the status of Gilesgate (Barmby 1896: xix-xx, Meade 1968:47) so, again, its emergence was, perhaps, slightly earlier than the formal chartering of Durham City.

About the final suburb, Framwellgate, virtually nothing is known. Gee has suggested it was created by Bishop Flambard when he is supposed to have cleared Palace Green on the Peninsula (VCH.iii 1928:11) (Fig.20) but this is a suggestion based on tradition rather than on documentary evidence. In Boldon Book of 1183 it was not mentioned. (21) Either it was not in existence at that date, or it was subsumed under Durham City which was 'at farm' and not described. In the fourteenth century it appears in Bishop Hatfield's Survey, which Greenwell dated to 1377-80 (1871:vii,85-7) but later it was subsumed under the City of Durham. In 1565 Bishop Pilkington's charter incorporated the City of Durham and Framwellgate (22) but it kept a vestige of former independence since in the eighteenth century it had separate officers within the bishop's court for the Borough of Durham. (23)

The status of the Peninsula was also controversial since there had been military tenure for the properties, tenure by 'castle-ward' (Surtees 1840 iv :37) and government under the bishop's constable, not the bishop's bailiff as in the City of Durham. (24) In the nineteenth century Fordyce suggested that the area was within the bishop's manor of Durham (1857 i :219) but Longstaffe disagreed (1858:208) and since in 1706 they did not appear in the mayor's court (Trueman 1858) Longstaffe's view appears verified. But they were connected with the City in terms of grazing rights (25) and in terms of guild jurisdiction. (26)

Certainly the town, later the Municipal Borough

of Durham, has not always been a single town but has been an archipelago of boroughs. The boroughs were not formally defined, they did not necessarily have the charter, market, fair or wall of the classic boroughs but they were recognised as boroughs for the purposes of royal taxation when this was levied during vacancies of the see. Even in the eighteenth century the City and suburbs were divided into different rural deaneries (Willis 1727:276-7); divisions which existed even by the time of the Pope Nicholas taxation of 1291.⁽²⁷⁾ The City and suburbs were also divided into different county wards in the thirteenth century ⁽²⁸⁾ when Bishop Bek created the divisions (Fraser 1957:80). Only in 1829 was a Durham Ward added (Fordyce 1857 i:101) to the existing six coroners' wards (Fraser 1959:467) by which period the suburbs had been submerged in the formally chartered, and later incorporated, borough of Durham.

Two lords emerge as being a critical factor to there having been more than one borough; the bishop and the prior. In 1083 Bishop St. Calais refounded the monastery at Durham as a Benedictine house (Barlow 1950 : xvii) but he does not appear to have divided the patrimony of St. Cuthbert between the bishop, the titular abbot, and the prior (Scammell 1956:154). The emergence of the group of boroughs at Durham, therefore, coincides with the period of dispute over property between 1083 and the settlement made in 1230.

The economic setting behind the formal creation, or recognition, of boroughs was one of economic recovery

following the 'Harrying of the North' in 1069 and Scottish raids. (29) Roberts has suggested that the replanning of rural settlement in the county in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (1970:246) was one outcome of the process of recovery (1972:37) with borough creation being another aspect. This is a reasonable suggestion since, at least according to Beresford, Co. Durham had an abnormally early period of borough chartering compared to England as a whole. In England there was a thirteenth century post-Conquest peak but in Co. Durham, of the eleven boroughs, seven were formally founded between 1086 and 1200, three between 1201 and 1250 and one between 1251 and 1300 (Beresford & Finberg 1973:38).

The early dating of the charters of Co. Durham boroughs may be further emphasised by the recognition that all three boroughs first documented in the period 1201 to 1250 were all first recorded in jury lists, not by charters. One, Sadberge, lay in a separate *wapentake* from the rest of the county and only became a ward of Co. Durham in 1293 (Fraser 1957:80) so its documentation may be different to the rest. Another, the Old Borough of Durham, has already been commented on and the hypothesis proposed that it antedates the New Borough of Elvet, which Beresford and Finberg count as a twelfth century foundation. The dating of both is not necessarily according to their emergence but according to the survival of their documentation.

Compared to lowland counties such as Suffolk or even partly upland counties such as Lancashire or Devon

the boroughs of Co.Durham were widely spaced (Fig. 18). Over the county the average was one borough to 56,000 acres compared to one to 22,000 acres in Devon or an average over England of one borough to 51,000 acres (Beresford & Finberg 1973:41). Yet despite this sparsity nearly half the boroughs in the county were located in the immediate vicinity of Durham City. All but two boroughs were ecclesiastical, which was an abnormally high proportion for any county (Beresford & Finberg 1973:41), the seignorial exceptions being the twelfth century Brus family foundation of Hartlepool, lying in Sadberge which only became a ward of Co.Durham in 1293 (Fraser 1957:80), and the twelfth century Balliol family foundation of Barnard Castle (Beresford & Finberg 1973:105). Amongst the ecclesiastical boroughs, the majority were bishop's boroughs (Dodds 1915, VCH.i 1905:271) with the exceptions of boroughs in the vicinity of Durham City.

The overall low density of boroughs probably reflects the low number of lords in the county, since the clustering appears to reflect abutting lordship areas coinciding with important routeways. The coast was largely devoid of natural harbours except on the River Tyne where lay the bishop's borough of Gateshead and on the Tees where lay the bishop's boroughs of Darlington and Stockton, the port of Hartlepool which was in mesne lordship, and at the mouth of the Wear. Here lay Monk Wearmouth, Bishop Wearmouth and Sunderland. At Durham City the North to South route from Edinburgh to York and London crossed an East to West route from the Wear's mouth to the Pennine

valleys and in the general context of boroughs being strategically placed on routeways (Beresford 1967:110-1,125) and the specific context of proximity to a renown' shrine the possibility of economic gain may have focused quarrels on property division more sharply than elsewhere.

Can it be inferred that the street plan relates to the chartering of boroughs? On the one hand each borough relates to a street or, in Elvet and the Old Borough, a group of streets (Fig. 20), but on the other hand the charters do not describe the laying out of the settlement unlike Stratford-upon-Avon (Carus-Wilson 1965) or Stockport (Tait 1904).

The hypothesis of ribbon development causing the 'crab' form of the streets can be discounted since although the fabric, with the exception of the churches, may appear to date from after the sixteenth century, the interiors are frequently older. (30) The streets both of the City and the suburbs are clearly associated with long thin 'burgage plots' either on both sides of the street or, in the case of Crossgate, just on the South side or, in the case of Allergate, just on the North side (Fig. 25). In contrast Castle Chare and Church Street Head, built along in later centuries, had irregular plots. (31) The 'bourg and faubourg' hypothesis can be discounted since it concentrates on the Peninsula and Durham City to the exclusion of the suburbs. Also the plan cannot be explained by the topography, despite this being stressed by Butler (1976:46), since the town of Warkworth in Northumberland has a similar site but whereas Durham has a multiple plan, Warkworth, with

a single lord, has a single street (Fig.16).

The long thin burgage plots are described in the 'Feodarium' of Durham Priory in 1430 in terms of plots lying in the Northrows or Southrows of streets but since this record appears to have been based on a mid-thirteenth century Feodarium ⁽³²⁾ it is suggested that the plots antedate the mid-thirteenth century. Either they were formed after the chartering of the boroughs, between the mid-twelfth and mid-thirteenth century, or they date from the period of chartering, or they antedate the charters.

The limited amount of excavation in the town makes any conclusion concerning the pre-twelfth century settlement difficult. On the one hand the Anglo-Saxon poem 'de Situ' ⁽³³⁾ stresses the wooded nature of the Peninsula before the monks came in 995 and Simeon of Durham described the site as wooded ⁽³⁴⁾ so the orthodox view was that the Peninsula had been uninhabited before the late tenth century (Wild 1969:81). On the other hand the poem 'de Situ' was eleventh or early twelfth century (Offler 1962) and Offler has pointed out that it was usual for monastic foundations to obscure their origins (1950:259) so the poem and the monkish chronicler were not necessarily strictly accurate. From excavations on North Bailey, it was suggested that a site had been occupied before 995 (Whitworth 1968) but the standard deviation on the radio carbon date of 1010 AD. $\pm$ 90 allows a 68% chance of the deposit being dated to the years 920 to 1100AD. The deposit could date from before or after 995 AD. Similarly

Carver's excavation at a site to the West of Sadler Street suggested that a fence of large oak posts, aligned to the surviving property boundary, dated from 1060 AD. $\pm$ 80 which indicated settlement before 995 AD. (1975:20). This could be so, on the evidence of stratigraphy between different fences on the site, but the dated fence itself had a 68% chance of dating from the period 980 to 1140 AD. or a 95% chance of dating from the period 900 to 1220 AD. In both cases excavation evidence must be judged inconclusive. The aligned fence merely emphasises the obscurity of the period prior to the establishment of the first monastic community and up to the mid-thirteenth century 'Feodarium' but it also suggests that, at least for Durham City, the main features of the plan do indeed date from these centuries.

Morphological analysis of the streets, together with their rows, illuminates this question further. In Elvet there are three main streets; Old Elvet which together with New Elvet formed the Borough of Durham, Hallgarth Street on which stands the hall of Durham Priory and Church Street on which stands St. Oswald's parish church, and which until the nineteenth century was a short road with buildings only on the North side of the church (Fig. 20). The church is pre-Conquest by documentation and by fabric ⁽³⁵⁾ yet is peripheral both to the rural 'Upper Elvet' or 'Elvet Barony' and to 'Elvet Borough' which suggests that the street of Hallgarth Street, with its present layout of plot rows, dates from a different period. Also the graveyard is discordant on the East

side with the 'burgage heads', to use Conzen's term, in Church Street (Fig.23) which suggests that Church Street was also of a different date to the graveyard, and probably a later date. The Borough of Elvet was known as 'Elvethaugh', a name which suggests that it was laid out on the meadows of the existing Elvet,⁽³⁶⁾ a feature common elsewhere (Beresford 1967:133-4), but despite it being associated with Bishop Pudsey's new bridge of Elvet, no street of the borough is aligned to the bridge. The inference is, from retrospective analysis, that it was not absolutely contemporary with that bridge.

Again, in the case of the Old Borough the medieval streets (Appendix 5.2) are out of alignment with Bishop Flambard's bridge of Framwellgate and they fall into three sets; Crossgate and South Street with the Romanesque Chapel of St. Margaret at their junction, Millburngate whose distinctive site will be commented upon later, and Allergate whose plot length suggests that it was a separate unit to the adjacent Crossgate (Fig.25). All were peripheral to the hall of Durham Priory which appears to have stood at the Grove beyond the South end of South Street (Fig. 25). The hall has been located on Crossgate itself⁽³⁷⁾ but Snape suggests that it was at The Grove from two pieces of evidence ⁽³⁸⁾, that the property was in the possession of the Almoner, the Prior obendientary in possession of the borough ⁽³⁹⁾ and that the dovecote and pinfold were located there. ⁽⁴⁰⁾ Between the infield closes of the township of Crossgate led driftways, or cattle tracks, up onto the moors but only some led down

into Crossgate; others, including one known in the nineteenth century as Blind Lane, led towards the Grove (Fig. 25).

It may be suggested, from retrospection, that the regular streets of Crossgate and South Street postdate the Grove, and are contemporary with the chapel but are not contemporary with the bridge, and that Allergate is approximately contemporary since it was mentioned by name between 1170 and 1180. (41)

St. Giles' church has a graveyard which is discordant with Gilesgate South Row (Fig. 23) and since the church was fortified in the 1140's (Barmby 1896:xviii, Thompson 1870) the South row may postdate that decade. The same inference cannot be made concerning the North row since it is of different dimensions and therefore was probably not contemporary to the South row in its laying out. To speculate, the South row may reflect the movement of population from the neighbouring two villas of the twelfth century, Clifton and Caldecote, which later appear to have been depopulated.

Early medieval features are not ruled out, however, since more conclusive evidence for Anglo-Saxon settlement exists in the suburbs than on the Peninsula. Elvet is documented as 'Ælfetee' in the eighth century (42) in connexion with the consecration of a bishop but a ninth century reference to 'Alutthelia' (43), accepted by Whitelock (1955:256), Blunt (1960:9) and Kirby (1962:276) as being Elvet is rejected by Stenton (Blunt 1960:fn.9). In addition, the parish church, St. Oswald's, had pre-Conquest crosses

built into its tower (Greenwell 1896, Cramp 1966). Further out, but within the townships, Finchale, the site of a twelfth century hermitage and a daughter-house of Durham Priory ⁽⁴⁴⁾ had a twelfth century tradition of earlier occupation on the site. In his 'Life of St. Godric' Reginald suggests that Godric came to a deserted spot but that this had been inhabited at an earlier date by Britons.⁽⁴⁵⁾ This could not be verified by modern excavation since pottery from the site lacked suitable analogies with which to date it (Jarrett & Edwards 1961:231). At Maiden Castle, in Elvet township, the hilltop ramparts have not been conclusively dated though Jarrett (1958) inclines to a medieval date rather than to the pre-Roman or sub-Roman periods, but certainly at Old Durham there was a settlement which has been termed a 'villa' (Richmond 1949:64) though this was not necessarily on the same site as the medieval farm (Wright & Gillam 1953).

This medley of excavation reports and other descriptions points to communities being in existence before 995 but not to the form of settlements or, except in the case of St. Oswald's Church which may be assumed to have had continuity of site, even where these communities were living. But Taylor (1974:95), Jones (1961:181), Medd (1962a:23), Bonney (1972:184) and Beresford (1957:27) have argued that the territories used for church purposes may have antedated the Christian period. Moving from the settlement forms to their territories and taking this hypothesis, what do parish boundaries in the vicinity of Durham City show?

On the evidence of both ecclesiastical rights and the shape of nineteenth century parishes, all the parishes of the City and suburbs of Durham appear to have been subdivisions of St. Oswald's and not just Durham as Rodgers has suggested (1972:63). By 1831 of two twelfth century foundations one parochial chapelry, Witton Gilbert, (Scammell 1956:97) was listed separately and one, St. Margaret's, was included in the mother parish ⁽⁴⁶⁾ though it had attempted to assert its independence in the sixteenth century. ⁽⁴⁷⁾ The other parishes were listed separately.

The parish shapes (Fig.21) indicate that St. Giles, St. Nicholas, St. Mary-le-Bow and St. Mary-the-less run as a tongue into St. Oswald's parish. By analogy with work by Hoskins (1972:51) this may indicate that the smaller parishes are later subdivisions but, it may also be argued, the parish boundaries follow the convolute course of the River Wear so the 'tongue' is merely an interfluve. Only by the evidence of ecclesiastical rights is the evidence of morphology verified. In the case of St. Giles' parish the vills of Clifton and Caldecotes were judged to have previously paid tithe to St. Oswald's. ⁽⁴⁸⁾ Could this have been a boundary dispute? This is unlikely since much of the boundary did follow the River Wear or its tributary, the Pellaw Beck, as is described in a 1334 perambulation ⁽⁴⁹⁾ and by the early fourteenth century the land in St. Giles' parish immediately adjacent to the boundary was agricultural land, the 'Southcroft' which in 1334 was described as an orchard. ⁽⁵⁰⁾ Meade has suggested that the two vills were located on the North side of the parish since in 1430 Caldecote was referred to as synonymous with Kepier Grange (1968:45) and Offler similarly

places Caldecotes on the North side (1968:66). This suggests that the rights claimed by St. Oswald's, and upheld, referred to an area in the centre of St. Giles' parish and that indeed St. Giles' had been carved out of St. Oswald's. The date of this division is unrecorded. Meade suggests that the parish was formed when the hospital was refounded by Bishop Pudsey but this hypothesis is unfounded (1970:63).

Within St. Nicholas' parish there was little agricultural land except for the grazings on The Sands (Fig.20). The glebe was a detached vill, Old Durham (Surtees iv:91), which in the fourteenth century and in the 1838 Tithe Survey lay in St. Oswald's parish ⁽⁵¹⁾ though in the 1851 census enumerators' books it was accounted a separate place (Fig.52). The infield closes and the grazings lay in Framwellgate township so lay in St. Oswald's parish ⁽⁵²⁾ and these were shared by the urban parishes of St. Mary-the-less and St. Mary-le-Bow. ⁽⁵³⁾ The thirteenth century foundation of St. Mary Magdalene ^(53a) had an even smaller territory (Thompson 1880) and formed an enclave in St. Giles' parish (Fig.21) while later chapels, St. Helen's on the Bailey, St. Andrew and St. James on Elvet Bridge, St. Thomas on Claypath, at Kepier, Old Durham, Houghall and Frankland ⁽⁵⁴⁾ had no territories. Rodgers has suggested that the absence of townfields within a parish indicates a late creation (1972:63-4). This is the view accepted here with the provision that the lateness is relative since despite these parishes first appearing in the Taxatio of 1291 ⁽⁵⁵⁾ their fabric, or former fabric, suggests eleventh century foundation. ⁽⁵⁶⁾

Was St. Oswald's a minster church? Addleshaw (1954, 1959) saw the English parochial system developing from a loosely territorial minster system but other writers have stressed the relationship between early churches and estates since there was a concept of a church as private property (Stutz 1967). The two views may not conflict in terms of ecclesiastical use of territorial boundaries for Barrow has suggested that minster churches relate to shires (1973:64) and Godfrey suggests a diffusion from dioceses based on kingdoms to minster churches and rural parishes (1969:27).

In the nineteenth century St. Oswald's parish was not unusually large compared to other parishes in the county (Appendix 5.3). In 1831 the average parish size was 9,856 acres, over the county, while St. Oswald's was 2,690 acres (Fig.22). Within the county, however, were extensive upland parishes, Stanhope, Lanchester and Middleton-in-Teesdale, small urban parishes including post-medieval foundations such as Sunderland,⁽⁵⁷⁾ small rural parishes along the Tees Valley and large rural ones such as St. Andrew Auckland of 45,470 acres and Chester-le-Street of 28,130 acres. St.Oswald's parish had been larger and, to raise a hypothesis which cannot be verified, it, like the large lowland parishes (Fig.22), had Anglo-Saxon crosses which, according to Medd, tended to predate churches (1962b:159). St. Andrew's was the church of Aucklandshire (Roberts 1977) but there is not enough documentary evidence to link other churches of large parishes and supposedly early foundation, to the shires of the counties. The question of St. Oswald's being a minster church must

remain unsubstantiated, though possible.

The parish boundaries give little evidence on street layouts unlike Stamford or Nottingham (Rodgers 1972), or Exeter (Hoskins 1968:150) since many follow watercourses; the Wear, the Browney, the Mill Burn, and Pellaw Beck (Fig.21). The exception is Tinkler's Lane, between the parishes of St. Nicholas and St. Giles (Fig. 20) which, by Hoskins' hypothesis antedates the twelfth century, but which by evidence concerning St. Giles' parish is more likely to date from the twelfth century. The parish boundaries on the Peninsula follow the town wall, despite the churches being older than the recorded wall ⁽⁵⁸⁾ or else they follow streets documented from other sources (Appendix 5.2) or else property boundaries. In the large parish of St. Oswald the most interesting boundary highlighting a street is within Elvet township and is Court Lane, forming the division between Elvet Barony and Elvet Borough (Fig.20). This was recorded in the forged eleventh century charters as being the way to Scaltoc, ⁽⁵⁹⁾ a pre-existing track cutting across the alignment of Old Elvet (Fig.20).

An anomaly remains in that 'vills' existed within the townships and are recorded in medieval grants (Appendix 5.4) and as territorial names, without boundaries, on the first edition 25 inch Ordnance Survey plans. By that date most were large houses with an estate, such as Croxdale, Frankland, Crook, Harbour House, Old Durham and Houghall but whether they originated as pre-urban territorial units or as medieval colonisation remains obscure. Butterby and Houghall had moats ⁽⁶⁰⁾ which are often a sign of late colonisation by freemen (Emery 1970) yet Houghall and other vills, Aldingrange,

Old Durham, Earl's House, Broom and Relley are documented in the twelfth century. ⁽⁶¹⁾ It is possible that the surrounding moorland was being colonised in the twelfth century both on the evidence of grants of waste, as at Baxterwood ⁽⁶²⁾ and the documentation of 'Newton' by Durham in Boldon Book. ⁽⁶³⁾ Such grants of moorland were being made into the fourteenth century ⁽⁶⁴⁾ but the later ones did not document a territory, or vill, but were grants of parts of fields or moors, with abuttals carefully stated so may have been the last stages of a process of intake. Some of these 'vills' were manors, as was Crook Hall, adjacent to Framwellgate ⁽⁶⁵⁾, and Old Durham ⁽⁶⁶⁾ but this does not necessarily show them as an early feature. Firstly it is unclear how manors originated (Aston 1958) and secondly, new manors were formed up to the Statute of 'Quia Emptores'. ⁽⁶⁶⁾

Street Plan Evolution may occur even in a planned layout, both as medieval additions and losses and post medieval changes, as Conzen's work has shown (1960, 1968). It has already been suggested that in the main the street plan of mid-nineteenth century Durham Municipal Borough dated from at least the sixteenth century and, by inference, from the eleventh or twelfth century. It has also been suggested that there were detailed changes in Milburngate, in the extension of Church Street and in the development of Castle Chare. The question of nineteenth century change has yet to be broached so, in summary, how significant were the detailed changes in street plan?

It is easier to recognize additions to the plan than losses. Losses there have been but very few, since

Sidegate ⁽⁶⁸⁾ (Fig.20) and some vennels form the total. Medieval additions can only be inferred, firstly by the type of site, and secondly, as will be discussed later, by plot dimensions. The first documentation of street names (Appendix 5.2) does not help to elucidate this question since names are only recorded from the twelfth century.

The City and suburbs are sited in an area where soils are based on deep and diverse glacial drifts (Willimot & Shirlaw 1957-63, Stevens & Atkinson 1970:51) overlying Coal Measures (Fig.55). The drift reaches a maximum of 233 feet at Newton Hall in Framwellgate township (Hindson & Hopkins 1947-8 Pt.III) but even at the site of Elvet Colliery, in Church Street Head, it is 120 feet thick (Woolacott 1905) since it is plugging a buried channel of the River Wear (Johnson 1970:13, Maling 1955:56-7). Unfortunately the nature of the drift deposits under the medieval streets (Appendix 5.2) is not known in full since evidence is based on excavations, pit-shaft sections and other boreholes (Fig.55) and the nature of the original soils, and especially their drainage qualities, are obscured by man-made ground. A thirteenth-century building at the College Gate on the Peninsula now partly lies below the street surface (Fowler 1912), Water Lane in Elvet has risen in level (Carver 1974:124) and behind the town wall on North Bailey made ground at Hatfield College has a depth of 20 feet (Whitworth 1968 Fig.6), a depth exceeded at Kingsgate Bridge where it is closer to 25 feet (Collard 1970:115). Such build-up is common in towns and has been exemplified in Oxford (Anon. 1971) and at York (Hope-Taylor 1971).

Yet it is notable, even bearing in mind the quality of the evidence, that within their townships the streets are sited to take advantage of freely draining soils, and often sloping sites. The lower part of Claypath is on sand (Green 1944) as are parts of North Bailey (Attewell & Taylor 1970, Whitworth 1968), Sadler Street (Anon. 1970a : 160),⁽⁶⁹⁾ and the Market Place (Green 1944). Similarly at the junction of Old Elvet and New Elvet were river sands ⁽⁷⁰⁾ and along New Elvet (Carver 1974). Even though the overall site of the town was hilly many of the medieval streets were so orientated that the slope ran from the burgage head to the burgage foot. Such was the case with both rows of upper Gilesgate and Claypath, with the south side of Claypath draining into Paradise Gardens, ⁽⁷¹⁾ South Street, Crossgate and Allergate (Fig.25) between the Wear, the Mill Burn and West Orchard depression, and Old Elvet. In the case of Old Elvet North row the drop across the sand ridge is only five feet which is hardly discernable on an Ordnance plan, in the other aforesaid streets it was more marked.

Perched water tables fed the wells in the Castle and the College (Fowler 1907, Holmes 1928:325) and the pond on Gilesgate green, drained in the 1850's. ⁽⁷²⁾ In the case of Gilesgate the flat top of the ridge, where lay the pond, was on a wide green, the plots lay on the ridge slopes to the North and South. As in the case of the Peninsula a defensible site was traditionally the motive for its use. ⁽⁷³⁾ More serious, in terms of drainage, are the low lying areas and the areas of heavy clay soil and it is suggested that these were used at a later date than the freely draining sites. Magdalene

Place appeared in the thirteenth century ⁽⁷⁴⁾ as a hospital foundation with a small enclave of territory within St. Giles' Parish (Fig. 52). The soils are heavy (Fig. 55), in the nineteenth century a brickfield was in operation ⁽⁷⁵⁾ and the earliest chapel collapsed on account of the 'terra aquosa' (Barmby 1896:xxxii) and was rebuilt on an adjacent site.

Adjacent to this hospital the street of lower Gilesgate is also situated on heavy clay soil (Fig.55). In the nineteenth century a Chancery Suit into the property of the pre-Reformation Guild of St. Giles discovered that the guild had held 24 burgages in the street of Gilesgate but that only 'Legge's Tenement' remained of the estate (Barmby 1896 : xxxv-xxxvii). This remaining property was the 'Woodman's Inn' in lower Gilesgate. There is no evidence extant of how the original estate was assembled, whether it was a block or scattered through Gilesgate Street; if it was a block, and this is speculation, this could be the origin of lower Gilesgate, as a later addition to upper Gilesgate by the ecclesiastic authorities, Kepier Hospital, who were also the lords.

Millburngate, connecting the other streets of the Prior's Old Borough to the Bishop's Framwellgate across the Mill Burn valley was the lowest lying part of the town in the nineteenth century ⁽⁷⁶⁾ despite a build up in level of at least ten feet ⁽⁷⁷⁾ and five feet over the Mill Burn itself (Anon.1934-6 : 10-12). In the thirteenth century its properties are described as 'placeae'⁽⁷⁸⁾ or 'terrae'⁽⁷⁹⁾ and not burgages, though in the fifteenth century they are

described as burgages.⁽⁸⁰⁾ Does this alteration in terminology indicate the development of a street with plot rows or does it only indicate a change in usage for units of property? In the fifteenth century, general usage throughout the suburbs and City was to use 'tenementum' or 'burgagium' both in charters and in the lists of the Priory property⁽⁸¹⁾ though specialist terms such as 'hortus' also appear. In the thirteenth century some 'placeae', 'terrae' and 'toftae' are documented⁽⁸²⁾ but 'burgagii'⁽⁸³⁾ is by far the most frequent term so Millburngate appears to be exceptional and therefore, it may be suggested, that it was a later addition to the Old Borough, perhaps of the twelfth century.

Vennels were the rights of way which tended to change position and status. A few became built on either side to form streets, a development which had occurred in Grape Lane, behind Crossgate, and Back Lane and Moatside Lane, Durham, before the mid sixteenth century,⁽⁸⁴⁾ but appears to have been more common in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as with Water Lane, Elvet and the vennels off Claypath (Fig. 43).⁽⁸⁵⁾ Others were blocked off, as in Silver Street⁽⁸⁶⁾ and in Crossgate where one was moved and built on.⁽⁸⁷⁾ In the latter case the nineteenth century morphology of the North end of the West row of South Street suggests that this referred to the displacement of the back lane of South Street, now called Grape Lane. It is postulated that this turned out of South Street at its present position, ran North along the 'burgage feet' and then turned and re-entered South Street to the South side of St. Margaret's chapel. Now it bends East and joins the back lane of Crossgate South row before entering

Crossgate (Fig. 25). The vennels appear to have been more mobile than the main streets and to have been treated as property units which could be built on, a point which will be further discussed with reference to property units.

Certain fieldpaths were also built on as streets but these only numbered five in all; Wanless Lane, later Providence Row, Paradise Lane, Castle Chare, Bakehouse Lane and Church Street Head, the latter being part of the turnpike road over Elvet Moor. (88) This turnpike and the one along the Mill Burn valley to Newcastle (89) were the forerunners of the second half of the nineteenth century when new streets were added to the existing street plan. As has been commented on in Chapter Four, the first half of the nineteenth century saw property being built along vennels and in former burgage plots while the second half of the nineteenth century saw property being built on greenfield sites. In each township the late nineteenth century streets are aligned according to the shape of former fields, whether curved closes, as at Atherton Street or Colpitts Terrace (Fig. 41), rectangular closes as in Ellis Leazes and Ravensworth Terrace (Fig. 42) or Boyd Street (Fig. 44), or rectangular Parliamentary enclosure fields as on Gilesgate Moor (Fig. 45). This confirms the morphological analysis done by Wardon Leeds, its nineteenth century building and former fields (1960). Very few streets cut across former field boundaries, except where there were large 'estate' developments in the Avenue (Fig. 39), and Hawthorn Terrace (Fig. 41).

In conclusion the street plan of the mid-nineteenth century was, in the main, a medieval bequest with alterations in the side

streets and by the addition of two new roads by turnpike companies. (90) During the nineteenth century more streets were added by this outward spread was small compared to other towns, including both Exeter and Oxford which were not nineteenth century boom towns (Fig. 2). The medieval streets postdated the existence of local communities and although they contain traces both of older plan elements and of alteration by growth or shrinkage they may, in the main, be dated to the eleventh or twelfth centuries. The later nineteenth century added short individual streets or short streets parallel to others. These were narrower than the medieval streets and their plots were of quite different proportions.

3. Plot Patterns

The Ordnance Survey plans of 1856 indicate 'herring bone' arrangements of property units each side of most older streets or one side in Allergate. Such an arrangement of plots was similar to those of other towns (Fig.17) and existed at least in the fifteenth century when 'rows' were described in Priory records (Appendix 5.1). Since early nineteenth century building was conducted within the medieval town kernel it is imperative to trace the evolution of the property units in which such development took place. This has been neglected in other studies of nineteenth century towns except in those by Conzen and his followers. Even those towns such as Norwich or Exeter which had strong medieval kernels (Fig.2) have been neglected since at Norwich Green and Young's study of the topography is superficial (1972), at Exeter Newton's study was largely social and economic (1966, 1968) and Morgan's (1970) ignored the town kernel. At York Armstrong's study was not morphological (1967, 1974), at Hereford Jones' study had a social emphasis (1956) as did Dyer's of Worcester (1973). Straw's analysis of Nottingham considered the infill of older property units (1967:75-6) but not how these had evolved, and Daunton, commenting on Cardiff was similarly brief (1977:9).

In Beresford's summary of medieval town morphology (1967) and his study of Leeds (1961) he took as illustration for medieval burgrave plots the property units shown on nineteenth century plans without discussing how these plots could change. Yet the question of change is

contentious. Specific archaeological work has indicated that property boundaries could alter. At Lower Brook Street, Winchester, the plots had been amalgamated and mediatised (Wilson & Hurst 1965:194) as they had also been at the Brooks, Winchester, (Anon 1970b), and at Chelmsford (Drury 1973). In other excavations the conclusions reached emphasised stability of property units. The excavations at North Elmham concluded that a proportion of the nineteenth century property boundaries were of ancient origin and that a regular pattern of boundaries dated from the mid-Saxon period (Wade-Martins 1973:24). Palliser has stressed continuity in tenement boundaries, on the evidence of York (1975:9) and this has been the stress of Biddle from the evidence at Shrewsbury, York and Exeter (1974:99). None of these three authors excluded the possibility of changes in boundaries and since evidence is limited as yet; so much urban archaeology being conducted in small holes between the property boundaries. It appears best to begin from Radley's findings from Ousegate, York, that both change and stability are possible (1971:41) and to ask the question how many boundaries are stable and why are some stable and others mobile?

Certainly in Durham City and suburbs mediatisation and amalgamation of plots occurred in the Middle Ages since parts of burgages are recorded. ⁽⁹¹⁾ In the late eighteenth century the Woodfield Survey recorded property boundaries passing through buildings (Fig. 26) and to this day some houses have 'flying freehold' over their neighbours with a property boundary which is neither straight nor vertical. ⁽⁹²⁾

Other burgage plots may have remained intact since in 1904 one burgage on Claypath, belonging to Sherburn Hospital, measured exactly one acre. (93)

There are three possible methods of reconstructing original burgages and assessing change. The first method would be to use plot dimensions given in charters and to compare these to large scale Ordnance plans. This would be possible for a host of towns including Burton-on-Trent, Stratford-upon-Avon (Ballard 1913:51), Salford, Bolton, Stockport, Deganwy, Rathcool, Warton, Wotton-under-Edge (Ballard & Tait 1923:62) or Sherborne, in Dorset, where there were three sizes of burgage plot (Hoskins 1972:90) but it is not possible at Durham where no plot dimensions are given in the charters and where the earliest descriptions of burgage plot size date from the fifteenth century (94) and the appear to be the outcome of mediation and amalgamation since the five recorded widths range from 18 to 48 feet.

The second method would be to reconstruct the history of each plot retrogressively. This might be possible for property in ecclesiastical ownership whether the Prior and Convent, the Churches and Chapels or the guilds but the records of property in secular ownership are far fewer. In addition there are signs in eighteenth century documentation of redefinition of the term 'burgage', that subdivisions and amalgamations themselves could come to be termed as burgage plots, a point to be discussed in more depth later. The third method, and the one adopted here, is to infer change from a hypothetical original burgage plot size.

In order to do this two assumptions must be made, firstly, that there was regularity in the size of the original plots, though the plots were not necessarily the same size in the different suburbs or even within different rows in the same suburb. Therefore a 'land rod' measure will underlie the dimensions of plot widths and lengths, street widths, and row lengths. The second assumption is that even after mediatisation and amalgamation some vestiges of the original layout remain and this seems justified by the description of properties so divided, that they were only described in charters by abuttals. (95) At Winchester Biddle described burgage frontage size in terms of the average (1976a:377) but if amalgamation and mediatisation have occurred, and these are not stressed by Biddle (1974:99), the average plot-size is not so significant as the actual position of property boundaries in sequence along a row since the average will be distorted by half width and double width plots while a sequence will show these as half widths and double widths if each is measured from the beginning of the row and not from its neighbouring plot (Fig.24).

The land rod employed was not necessarily a standard Royal rod of $16\frac{1}{2}$ statute feet. Dilley has pointed out that the acre, and therefore the land rod and the foot could be local (1975) and Sheppard, working on Yorkshire villages, has suggested that a range of local measures had been employed there (1974). In Co. Durham the 'Bishopric Acre' was larger than the statute acre and was based on a 21 foot rod (96) and Roberts has concluded that land rods corresponding to measures of 18, 20 and 21 feet underlay the

dimensions of regular village plans in the county (1972:43). With the exception of the Oxford college perch of 12 feet (Pollock 1896:218) most known local land rods fall between 15 and 30 statute feet so it is to within this range that the 1856 property units are compared. In discussion the term 'foot' will be used to denote a statute foot, while the land rod or perch will be defined. All dimensions will be stated in Imperial measures rather than metric in order to see clearly any regularity in plot dimensions. (Appendix 5.5).

Overall measurements of rows usually showed a clearer pattern than the plot frontage measurements. The East row of the Prior's Borough of Elvet by row length, street width and plot length appeared to be based on a 20 foot rod, the Prior rod (Roberts 1972:43), but this was not without doubt since the row length of 600 feet has other factor numbers (Fig. 24). Hallgarth Street East row, South of the Hallgarth, and the West row, opposite, had row lengths of 440 feet, a street width of between 43 feet and 48 feet and a back lane on the East side of 10 feet. Again, it could be based on a 20 foot land rod (Fig. 24). The row length of South Street East row, of 760 feet, would divide by 16 feet, 19 feet and 20 feet but the line of the burgage feet being stepped suggested by analogy to Staindrop (Roberts 1970:239), that it was a multiple row of adjacent blocks of burgages. These blocks could be divided neatly by 20 foot land rod if 10 foot was allowed at each end for a vennel, the existing vennel at the South end measuring 9 feet in 1856 and that at the North end probably having been taken into burgage plots (Fig.25).

In Elvet East row the nineteenth century property units also appeared to be in blocks. The width and depth of these blocks varied but each in area was approximately 0.25 Durham acres, the Priory acre. Sample areas in the Bishop's boroughs, in Claypath and Gilesgate, again indicated that plots grouped into blocks but that these were parts of statute acres (Fig. 24). These blocks are comparable to the burgage dimensions recorded in the charters of other towns. At Stratford-upon-Avon the burgages were quarter of an acre (Carus-Wilson 1965:57), at Burton-upon-Trent they were half an acre (Ballard 1913:51), at Southampton an acre or half an acre (Platt 1973:46) and at Salford an acre (Ballard & Tait 1923:62). But it must be stressed that the nineteenth century plots in Durham and its suburbs are very small since it is only when these plots are grouped with their neighbours that they are comparable with other towns. The exceptions were scattered burgages which went into ecclesiastical ownership such as an acre plot on Claypath belonging to Sherburn Hospital.⁽⁹⁷⁾

The plots shown on the nineteenth century Ordnance plans show no clear patterns of width. For selected rows each property boundary was measured in terms of the origin, or row end. This was formed by the plot head of another row at right angles in the case of New Elvet. In the case of South Street the origin was taken from each end of the row since there was evidence that an infilled vennel had been included in the row at the North end (Fig. 25). By measuring each boundary from the row end the position taken for the row end was critical but it freed each boundary from being measured from its neighbour and eliminated any 'a priori' recognition of later boundaries. This gave a series of observed boundary positions. Expected observations

were calculated from the same origin by using each land rod, in whole feet from 15 foot to 30 foot and including the calculation of half land rod positions. The observed values were then compared to the expected values and six inches of divergence on the ground were allowed since cartographic error, although smaller than that allowed for by Sheppard using a 25 inch Ordnance plan for rural settlements (1974), could not be ignored even using a 10 foot scale plan.

In Elvet East row 46% of property boundaries corresponded to expected positions using a 20 foot land rod but 42% of boundaries corresponded to a 16 foot rod. Other land rods gave weaker results (Table 5.1). In Hallgarth Street the East row had a best fit with an 18 foot rod, 65% of boundaries corresponding with expected positions, but on the West row 18 foot and 16 foot gave equally strong results (Table 5.1). An 18 foot rod is known from Co.Durham (Roberts 1972:43) and elsewhere as a 'wood rod' (Roberts 1965:108, Pollock 1896:218) but this does not correspond to the overall row dimensions which appear to be based on 20 foot. In addition the Southern section of the West row (Fig. 24) mirrors the East row but to the North the strips curve as if they were formerly agricultural land in curving closes lying between Church Street and Hallgarth Street as shown on the Schwytzer Map of 1595 (Fig. 15). The use of agricultural land for house plots is known at Knutsford, Cheshire (Beresford 1967:102) and Newcastle (Conzen 1960 b) so the West row may be postulated as multiple, partly a row matching the East row and partly developed from agricultural closes.

Table 5.1 Nineteenth century property boundaries and relationship to local land rods, Elvet Borough and Barony (98)

<u>Rod in feet</u>	<u>Hallgarth St. E.</u>	<u>Hallgarth St.W.</u>	<u>Elvet Borough E.</u>
15	0%	18%	21%
16	41	32	42
16.5	6	9	8
17	12	21	17
18	65	32	13
19	18	6	8
20	18	29	46
21	24	15	13
22	35	29	38
23	6	6	21
24	35	24	25
25	6	9	13
26	35	24	33
27	6	3	4
28	24	29	17
29	24	6	8
30	18	18	21
Total boundaries	17	34	24

South Street West row showed low comparisons between expected and observed boundaries for all land rods between 15 and 30 feet. The highest results were for a 15 foot rod, counting both from an origin at the North end and then from the South end, but these were only 21% and 29% respectively out of 28 boundaries (Table 5.2). No pattern emerged within the row of correspondence with one land rod in one part of the row and another elsewhere (Appendix 5.7).

Table 5.2 South Street East row, relationship between
nineteenth century property boundaries and
local land rods

<u>Rod in feet</u>	<u>Origin at N. end</u>	<u>Origin at S. end</u>
15	21%	29%
16	18	14
16.5	14	18
17	4	18
18	14	4
19	7	0
20	14	14
21	18	18
22	7	14
23	18	11
24	11	4
25	11	14
26	4	4
27	4	14
28	11	4
29	11	14
30	14	14

The frontages between nineteenth century boundaries are far narrower than those for rural 'tofts'. At Byers Green, Co.Durham, Roberts has suggested that the layout was based on a statute rod of 16.5 feet with toft widths of 80 foot (1972:43) while at Shelom the toft width appears to have been 160 feet (Roberts 1973). In rural settlement the building line would usually be 'open' with spaces between the buildings themselves but in an urban context houses with gables to the street could be eaves to eaves and on plots only 15 foot wide or up to 25 foot wide, taking the roof span from examples of medieval buildings on unconstrained rural sites as shown by Bailey (1961) and Austin (1976:85). Pantin cites widths for town houses of 30 to 50 feet

(1962-3:203) when the eaves were to the street and when the number of bays had been extended but he does not discuss how the buildings he describes relate to the property unit dimensions. The unsoluble question is whether eaves-houses, (Dickinson 1948), such as No. 4 Church Street are late building forms or not and whether the original buildings were 'gable-houses', as at Oslo (Christie 1966), and whether the building line was 'closed' or not.

It is not surprising that the property units shown on nineteenth century plans are much smaller than rural houseplots but it is surprising that they are so much smaller than recorded plot sizes in other English boroughs. There appears to have been progressive diminution in layout scale from the twelfth century to the fourteenth century as shown by the difference between plot lengths at Gateshead, Durham and Queenborough (Fig. 17) but the comparison here is between plots in Durham and its suburbs and plots in a contemporary twelfth century borough, Stratford-upon-Avon (Carus-Wilson 1965:49). The conclusion that is drawn, therefore, is that the property boundaries shown on the nineteenth century plans reflect original burgage boundaries and are derived from them but they are much closer than the original boundaries and reflect centuries of mediatisation, the degree of which varies between rows and within rows. Some boundaries correspond to expected position inferred from the overall dimensions of rows, plot lengths and street widths but many have disappeared and many more have been added.

In the late eighteenth century it was perceived that the burgages of the City and suburbs were not synonymous with the contemporary house plots. Seasonal grazing rights in the town fields and grazing rights on the moors of Elvet, Framwellgate and Crossgate were seen as depending on the 'ancient burgages' (99) and inquiries were held at the time of Enclosure to determine the ownership of these burgages. In the Framwellgate Award the total arrived at was $300\frac{1}{2}$ 'ancient burgages' and the Elvet total included a moiety of a burgage so, clearly, the term did not refer to the original burgages. Neither did it refer to contemporary house plots since 'ancient burgages' cut through houses and, indeed, it was never defined by the Enclosure Commissioners. Their interest appears to have been grazing rights rather than tracing individual properties through deeds.

But grazing rights, or stints, were not constant over the centuries. In Elvet and Gilesgate these rights were reorganized in favour of the existing inhabitants, with newcomers allowed grazing by payment (100) and, in Gilesgate, there were wrangles over rights to use the moorland (Barmby 1896:110). Even year to year there was altering use of the Gilesgate moor. In 1610 a cess on cows to provide hay for the bull suggests a total of 80 cows (101) while in 1726 a cess to fight a law suit suggests a total of 315 stints. (102) Between 1723 and 1724, for example, the number of stints fell 19%. (103) So to what period do the 'ancient burgages' refer?

At no period is it possible to reconstruct the

pattern of burgages for all parts of the City and suburbs since lordship was divided and ownership was heterogeneous.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ The fullest listings are the Receiver's Books of the Dean and Chapter from 1542 ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ since these list not only their own property but also all property held from them, as lord in Elvet and Crossgate, and paying nominal 'landmale' rents. The question of 'ancient burgages' can, therefore, be analysed for Elvet and Crossgate, including Framwellgate.

For each of these three suburbs there was great similarity between the total number of 'ancient burgages' listed in the Enclosure Awards and the 1542 totals ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ with the weakest comparison being found in Elvet (Table 5.3). In Crossgate the number was virtually identical to 1542-3, in Elvet there were more in 1773 and in Framwellgate fewer in 1770. The 'ancient burgages' clearly did not relate to the fifteenth century property units since they took no account of 'wastes' existing in 1542 and the Elvet ones either postdate 1542, when wastes had been rebuilt⁽¹⁰⁷⁾, or antedate 1542 before burgages became waste. The former is more likely since the grazing rights were reorganized in the late seventeenth century. ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾

Table 5.3 Comparison between burgage totals in 1542-3 and 'ancient burgage' totals in the Enclosure Awards of Crossgate, Elvet and Framwellgate.

<u>District</u>	1542-3		<u>Enclosure Awards</u> <u>'Ancient Burgages'</u>
	<u>Burgages</u>	<u>Burgages & Wastes</u>	
Crossgate	154	164	157
Elvet	157	189	207 & a moiety
Framwellgate	102	135	99½
Sources:	DDPD. PK. D. & CD.	Rec.Bk. 2 1542-3	
	DDPD. PK. D. & CD.	Register 51 ff 1-69	
		Crossgate Award 1770	
	DDPD. PK. D. & CD.	Elvet Enclosure 1773	
	DDPD. SR. HC.	Framwellgate Award 1809	

Since in Elvet North row, in Old Elvet, a large proportion of the properties were Dean and Chapter owned it is possible to use it to illustrate burgage change between 1542 and 1856 and to extend the survey back to the 1440's for the East end of the row since this is covered by a map of c.1439-42. (109) In 1542 the perambulation order and descriptions exist for all property, in 1772 the row can be reconstructed from abuttal descriptions in the Enclosure Award while in 1856 evidence is based on the 25 inch survey. (110) Figure 27 shows how the number of properties altered, how church properties were more stable and how the vennels, which are often used as marker points in morphological analysis, were mobile. In 1772 this mobility of the vennels is reflected in the uncertain status of many vennels, whether they were considered abuttal or as part of the property. (111)

It may be deceptive to infer the importance of population trends on the degree of change in the property units since neither the overall proportion of boundary change is known for any one century nor the population trends before the sixteenth century. Lomas, in discussing the fifteenth century (1973:95-6) makes the 'a priori' assumption that unlet properties indicate population decline which may be misleading since he is discussing Priory property in the suburbs rather than secular City properties. In the seventeenth century the population was rising (Table 2.4) and 'wastes' disappeared from the Dean and Chapter lists of property (112) but there is no evidence available by which to correlate population changes and

property unit morphology changes.

A clearer relationship may be drawn between ownership boundaries and boundary stability, and especially where ecclesiastical property abutted lay property. The bulk of the ecclesiastical property was that of the Prior and Convent of Durham and later the Dean and Chapter of Durham. The Benedictine Priory had had a monopoly in the town concerning the establishment of religious houses, an Augustinian community at Baxterwood had been suppressed and its property made over to the Benedictine daughter house at Finchale (Raine 1837:xi) and a Franciscan house had been short lived (Hutton 1926:94). This was typical of the area between the Tyne and the Wear (Hadcock 1939) except for the mesne boroughs of Hartlepool, where there was a Friary (Hutchinson ii 1788:33), and Barnard Castle (Cornford 1928:109-111), but it was not typical of towns in the North of England such as Carlisle, which had both Dominican and Franciscan Friars (Gosling 1976:81), and Newcastle which had Friars of the Sack and Franciscan, Austin, Dominican, Trinitarian and two Carmelite Friaries (Harbottle & Clack 1976:115).

Other ecclesiastical bodies, the parish churches, hospitals and guilds had owned some property. ⁽¹¹³⁾ Property of the daughter house of Finchale reverted to Durham Priory ⁽¹¹⁴⁾ and so to the Dean and Chapter and only the smaller estates of the hospitals of Kepier and St. Leonard's (Cornford 1907:111-125) and the guilds ⁽¹¹⁵⁾ passed into secular hands in the sixteenth century. The result was, since the Dean and Chapter could not dispose of property ⁽¹¹⁶⁾,

that at the turn of the nineteenth century about 25% of houses in the town were Dean and Chapter property on the evidence of the Woodifield Survey and the 1801 census total of houses. (117) This total fell dramatically until in 1849 the Dean and Chapter merely owned houses in the Cathedral precincts, seven in Crossgate, five in Gilesgate Moor, three in St. Nicholas parish and one in North Bailey. (118) The proportion of Dean and Chapter property varied by district. The highest proportion of 'ancient burgages' under church leasehold, at the time of Enclosure, being in Elvet (Table 5.4).

Table 5.4 'Ancient burgages' under church leasehold
 by district

<u>District</u>	<u>'Ancient Burgages'</u>	<u>% church leasehold</u>
St. Nicholas & Framwellgate	196½	28.5
N. & S. Bailey	97½	51.3
Elvet Barony	104	72.1
Elvet Borough	69½	46.6
Elvet (unlocated)	36	52.8
Crossgate	157	61.2
Gilesgate	no data	no data

Sources: DDPD. Pk. D. & C.D. Elvet Award 1773
DDPD. Pk. D. & C.D. Register 51 ff.1-69, Crossgate 1770
DDPD. SR. HC. Framwellgate Award 1809
DDPD. SR. Gilesgate Award 1817 (copy)

The Dean and Chapter estate had been built up piecemeal and was scattered through the rows with greater concentrations in Elvet and Crossgate. Where its properties abutted there was the possibility of eliminating the physical presence of a boundary, though not necessarily the legal presence if neighbouring properties were held on different leases (Fig. 26). But where its properties abutted those

of other owners the boundaries tended to be stable.

Gardens of the Dean and Chapter property were not infilled and the property tended to be repaired rather than to be redeveloped. In the late eighteenth century the Chapter were noted as keeping their property in good repair (Stukeley 1776:70-1) but they had no policy to acquire more property. (119) It is important to note that the Dean and Chapter had a large income in the eighteenth century and that the proportion of their income contributed by urban property fell between the mid-seventeenth century and mid-nineteenth century due to the growing income from colliery leases (Table 5.5). (120) The change to leases for land and the struggle against tenants claiming tenant right in the sixteenth century (Booth 1889:xxxviii, Marcombe 1973: 141-155) may indicate an income crisis parallel to that which Hill has outlined for all those dependent on fixed incomes in that period of rising prices (1967: 45). But here there is no indication of an income crisis after the Restoration and there is evidence to suggest that the Dean and Chapter were not raising the maximum possible income from their urban properties. (121)

Table 5.5 Sources of Income of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, Sample years 1641 to 1842

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Income (£.s.d.)</u>	<u>% Urban</u>	<u>% Collieries</u>
1641-2	1397.10.11	20.21	5.86
1742-3	2748. 8. 2	10.29	1.15
1800-1	4540. 6. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$	9.52	26.68
1842-3	19049. 8. 5 $\frac{3}{4}$	2.10	81.80

Sources: DDPD. Pk. Rec. Bks. 40,114,170, 120
 Based on Appendix 5.6

The strongest bequest from the medieval town to its nineteenth century successor was heterogeneous ownership in each district except the Cathedral precincts (Table 5.6). In 1850-1 23.1% of households owned some dwellings ⁽¹²²⁾ and 17.0% of dwellings were owner occupied. ⁽¹²³⁾ The proportion of owner occupation was high since in 1884 9.6% of dwellings in Cardiff were owner occupied (Daunton 1976:24) compared to 17.5% in Durham in 1880 ⁽¹²⁴⁾ and in 1914, in Leicester, 5% were owner occupied (Pritchard 1976:4), and 7.2% in Cardiff (Daunton 1976:4), compared to 15.2% in Durham in 1919. ⁽¹²⁵⁾ Unfortunately, there appear to be no comparative figures from studies of other towns of the period directly indicating the heterogeneity of house ownership.

Table 5.6 Ownership of rateable units by district,
Durham MB. 1850 and 1880

<u>District</u>	<u>1850</u>		<u>1880</u>	
	<u>Rateable</u> <u>Units</u>	<u>Owners</u>	<u>Rateable</u> <u>Units</u>	<u>Owners</u>
Castle	18	8	nk.	nk.
College	13	1	15	4
Crossgate	223	110	495	200
Elvet	504	167	419	164
Framwellgate	190	102	233	94
Gilesgate	341	126	413	165
Gilesgate Moor	156	65	204	73
St.Mary-le-Bow	67	29	51	18
St.Mary-the-less	18	14	18	13
St.Mary Magdalene	3	3	nk.	nk.
St.Nicholas	477	192	411	172

Sources : DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 137,148
nk. not known, district included elsewhere

The plot pattern of the nineteenth century appears to have been derived from the pattern of burgage plots but was not synonymous with the original burgages, or indeed with late medieval burgage plots, since the 'ancient burgages', on which grazing rights depended, differed from both fifteenth century burgage totals and cut through eighteenth century plots. Instead there appears to have been mediation, reorganisation and, in some cases, discrepancies between physical boundaries, as shown on the Ordnance survey plans, and boundaries pertaining to legal rights, whether leases or rights of grazing.

4. Fabric

In considering the character of the nineteenth century townscape contributed by the building fabric it is necessary to categorize the evidence. Some fabric of that period still survives but yard property has, to a great extent, been cleared. (126) Engravings and photographs form a supplement for parts of the town but are strongly biased to the Peninsula area (Fig. 30) and descriptions from the period may be more indicative of the writer's attitude to the aesthetics of townscape than useful in forming a base of information from which to assess the age and quality of fabric at that time. Early nineteenth century observers described the town as being 'old-fashioned' in character. Is it possible to assess this view and to evaluate the age and character of the building stock? Secondly, how important was nineteenth century building, both in terms of the quantity of buildings added and in terms of the character

of those buildings, their size, style and building materials?

Descriptions of the town were impressionistic. They described the condition of the town in terms of cleanliness or tidiness or else selected buildings and streets. Earlier literary sketches by Leland (Toulmin-Smith 1906-10 i:72-3), Camden (1806 ed.:349-71) and Celia Fiennes (1888 ed.:179-81), in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were more favourable than most eighteenth and nineteenth century commentators. Leland summed up the fabric as being

"...meately strong, but it is nother high nor of costly work." (p.73)

while Celia Fiennes described the town as having

"cleane and pleasant buildings, streetes large, well pitch'd" (p.181).

Camden, after outlining the disposition of the streets, concluded that

"This City is of no great antiquity..." (p.351)

The appraisal probably refers less to the appearance of the town in his day than to its supposed foundation in 995 AD., in contrast to towns of earlier, Roman foundation which he described elsewhere. Cox, in 1720 followed this appraisal and, indeed, quoted Camden.

"The Town is pretty large and well compacted... but has no great Beauty, nor is of any great Antiquity."
(1720 i:612)

The Universal Magazine of 1749 similarly quoted earlier writers (Anon 1749:275) and was panegyric

"The streets are wide, well paved, and well built; and, as they lie mostly upon a descent, very clean..." (p.275).

The outsider's description, therefore, contrasts those of

contemporary residents, Dean Spencer Cowper wrote, in a letter of 1746 that

"The country about the town vastly romantic and beautiful, the hills being mostly covered with fine woods. The town itself nasty and disagreeable, the streets narrow and wretchedly paved, and the houses dirty and black, as if they had no inhabitants but colliers." (127)

and four years later that Mrs. Poyntz

"...likes our situation much, but does the Town the Justice to say that it is the dirtiest, scrubbiest Town she ever saw." (128)

Argan (1969) has outlined how ideals of townscape altered after the fifteenth century to an appreciation of symmetry and the use of vistas; ideals which were absent from the Durham townscape where

"The very curious old buildings of the city are crowded on the rising hill, pile upon pile."
(Westall & Moule 1832:65);

a very similar impression to that derived from a modern survey (Pocock 1975). In the eighteenth and early nineteenth century it was the College, the North and South Baileys and Elvet which were mentioned with approbation (Cox 1720 i:638, Anon. 1749:275, Cooke 1822:75, 101, Glynne 1906-11:33). These streets, at the present time, have townhouses which appear to date from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (129) so they fitted contemporary ideas of desirable streets. In the other streets the impression of irregularity and heterogeneity was equated with squalor. An 1801 guidebook wrote

"But all the beauty of Durham is confined to its outside; like all other old cities built in times when men were content to sacrifice comfort to safety,

or before they had attained to adequate ideas of refinement or convenience; the streets are narrow, dark, and dirty - the houses old, gloomy, and ugly." (Warner 1801:284)

Similar impressions are given in descriptions in 1825 and 1838.

"The general character of the streets (especially in the main part of the town) is very great steepness, narrowness and dirt. The houses are mostly mean and untidy, and the town full of very small filthy allies and courts." (Glynne 1906-11:33)

"...a town, remarkable for the impoverished aspect of its streets and its houses" (Dibdin 1838 i:260)

The picture which emerges for the early nineteenth century townscape is of a few streets with buildings fitting the then contemporary fashion and the other streets being viewed as old fashioned. Can these comments be amplified in order to see the age of the building stock?

In 1848 a resident commented that

"There were many old houses in Durham which would have to be pulled down, many as old as to be built in the Elizabethan style of architecture" (130)

but at the present day, as Dobson rightly remarks (1973:43), few timber framed buildings remain; the Hallgarth Barn in Elvet (Plate 1), No. 4 Owengate (Plate 2), which was virtually rebuilt in the 1960's (Christopherson 1969:82), a building in Millburngate (Plate 3) and part of the 'Big Jug' on Claypath (Plate 4) form the total visible legacy. Others, which have been demolished in this century, are recorded in the Edis and Gibby photographic collections (131) and in the Annual Reports of the City of Durham Preservation Society. (132) Others probably remain to be discovered under plastering and refacing as on Silver Street (Plate 6) where

an earlier photograph shows the half timbering (Nelson 1974), but in all the number of timber framed buildings appears to be small.

Literary sources and excavations suggest that, as elsewhere, the medieval fabric of the City and suburbs, apart from the churches, castle and monastic buildings (Greenwell 1880:177, 1896:123-133), was of wood. Dickinson's comments emphasising stone appear to be guesswork (1957:311). The earliest church on the Peninsula, the Bough Church was of wood (133), the bishop's palace, burnt down in the eleventh century may have been of the same material (134), and excavation on the Sutton Site between the Castle and Sadler Street found wattle and daub buildings (Carver 1975:20).

The surviving timber framed buildings have widely spaced timbers (Plates 1,2,3, & 4) which suggests that they date from a late period of building in timber; timber buildings having been replaced at frequent intervals both in rural settlements, as at Wharram Percy (Hurst 1965:190), and in towns, as at Winchester (Biddle 1967:212-3). Carter, Roberts and Sturmeister have suggested, from Norwich fabric, that there was a rebuilding cycle of between 150 and 200 years which was synchronized across the city, firstly by the rapid introduction of stone plinths between 1250 and 1300 AD., which slowed the rate of timber rot, and secondly by fires in 1505 and 1507 (1974:48). Such replacement was the outcome of degeneration and not of appraised obsolescence (Nutt 1976:6).

The change from building in timber to building in

local stone or brick was dated by Hoskins, from work on Leicestershire buildings, to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (1957:58). In general he emphasised the years 1570 to 1640 for rural rebuilding and suggested that this may apply to towns as well, though he recognized that urban evidence has been removed (1953:44). The problem is that the majority of work on vernacular building has been within the English Midlands with inferences made from that region to the North of England. Portman dated the 'Great Rebuilding' in Oxfordshire to the period 1570 to 1640 and inferred that it was later, in the eighteenth century, in the North of England (1974:138-9) and Barley, in his general study, concentrated on Midland examples and suggested later rebuilding in the uplands (1967:757). This lag was repeated by Millward for houses in Furness where he dated the change from timber to stone to the period 1650 to 1710 (1955:43) and was confirmed for the Northern Pennines (Brunskill 1975:117). But Brunskill's fuller study of rebuilding in the Lake District suggested that there was no single period but that the size of house was an important factor. Large houses in that area were rebuilt in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, small houses in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and even as late as the mid nineteenth century, while cottages were rebuilt in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (1974:39-76).

Hoskins' concept of the 'Great Rebuilding' was based firstly on probate inventories which survive in quantity from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and which, in many cases, describe house layouts and fitments, and, secondly, on

surviving building fabric. But since the introduction of stone sills at Norwich has also been reported at Winchester for the same period (Biddle 1967:212-3) and at Elvet, Durham (Carver 1974:101), it is possible that urban rebuilding was periodic and that the sixteenth, or seventeenth century 'Great Rebuilding' is the outcome of better documentation of change, in the form of probate inventories, and a change which, unlike earlier periodic changes from timber building, to timber building, involved a change from timber to more permanent stone or brick which was then not replaced. The vernacular buildings of the early modern period may not record a sudden change in housing style from earlier periods so much as a lack of change and replacement in the following centuries.

The latest public building to be built in timber in the City and suburbs appears to have been the County Court House on Palace Green, built in 1588 (Gee 1929:32) but the smaller 'bull-house', in Gilesgate, was built of timber, clay and wattles as late as 1606. ⁽¹³⁵⁾ Stonework was employed for churches and monastic buildings from at least the eleventh century (Greenwell 1896 b) and was being used to some extent in domestic buildings during the Middle Ages. A fragment of medieval masonry was discovered in Walkergate during demolition (Dobson 1962:179) and in 1463 the dwelling, now No. 38 North Bailey, was repaired both by carpenters and by masons (Greenslade 1947-8).

What was the balance between the use of stone, brick and timber in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? Celia Fiennes, in 1695, commented on stone buildings (1888 ed.:179). Her list cannot have been complete since she

excludes the Cosin almshouses on Palace Green which had been built in the 1660's (Parson & White i 1827:179), but her selection of stone buildings may imply that they were the exception. Many stone buildings dating from this period are indeed church properties rather than secular domestic buildings. They include the school-house on Palace Green (Eden ii 1952), the rectory of St.Mary-the-less (Plate 7) and the houses in the College ⁽¹³⁶⁾ but their full number cannot be assessed without a full and detailed fabric survey being made of the buildings in the town since many stone buildings were constructed of local Coal Measure sandstone rubble that was stuccoed at some date. ⁽¹³⁷⁾ Secular domestic buildings of stone are similarly obscured by stucco and refenestration but included small houses on the outskirts of the town at Houghall (Pevsner 1953:169), Old Durham ⁽¹³⁸⁾ and Kepier ⁽¹³⁹⁾

Seventeenth century brickwork survives in a number of buildings including Abbey House which has a Dutch style gable but an eighteenth century ashlar front ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾, No. 4 Church Street (Plate 11), which before the stucco was removed had been described as "fairly nondescript eighteenth century" ⁽¹⁴¹⁾ and a domestic building, formerly St.Andrew's Chapel on Elvet Bridge. ⁽¹⁴²⁾ Again the total is obscured by the almost ubiquitous stucco in the old streets. It is significant, however, that Sir John Duck's house in Silver Street, now demolished ⁽¹⁴³⁾, was a brick building built after the style of a timber framed building since it had both jettying and a detached staircase. ⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ This was the house of a prosperous merchant ⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ yet it was

drawing upon timber house building techniques as if brick was an innovation and not in general use, despite Lloyd suggesting the general use of brick in the seventeenth century (1935: 3). But Durham was not so dilatory as Stockton-on-Tees where the curate noted in 1662 that the town had no brick houses (Hutchinson iii 1794:129).

In terms of roofing materials there was a change from thatch to stone tiles or brick tiles. Houghall was roofed in stone in the fifteenth century⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ and slaters are known in the seventeenth century.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Stone tiles remain on the St. Mary-the-less rectory (Plate 7) and on the eighteenth century Prebend's Cottage where they underlie pantile, and they were found on the site of the seventeenth century No. 4, New Elvet.⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ Hughes dates the use of roofing tile to the early eighteenth century (1952:59) and mid-nineteenth century engravings show that pantile was the dominant roofing material by that period.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾

Change in roofing material appears to have been more thorough than that of walling fabric. The keynote to walling fabric appears to be shift in the materials from timber to stone or brick but partial rebuilding of each building being more common than total rebuilding. The appearance of the building stock is, and was, therefore, not identical to an assessment of the actual fabric type.

Many houses along the Bailey are heterogeneous in age and in fabric (Gibby 1958:16) and as more studies are made of specific buildings both along the Bailey (Kynaston & Johnson 1969:8, Dodds 1971) and elsewhere in

the town (Knox 1962) ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ the more this heterogeneity appears. In the College the houses of the twelve canons had, by 1720, mostly been partly rebuilt. Only one canon had fully built a house while ten had partly rebuilt or improved their houses (Cox i 1720:638-9) ⁽¹⁵¹⁾ and in the following century several of these houses were refenestrated ⁽¹⁵²⁾ or refronted, leaving a steeply pitching roof which would accommodate thatch (Braun 1962:142) behind a facade (Plate 8). The eighteenth century facade of the Gatehouse hides a twelfth century building (Fowler 1912:195-6) and these are not exceptions since other facades are clearly visible on Sadler Street (Plate 10).

Many buildings have stone plinths whether they are timber framed, as in Millburngate (Plate 3) or the Hallgarth Barn (Plate 1), or whether they are brick buildings of the seventeenth century or later, as at No. 4 Church Street (Plate 11). Such stonework formed a primitive damp course ⁽¹⁵³⁾ and it could be re-utilised when a building was rebuilt. In the case of a rural building at West Hartburn, Co. Durham, Still and Palliser concluded that a longhouse, which had been in existence between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, had had its wooden structure dismantled, leaving the clay and stone foundation (1964:187-196) while in Durham, in the second half of the nineteenth century, there are cases of builders pulling structures down as far as the base and then rebuilding on that ⁽¹⁵⁴⁾; a practice which the Local Board of Health tried to combat. ⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ The implication is that while the old town area lacks cellars ⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ which in other towns, including Chester and Winchelsea, were reused by later building (Faulkner 1966) ⁽¹⁵⁷⁾, it had stone plinths

which were reused when buildings were remodelled.

Remodelling, as well as rebuilding, was stressed by Insall (1961) for late sixteenth and early seventeenth century Lavenham and remodelling seems the aspect which must be stressed for the Durham fabric. There is a paucity of references to new building in late sixteenth century probate records (158); only two mentioning new buildings, one a 'new chamber' in 1578 and the other a 'New House' in 1565. (159) More frequent are references to improvements; staircases (Johnson 1970), horizontally moving sash windows (Plate 12) which Braun dates to the seventeenth century (1962:106), glass windows (160) and houses with a proliferation of rooms rather than 'hall-houses'.

Unfortunately, over half the extant inventories included no details of the form of the dwelling. (161) Of those described there were single roomed dwellings, dwellings with a hall and chamber or hall and parlour, and, the largest group, dwellings of many rooms. (162) It is possible that the preponderance of many-roomed dwellings may be overstated if inventories for wealthy tradesmen and merchants survive in greater numbers than those for the poor. But, as there was no close relationship between the number of rooms and the total value of the inventory since the proportion of the value in stock in trade varied from 4% to 99%, and as lower value inventories were as well represented as high value ones (Table 5.7), it must be recognized that dwellings with many rooms and with rooms ranged above each other (163) were common in the town and that though hall-houses existed they were not ubiquitous. In the rural parts of the county and in

Yorkshire the hall-house still existed in this period (Still & Palliser 1964:196, James 1974:12, Hurst 1965:194, Barley 1961:756) but urban housing was not necessarily of the same standard as rural.

Table 5.7 Relationship between total value and room total, inventories of Durham City and suburbs, 1540 to 1599

	<u>Room Total</u>												Total
Value	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
less than £20	3	1	1	2									7
£20 - 40		1	1	1			1						4
£40 - 60	1				1	1				1			4
£60 - 80									1	1			2
£80 - 100				1									1
£100+			1	1		2	2	2					8

Source : DDPD. SR. D. Probate. Inventories of persons resident in Durham City and suburbs, 1540 to 1599

Remodelling appears to have left traces in the typical layout of buildings along the old streets (Appendix 5.2) in that even buildings with eighteenth or nineteenth century fronts have a passage through the ground floor from the street to the garden behind (Fig. 56). These could be used as a vennel, as at the 'Big Jug' on Claypath, or could be within the front house and have a street door yet give access to other dwellings in the yard, as at Lumsden's yard behind the 'Angel' on Crossgate, or could be within the house. Not all were old since some such passages appear to have been created in the early modern period. Carver has argued from excavation of dwellings in New Elvet West row that the passage was created in the seventeenth century (1974:106) and this

also seems the case in New Elvet East row where before its demolition, No. 4 had a passage⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ within a building built subsequent to the Speede map of 1611 (Fig. 15).

Such passages are analogous to screens passages, discussed by Pantin in surviving medieval town houses elsewhere (1962-3a). They are common in town houses on medieval sites and have been described in Ipswich, where Hoskins suggests that they arise out of necessary access to narrow sites (Hoskins 1957:953), and in nineteenth century Glasgow (Gauldie 1974:74). Access and cattle appear to have been contributory factors, though neither is a sufficient reason since passages are found both through dwellings on streets with back lanes such as the Market Place, Claypath South row, Gilesgate and Old Elvet North row (Fig. 56) as well as through dwellings where the curtilage had no back access, as on the Baileys, Claypath North row, Allergate, Old Elvet South row, New Elvet, Church Street and Hallgarth Street West row. Cattle are mentioned in half the late sixteenth century inventories of residents of the City and suburbs but although some were on the town moors⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ and were housed in the town⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ other cattle were specifically mentioned as grazing elsewhere in the county⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ and since six other deceased had land elsewhere their cattle cannot be assumed to be local.⁽¹⁶⁸⁾

As at King's Lynn and Oxford (Pantin 1962-3a:181, 1958) buildings appear to have been palimpsests, the outcome of partial rebuilding. In the mid-nineteenth century there were more timber-framed buildings⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ than now and the fabric was old enough, in general, to contrast the eighteenth

century renovations of Elvet, the Baileys and the College. But strictly the appearance of even these buildings belied their older interior fabric. On the other hand much of the newer building was not immediately visible since up to the mid-nineteenth century most new building was carried out on yard sites behind the burgage-head buildings. Such additions are known in the sixteenth century when in 1584 two sons were instructed to divide their father's house in St. Nicholas parish between them, one son taking "a stephouse on the backside". (170) Abuttals describing Elvet property in 1772 similarly indicate some yard property (171) and the yard property off Claypath has been dated to the late eighteenth century. (172)

The question of the age of the fabric in the mid-nineteenth century is a complex one involving both objective appraisal of the fabric and perceptive appraisal of those parts which were visible. Objectively by 1841 half the dwellings were relatively new since there was a 125.1% increase in the housing stock between 1801 and 1841 (173) but perceptually the fabric of the town was old, except for the streets already mentioned where the fabric was, in fact, old but had been remodelled.

By 1901 about 39% of dwellings had been built before 1801, 49% between 1801 and 1841 and 13% between 1841 and 1901. (174) The later nineteenth century, therefore, inherited much of its dwelling stock, and it inherited the tradition of dwellings not being separate houses or buildings. (175) (Fig. 47). The importance of the later nineteenth century was in new dwelling styles being built;

single family houses being the norm, and in new building materials being employed.

Homogeneous terraces had been built in the early nineteenth century, as in Leazes Place in the 1820's (176) but they were the usual form of building later in the century (Figs. 41, 42, 43, 44, 45). Before the implementation of bye-laws, or, in cases where the property was outside the jurisdiction of the Local Board of Health, terraces were built without separate back yards, as in the case of Colpitts Terrace, at Crossgate Head, or without back access. Within the jurisdictional area of the board the houses built were typically through terrace houses with separate yards and back access lanes but with variety as to front gardens, bay windows, upper bay windows and actual size; variety as Forster found at Hull (1968, 1972). At the end of the century a variation was added in the form of 'Tyneside flats' which had two dwellings, one on top of the other, in each terraced unit (Plate 13).

There was some tendency for local styles to lag behind those in vogue in the rest of the country in the nineteenth century but national styles were used, not vernacular. The Classical style, employed in the Assize Courts in the second decade of the century (Pevsner 1953:128), was still being used in the case of Bethel Chapel, North Road, in the 1850's (177) and for the detail on some houses in Western Hill in the 1860's (Plate 14). 'Gothick' was used for St. Cuthbert's, Old Elvet, in the 1820's (Doyle 1977) but came into general use for public buildings in the 1840's; examples being Durham School (178), the Town Hall (179),

St. Margaret's Vicarage (180), the County Hospital (181), the castle keep (Gomme 1893:20-2), and the Mechanics' Institute (Fordyce i 1857:210). This was in step with national vogues but in Durham the styles of Gothic did not change for the following two decades. (182) Gothic was rarely used for dwellings, rare exceptions being No. 50 South Street, built in 1850 (183) and Nos. 60, 61 and 62 Hallgarth Street. A more common style was Italianate as used for Elvet Villa (Plate 15).

At the end of the nineteenth century houses were being built to designs in books published for the use of builders. Springwell Villas (Plate 16) are very similar to designs in Goldsmith's 'Economical Houses' (1895 Plate 5) and Gladstone Villas are similar to villas in Didsbury, Manchester (Plate 17).

In the 1840's all terraces were built of brick at the front and stone rubble at the back (184) (Plate 18) which suggests that brick was considered superior to local poor stone but that stone was cheap. The trend was, however, for small houses to be built of brick and for only public buildings and large villas to be built of stone, which was dressed stone. One builder continued to use stone for his terraces into the 1860's (185) but with the exception of some large terraced houses in Western Hill, and Mountjoy Crescent (186) all other terraces were of brick. The institutional buildings of the mid-century were of stone (187) with a few of brick with stone trimmings (188) but those of the late nineteenth century were predominantly of brick with stone trimmings. (189) Honey coloured stone colour was

giving way to dull red brick and, in the case of roofs, red pantile was giving way to grey Welsh slate with the result that a modern architect picked out grey as the characteristic colour of the modern town (Sharp 1944).

5. Conclusion

The nineteenth century saw great changes in the townscape in terms of architectural styles, which were national not local vernacular, building materials, which were increasingly imported from other areas, and the form of new houses which were, in the main small single family dwellings rather than large townhouses or large houses divided into tenement dwellings. Some houses were identical to those to be found in other towns, especially those built at the end of the century, but others, and especially those terraced houses with bay windows were within a local nineteenth century tradition of employing more wood, as in Atherton Street (Plate 9), than would be allowed under the building byelaws of other towns. There was a colour change in the townscape to greys as buildings were repaired and reroofed and covered with soot from the multitude of domestic and industrial chimneys against which the Local Board of Health waged battle. (190) Buildings were rebuilt in the old streets, especially in the Market Place area (191) and public buildings were initiated or rebuilt.

The major changes were not immediately apparent since in the first half of the century most new building, in distinction to rebuilding or alteration, was sited in

the yards of existing property, with the exception of Peele's Buildings on Hallgarth Street, Wardell's Buildings on Crossgate, Neville Street and Reform Place off New North Road, Leazes Place off Claypath, Freeman's Place on the Sands and Magdalene Street off Gilesgate. In the second half of the century the blocks of terraced dwellings were peripheral to the town, and except from the vista of the railway viaduct were, again, not immediately apparent.

The earlier inheritance in the townscape was subtle but strong. The streets were, up to the mid-nineteenth century, of medieval foundation and despite the addition of streets in the second half of the century the major streets, apart from New North Road, were old streets while the new additions ran parallel or cross-wise as by-ways or culs-de-sac. In addition the essential juxtaposition of varied buildings and different rooflines in each street in the centre was the outcome of heterogeneous ownership of property units along each street. Long thin property units underlay the fabric and though these plots were not identical to the original burgages they were derived from them originally.

Most judgments of the townscape derived from an assessment of the buildings. In the early nineteenth century this was thought of as old-fashioned but by the late nineteenth century it was thought to be uninteresting; lacking old houses (Boyle 1892:390). Such judgments are interesting in their own right but give no hint as to the balance of new and old in the townscape. The crucial change was at mid-century. Up to then the inherited pattern of

small urban property units framed ongoing development, after then it was a coarser pattern of rural property units which framed new building which was planned in larger block plans instead of house by house. (192) Yet, in irony, it was in the first half of the century that most nineteenth century building was conducted, the later operations were far fewer in number and through this the balance in townscape was more heavily weighted to inheritance than it was in larger, rapidly growing towns where there was some inheritance from property unit layout, as at Leeds (Ward 1960, 1962) but not a strong kernel dominated townscape (Fig. 2).

1. A comparison of Camden (1806 ed.), Cox (1720 : 612-6), the Universal Magazine (Anon 1749), Brayley & Britton (1808), Billings (1846), Fordyce (1857i : 218-9), Boyle (1892), Mackenzie & Ross (1834 ii) and Hutchinson (1787 ii) illustrates this point. All describe the Cathedral and churches at length. Five discussed the powers of the bishop and points of legal interest but only three discussed employment; Fordyce, Brayley & Britton & Mackenzie & Ross. In contrast, at other towns, in the pre-nineteenth century volumes, Gough added details on economy to Camden's description of Darlington in the 1806 edition, Cox described the economy of Barnard Castle (p.607), Darlington (p.608-9) and Sunderland (p.619) at length. Similarly the Universal Magazine made comments on the economy of Barnard Castle (p.146) and Darlington (p.147) and Brayley and Britton on Chester-le-Street, Darlington, Stockton, Sunderland and Bishop Auckland.
2. Du. Routh. Map of Durham surveyed by J. Wood, 1820. 5 inches to $\frac{1}{4}$ mile. cf. Turner (1954:29).
John Wood surveyed a great number of towns in Great Britain between 1818 and 1841. Some are listed by Eden (1975) but more emerged when each record office was contacted. They can be attributed to Wood not only by name but also by style, his use of insets, his naming of properties and his choice of scale, which was usually 3 chains or 4 chains to one inch. In addition he usually used Edinburgh engravers. The plans show a sequence round Britain. He started surveying in Scotland and the North of England, a map of Dunbartonshire in 1818 being the earliest of his work which is known. Plans of Durham City in 1820, Carlisle in 1821, Newcastle-upon-Tyne in 1827 and an undated one of Barnard Castle followed this. He then moved to London but continued to use the Edinburgh engraver W. Murphy and he appears to have been surveying in Eastern England, surveying Wisbeach in 1830. He then surveyed towns in North Yorkshire; Northallerton in 1831 and Croft in 1832, and used North Yorkshire addresses as a base for surveys in Cumbria; Ulverston, Cockermouth and Wigton all being dated 1832. In 1833 his base was again Edinburgh though in this year he surveyed Chester and Oswestry. In 1834 his base was Caernarvon from which he surveyed Wem. Surveys in Aberystwyth, Pwllheli, Caernarvon and Bangor in 1834 indicate no address but they were engraved by W. Murphy in Edinburgh. The survey of Brecknock in 1834 indicates Wood had an Edinburgh address. In 1835 Wood was still at Caernarvon when he surveyed Ellesmere but surveys of Ludlow, Stroud and Cirencester in the same year indicate an Edinburgh base. In 1836 he surveyed Merthyr Tydfil in South Wales, and in 1838 Shrewsbury. 1839 saw him working in the East Midlands at Melton Mowbray and Market Harborough. There is, in addition, an undated plan of Ashby-de-la-Zouch. His plan of Uppingham in 1839 indicates

that he had a London address. In 1840 he produced a plan of Taunton, and, in the same year, one of Exeter, from an Exeter address. Then in 1841 his plan of Lyme Regis shows a London address. There are, in addition, two tithe plans in Devon by a John Wood, for Barnstaple and Great Torrington, both in 1843, but it has not been ascertained whether these were by the same surveyor. A plan of Arbroath of 1842, which is out of sequence in his working through Britain, is probably a re-issue of an earlier survey.

3. In the townships of the town of Durham the Framwellgate tithe award shows houseplots, in Elvet the houseplots were tithe free and in Crossgate and Gilesgate they were not shown. DDPD. SR. DR.
4. Bylund Lodge, Durham, has a copy of this survey but portions exist in DDPD. SR. and Du.GD.
5. BM. Catalogue of Printed Maps, Charts and Plans (1967). 2265 (6). Schwytzer, C. 1595. Copy in DDPD. SR. search room. Skelton (1952) described it as a perspective view by Matthew Patteson, engraved by Christopher Schwytzer.
6. D.S.St. 720/L Provisional List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest. July 1947. Revised Feb. 1949. D.CRO. D/X 146/1-15.
7. VCH. Durham iii 1928 : 1.
8. Du. Routh ELFR. FO 4R.
9. The town of Durham is relatively wealthy in terms of medieval maps. Part of Old Elvet is portrayed in a map of 1439 x c.1445. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Misc. Ch. 7100. I am grateful to Mr. M. Snape of the Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, Durham, for allowing me to read his forthcoming article on this map. See Fig. 27.
10. See court rolls, DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35.
11. Legal documents use the municipal title carefully. The Elvet Enclosure Award, DDPD. PK. D.& CD. Reg. 52 p.1, describes Elvet as 'in or near the City of Durham'.
12. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 1.1.
13. Smith, A. The Corporation of Durham Official Guide. 1938.
14. The text is also given in Surtees Society 13, 1841.
15. DDPD. PK. D.& CD. Rec. Book 2, 1542-3, Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis SS. 58, 1871 of the thirteenth century.

16. The last court rolls extant are dated 1793. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Post Dissolution Manorial Documents Box 6. Loose Papers. The last court costs are entered in 1795, DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Audit Book B VI f. 18r.
17. Abstract of Answers and Returns. 1831 census, vol. 1 p. 176.
18. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Audit Book B VI f.32.
19. Personal communication with Mr. M. Snape, Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, University of Durham.
20. Barmby, J. ed. SS.95 1896 p.195.
"concedimus etiam eidem magistro et fratribus burgagium, et omnibus hominibus eorum quibus illi concesserunt libertatem in vico S. Egidii Dunelmo : et quieti erunt de exercitu et omnibus auxiliis, et in-toll et u-toll, et operationibus et consuetudinibus et vexationibus et exactionibus ..."
21. Liber Censulis vocati Domesday Book, Addimenta ex Codic. Antiquiss. London 1816. Also VCH.i 1905 : 327.
22. Weinbaum 1943 : 33 ff. lists all the post Reformation Charters. All use the same municipal title.
23. D.CRO. EP/Du SN 14. In 1639, 1644 and 1646 listed separate grassmen for St. Nicholas, for Framwellgate and for North Bailey in the Vestry Accounts. Amercements were made separately on the inhabitants of St. Nicholas and those of Framwellgate, DDPD. SR. D.City Box 22, 23. See 1782, 1784 and 1780.
24. Whiting SS.160 1952 p. xvi.
25. DDPD. SR. HC.Framwellgate Enclosure Award 1809, D.CRO. EP/Du SN 14.
26. Trueman, Archaeologia Aeliana, 2nd series, 2, discusses the guild disputes.
 It was usual to term it 'in or near the City of Durham', for example 'The Trial of Ambrose Wilson for a Libel on the Clergy contained in the Durham Chronicle Aug. 18 1821' Durham 1823, 2nd ed. p.19.
27. Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae Auctoritate P.Nicholai IV circa AD. 1291, London 1802 : 314-5. Deanery of Durham : St. Oswald, St. Nicholas. Deanery of Darlington : Kepier.
 Gee VCH.ii 1907 : 76, discussing changes between 1291 and 1535.
 Durham Deanery : St. Oswald, St. Nicholas.
 Chester-le-Street Deanery : North Bailey, South Bailey.

Willis 1927 : 276-7

Chester Deanery : St. Margaret, St. Oswald.
Easington Deanery : St. Giles, St. Nicholas,
North Bailey, South Bailey.

28. Cox 1720i : 641

Easington Ward : S. Bailey, St. Giles, St. Nicholas,
Old Durham, part of St. Oswald.
Darlington Ward : N. Bailey.
Chester Ward : St. Margaret, part of St.
Oswald.

SS. 135 1922 pp.118-130, The Protestation Returns, 1640.

Easington Ward : St. Nicholas, N. Bailey, S. Bailey,
St. Giles, St. Margaret.

DDPD. SR. copy of Bishop Cosin's survey of the Bishopric
of Durham, 1662, D. Cath. MS. Sharp No.167 p.145.
Easington Ward : The City of Durham.

D.CRO. Index to the Ordnance Survey of the County of Durham.

Easington Ward : St. Giles, N. Bailey, S. Bailey,
St. Mary Magdalene, St. Nicholas,
Cathedral, College, part of
St. Oswald.

Darlington Ward : part of St. Oswald.

Chester Ward : part of St. Oswald.

29. Le Patourel has questioned how much devastation was wrought
by William and how much had been contributed by the
Scots and by general fighting but accepts that the
effects of devastation were felt for fifty years
(1971 : 7). Simeon of Durham described the area
from York to Durham in 1070 as devastated and without
a vill. Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores.
Simeon of Durham Opera Omnia. Rolls Series Vol.2,
Historia Regum p.188 no. 154.

30. Gee, VCH.iii 1928, comments on this as does The Provisional
List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic
Interest, July 1947 D.S.St. 720/L. Specific
examples are cited by Johnson (1970) and in
D.CRO. D/X 146/1-15, a collection of newspaper
cuttings relating to Durham City.

31. Compare Figs. 15, 20 and 31.

32. Greenwell W. ed. SS.58 1871 Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis
p. 1, suggests that it is based on a Feodarium of
Prior Melsonby (1233-44) but does not make it
clear whether the text is a copy of Melsonby's
or whether it follows a general order.

33. Hinde, H. ed. SS.51 1868 p.153 gives a text of 'De Situ'.
This was kindly translated by Miss J. Rainbow.

34. Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores. Simeon of
Durham. Opera Omnia. Rolls Series vol. 1. Historia
Ecclesiae Dunhelmensis Liber Tertius cap. II p.80-1
"densissima undique silva totum occupaverat"

35. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 762 AD., Cramp 1966.
36. See Beresford 1967, Appendix Co. Durham, A Second Calendar of Greenwell Deeds, Archaeologia Aeliana (4) 7 1930 p.98. No. 39. Field (1972) notes 'haugh' as a Northern term for riverside land.
37. Gee, VCH.iii 1928 : 128.
38. Mr. M. Snape, Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, Durham University, personal communication.
39. DDPD. PK. D. & CD. Rec. Book 2.
40. DDPD. SR. HC. index III p.30 Plan and valuation of 'the Grove' land and cottages Feb. 1841. See inset Fig. 25.
41. SS. 20 1845 Reginald Libellus de Vita et Miraculis S. Godrici. p. 403 and editor's note p.488. I am grateful to Miss V.M. Tudor for pointing out this reference to me.
42. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 762 AD.
43. Reference in 'Flores Historiarum', see Whitelock 1955.
44. SS. 2 1837 The Priory of Finchale ed. J. Raine p. xiii, xiv.
45. SS. 20 1845 Stevenson ed. fn. 62
"Est enim vallis profundissima et spinosa, undique saxis altissimus circumcincta, quam dicunt antiquitus habitatem, sed propter molestiam virulenti generis derelictam"
'For there is a most deep and thorny valley, and on all sides by most high rocks surrounded, which they say was anciently inhabited, but on account of the nuisance of virulent type was abandoned'
op. cit. p. 69-70
Reginald mentions a legend of a British King Finc and the discovery of masses of bones.
I am grateful to Miss V.M. Tudor for pointing out these references to me.
46. 1831 printed census. The boundary of Witton Gilbert had been described in the thirteenth century.
DDPD. PK. D. & CD. Cart. Elemos. p.36, Cart II f.306 r.
47. SS. 21 1845 p. 276-280, Raine, J. ed. Depositions and Ecclesiastic Proceedings. p. 276 that the inhabitants of St. Margaret's were parishioners of St. Oswald's but could receive all sacraments at St. Margaret's, p.277 that St. Margaret's was responsible for the repair of the south side of St. Oswald's, p. 278 that the dead of St. Margaret's,

in the plague, had been buried at St. Oswald's. These are from the Book of Depositions, 1575-1576, and refer to a plague in the period c. 1537-1539. It won its right to a baptismal font in 1343 (Gee 1928 : 21).

48. SS. 95 1896 p.204.
49. Hutchinson 1788 ii fn. p.315, Randall MSS. p.194
"Quod incipiendo ad novum pontem Dunelm.& procendo
versus orientem & Molendium de Scaletoke miln
circa & juxta were fines & limites dicte Sancti
Oswaldi se ostendunt usq. ad oppositum rivuli
decurrentis inter Pellow et pomarium S'ti Egidii
& descendentes in pred. aquam were & extunc
procendendo citra & juxta rivulum pred. usq.ad
parvum pontem qui vocatur Gillybridge..."
See also DDPD. PK. D.& CD. 4. 16. Spec.14
It is also implied in DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Cart. Elemos.p.35,
thirteenth century, where the bounds described
for Elvet follow the fields of Old Durham and
stop at the 'Gillesbrigg'.
50. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. 4. 16. Spec. 14, Barmby 1896 SS.95
pp. xxix - xxx.
51. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. 4. 16. Spec. 14 AD. 1334, 4. 16. Spec.
40 AD. 1344, DDPD. SR. Elvet Tithe, 1838.
It became part of Shincliffe parish in 1831
(Whellan's Directory 1856).
52. DDPD. SR. HC. M5.Framwellgate and Witton Gilbert Enclosure
Award, Fordyce i 1857 : 219 quoting a MS. of
J. Bell, "Entercommons in Framwellgate 1667"
53. DDPD. SR. HC. M5. Framwellgate and Witton Gilbert Enclosure
Award awarded land to property in the parishes
of St. Mary-the-Less, St. Mary-le-Bow, St. Nicholas
and the township of Framwellgate.
54. In other words these were oratories rather than parish
churches or parochial chapelries. Those of
St. Andrew and St. James are recorded as being
founded in 1274 to 1283 and 1312 respectively,
(Gee 1928:20). The oratory at Old Durham dated
from 1268 (Gee 1907:16, Surtees iv:91), that
at Butterby is mentioned D.& CD. 2a. 14 Spec.
(Surtees iv : 109).
55. Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae Auctoritate
P. Nicolai IV circa AD. 1291. London 1802,
pp. 314-318.
56. St. Nicholas' was mentioned by Reginald, c1170-80, SS.20
1845 p.388 and was in a Norman style of
architecture. Engravings of the building in the
eighteenth century indicate this, Du. Routh,

collection of prints. There is a photograph of the 1840's or 1850's in the vestry. St. Mary-the-Less is commented upon by Gibby (1969) and Gomme (1893 : 18-19). St. Mary-le-Bow is less well documented but Russell (1769 : 165) comments upon its rebuilding.

57. Durham Diocesan Directory, 1973 pp. 89-119. The first incumbant at Sunderland was 1719.
58. The parish boundary of South Bailey, on the East side, follows the town wall but on the West side follows individual parcels of land (Fig. 44). That of North Bailey appears to follow an inner wall along the East side of Palace Green (Fig. 44). The Southern boundary of St. Nicholas' parish follows the wall between the City and the Peninsula (Figs. 43, 44) but on the North side goes beyond the wall at Claypath Gate as far as Tinkler's Lane (Figs. 43, 20). However, the Second Receiver's Book, DDPD. PK. D&CD. Rec. Book 2, 1542-3, distinguishes Claypath, which lies outside the walls, from the rest of the City. Murage grants are known in 1315 and 1337 (Dobson 1973 : 38, Bayley 1928 : 65) and the walls are known by an abuttal in 1347 (Longstaffe 1858 fn. p.203). They may have existed earlier since the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle E records a seige in 1087/88 (1972 ed.: 225) and Symeon mentions one in 1035 (Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia Historia Ecclesiae Dunhelmensis lib. Tertius cap. 9, 1857 ed. pp. 90-1, Greenwell 1934-6:58).
59. Beresford 1967
Scaltoc is shown on DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Misc. Ch. 7100 c. 1440-5.
60. Butterby is mentioned by Surtees vol. iv p.109 and shown on OS. Sheet Durham xxvii, Houghall is shown on OS. Durham xxvii (1857) as are fish ponds at Burnhall and Croxdale. A fish pond also existed at Newton Hall, OS. Durham xx, and a moat existed at Relley, OS. Durham xxvi.
61. Houghall in a grant of Bishop Flambard, Surtees iv : 94, Offler SS.179 1968:72. Aldingrange as an abuttal in a grant of Bishop Pudsey SS.2 1837:8-9, 167. Old Durham in a notification of Bishop Rufus, Offler SS.179 1968:31. Broom and Relley in a grant of Bishop Pudsey SS.2 1837:167.
62. SS.2 1837:8-9.
63. Liber Censualis vocati Domesday Book, Additamenta ex Codic. Antiquiss. London, 1816, pp. 565-587.

64. Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense vol. 2 Hardy Sir T.D.ed. Rolls Series. London 1874 p. 1214, 1313 Charter of Bishop Richard "quadraginta tres acras terrae in mora inter Kymlesword et Dunelmum" for 1/40 knight's fee and 29 solidas. 1311 Charter of Bishop Richard "totum vastum et moram quae incipit a porta occidentali prioratus de Fynkhal', et extendit se a dextus viae quae ducit versus Dunolmum..."
D.CRO. D/Fo/6-17, the Forcer MSS, describes Harbourhouse in a Crown lease and recusancy forfeit of 1593 as the 'Northwaists'.
65. Surtees iv : 137, Garbett VCH.iii 1928:147.
66. Surtees iv p.91 quoting 3. 17. Spec. 18 (1268), a license of Bishop Hugh for a chapel there. Mentions 'infra curiam suam Veteris Dunelm'
67. A statute of 1290.
68. Surtees iv : 137.
69. Personal communication Mr. H. Watt, Department of Archaeology, Durham.
70. Personal communication Mr. J. Clipson, director of the Elvet III excavation, 1976.
71. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44, Report of Wm. Winter, Surveyor to Durham LBH, 12th September 1849.
72. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44, Petition, 29th September 1849, from eleven surgeons, DDPD. SR. D.City vol.162 p.25 motion to drain 2nd October 1849.
73. Dodds (1915), Aston & Rowley (1974:112). The Church of St. Giles on the ridge top of Gilesgate was itself defended during the strife between Bishop de St. Barbara and William Cumin in the 1140's (Scammell 1956:108, quoting Symeon of Durham).
74. SS.95 1896 p.204.
75. D.Adv. Fri. April 4th 1851 no. 1909 p.2 col. 5, lane behind Gilesgate filled with potters' carts
DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163, 6th Aug. 1873 p.542.
Letter of complaint about a brick field close to the Goods Station, Gilesgate.
76. G.T. Clarke Report to the General Board of Health on a Preliminary Inquiry... of the Borough of Durham. London 1849, paragraph 54.
77. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 168 p.416.
78. Longstaffe, WHD. Local Muniments. Archaeologia Aeliana (2) 2 1858 pp. 24-38, 1294 Richard Fitz-David Wulpuller conveyed to Richard de Chilton a place (placea) abutting the Milneburne.

79. Longstaffe, Archaeologia Aeliana 2nd series, 1, and 2nd series, 2.
80. SS.58 1871 p.73 Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis
"Heredes Richardi filii Gilberti ... tenent libere i burgagium, situatem supra Milburn, et reddunt inde ad scaccarium Prioris Dunelm per annum 3d. "
"Heredes Johannis Hert ... tenent ibidem libere i tenementum vastum, ex parte australi de Milburn"
 p. 92 "Richardo Newton pro i burgagio in Milburnegate, per annum, 2ld."
81. Longstaffe, W.H.D. Archaeologia Aeliana (2) 2 1858 pp. 24-38, SS.58 1871 Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis, SS.9 1839 Appendix, DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Mag. Rep.
82. SS.58 1871 p.197 fn.
83. Walton, G. The Greenwell deeds, Archaeologia Aeliana (4) 3 1927 pp. 1-27, DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Mag. Rep. favour 'tenementum', 'messuagium' or 'burgagium'.
84. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Rec. Book 2. Back Lane properties were counted as 'ancient burgages' in the Framwellgate Enclosure Award DDPD. SR. HC. M5.f.132 ff.so date at least from the early sixteenth century. See below, Table 5.3 and comments.
85. D.S.St. 720/L Provisional List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest. July 1947. Revised Feb. 1949.
86. Kirby (1968:142), DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 1.
87. Longstaffe, W.H.D. Local Muniments Archaeologia Aeliana (2) 2 1858 pp. 24-38. Deed of 20th May 14 Hen.VII (1499) between John Henryson and John Potter of Durham. Burgage in Crossgate with burgages of the Guild of St. Cuthbert to the East and West. That to the West was formerly a vennel leading to the Westorchare and is newly built as one tenement by the guild.
88. 18 Geo. II c.8, 1745, Durham and Boroughbridge Road.
89. 20 Geo. II c.12, 1747, Durham and Newcastle Road (Albert 1972 App. B).
90. See footnotes 88 and 89, supra. The other turnpike companies, the Durham and Sunderland, 20 Geo. II c.13, 1747, and the Catterick, Stockton and Durham, 20 Geo. II c. 28, were supposed to repair existing roads.
91. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Mag. Rep.
 3.16. Spec. 47 Relaxacō i' Vok & Elene ux' ei' de i ten' & i curtilag' i' veti' Elvett...
 4.16. Spec. 4 Relaxacō Roberto Bellacis de vno mess' et quatuor cotagiis in Eluett...

- SS.58 1871 Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis
p. 76 a burgate in Claypath, now three
p. 73-4 a tenement in Elvet now two, and a part
of a tenement
p. 92 "Richardus Smyth pro medietate j burgagii
ibidem super Southrawe, per annum 3s." (Elvet)
92. An example is Potts House, Church Street, Elvet.
93. Charity Commission 1904. Endowed Charities, Administrative
County of Durham and County Boroughs of Gateshead
and Sunderland vol. 2 p. 253. It is assumed
that this is a statute acre.
94. SS.58 1871 p. 74-5 burgages of xlvij pedes, xx pedes,
xvii pedes, xxij pedes and xxiiij pedes. A search
of DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Mag. Rep. revealed no
examples of measurements.
95. Longstaff, W.H.D. Archaeologia Aeliana (2) 2,1858,pp. 24-38,
example of format:
6 Hen. V (1418) Thomas and wife Alice Glover of
Durham convey 2 burgages in Framwellgate. One
lies breadth between William Shorowton on South
and Thomas Cokyn on North and length from king's
highway before to Wear behind.
SS.58 1871 p. 76, example of format:
1430 "Capellanus cantariae Sancti Jacobi in
ecclesia Beati Nicholai in Dunelm. tenet libere de
Episcopo Dunelm. j. burgagium super Suthrawe in
Clayporth, quondam Johannis Bill et Willelmi Chalker
inter burgagium capellani cantariae sanctae Mariae
de Pittyngdon ex parte occidentali et burgagium
capellani cantariae Sancti Jacobi in ecclesia Beata
Nicholai praedicta ex parte orientali..."
96. DDPD. SR. HC. Miscell. Files Box 2 401 The Bishopric Acre,
DDPD. SR. DJ. 4/1 p.57.
97. See footnote 93 supra.
98. The totals are not 100% since an observed boundary may
coincide with more than one expected boundary if
a number of different land rods, and therefore series
of expected boundaries, are employed.
99. Gilesgate was somewhat different since it had been partially
enclosed in the seventeenth century. This
probably was linked to the tithe modus of 1637
D.CRO. EP/Du SG 3 pp. 41-43, 45. It was finally
enclosed under 56 Geo. III c.58 (1816).
100. Elvet D.CRO.EP/Du SO 114. Initial fines for stints : Freeman's
son £0.0.8d, freeman's apprentice £0.1.0d,
freeman's son-in-law £0.5.0d, freeman's widow's
husband £0.5.0d, inheritor or purchaser of a
dwelling £0.10.0d, outman £2.10.0d.
Gilesgate SS.95 1896 p.2, 96-8.

101. SS.95 1896 p.37 receipt 13s.4d. @ 2d/cow.
102. SS.95 1896 p.110 receipt £15.15.1d @ 1s./stint. Why there was the receipt of an extra penny is not explained.
103. SS.96 1896 p.110.
104. Lordship was divided between the bishop, the Prior and Convent and Kepier Hospital (Fig. 19) with Crook Hall and Old Durham forming other separate manors. The property of the bishop, and that for which he was lord, is not documented in detail since it tended to be at farm even as early as Boldon Book in 1183 (1816 ed :565) so is recorded as a total and not property by property. Such is also the case in Bishop Cosin's Survey in 1662 DDPD. PK. Sharp No. 167. When the Durham court rolls exist for the eighteenth and nineteenth century these clearly do not include every property. See Chapter 6 footnote 10.

The properties of the Prior and Convent also present problems for analysis since they were divided between the obedientaries up to 1541 (Lomas 1973). From 1542, DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Rec. Book 2 their properties are well documented and in addition there were surveys in 1580, SS. 82 1889, and in the late eighteenth century, the Woodifield Survey, DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. These can be compared to the Feodarium, SS. 58 1871, since the property of the Prior and Convent passed to the Dean and Chapter. But a complete picture cannot be built up for the town since their properties were not evenly spread through the built up area (Fig.28). There was little in the City of Durham itself. In addition there is very little information available for the Manor of Gilesgate which passed from Kepier Hospital to the Heath family and later to the Londonderry family. SS.95 1896 Introduction. A few copies of the court rolls exist, D.CRO. EP/Du SG. 107; 1523, 1525, 1542, 1555, 1600 and 1617 but no overall picture can be established from these.
105. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Rec. Book 2. Landmale was usually fixed at 1s. (Lomas 1973 : 94).
106. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Elvet Enclosure Award 1773, DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Register 51 ff. 1-69 Crossgate Enclosure Award 1770, DDPD. SR. HC. Framwellgate Enclosure Award 1809.
107. For example the wastes shown on the Speede map of 1611 had disappeared on the Armstrong map of 1768 (Fig.15). The small rise in income for the Dean and Chapter from urban property, Appendix 5.6, may also be attributed to the infill of wastes, rather than alteration of receipts from each property or buying additional property.

108. See footnote 100, supra. See also Chapter 2 footnote 76.
109. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Misc. Ch. 5828/12.
110. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Rec. Book 2, DDPD. PK. D.& C.D.
Elvet Enclosure Award, 1772.
111. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Reg. 52 f. 58r - 126r. The Elvet
Enclosure Award shows the vennels in the abutments
of 'ancient burgages'. For example No. 66, on
the North Row, indicates a stable to the west but
its westerly neighbour, No. 207 indicates a vennel
to its East.
112. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D.
Rec. Book 2 1542-3 total 'vasta' 69
18 1592-3 42
40 1641-2 32
638 1692-3 24

In the receiver's books only one explicit reference is recorded to a waste burgage being rebuilt. Significantly this is in the seventeenth century, DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. 40, 1641-2, p.51 under 'Baronat de Eluet'

"Eodm. (Willimo Dunne) pro Burg nouit' Edific'
ibm"

113. Parishes of the town:- St. Oswald; terrier 1788 (Surtees iv (2) 1840 : 81-2), St. Giles; (Cheetham VCH.iii 1928 : 189), D.CRO. EP/Du SG 107 copies of court rolls St. Margaret; Longstaffe in Archaeologia Aeliana (2) 2 1858 pp. 24-38 texts of leases, St. Nicholas; Valor Ecclesiasticus vol. V (1825 ed.) p.318, St. Mary Magdalene; SS.95 1896 p. xxxii. But St. Mary-le-Bow appears not to have had urban property; D.CRO. EP/Du MB 2 terrier 1792. Guilds, chapels and hospitals of the town:- Kepier Hospital; D.CRO. EP/Du SG 107, St. Andrew on Elvet Bridge; SS.58 1871 pp. 74, 75, 92 (Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis), Guild of St. Cuthbert; Longstaffe in Archaeologia Aeliana (2) 2 1858, 1499 abuttal, Guild of St. Mary in St. Margaret's church; Longstaffe in Archaeologia Aeliana (2) 2 1858, 1485 lease, Guild of Holy Trinity in St. Oswald; SS.58 1871, Rentale, lease 1539, Guild of St. James in St. Nicholas' church; SS.58 1871 p.76. Other ecclesiastical bodies:- Abbot of Blanchland; Longstaffe in Archaeologia Aeliana (2) 2 1858, lease 1426, Vicar of Heighington; SS.58 1871 p.77 Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis, St. Mary of Pittington; SS.58 1871 p. 76.
114. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Rec. Book 2, for the example of Bowes House, South Bailey see Kynaston and Johnson (1969).

115. Even as late as 1641-2 former guild property was identified in the Receiver's Book, DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Rec. Book 40. The entries for such property are as follows:-

Ballium, p.17, "Thoma Pearson aut Tho : Cooke' pro Lib' ffirm'. nup' Guild Trinitate "

Claporth, p.21, "capo. Guild Sti Cuth : pro lib'. ffirm' unius tenemento iacent inter aliud vast ex parte occident, et tenementum. Willimi Ffirst, ex parte orient' "

Burgus de Elvet, p.37, "Eodm. (Robto. Collingwood) pro Lib' ffirm' nup' Guild Salva: "
 p. 37, "Eodm. pro Lib' ffirm' alt B:Eiusdm. Guild "
 p. 40 "Eodm. (Arthuro Smith) pro vast' nup' cap. Sti. Andraeae "
 p. 40 "Richardo Keinlyside p le Guildhall"
 p. 42 "Cap' Stae. Mariae Virginis - sect cur'"
 p. 42 "pro ter. nup' Guild Salvat la Rosa "
 p. 43 "Guild Sti. Cuthbti - sect cur'"
 p. 46 "Cap' Scti. Andraa pro Lib' ffirm' octo opellorum"

Crosgate p. 73 "Johanne Richardson Arg' pro Lib' ffirm' nup' Guild St' Cuthbti "

So some property was recorded under the name of the guild or chantry and some was recorded under a layman and described as being former property of a guild or chantry. Much of the shift to entries under lay names occurred, in the Elvets, between 1564-5 and 1592-3, DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Rec. Books 9 and 18. These volumes have no foliation numbers.

"Pro gild Salvator p li firm. j burg..." in 1564-5 becomes

"Pro Gerardo Dootes pro ij⁶³ vast' "

"Pro cap no Scti Andrae p li firm. ij⁶³ burg' ii" remains the same entry

"Pro cap^{no} Scti Anrere p i vast' " becomes "Pro eodē (Thoma Roiyle) p vast cap ni Sci Andree

"Pro cap^{no} bti Virginis in ecclia Scti Oswoldi..." becomes "p' Jacobo Storie & Tho blenkynsop p li fir^m ij⁶³ burg."

"Pro gild Scti trinitate p li fir^m de gildhall" becomes "p' Thoma Chayter ... pro lez gildhall"

This appears in an Inq.p.m. for Thomas Chaitor on 3rd April 1619, Deputy Keeper's Report 1883 p. 363

"Pro gild chuthberti p l orteo" becomes "P' gild sci Cuth" - " (followed by a blank)

"Pro gild Salvator p j burg" becomes "P' Regero Hocheson p ten endⁿ gild Salvat" and "A ead gild" (followed by a blank) and

"P' Rogiro hocheson p li firm ij⁶³ burg vast"

"Pro capno. scti Andree p li firm. i vast" becomes
"P' Jacobo Lyddell p un' vast ibm"
"Pro gild chuthberti p l orfeo" becomes "P'
rogero ffissher p li firm burg ibm"
"Pro capno. bti virginis in ecclia Scti Oswaldi" p
ij burg" becomes "p John Philpe pro
li firm. burg ibm"

116. See Chapter 4 footnotes 44, 49 and 50.
117. The Woodifield Survey, DDPD. PK. D. & C.D., indicates 299 houses and at least 9 parts of houses. The 1801 census gives 1,054 as the total of inhabited and uninhabited houses. A comparison of the two totals cannot be accurate since the term 'house' in the census was not precise. See Chapter 4 footnotes 11 to 13a.
118. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 46.
119. There is no trace of any such policy in the Dean and Chapter Minutes, DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. transcripts vols. II, III.
120. Confirmed by a 1698 paper quoted by Fordyce in connexion with a Select Committee of the House of Lords, 1851 (Fordyce 1857 i : 141). This gave the income of the Dean and Chapter as £2,698.3.7½d, in addition to the prebendal estates which yielded £12,000 pa. Of the Dean and Chapter income £540 was from urban property, £997 from tithes and £10,058 from leases of land.
121. It commented that burgages were let at 40s. per annum which was lower than their market value of £4 per annum.
122. Compare also Table 8.4 for proportion of population owning property. Compare also Appendix 4.4.
123. 1850 2,027 rated units, excluding land and pipes, but including those with outbuildings, 350 appear to have been owner occupied, excluding persons of the same surname but different initials and trustees. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 137.
124. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 148. 2,564 rated dwellings, 449 owner occupied.
125. DDPD. SR. 1919 ratebook, Surveyor's deposit 1970. 3,550 rated dwellings, 538 owner occupied.
126. Some clearance occurred between the wars (Gibby 1977) but most was in the 1960's following the recommendations by Thomas Sharp (1944).
127. Hughes, E. ed. Letters of Dean Spencer Cowper SS.165 1950 p.61, Letter 18 Sept. 1746.

128. op. cit. fn. 127 p. 128, Letter 14 Sept, 1750.
129. D. S.St. 720/L Provisional List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest. July 1947. Revised Feb. 1949. Gee VCH.iii (1928).
130. D. Adv. Fri. Dec 1 1848 no. 1787 p.5 col. 3, comment by Mr. Marshall.
131. I am grateful to Dr. C.W. Gibby for allowing me access to his collection of photographic negatives and to the Keeper of Science Books, Durham University Library for allowing me access to the Edis Collection of photographs.
'The Curtains', South Street (Plate 5) and cottages in the Horse Hole, Millburngate (Gibby 1977) are amongst those which have been demolished.
132. D.S.St.942/L11. Houses on Bow Lane and in Millburngate were demolished in 1964.
133. Cox (1720 : 613), citing Turgot. The name 'Bough Church' was being used in the early seventeenth century (Legg 1904) It is not clear whether St. Mary's, referred to by Reginald, SS.20 1845 p. 345, is this church or not.
134. Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores. Simeon of Durham. Opera Omnia. Rolls Series. London 1882. vol.1 Liber Tertius cap. 15 p.99.
135. Barmby SS.95 1896 pp. 32-3.
136. D.S.St. 720/L.
137. D.S.St. 720/L. The stone came from small local quarries such as those at Crook Hall (Garbett 1928:147), OS.Durham xxvii.1, in the Browney Valley (field observations), on Crossgate Moor, DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Register 51 ff. 1-69, Enclosure Award 1770 and on the Banks, DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Transcripts of Minutes vol. II p.401, 403. These quarries on the Banks may be the source of Leland's anecdote that the river gorge had been dug out to build the town (Gee 1928 : 23-4). The use of stone was common throughout the North East of England (Smailes 1960 : 155), as was the custom of plastering the outside walls (Lloyd 1975 : 69).
138. See Pevsner (1953). This was demolished in the mid-nineteenth century (Garbett 1928 : 157).
139. See Pevsner (1953).
140. Dodds (1971). See also D.S.St 720/L. A stone pointed arch door frame appeared on the South side during restoration work in 1975-6.

141. Du LC. D. Adv. Fri 23 April 1971 no. 8632 p. 9 col.3.
It was already known to have a seventeenth century staircase (Johnson 1970 : 21).
142. DDPD. PK. D.& C.D. Rec. Book 48 1667-8 f.17 "cap. Scī. Andrae - sect cur.", Rec. Book 63B 1692-3 p.30
"Marg : Smith... Ead'p vasto cap : St : Andrew - 00 : 00 : 05"
143. D.CRO.D/X 146/1-15 Sunderland Echo Sat. Sept. 15 1962 p.6,
Sat. Aug 11 1962 p. 2 See also Nelson (1974).
144. Nelson (1974), Gibby (1977).
145. D.CRO. D/X 146/1-15, Sunderland Echo, Saturday, September 15, 1962 p.6 'The House that Jack built is doomed'
146. Greenwell, W ed. SS.58 1871 pp. 200-1, Inventarium Prioratus Dunelmensis, 1464. "Reparacio unius grangiae cum lapidibus tectae et unius granariae similiter cum lapidibus tectae assessatur ad 4 li".
147. Wood, H.M. ed. SS.135 1922, Durham Protestations, p.119, 1641 "William Ransom slaitor", Headlam AW.ed. (1891:94) 1639 burial "George Hedwine sclator".
148. Personal communication, Mr. J. Clipson, director of Elvet III excavation, 1976. D.S.St.720/L, Du. Routh Speede's map of Durham.
149. Du. Routh, Durham University Collection of engravings.
150. D.CRO. D/X 146/1-15 Sunderland Echo Sat, Sept. 15 1962 p.2.
151. The final canon is not mentioned by Cox. Photographs in the Gibby Collection indicate medieval fabric.
152. D.S.St 720/L, see also Plate 8a & 8b.
153. Personal communication, Mr. George, Bylund Lodge, Durham.
154. Examples are DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 158 p.25, March 5 1850, vol. 160 4 June 1953, house and shop in Gilesgate, vol. 162 p.393 4th November 1857 and vol. 162 p.421-2 5 May 1858 in Gilesgate.
155. They complained to the General Board of Health. See DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 161 p.113-4, 18 November 1857.
156. D.Adv. Fri. Dec. 12 1975 p.9.
157. This is not to say that there are no cellars in buildings along the older streets. Carver found that House No.4 in his excavation in New Elvet had a cellar which had been reused when the house was remodelled (1974:106), arched basements survive on Sadler Street (Gee 1928:1), for example under the 'Buffalo's Head', which was rebuilt in 1975, others in Claypath were discovered during demolition (Dodds 1967:19).

158. DDPD. SR. D.Probate. Total 61 inventories for residents in the City and suburbs proved between 1540 and 1599 in addition to one bond and 30 wills without inventories. The remaining six probates for the period have been lost. These are William Elwicke 1577, James Lambton 1595, Thomas Mallyver 1565, Edward Newby 1576, G. Smith 1576, Tho. Swinnoe 1594.
159. DDPD. SR. D.Probate Hugh Whitfield, 1578, Silver Street, D.Probate Reg. II 194r - 196r John Wall, 1565, South Bailey.
160. DDPD. SR. D.Probate Jayne Hall 1567 Reg. III 24r - 25r, Wood HM.ed. SS 135 1922 p.120.
161. 35 out of 61 inventories.
162. DDPD. SR. D.Probate. Single room John Talentier 1580, Hall & Chamber or Parlour Ra. Awdwood 1596, Jhon Horne 1584 St. Oswald, John Humble 1597, Thomas Lawes 1566, Eliz. Robinson 1596, Rich. Wheatley 1556. Many rooms Rob. Booth 1592, John Dawson 1582, Henry Dawson 1588, John Fairbuk 1597, Jayne Hall 1567, Tho. Hall 1586, Cuth. Hutchinson, the younger, 1596, Richard Marshall 1581, John Mawer 1588, Margaret Nicholson 1572, Richard Rowell 1570, John Stowt 1582, Christopher Surties 1587, Raff Surtes 1558, John Taylfare 1571, Nic. Taylor 1587, John Wall 1565, - Walton 1587, Hugh Whitfield 1578, Ralph Wilson 1587, Will. Wilson 1587. Ric. Walton 1584 differentiated between the house and the shop.
163. DDPD. SR. D.Probate, 1540 to 1599 include the following rooms in inventories :

Christopher Surties	1587	'low parler' (City)
Will. Wilson	1587	'chamber over the hall, back loft' (Gilligate)
- Walton	1587	'lower chamber' (City)
John Wall	1565	'inner highe chamber, other chamber, childer chamber' (City)
John Taylfare	1571	'plor beneth the hall, chamber above the plor, chamber above the hall, chamber over the lowe plor" (Durham)
Raff Surtes	1558	'high chamber, other chamber, on other chamber, highe chamber' (Durham)
John Stowt	1582	'high chamber over the hall, chamber over the studdie, chamber over the plor, chamber over the plor, vawt under the plor' (N.Bailey)

Margaret Nicholson	1572	'lower chamber' (St. Margaret)
Richard Marshall	1581	'chamber, onder chamber, hey chamber' (Kingsgate)
Tho. Hall	1586	'hygeste chamber' (City)
John Fairbuk	1597	'low parlour, high chamber' (Cittie)
Henry Dawson	1588	'hygh chamber, lofte over ye shoppe' (St. Oswald).
164. Personal communication Mr. John Clipson, director of Elvet III excavation, 1976.
165. DDPD. SR. D.Probate Thomas Johnson (Thomas Weneman) 1582.
166. DDPD. SR. D.Probate Jayne Hall 1567 South Bailey includes a milkhouse, Reg. III 24r - 25r. John Humble 1597 and Cuthbert Hutchinson 1596 had milk churns listed amongst their chattels.
167. DDPD. SR. D.Probate Rob. Booth 1592 5a, 5d, at Houghall, Thomas Oliver 1573 at Bradbury and Edmundbyers, John Stowt 1582 68a, 68b at Langley, John Wall 1565 Reg. II 194r - 196r at Kellow and The Isle, Hugh Whitfield 1578 at Grindon.
168. DDPD. SR. D. Probate Richard Marshall 1581 at Murton, Thomas Rutter 1540 at Middleton-in-Teesdale, Robert Smithers 1548 at Pittington, William Jackson 1593 33a, 33b at St. Mary Holme, Cumberland, William Wilson 1587 at Billyrow, Jhone Buckle 1584 no. 15 at Wolsingham.
169. see footnote 130 supra.
170. DDPD. SR. D.Probate Jhone Buckle 1584 no. 15.
171. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Elvet Enclosure Award 1773.
172. D.S.St. 720/L.
173. 1801 1,054 houses, 1841 2, 373 houses, printed censuses.
174. Exact figures 1901 2,712 houses. Pre 1801 38.86%, 1801-1841 48.64%, 1841 - 1901 12.50%. But allowance must be made for occasional demolitions and for redefinition of the term 'house'.
175. This does not show at all in the Durham Probate records. DDPD. SR. D.Probate.
176. DDPD. SR. search room, Wood map 1820.
177. Plaque on the building.
178. A plaque on the school buildings is dated 1841. The estimate for the buildings appears in the Chapter Minutes on 13th Nov. 1841 DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Transcripts of the Minutes vol. III p.937, and payment on 24th May 1843 p. 955.

179. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 pp. 195-6 7 Nov 1853. Comment by the Building Committee that it was already outdated.
180. Walker's 1849 p.74.
181. The Infirmary began in Allergate in 1792 (Surtees i 1816 : 12) but was rebuilt on North Road (Fordyce 1857 i : 334-5) and appears in Du. Routh. Engraving marked John Bouet delt. 1850, W.H. Lizars sc., "Durham County Hospital".
182. St. Margaret's Schools of 1860, DDPD. SR. D.City Box 48/243, St. Giles's Schools of 1863, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 p. 36 and St. Oswald's Vicarage of 1864, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 p. 87-8 were still built in Gothic style.
183. Plaque, no. 50, South Street, 1850.
184. This is not only the case in Magdalene Street, Gilesgate, but also in Peele's Terrace, Hallgarth Street and Wardell's Buildings, Crossgate.
185. John Forster who built Tenter Terrace and Neville Street.
186. Mountjoy Crescent reused dressed stone.
187. The Townhall, the Guildhall, St. Nicholas' church, St. Cuthbert's North Road, Elvet Methodist, St. Godric's Castle Chare, St. Cuthbert's Old Elvet, Claypath Chapel, Waddington Street chapel, Bethel Chapel North Road, the County Hospital, the Workhouse, the Penitentiary, the Teacher Training Colleges, the Training School, St. Margaret's Schools, St. Oswald's Schools, St. Margaret's vicarage, St. Nicholas' vicarage and the Masonic Hall were all of stone. See Pevsner (1953) and D.S.St. 720/L.
188. Such as the Mechanic's Institute, Claypath. Walker's Directory and Almanack.
189. Including St. Godric's parish Hall, Framwellgate, and St. Oswald's Institute, Church Street, plaque 1902, Old Shire Hall, Old Elvet, plaque 1896. Field observations.
190. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p. 484, 5th October 1849, conditional passing of a building plan. vol. 161 p. 155, 17th September 1859, reply to Ipswich LBH. that byelaw but not yet under Town Improvement Clauses Act.
191. See Chapter 3 footnotes 50 and 51, also DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44 Oct. 29th 1849, a property at Claypath Gates, Box 44 3 June 1850 and 16th July 1852, 'The Green Tree', vol. 162 4 Aug. 1852 pp. 145-7,

Durham Market Co. offices, vol. 162 2 June 1858
p. 424 St. Nicholas's school rooms, vol. 163
7 March 1866 p.156 Backhouse & Co., a bank
a dwelling, vol. 163 4 March 1868 p.243 to
alter a shop, vol. 164 6 Sept 1876
p.67 for National Provincial Bank, vol. 164
p.71 for shops and offices, vol. 164 5 March
1879 p. 215 rebuild shop and house, vol. 168
7 Feb. 1900 p.29 a bank and Bylund Lodge
undeposited Building Register Dec. 1913 No.301
a bank, offices and a house.

192. Appendix 4.7.

CHAPTER SIX

FORMS OF LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

1. Introduction

Between the property rights of individuals and the townscape, between the theoretical prescriptions of statute law and their actual enactment lay local government. There is no doubt that the structure and powers of local government altered dramatically during the nineteenth century but it has been the dating of significant changes and assessing the impact that is still debated. Dicey argued that the most important changes in both structures and attitudes to local government took place after 1865 (1905). In his view the preceding decades were characterized by "laissez-faire", the period between 1830 and 1870 being one which saw stationary or diminishing central government intervention in local administration. The turning points, in this argument were the 1866 Sanitary Act and the 1875 Public Health Act. (1)

Such a view has been followed in many general commentaries on the period, including that by Ashworth (1954), but has been challenged by both Brebner (1948) and Parris (1960). In addition the challenge by MacDonagh must be noted (1958:61fn) but this was more specific to the operation of the Emigration Office. Parris and Brebner argue that change came earlier and that the 1830's should be seen as a decade of genesis followed by decades of state intervention. 'Laissez-faire' was a myth (Brebner 1948:59-60) and the appraisal of the role of central government between 1830 and 1870 was mistaken (Parris 1960:26). Modern general commentators have accepted these appraisals (Thompson 1960:337, Keith-Lucas 1977) and specific work on the Local Government Act Office has confirmed the view (Lambert 1962) but work on

specific localities, and in particular on Lancashire, has again raised doubts (Midwinter 1965).

This is not to deny that there was feeling against centralization in the middle decades of the century and a contemporary perception of failure is reflected in the comments by Stewart and Jenkins on sanitary legislation (1867). A distinction must be made, however, between contemporary perception and contemporary action since Gutcheon has argued that in theory the middle decades of the century were ones of decentralized power but in practice they were centralist (1961:96). In addition Cromwell has stressed that these decades saw adaptation of existing means of government and continuity of personnel (1966:246-7).

Interest in the local government of Durham City has two aspects. Firstly, to some extent, the townscape has been directly influenced by administrative decision making,⁽²⁾ though to what extent and in which decades remains a question to be discussed. Secondly, and in a wider context, Keith-Lucas has introduced the idea that small towns were often lethargic in their adoption and use of powers (1977:14). How far was this the case in this specific small town? Was there local initiation of ideas or was the town

'Accustomed to receive its law and opinions, like its ribbons and other manufactured goods from London'. (3)?

Administrative history for Durham City is viewed as a link between a changing townscape (Chapter 5), a changing economy (Chapter 3), and a changing society (Chapter 8); a background stressed both by Aylmer (1958)

and by Cromwell (1966:254-5). Too often legal and administrative frameworks have been ignored except in cases where, in comparing similar formal regions in different countries, the differences had to be attributed in part to legal differences as Elkins suggested when comparing British and German coalfields (1954, 1967). In this case study administration is probed even down to the level of the administrators, their interests and cliques both in an attempt to go beyond a 'black box' approach (Chorley & Kennedy 1971:7) or an implicit 'Tory' approach to history (Hart 1965:197), and in an attempt to understand the differences between structures of government and legal powers; a constitutional approach, and the implementation of those powers. The structures are considered in Chapter 6 and the implementation in Chapter 7.

2. Inherited Local Government Structures

The City and suburbs of Durham were governed in the first half of the nineteenth century by a bevy of administrative bodies which not only duplicated by area, since they reflected the former distinct parts of the town - Durham, Gilesgate, Elvet, Crossgate, the Peninsula parishes and the extraparochial places, but also duplicated in their roles. In addition to the hallmote courts of the various manors; Durham, Gilesgate, Elvet and Crossgate ⁽⁴⁾ there were the parish vestries of St. Nicholas, St. Giles, St. Oswald, St. Mary-le-Bow, St. Mary-the-less and the parochial chapelry of St. Margaret, the Corporation of Durham, the Dean and Chapter and the county authorities. All these bodies dated

from the medieval or early modern periods. To these had been added, in the eighteenth century, Turnpike Trusts dealing with the repair of certain roads and an Improvement Commission, after 1790, dealing with street repair, cleansing, watch and lighting. (5)

Not all the administrative roles of these bodies, or indeed the roles in which they were most active, are pertinent to the question of the relationship between the administrative bodies and the development of the townscape. The hallmote courts appointed meat searchers, (6) bread weighers and aletaster (7) and their tenurial role was the major item on the early nineteenth century court rolls, while the regulation of the trade guilds was the main emphasis of the byelaws of the Corporation (8) and poor relief was the main concern of parish vestries. Yet even these roles illustrate that within an inherited administrative structure the role of that body could change. The hallmote court for Durham City, the best recorded hallmote court (9), was steadily losing its tenurial role in the early nineteenth century. In April 1801, when households were still obliged to pay landmale, approximately 55% of households in Framwellgate and the City were presented for default. (10) The number of households liable to pay was reduced but the proportion defaulting rose over the following two decades (11) and the main activity of the court shifted to upholding the quality of urban life.

Between 1752 and 1866 the Durham hallmote court made amercements for the sale of rotten goods, allowing swine to wander in the streets, the accumulation of dirt in the

streets, stacking goods or leaving carts in the streets and, in a single case, for a smoke nuisance. (12) With regard to the fabric of the town amercements were made, in the same period, concerning the dangerous decay of property, the protection of cellar openings, the blocking of vennels, footpath repair, encroachment on the streets and encroachment on the common grazing of the Sands. (13)

With the exception of the late 1830's when privies were amerced as nuisances (14), the Durham hallmote court dealt exclusively with public spaces (15) including both main streets and certain back lanes and vennels. In the case of public spaces not only was the preservation of the right of way upheld, the aspect stressed by the Webbs (1920:5), but also the public space as an area with fixed bounds for frontages and paving. The main streets, and Providence Row, leading to the Sands (Fig. 20), were dealt with but also vennels along the burgage tails at Framwellgate East row (16), Back Lane behind Silver Street and Paradise Lane behind Claypath. The only amercements for private vennels occurred for Drury Lane and for New Place Yard in the 1840's (17) and, in the latter case, the property was that of the parish rather than of an individual. (18)

The later amercements suggest that the court was edging beyond its customary role; not only by amercing private property but also by acting as a watchdog to other administrative bodies since in 1866 it inspected the condition of the Sands and, in 1867, the state of the River Wear and commented upon these to the Durham Local Board of Health. (19)

But this was not a steady alteration in role but rather the activity of the court, as measured by the number of amerce-ments, fell after the mid-eighteenth century and reached a nadir at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Appendix 6.1). After this the court revived and tackled new problems and new perceived problems such as smoke nuisance and cleanliness. The report of 1867 was the swan-song of the Durham hallmote court, however, and it followed the Elvet and Crossgate hallmote courts into effective extinction. (20)

The turn of the nineteenth century saw the nadir of activity in another body, the Corporation (Todd 1931). During the years 1809 to 1826 no records were kept and Henderson, the carpet manufacturer, was not prevented from amalgamating the charity land in Back Lane into one factory site. (21) It had no direct role in the evolution of the townscape except as a property owner since it was trustee for the Charity property. (22) Instead its role was as a perpetual body which, from the sixteenth century (23), regulated the trade guilds, was lessee for the hallmote court of Durham City (24) and holder of the Court of Pye-Powder on fair days (Willis 1720:638). After reform in 1835 (25) and up to 1849, its main activities were the provision of watch (26) and the improvement of property (27) but in 1849 its members gained a dual identity as the Local Board of Health. (28) This period after 1835 will be considered separately in section 4 of this chapter since it was effectively a new administrative structure after that date.

Since the sixteenth century five parishes and one

parochial chapelry had had vestries responsible for poor relief, watch and highway repair ⁽²⁹⁾, and for the maintenance of the church and churchyard fabric. For these purposes separate rates were collected for the Poor, Highways and the Church with the assessment of the latter two rates based upon the Poor Rate. Although the Durham Poor Law Union was formed in 1834 ⁽³⁰⁾ it was the Union Assessment Act of 1862 which marked a change in rating since thereafter the union, rather than the individual parishes, were responsible for the maintenance of the poor through rating. ⁽³¹⁾ The changes in rate assessment did not alter the importance of the Poor Rate, however, and throughout the century it was the major financial item for each vestry. ⁽³²⁾ In contrast compulsory church rate was abolished ⁽³³⁾ and responsibility for highway repair passed, in part, to turnpike trusts and, later, in part to the Local Board of Health and, in part, to the County Council. In addition the vestries appointed constables ⁽³⁴⁾, though there was overlap in this respect with both the hallmote courts, since in Elvet and Crossgate, at least, the constables and grassmen were court officials ⁽³⁵⁾, and, later in the century, with the regular police force of the Borough. ⁽³⁶⁾

The townships and parishes administered by the vestries did not correspond identically with the manorial areas administered by the hallmote courts. Arising from such overlap, the grassmen, who regulated the common grazings of each township, could appear in different vestry minutes to the actual parish in which that township lay. The grassmen of the parishes of St. Mary-le-Bow and St. Mary-the-

less are recorded both in their own vestry minutes and in the vestry of St. Nicholas (37) while an even more complex situation arose in Framwellgate township. That township was in the parochial chapelry of St. Margaret within the parish of St. Oswald but it was also considered to be within the City of Durham for the purposes of the hallmote court (38) and for enclosure (39), although it retained vestiges of a former separate identity. (40) The overseers of the poor and the constables for Framwellgate appear within the vestry of St. Margaret's but the grassmen appear within the vestry of St. Nicholas. (41)

The vestries were, therefore, an overlapping administrative structure to the hallmote courts and the Corporation. But although they were an old structure of administration which continued into the nineteenth century it would be a mistake to see them as static either in structure or in role. With the exception of St. Mary-the-less (42) each vestry changed in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century from an open meeting to an elected meeting of twenty four members. (43) But unlike Manchester or Leeds (Hennock 1973), these select vestries do not appear to have been the centres of administrative and political power in the town.

Their role gradually contracted as newer 'ad hoc' authorities became responsible for highway repair, the poor and burial grounds. (44) In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the vestries had been responsible for bridge repair (45) and St. Nicholas' vestry appointed Bridgemasters (46) but, as was usual elsewhere (Webb & Webb 1920:88), the duty

passed to the county and in the Survey of Bridges, made in 1689 ⁽⁴⁷⁾, Elvet Bridge, Framwellgate Bridge and Shincliffe Bridge were the responsibility of the county, Croxdale Bridge was not listed and Giles Bridge remained the responsibility of St. Giles parish. In comparison responsibility for approximately one third of the bridges in the county was, by 1689, vested in the county authorities. ⁽⁴⁸⁾

Highway repair duties contracted but were not extinguished until the 1880's when the county council came into operation. ⁽⁴⁹⁾ Within the borough the Improvement Commission was responsible for road repair ⁽⁵⁰⁾ and, in addition, certain roads were the responsibility of Turnpike Trusts. ⁽⁵¹⁾ In 1792 the urban parish of St. Mary-the-less repaired 'from the Great Gate to the Church Porch' ⁽⁵²⁾ but it did not come within the area encompassed by the Improvement Commission. Its vestry also collected a lamp cess in 1818 and 1819 ⁽⁵³⁾ which elsewhere in the town was dealt with by the Commission. Within the area covered by the Commission highway repair ceased to be a duty of the vestries but beyond that area, in rural parts of the townships, highway repair continued as a vestry obligation. ⁽⁵⁴⁾ This obligation continued to operate over the turnpike roads, as was common elsewhere (Webb & Webb 1920); St. Oswald's vestry, for example, making payments to the trustees of the Stockton Road, Lobley Hill Road and Borough-bridge Road. ⁽⁵⁵⁾

In the early nineteenth century new roles appear for the vestries including scavenging but this may be explained as a means of employing the poor and fulfilling their

existing obligations. (56) An example can be drawn from St. Giles parish where the vestry combined two duties by employing the poor directly as road repairers. (57)

The Dean and Chapter of Durham took responsibility for the extraparochial area of the college by appointing a constable (58), by paving (59), laying on water (60), and draining. (61) The College, or Cathedral precincts, were outside the jurisdictional area of the Improvement Commission, when it was formed in 1790, so remained the responsibility of the Dean and Chapter until the Durham Local Board of Health was formed in 1849. (62) But the Bailey, which had been repaired by the Dean and Chapter in 1728 and 1768 (63), became the responsibility of the Improvement Commission. In all, the role of the Dean and Chapter may be termed a responsible property owner; it was not an administrative body over the community as a whole.

The final administrative body to be considered amongst those already in existence by the nineteenth century was the county. It was responsible for specific buildings and areas in the town; the Courts on Palace Green, the old Gaol, which became the extraparochial area of Great North Gate between North Bailey and Sadler Street, and for the new County Court and Gaol in Old Elvet. (64) It also took responsibility for the paving of Court Lane adjacent to the Gaol, in the early nineteenth century; despite this being an ancient right of way (65), and it cleansed the bridges it maintained. (66) But its main role was as a watchdog over the actions of other administrative bodies and through indictments at the Quarter Sessions it enforced highway repair (67)

and not only authorized highway rate but also supported the vestries against defaulters from that rate. (68)

Administration was far from perfect, there was overlap between these bodies and there was duplication between different parts of the town but it is important to note that there was some administrative control over the actions of the individual and, through the role of the county, a watchdog to ensure, at least in highway repair, that some standards were maintained. But the various bodies were not empowered to take any preventive measures and their powers of compulsion retrospective to nuisances were weak. The normal procedure in the Durham hallmote court was merely to repeat an amercement (69); there is only one documented case of goods being distrained in order to effect a court order. (70)

3. Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Local Government Structures

It was perceived in the eighteenth century that the existing administrative bodies were ineffective so new bodies for specific purposes were added to those already in existence. In 1745 and 1747 Acts of Parliament were passed for the creation of turnpike trusts for the roads from Durham to Newcastle, Durham to Catterick, Durham to Sunderland and Durham to Boroughbridge (71) and in 1790 a Paving Commission was created, again by Act of Parliament (72), with an amending act in 1822. (73) In both respects the town was in the rearguard of national ideas on administrative bodies since both turnpike trusts and improvement commissions had been adopted in other places at earlier dates (Gill

1948:256, Smellie 1968:21, Webb & Webb 1922).

The need for a local Commission was summed up in the preamble to the 1790 Act as

"the Streets, Lanes, Ways and publick Passages, and Places, within the City of Durham, the Borough of Framwellgate, and the Suburbs thereof, and streets thereto adjoining, are not properly paved, cleansed or lighted." (74)

but in its actions the Commission never exhibited zeal for that paving, cleansing or lighting. The first commission was so inept at paving that Claypath was presented at the Quarter Sessions in 1822 (75) and the General Post Office threatened to indict the Commission for the state of the streets as a whole. (76) Even on their own admission the flagging in Gilesgate, Claypath, New Elvet, Hallgarth Street, Church Street, Dun Cow Lane, South Street and Crossgate were in bad repair in 1818. (77) Under the reformed commission the paving of new streets was avoided (78) or else the responsibility was divided between the street and the house frontage. In Water Lane, New Elvet, the paving was left to the responsibility of the householders but the Commission agreed to scavenge (79) while later at the new development of Wardell's Buildings, Allergate, the Commission agreed to flag the frontages only after discussion. (80) During the 1840's they appear to have been more active, taken more responsibility, and macadamised the streets (81) as well as flagging the pavements and they thereby did exceed the major achievement of most local commissioners as studied by the Webbs; namely the laying of stone footpaths (1922:274).

In scavenging too the Commission became more active.

Scavenging was contracted for in the "Streets Lanes Ways Public Passages and Places" (82) but this was interpreted as the main streets together with side streets on which stood houses. Thus Ratton Row and Water Lane were scavenged (83) while Moatside Lane was amerced by the Durham hallmote court. (84) Thereafter the area scavenged was extended to include Gilesgate in 1815 (85), Castle Chare in 1832 (86), Paradise Lane in 1845 (87) and, in 1836, the pavements in front of unoccupied houses. (88) In South Bailey there was no scavenging until the area was included within the area covered by the Commission in 1822. (89) By the 1840's roles were reversed with the county, the traditional watchdog on standards; for the surveyor to the Commission was bold enough to criticise the cleanliness of Framwellgate Bridge which was managed by the county. (90)

Lighting appears to have been poor but some improvement occurred up to the mid-nineteenth century. The first Commission levied a lighting cess (91) but in 1822 only 180 lamps were provided (92); and these only for the winter months in the main streets. Elvet Bridge, Framwellgate Bridge and Ratton Row remained unlit, being under county jurisdiction. (93) In 1823 gas lighting was introduced under contract from the proprietor of the gas company and later from the joint stock company. All through the period from 1823 to 1849, after which the Commission was replaced by the Local Board of Health, the Commission complained of unlit lamps and high prices (94) but they were held in a monopolistic situation with only one local company supplying gas. Despite this, part of the blame for poor lighting must be

attributed to the Commission. They did extend lighting up North Road (95) but only after delay and discussion (96) and in 1843 there were only 186 lamps in the town (97) and these were only on the main streets. (98)

In all, the Commission kept well within its statutory powers but increased its activities after the amendment act of 1822 and again during the 1840's. In 1842 it showed its only flight of imagination by suggesting that it should provide a water supply. The idea was firmly quashed by the clerk (99) so, unlike the Manchester Police Commission which did provide gas itself (Webb & Webb 1922:258), the Durham Commission kept strictly within its legal powers.

The turnpike trusts can be summed up as a negative influence. They did little to improve the streets over which they had jurisdiction and, as has been commented, the vestries continued in their role as highway repairers. (100) Instead the trusts complicated responsibility and caused delay in actions proposed by the Commission. (101)

4. Nineteenth Century Local Government Structures

New forms of local government were created in the 1830's and 1840's; the reformed Corporation, which has already been mentioned, the Poor Law Union and the Local Board of Health, which in 1875 became the Urban Sanitary Area. (102) Spencer stressed that these were new creations (1911:3) but in terms of general roles each followed its predecessors. The Durham Union was concerned with poor relief but did not entirely replace the vestries since it was they who continued to raise the poor rate. The Union workhouse was located in

Crossgate; a factor which influences both estimates of the population of the town and estimates of the mortality rates.⁽¹⁰³⁾ But in terms of the administration of the town it was a body existing in parallel, with its work supplemented by charities such as Sherburn Hospital ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ and the Durham Mendicity Society.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾

The reformed Corporation formed byelaws in 1845 and was active in the improvement of the Market Place. Its actions were not concerned with the whole town and the byelaws had an emphasis towards seemly conduct rather than towards building regulations. This was not entirely intentional since they originally intended to base the Durham byelaws on those of Liverpool which did include building regulations (Tarn 1969:321-3) but Liverpool failed to supply a copy for their use. Instead the byelaws of Sheffield were adopted with minor modifications. ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ In this respect they were borrowing ideas but in their petitions to Parliament on national and local issues they can be seen to have taken some initiative. ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

Their improvement scheme was limited in extent but was carried to completion. Between 1839 and 1849, in conjunction with the Improvement Commission and the Vestry of St. Nicholas, they extended the area of the Market Place by levelling the graveyard of St. Nicholas ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾, widened Claypath by removing the chancel of the church⁽¹⁰⁹⁾, utilised the charity property adjoining the Market Place for a covered market, finally rebuilt the covered market in 1846 ⁽¹¹⁰⁾, remodelled the Town Hall ⁽¹¹¹⁾ and removed the Piazza from the centre of the Market Place. ⁽¹¹²⁾ In addition property in

the Market Place and in Silver Street was set back and the gradient of Silver Street reduced.⁽¹¹³⁾ Such ventures of small scale civic redevelopment were common not only among large towns such as Birmingham and Manchester (Webb & Webb 1922: 254, 269) but also among small ones such as Croydon (Cox 1973:187).

From 1849⁽¹¹⁴⁾ the most important administrative body in the town was the Durham Local Board of Health, or after 1875, when it changed its title, the Urban Sanitary Authority. Its powers were derived from the 1848 Public Health Act⁽¹¹⁵⁾, the 1858 Local Government Act⁽¹¹⁶⁾, the 1875 Public Health Act⁽¹¹⁷⁾ and the 1890 Public Health Act⁽¹¹⁸⁾ together with certain clauses from the Durham Local Acts of 1790 and 1822 which were retained in the provisional order for Durham of the 1848 Act. Notably the water and gas supplies were left in the control of private companies⁽¹¹⁹⁾; a situation deplored by the General Board of Health.⁽¹²⁰⁾ By the Provisional Order of 1848⁽¹²¹⁾ the Commission was suspended and the Corporation became the Local Board of Health. Durham thereby differed from both Darlington, where the Local Board of Health was a separate elected body (Smith 1967:4-5) and from Gateshead where local acts remained in force.⁽¹²²⁾ The only act in force in Durham City was The Durham Markets Act of 1851⁽¹²³⁾ so on one hand the administrative structure was simplified but on the other hand the supply of water and gas remained outside the jurisdiction of the Local Board of Health and, in addition, the hallmote court, the vestries,

the Corporation, the county and the turnpike trusts continued in their administrative roles.

Issues already dealt with by the Commission were dealt with in more detail by the Local Board. Slaughter houses were regulated under byelaws of 1851 and 1865 ⁽¹²⁴⁾, but they had been discussed in 1822.⁽¹²⁵⁾ Also common lodging houses were regulated by byelaws in 1851 and by revised byelaws in 1854 ⁽¹²⁶⁾ and these establishments were registered and inspected. ⁽¹²⁷⁾ Other byelaws on hackney carriages ⁽¹²⁸⁾ and emptying privies followed ⁽¹²⁹⁾ but the Local Board were dilatory on building byelaws. The main change in byelaw formulation was that the Local Board of Health could, and did, draw upon the advice and follow the directions of the Local Government Act Office, after 1858. Whereas in 1845 the Corporation framed byelaws with reference to those already drawn up in Sheffield the Local Board drew upon a wider field of experience collated and redistributed by the Local Government Act Office.

Certain other statute law was utilised by the Local Board of Health for specific purposes. Public baths and wash-houses were built in 1852 under the 1846 Washhouses Act ⁽¹³⁰⁾ by means of a mortgage from the Public Works Loan Commission ⁽¹³¹⁾ and a subscription from the Dean and Chapter. ⁽¹³²⁾ This illustrates how the Local Board was able to draw upon wider sources for loans, a point to be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7. Other statute law was not implemented. Some such statutes were concerned with the general quality of life, an example of which was the Sale of Food and Drugs Act of 1875 ⁽¹³³⁾, but others were concerned

with housing and it is notable that The Artisan and Labourers Dwellings Improvement Act of 1875 had not been implemented by 1885 ⁽¹³⁴⁾ although eventually, by 1899, it was utilised to a limited extent. ⁽¹³⁵⁾ The Local Board could, therefore, draw upon a wider range of legislation than could the Commission. The latter was limited to the powers contained in the local acts and in order to extend its powers would have had the trouble and expense of carrying further local acts.

Gas was supplied by the Durham Gas Company up to the twentieth century. The Local Board debated the idea of supplying gas but did not act upon the suggestion ⁽¹³⁶⁾ and, again as in the days of the Commission, the town's water supply was supplied by the Durham City Water Company. The Local Board attempted to become partly independent of that joint stock company in their management of the public baths. These were sited by the River Wear in order to be able to use the river water ⁽¹³⁷⁾ and, in 1881, they considered using water from Elvet Colliery. ⁽¹³⁸⁾ Changes in the supply of water were independent of any action of the Local Board and instead stemmed from the amalgamation of joint stock water companies in the district ⁽¹³⁹⁾ (Fig.49).

In addition, the Local Board was concerned with paving, street cleansing and general urban cleanliness, lighting, building control and some small street improvement schemes at the Pant in the Market Place ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾, Millburngate ⁽¹⁴¹⁾ and Magdalene Steps. ⁽¹⁴²⁾ All these had been roles of the Commission but the question is whether the Local Board was more effective than the Commission, a topic discussed in Chapter 7. Certainly the role of the Local Board increased over the second half of the nineteenth century. It subdivided into specialist committees ⁽¹⁴³⁾

and new ventures were initiated, such as the foundation of an isolation hospital in 1871 ⁽¹⁴⁴⁾, and it enforced the paving of private yards and streets; so affecting a greater area of the town than the Commission. ⁽¹⁴⁵⁾

But in its first decade of existence it followed both the pattern of action and, to some extent, the attitudes of the Commission. In 1850 it had a dispute over the cleansing of street frontages. On the one hand the Local Board, attempting to take minimum responsibility, claimed that the inhabitants should clean their own frontages and cited the 1845 byelaws while the inhabitants claimed that the Local Board was responsible under the 1848 Public Health Act, section 55. ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ Also during the 1850's the Local Board changed its procedures. Between 1849 and 1853 nuisance removal orders were made under the 1848 Public Health Act ⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ but during 1853 orders were made using non-official forms ⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ and thereafter under the Nuisance Removal Acts. ⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ This may be seen as the effect of the influence of those members of the Corporation who had not supported the application of the Public Health Act to the town in 1849 ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ compounded with general disillusionment with that act. It parallels at a local level the moves in London, described by Lewis ⁽¹⁹⁵²⁾, to oust the General Board of Health.

The adoption of the 1848 Public Health Act had centred around the necessity of laying town drains and the means by which this could be financed. The Local Board was again not making a new initiative in executing the drainage plan since it had already been drawn up for the Commission ⁽¹⁵¹⁾ and in essence the old plan was utilised (Holt 1978).

Instead the town mirrored changes in direction in public health administration in London since the Durham drains, laid in 1853 and 1854, were partly laid in pot-pipe, after the ideas of Chadwick (Chadwick 1843, Lewis 1952), and partly after the older idea of brick drains. The plan was experimental since the first inquiry by the Local Board into the existing drains of the town was in 1849 (152) yet by 1852 only 16 of the 215 authorities under the General Board of Health had taken out mortgages to drain (153) and by 1854 only 31. (154) It also reflected the growing differences of opinion between Chadwick and Hawksley, the engineer executing the local drainage. (155)

5. Conclusions

Certainly structures of local administration changed during the nineteenth century as new bodies were formed. Certainly these bodies were operating in a variety of roles prior to the 1875 Public Health Act and were acting parallel to older forms of administration; vestries, the county and the hallmote court. The older bodies illustrate, however, that the outward form and legal basis for an administrative body could be static while its actual role and actual importance in relation to other bodies was altering. Similarly, in the case of the Local Board of Health, its legislative powers can be compared to that of the earlier Commission but in detail it appears to have followed the work of the Commission. It is impossible to judge from the records of the Local Board itself how effective it indeed was. Rather it is necessary to judge it against those

criteria which it itself stressed, and in particular the level of mortality. One aspect is clear, however, the Local Board appeared to follow public opinion in London both in the local campaign for the creation of the Local Board, which only became strong in 1848 ⁽¹⁵⁶⁾, and in its subsequent actions. It followed and it discussed rather than initiating ideas.

The structures of administration changed in 1849 but the question of effectiveness must be seen in the context of effects, of public opinion, of personnel, and of ideas and experience.

Footnotes

Chapter 6

1. At least as interpreted by Ashworth (1954 : Chapter 3) with reference to town planning and public health. Dicey's argument is wider and discusses ideas of liberty of the individual as worked out in a variety of spheres. His argument is in many ways contradictory since in Lecture VII he shows the development of collectivism from the 1830's yet in Lecture IV divides the nineteenth century into the three periods of quiescence, individualism and collectivism; a division which has been criticised.
2. It could be argued that the study of the administrative history of a town is beyond the scope of geography but it is a necessary background to understanding the townscape and an analogy may be drawn with political geography where in Prescott's opinion the study of public policy is pertinent (1972:94).
3. D.CRO. D.Adv. Friday January 2, 1846 no. 1635 p.2 col.3 Mrs. Gore 'Decline of English Country Towns' taken from the 'New Monthly'.
4. The Durham hallmote court was, in title, the Court Leet and Court Baron, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 24.3
There had been manors at Old Durham D.CRO. D/Lo/D.43, Surtees iv p.19 citing DDPD.Pk. D & CD. 3.17.Spec. 18, and at Crook Hall Surtees iv, p.137, 141.
5. DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 130; 30 Geo.III c.lxvii sec. lvii, lxviii, lxxx & 3 Geo.IV c.xxvi sec. xvii, xxiii.
6. DDPD.SR.D.City Box 24 1/23/1.
7. DDPD.Pk.D.& CD.Box 6 Post Dissolution Manorial Documents.
8. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.1 p.21, vol.2 p.51, vol. 4 1728, 1768 and 1780.
9. Elvet courtrolls exist only for 1753, 1757, 1764, 1771, 1776, 1785 and 1793.
DDPD.Pk.D.& CD. Box 6 Post Dissolution Manorial Documents
Crossgate court rolls exist only for 1764,1771,1776,1785 and 1793.
DDPD.Pk. D.& CD. Box 6 Post Dissolution Manorial Documents
Gilesgate has no known extant rolls but the existence of the court is not in doubt. SS. 1895 95 Memorials of St. Giles's, Durham 'Liber Sancti Egidii, Dunelm' pp.161-163, deeds of St. Giles's Church D.CRO.EP/Du. SG 107 Durham rolls are deposited DDPD.SR.D.City Boxes 21,22,23 and 24.

10. DDPD.SR.D.City Box 22 1/38/1 28th April 1801

	Framwellgate	St.Nicholas	Total
Defaulting households	126	247	373
households in 1801 census	246	439	685
% defaulting	51.2	56.3	54.5
11. DDPD.SR.D.City Box 23 1/21/2 1812, 1/29/2 1817
vol.6 pp.16-19
87 liable but 51 refused.
12. DDPD.SR.D.City
Rotten goods : 1831 Box 24/11/1, 1833 Box 24/11/2
Swine wandering: 1780 Box 21 14/5 (3 cases), 14/6
Dirt in the streets : 1752 Box 21 13/1 (11 cases), 1766
14/1 (2 cases), 1767 14/4 (4 cases),
1780 14/5 (13 cases), 1781 14/6
(3 cases), 1782 Box 22 1/2/2 (2 cases),
1784 1/4/3 (1 case), 1785 1/7/2
(3 cases), 1786 1/8/2 (2 cases),
1787 1/10/2, 1/11/2 (4 cases),
1788 1/12/2, 1/13/2 (7 cases),
1789 1/14/2, 1/15/2 (8 cases),
1790 1/16/2 (2 cases), 1795 1/27,
1800 1/37/2 (12 cases), 1801 1/38/2,
1/39/2 (11 cases), 1810 Box 23
1/17/2, 1840 Box 24 1/12/2, 1866
1/23/2 (6 cases), 1865 1/22/2
(4 cases).
Pig sties : 1788 Box 22 1/12/2 (2 cases)
Stacked goods, carts : 1756 Box 21 14/1, 1780 14/5
(7 cases), 1781 14/6, 1783 Box 22
1/4/2, 1784 1/4/3, 1/5/2 (2 cases).
Smoke : 1821-4 Box 23 1/33/2, 1/34/2, 1/35/2, 1/36/2.
13. DDPD.SR.D.City Moatside Lane 1836 Box 24 1/8/2, 1837
Box 24 1/9/2, 1866 Box 24 1/23/2, vennell on Claypath
1787, Box 23 1/10/2, way to Frankland 1813 Box 23
1/22/2, 1866 Box 24 1/23/2, way to Old Durham
1789 Box 22 1/14/2, 1/15/2.
The Sands 1813 Box 23 1/22/2.
14. DDPD.SR.D.City 1839 Box 24 1/11/2, 1840 1/12/2
15. Roberts 1977 : 26, a term derived from the writings of
MRG Conzen.
16. DDPD.SR.D.City Box 24 1/1/2.
17. DDPD.SR.D.City Box 24 1/23/2, 1/12/2.
18. Parson & White 1827 i : fn.184, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 21
14/6, 1/11/2.
19. DDPD.SR.D.City Box 24 1/23/2, Box 50/676.

20. The last court expenses for the Elvet and Crossgate hallmote courts are recorded in 1793. DDPD.Pk. D & C.D. Audit Books B VI, B VII, B VIII, B IX, 1793 to 1860, entries under "In Curijs Tenendis" end in B VI p.18r, But new weights and measures were bought for Elvet Court in 1795 B VI p.32 and Mr.Rowlandson was appointed Bailiff of Elvet and Crossgate in 1862. DDPD. Pk. D & C.D. Minutes. Transcripts vol.III p.1147 20th November 1862.
21. DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 6 p.275, Endowed Charities, Administrative County of Durham. Charity Commission. 1904 vol.1.
22. The leases for the property are recorded in D.CRO. MB/Du 9-49, DDPD.SR.D.City vol.6 pp 65,78 & 79.
23. Bishop Pilkington 1565, The Corporation of Durham Official Guide 1938 and Gee 1928:33 (VCH iii) followed by Bishop Matthew 1602, text in DDPD.SR.D.City vol.1 pp.1-9, Bishop Crewe 1684, text in DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 1 pp. 11-20, and Bishop Egerton 1780, text in DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 2 pp.29-49.
24. DDPD.PK. Sharp No.167 Cosin Survey 1662. It had been at farm in the Middle Ages cf. Boldon Book (1816 ed.), Lapsley (1905:277) and Whiting (1952:xvi).
25. 5 & 6 Wm. IV cap. 76, DDPD.SR.D.City vol.6.
26. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.6 p.4,6,32 Watch Committee formed and rate levied.
27. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.6 p.152 to 170 Market Place improvement.
28. DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 7 p.7 9th August 1849.
29. Echart et al. (1958:8) cites 1601 consolidating Act.
30. 4 & 5 Wm IV cap.76 Poor Law Amendment Act, Fordyce 1857i : 162.
31. 25 & 26 Vic. cap. 103 'The Union Assessment Committee Act, 1862.
32. D.CRO. EP/Du SG. St. Giles parish as a detailed example. The comment is based on a subjective appraisal of the vestry records. It is actually rare to have the accounts stated in full.

Year to March 1835	Total income	£585.8.2d.
	Total expenditure	£576.8.2d.
	Expenditure on poor	£478.15.3d.
Year to March 1836	Total income	£550.14.0d.
	Total expenditure	£557.16.9d.
	Expenditure on poor	£460.12.4d.

33. 31 & 32 Vic. cap. 109 Compulsory Church Rate Abolition Act, 1868. The rate was last levied in St. Nicholas parish in 1870 DDPD.SR.D.City Box 50/353 and in St. Giles parish in 1874 D.CRO. EP/Du SG. 34 p.20.
34. D.CRO.EP/Du SG. 33 p.154 1857, EP/Du MB. 7 p.29 1828 p.46 1842, EP/Du ML 7 p.2 1752, 8 p.23 1836
This duty is discussed by Stewart-Brown (1936)
35. D.CRO.EP/Du SO.114, DDPD. Pk, D. & C.D. Post Dissolution Manorial Records. Elvet Roll 9 October 1764, 18th October 1753, Crossgate Roll 9th October 1764.
36. 2 & 3 Vic. cap. 93 Police Act, 1839. Formed in Durham City by 1842 DDPD. SR. D.City vol.122 p.25-6.
37. D.CRO. EP/Du SN. 14, EP/Du ML 7 p.2, Longstaffe (1858)
38. For example see DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35 2/61
39. DDPD. SR. HC. M5 ff. 226 r. ff.
40. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 21 13/4 1762 2 constables : one for Durham and one for Framwellgate, Box 22 1/1/2
4 grassmen : two for Durham and one for Framwellgate.
41. D.CRO. EP/Du SN. 14, EP/Du SM 53 p.8.
42. This parish had only 16 households in 1793, DDPD. SR. DR. xvii. 1 Diocesan Book 1793, so was too small to need or to form a select vestry of 24.
43. Sturges Bourne Act 1819 (Webb & Webb 1922:475). They saw this as common but not common in Co.Durham (Webb & Webb 1924:179). Fraser has suggested the act marks a move towards oligarchy (1976).
St. Nicholas 1819 D.CRO. EP/Du SN 15, St. Giles 1829 D.CRO EP/Du SG. 32, St. Mary-le-Bow 1819 D.CRO.EP/Du MB. 7, St. Margaret D.CRO. EP/Du SM.53, St. Oswald 1819 D.CRO. EP/Du SO 2.
44. St. Nicholas' had a Burial Board under 16 & 17 Vic.cap.134, D.CRO.EP/Du SN. 16 1859, but St. Giles' vestry maintained direct responsibility D.CRO. EP/Du SG. 35.
45. This was not universal since at Cambridge the county had been responsible for the bridge (Maitland 1897:187) and other examples are cited by the Webbs (1920:86).
46. D.CRO.EP/Du SN. 14 1646, 1667 and 1668. Cannan suggests that this was the usual situation under 22 Hen.VIII cap.5 rather than the county being responsible (1927:30). But some joint responsibility existed in the seventeenth century in the case of Elvet and Framwellgate Bridges since St.Giles was levied for their repair in 1601. SS 95 1896 p.29.

47. D.CRO. Q/S/OB/7 pp.612-616.
48. D.CRO. Q/S/OB/7 pp.612-616 Total 119 bridges : 40 by county, 4 by county and another county, 45 by parishes, 9 by villis, 2 by chapelries, 18 by others, including the bishop; and Sherburn Hospital.
49. St.Giles appointed its last highway surveyor in 1879
D.CRO. EP/Du SG. 34 p.25
50. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 130 30 Geo.III cap. lxxvii, Preamble, sec. xvi, lvii, lviii, lix, and 3 Geo.IV cap. xxvi, Preamble, sec. xii, xiii.
51. Albert 1972 Appendix B.
52. D.CRO. EP/Du ML 7 p.186.
53. D.CRO. EP/Du ML 7 p.354,360.
54. The parish of St. Oswald continued to levy Highway Rate after the formation of the Local Commission but after 1790 they deal exclusively with roads in the rural parts of the parish. D.CRO EP/Du SO. 30-36 (1776-1828), 37 (1791-1852).
55. D.CRO. EP/Du SO 112/21, vol. 37 p.11, 15r, 22.
56. D.CRO. EP/Du SG 32 17th February 1831, 5th April 1833, EP/Du SM 55 Contracting with the Improvement Commission to employ the poor.
57. D.CRO. EP/Du SG 32 9th November 1830.
58. DDPD. PK. D.& CD. Minutes. Transcriptions 1726-1829.
An example is 22nd November 1746 p.485.
59. DDPD. PK. D.& CD. Minutes. Transcriptions 1726-1829,
p.417 26th November 1729.
60. DDPD. PK. D.& CD. Minutes. Transcriptions 1726-1829
p.564 20th November 1771.
61. DDPD. PK. D.& CD. Minutes. Transcriptions 1726-1829
p.619 20th November 1791.
62. This was a topic under discussion in 1848, when the formation of a Local Board of Health was under consideration. The Dean offered to pay rates even if the Public Health Act gave immunity D.CRO. D.Adv. Friday December 1 1848 no. 1787 p.5 col.1. Their immunity "was a great annoyance to the town" D.CRO. D.Adv. Friday May 4 1849 no.1809 p.5 col. 1.
63. DDPD. PK. D.& CD. Minutes. Transcriptions 1726-1829
p.411 26th September 1728, p.552 20th November 1768.

64. Fordyce 1857 i : 292-3.
Gee 1928 : 32, 40, 51 (VCH iii)
65. Surtees iv 1840 : 73 citing a charter of Prior Bertram
66. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 5 Jan 1842 p.23, 1 Nov. 1842
p.39-40, 4 April 1843 p.47-8 correspondence on the
subject.
67. D.CRO.EP/Du SO. 112/21 An action against Elvet township
for the state of roads over Elvet Moor, 1773 to 1776,
is one example.
68. D.CRO.EP/Du SG 32 7 October 1830, supporting St. Giles
parish, is one example.
69. For example the smoke nuisance in Silver Street 1821-1824,
DDPD. SR. D.City Box 23 1/33/2 repeated 1/34/2 and
1/35/2 or the repair of the steps in Back Lane 1802-1817
DDPD. SR. D.City Box 23 1/1/2, 1/2/2, 1/3/2, 1/5/2,
1/8/2, 1/27/2.
70. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 23 1/39/2, paper enclosed in court roll.
71. Durham to Newcastle 20 Geo.II c.12, Durham to Catterick
20 Geo.II c.28, Durham to Boroughbridge 18 Geo.II c.8,
Durham to Sunderland 20 Geo.II c.18.
72. 30 Geo.II c.lxxvii.
73. 3 Geo. IV c.xxvi.
74. DDPD. SR. D.City vol.130.
75. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 38 1/16, 1/17/1.
76. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35 1/10/1. Draft Brief for the
support of the Durham Paving Bill before the Lords,
13th July 1822. This, and the Quarter Sessions action
in the same year, may have been fictional disputes to
give grounds for the amendment act.
77. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 36 4/1-5.
78. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 121 p.95 7th February 1827, p.110
4th September 1827, vol.122 p.137 2nd February 1847,
p.152 6th April 1847.
79. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 41 38/4/2 4th February 1817 on
scavenging, vol. 122 p.84 3rd September 1844 on paving
by householders, vol.122 p.132 5th May 1846 on
paving by the Commission.
80. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.94 4th March 1845.

81. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.3-4 3rd November 1840 :
Gilesgate p.8-9 2nd February 1841, Claypath p.18-19
7th September 1841, Sidegate p.84 3rd September 1844,
Hallgarth Street p.111 5th August 1845, Milburngate
and Providence Row p.131-2 5th May 1846, Sadler
Street p.161 7th September 1847, Silver Street p.161
7th September 1847.
82. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 41 38. An agreement on Elvet in 1811
differs since it appears to include the lanes D.City
vol. 123 5th February 1811.
83. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 41 38 scavenging contracts 1815 (7),
1816 (4), 1817 (5), 1818 (7), 1819 (2), 1823 (3),
1824 (3), 1825 (4), 1826 (5), 1827 (6), 1828 (5),
1829 (5), 1830 (6), 1832 (1), 1833 (2), 1834 (3),
1835 (4), 1836 (5), 1837 (2), 1839 (1), 1843 (3),
1844 (5), 1845 (4), 1846 (3).
84. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 22 1/37/2, 1800 Back Lane and
Rashells Lane, 1/38/2 1801 Back Lane and Wandless Lane,
1/39/2 1801 Back Lane. Box 23 1/17/2 1810 Moatside Lane.
85. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 124 p.3r, 7 February 1815.
86. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 127 p.8 4 September 1832.
87. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.122 5 August 1845.
88. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 41 38/19/4.
89. 3 Geo.IV c.xxvi sec. xliv included South Bailey,
discussion DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 124 p.51 5th May 1818,
vol. 125 p.12r 7th March 1820.
90. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.118 4th November 1845.
91. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35 1/2/2 objection, vol.130
3 Geo.IV c.xxvi sec.xliii excepted.
92. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35 1/10/1.
93. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.32, vol. 121 p.139.
94. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.25-8 February-March 1842,
Box 35 3/15 that the price of gas exceeded that in
other towns near coalfields.
95. DDPD. SR. Box 35 2/4 22nd April 1847.
96. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.25-6 discussion about North
Road and Crossgate Head, 1st February 1842.
97. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.42-3, Box 35 3/15. Estimated
from a half year's expenditure in 1843 of £164.0.0d.
@ £1.15.2d. per lamp.

98. Full list DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 pp.111-112, Framwellgate vol. 122 p.27 (March 1842), Sadler Street Box 35 2/13 nd. (1847), New Elvet, North Bailey and Church Street Box 44, Report to LBH. September 1849.
99. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 pp.32-3, idea raised July 1842, pp. 34-5 question of legality August 1842, p.36 opinion that it was not legal September 1842.
100. An example is Church Street in 1846 which the Trustees of the Durham and Boroughbridge Road refused to repair. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.143.
101. Examples are a drain in Church Street which was delayed for nearly a year DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.144 January 1847, p.165 November 1847.
102. 38 & 39 Vic. cap. 55, The Public Health Act, 1875.
103. The Medical Officer of Health would cite deaths in institutions separately for this reason. Comment on its importance DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/8 p.4.
104. Endowed Charities, Administrative County of Durham. Charity Commission 1904.
105. The existence of this society is known but its records do not appear to be extant. For example in February 1870 they applied to build a dwelling. DDPD. SR.D.City vol. 163 pp.346-7 There was, in addition a Compassionate Society, D.CRO. EP/Du SO.115.
106. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 p.243, Box 2 5/8, 5/9.
107. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6. In the period 1835 to 1849 Durham petitioned Parliament in support of Negro Emancipation 1838 p.64-5, Penny Postage 1839 p.75-6, Jewish Declaration 1841 p.128, Corn Laws 1841 p.32, Import Duties 1841 p.128-9, Control of Sale of Gunpowder 1845 p.231, Irish government 1845 p.223, and Jewish Disabilities 1848 p.316. It petitioned against the Church of England's educational powers contained in the Employment of Children Bill 1843 p.184-5, Health of Towns Bill 1848 p.316.
108. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 p.71, 126-7, Walker's Directory 1862 p.27-30.
109. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.12-13, 1841.
110. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 p.109, 115, 251.
111. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 p.349.
112. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 p.158.
113. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 122 p.10-11, 1841 Box 35 2/50 nd. (1850)

- 114. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 160 9th August 1849.
- 115. 11 & 12 Vic. cap. 63 Provisional Order 19th July 1849.
- 116. 21 & 22 Vic. cap. 98, DDPD. SR. D.City Box 49/139. It did not accept the 1866 Sanitary Act 29 & 30 Vic. cap. 90, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 pp.196, 198.
- 117. 38 & 39 Vic. cap. 55.
- 118. 53 & 54 Vic. cap. 59, Public Health Acts Amendment Act, 1890.
- 119. Provisional Order 19th July 1849, DDPD. SR. D.City Box 49/139.
- 120. HC. PP. 1849 xxiv : 23.
- 121. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 130, Provisional Order 19th July 1849.
- 122. Du LC. The Constitution of the Local Board of Health for the Corporate District of the Borough of Gateshead. Gateshead 1852.
- 123. 14 & 15 Vic. c.6 (L&P) DDPD. SR. D.City Box 49/138, 139 Return to the General Board of Health. But the idea of a local Improvement Commission did not die and indeed was revived in 1875, prior to the 1875 Public Health Act. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 p.2.
- 124. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44 8th March 1851, vol. 162 p.90-2 14th March 1851, D.CRO.D.Adv. Friday March 28th 1851 no. 1908 p.4 col. 6.
DDPD. SR. D.City Box 49/225 4th October 1865, vol. 163 p.134, 137-8.
- 125. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35 1/4/1
Clauses were incorporated in the Local Act amendment of 1822, 3 Geo. IV cap. xxvi, text in DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 130.
- 126. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 160 5th February 1851, vol. 162 p. 96-7 1st April 1851, vol. 162 p.255 7th November 1854.
- 127. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 159, D.CRO MB/Du 6.
- 128. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.460-1, 1859.
- 129. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 161 p.144, 1859.
- 130. 9 & 10 Vic. cap 74.
- 131. D.CRO. M1/19 D.Co. Adv. Friday September 7th 1855 p.2 col. 5-6.
- 132. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p.21-2, November 1849.
- 133. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 51/2/142.

134. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 51/2/33.
135. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 43/5/37, an example, No.11 New Elvet being declared unfit.
136. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 pp.26-7, 5th October 1849.
137. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 pp.170-1, 23 March 1853.
138. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 pp. 372-4, 4th May 1881.
139. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 4/2/1, Weardale & Shildon District Waterworks Act, 1875.
140. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 178 pp.30r, 31, 33, July to August 1860.
141. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 178 p.24r, 19th October 1858.
142. D.CRO. D/Lo/E 553.
143. cf. Chapter 7 sec. 3 DDPD. SR. D.City Box 50. 14, 15, 16, 17 50/19, 50/22, 70, 81, 156, 191, 192, 244, 245, 248, 267, 302, 315, 398, 419, 424, 442, 456, 460, 475, 536, 543.
144. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 pp.445-6 July 1871, Box 55/226.
145. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 168 p.558, 5th May 1903 vol.166 p.85 6th December 1893 to adopt Private Streets Works Act; enforced 1895 vol. 166 p.349 Cross Street, Lambton Street, Mowbray Street, Bridge Street, 1896 vol. 167 p.63 Renny Street area, vol.168 p.339 Lovegreen Street.
146. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 160 25th January 1850.
147. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44.
148. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44 9th December 1853, and following
149. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 50/19.
150. Led by John Bramwell, see Chapter 7 section 4 D.CRO. D.Adv. Friday October 5th 1855 p.2 col.4.
151. DDPD. SR.D.City Box 36 4/5/2 5th February 1849, 4/5/3 5th March 1849.
152. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 160 27th October 1849.
153. HC. PP. 1852 liii : 1-36, especially pp.9-10.
154. HC.PP. 1854 xxxv : 14.
155. The Builder December 18th 1852 vol.x no.515 p.794.

156. D.CRO.D.Adv. January 1840 to August 1849. Items
concerning public health

	1840	1841	1842	1843	1844	1845	1846	1847	1848	1849
News items										
Royal Commission evidence	1		2	3	1		1		1	
Parliamentary Acts	3									
Registrar - General reports		1		1	1	1	3	1	2	
Census reports		1		1			1			
Medical news	3	1			2	2	6	11	12	3
Public Health Bill									9	4
Sanitary Association					1		1			
Local items										
Local Commission meetings			1	4			1	1	4	8
Durham Council meetings								1	2	
Durham Sanitary Assoc. letters		2	1	1				2	1	1
Darlington & Public Health Act									3	
Other, Durham			1						1	4
Book review									1	
Leading article			1		1			1	8	14
Total including borrowed items	7	5	6	10	6	3	13	17	54	34
	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	5	5	3

CHAPTER SEVEN

INFLUENCES OF LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

1. Introduction

In comparing the administration under the Durham Local Board of Health, later the Urban Sanitary District, and other and earlier administrative bodies the effects of their administration and their intentions must be assessed rather than the powers on which they could act, since the 1848 Public Health Act, and other legislation, was permissive. Here there are two main concerns; firstly, the trend in mortality in the town, since this was the issue on which the Local Board was formed ⁽¹⁾ and, secondly, the influence on the development of the townscape. From these arise a third question, which is to ask why there should be contrasts or similarities in effectiveness compared with former administrative bodies and whether there was ever a decisive watershed in the administrative history of the town.

2. Trends in Mortality

In the ten year periods centred on 1841 and 1851 crude mortality in the town was rising. For the years 1836 to 1845 it was 23.82/1000 and for the years 1846 to 1855 it was 23.24/1000 ⁽²⁾ which was at the same level as the Durham Registration district, where crude mortality was 23/1000 between 1841 and 1851. ⁽³⁾ It was, however, slightly higher than the crude mortality for the county as a whole where the crude mortality rate in the 1840's was 22.28/1000. ⁽⁴⁾ There is no doubt that the calculation of the crude death rate for the town in the 1840's caused a shock. It had been perceived that Durham was a healthy place ⁽⁵⁾ but the crude death rate showed it to be a black spot even in England and Wales

as a whole. The crude death rate, over the years 1841 to 1849, was calculated as 32.5/1000 and was recalculated as 29.94/1000 ⁽⁶⁾ but strictly this was an exaggeration since the calculation incorporated an inaccurate estimate of population ⁽⁷⁾, and such exaggerations persisted since the Medical Officer of Health never estimated population growth between census years with any accuracy (Fig.13).

After the inception of the Local Board of Health, its drainage scheme and cleansing activities, the crude mortality rate did not immediately fall. In the later part of the 1850's it rose, bringing the average crude mortality rate for the years between 1851 and 1860 to 25/1000. ⁽⁸⁾ Even after removing the cholera years of 1849 and 1854 from calculations the crude mortality of the 1850's appears to have been higher than that for the 1840's being an average of 24.3/1000 compared to 22.3/1000 for the non-cholera years of the 1840's. This rise in crude mortality was not peculiar to the town but was reflected both within the county, where the crude death rate rose to 23/1000 for the years 1851 to 1860 ⁽⁹⁾ (Table 7.1), and within England and Wales where the General Board of Health argued that public works had prevented an even steeper rise. ⁽¹⁰⁾ Only in the 1870's and 1880's did the crude death rate decline (Table 7.1) both in the county as a whole (McKeown 1976:30) and in the town.

Throughout most of the county the crude mortality rate deteriorated during the 1850's. The exceptions were in Teesdale Registration District and those districts which had had the highest crude mortality rates in the 1840's (Table 7.2) so the deterioration experienced, and recognized

Table 7.1 Crude mortality, by decade, 1841 to 1900

	1841-50	1851-60	1861-70	1871-80	1881-90	1891-1900
England & Wales	22.8	22.17	22.42	21.27	19.08	
Co.Durham	22	23	23	23.77	19.83	
Durham Reg. Dist.	23.10	22.57	20.96+	23.31+	17.66+	19.93+
Durham MB*	23.38	24.97	23.93	26.36	21.01	
St.Oswald RD	25.01	25.19	23.55	25.11	19.10	19.24
St.Nicholas RD	22.74	23.01.	23.98	25.53	20.45	19.38

deaths/1000 population

+ Durham & Lanchester *including deaths in institutions

Sources: HC.PP. 1865 xiii.lvi, 1884-5 xvii. 370,435,
1895 xxiii.1.vii

D.CRO. Durham County Advertiser (12)

DDPD.SR. D.City Box 53/2

in Durham City was not unusual. It is, however, difficult to explain since the subject is obscured by contemporary classifications of the cause of death and by the probable poor quality of the diagnosis of cause of death. (14)

Table 7.2 Crude mortality, by decade, 1841 to 1880, for the
registration districts of Co.Durham

<u>District</u>	<u>1841-50</u>	<u>1851-60</u>	<u>1861-70</u>	<u>1871-80</u>
Auckland	21	23	24	25
Chester-le-Street	20	21	24	23
Darlington	20	20	21	21
Durham	23	23	21	22 a. 26 b.
Easington	20	20	22	26
Gateshead	23	26	25	25
Hartlepool	- c.	- c.	22	23
Houghton	20	21	24	24
S. Shields	26	24	24	24
Stockton	21	22	24	27
Sunderland	24	23	24	25
Teesdale	20	19	19	19
Weardale	20	21	21	21

deaths per 1000 population

a. Lanchester b. Durham c. included in Stockton

Source : HC.PP. 1884-5 xvii. 435, 449

The change in crude mortality in some districts in the county is attributable to changes in the age structure of the population. Such is the case for Darlington, Durham, Easington, Houghton, Stockton and Sunderland when comparing the decades 1851 to 1860 and 1871 to 1880 in terms of the crude mortality rate (Table 7.2) and the proportion of the population aged less than five years, since children incurred much higher age-specific death rates (Appendix 7.1). The exceptions, where the trend in crude mortality could not be attributed to age structure changes, in Auckland, Chester-le-Street and Gateshead, do reflect changes in age specific mortality. In all three districts the child age specific death rate rose between the decade 1851 to 1860 and 1871 to 1880 (Appendices 7.2 a & b) while in Auckland and Gateshead the age specific mortality rates among adults fell. So over most of the county the changes in crude mortality may be attributed to changes in age structure associated with migration but in three districts there was specific deterioration as shown by the age specific mortality of children under the age of five years. In Durham City the Medical Officer of Health attributed the rise in crude mortality, from 22.21/1000 in 1851 to 1852 to 23.28/1000 in the following year to increased child mortality ⁽¹⁵⁾ whereas in the Durham Union as a whole it may be attributed to a growing number of children in the population. The proportion of children in the Durham MB. population was not increasing (Fig.6) so for the specific locality of the town the Medical Officer's interpretation is probably correct. This implies that the deterioration in the crude death rate in the town was the outcome of different factors to that in the surrounding

registration district, that it was a real deterioration and not the outcome of demographic changes and that it was independent of Local Board activities.

Child mortality in the county in the mid-nineteenth century appears to have been not only the outcome of childhood illnesses but also hygiene since male child mortality was higher in all districts than female child mortality (Table 7.3).

Table 7.3 Age specific death rates for males and females under the age of 5 years, Co.Durham registration districts, 1851 to 1860

<u>District</u>	<u>males</u>	<u>females</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>males</u>	<u>females</u>
Auckland	774.80	707.54	Houghton	711.28	560.44
Chester	665.95	591.48	S.Shields	788.83	726.78
Darlington	597.96	491.32	Stockton	780.59	1119.42*
Durham	790.08	702.76	Sunderland	891.04	806.69
Easington	738.46	651.00	Teesdale	487.38	447.55
Gateshead	828.09	733.80	Weardale	609.82	490.11

* This may be the outcome of underenumeration or a misprint

Source : HC.PP. 1865 xiii. 383-389

In the second half of the nineteenth century infant mortality, the number of deaths of babies under one year of age compared to the number of births, fell in Durham City. (16) In the year 1855 to 1856 it stood at 226.9/1000 births but by 1889 it had fallen to 127.6/1000 births. Comparison with sixteenth century data for St. Oswald's parish (17) suggests that even the mid-nineteenth century rate was lower than the mid-sixteenth century rate for in the years 1566 to 1578 the rate was approximately 274.11/1000 baptisms. The fall in infant mortality was not a steady decline but it was significant

that it was earlier than the early twentieth century fall in infant mortality postulated by Brockington (1966:29) and Benjamin (1963-4:239). Yet it cannot be attributed to any direct action by the Local Board of Health.

By the end of the nineteenth century crude mortality rates had fallen in Durham Union (Table 7.1) but this cannot necessarily be attributed to actions by the Local Boards of Health. These, up to 1875, covered a limited area of the county (Fig. 49) and their actions were directed at specific causes of death which were not necessarily the major causes of death.

Drainage schemes were implemented by various Local Board of Health, including that of Durham City (Fig.49) but these only accidentally combatted waterborne diseases since not only was there no idea of combatting waterborne micro-organisms but also, in the case of Durham City, the Medical Officers of Health, appointed by the Local Board of Health, were, up to 1886 (18) miasmasists rather than contagionists. Both views, miasmasist and contagionist, existed in the mid-nineteenth century and the Durham Medical Officers were not necessarily old fashioned.

In retrospect it can be seen that John Snow had demonstrated the link between cholera and water supply (Gilbert 1958) and had made his ideas known (19) and it can be seen that the micro-organisms of various diseases were becoming known from mid-century onwards. Anthrax was described in detail in 1849 and the cholera vibrio in 1883 (Turk & Porter 1969). But the balance in opinion was not

tipped towards the idea of germs until the last quarter of the century though the idea of separate diseases had already been developing. The General Board of Health was miasmasist (20) and as late as 1871 the Royal Sanitary Commission included miasmasist comments (21) but in 1875 Farr was discussing the possibility of 'zymads', or what would be later called germs and the term 'zymotic' was already in use. (22)

Contemporary medical views are crucial to understanding the logic of public health activities in the second half of the nineteenth century. It is clear that they were not consistent for, on the one hand, smallpox was recognized as a transmittable disease combattable by vaccination (Lambert 1962) and isolation (23) while, on the other hand, at mid-century, other diseases were not seen as distinct entities or as transmittable. Typhus, diarrhoea and English cholera were grouped together as fevers, and Asiatic cholera was seen as a further stage of diarrhoea. (24)

The Durham Local Board of Health were interested in combatting cholera and diseases termed 'zymotic'; crowd diseases of measles and influenza and water and milk-borne diseases, scarlatina, typhoid and 'diarrhoea'. (25) These were not the major killers anyway (Fig. 50) since unspecified infant mortality, tuberculosis and bronchial infections were larger killers. In 1854 the town largely escaped the national cholera epidemic, a fact which the Medical Officer attributed to increased cleanliness (26) but it is not certain that the town escaped completely in 1866, though this was claimed. (27)

Between the 1850's and 1870's the proportion of deaths from crowd diseases and waterborne diseases shrank (Fig. 50) but up to the 1880's this did not affect the crude mortality rates since other causes of death became more important. The Local Boards of Health, in urban areas, constructed drainage schemes (Fig.49) but these were probably not so important in terms of altering causes of death as the spread of piped water. At Bishop Auckland and at Gateshead early piped water supplies were of poor quality and had a negative effect in the health of their consumers (28) but at Durham City the crucial difference between 1848 and 1854, in terms of freedom from cholera, was probably not the drainage, since this was incomplete in 1854 (29), but the supply of water. In 1848 the Pant water in the Market Place was so poor in quality that a proportion of the town were using river water (30) whereas by 1854 the joint-stock water company was operating. (31)

Asiatic cholera was really a minor cause of death and its lessening impact in the area cannot be attributed to drainage works since in 1849 there were 241 deaths from cholera in Durham Union, one third of which were in Durham MB. (32) but in 1854 cholera deaths in the Union numbered 65 and in Durham MB. a mere eight (33) and in 1866 66 deaths in the Union and apparently none in Durham MB. (34) The number of deaths from cholera was falling despite the fact that the Union included rural and mining areas without Local Boards of Health (Fig.49).

In the case of deaths from other waterborne diseases there was a trend across the county from West to East, and

down the major watercourses, for deaths from waterborne diseases to be more important. This analysis is crude since the registration districts cut across the valleys and used rivers as boundaries and since the population density in the county increased from West to East but an approximate trend was apparent both in the 1850's and in the 1870's (Table 7.4).

Table 7.4 Co. Durham river basins and cause of death from waterborne diseases, by registration districts, 1851 to 1860 and 1871 to 1880

<u>River Wear</u>			<u>River Tees</u>		
District					
Weardale	13.91%	7.96%	Teesdale	9.38%	3.15%
Auckland	10.50	8.32	Darlington	11.87	7.52
Durham	15.37	8.35 ^{d.}	Stockton &	18.96	10.92 a.
Chester	9.79	8.25	Hartlepool		10.79 b.
Sunderland	13.83	8.77			7.25 c.

a. Hartlepool b. Stockton 1871-5 c. Stockton 1875-80
d. Durham & Lanchester

Waterborne diseases : cholera, diarrhoea, dysentery,
enteric fever, simple continuing
fever, typhus & typhoid, "other
zymotic"

Sources : HC.PP. 1865 xiii. 383-388, 1884-5 xvii.814-821

Between the 1850's and 1870's the proportion of deaths from waterborne diseases was reduced (Table 7.4, Fig.50) but was not eliminated. In terms of drainage the overall impact of the Local Boards of Health appears to have been to increase river pollution since sewage was not treated and, in the case of the River Wear, this involved three Local Boards, Bishop Auckland (Kirby 1968: 145-195), Durham⁽³⁵⁾, and Chester-le-Street⁽³⁶⁾ piping raw sewage into it. In addition

there was increasing pollution from industry (37) and from colliery washings. (38) The state of the river was deplored by the General Board of Health inspector (39) even in 1854 and the question was taken before the Court Leet in 1866 (40) But it was not improved until after redraining and sewage treatment, which in the case of Durham MB. occurred between 1898 and 1903. (41)

Down each river in the 1850's and 1860's were both untreated outfalls from sewerage schemes, and intake points for piped water supply (Fig. 49). It is therefore rather surprising that deaths from waterborne diseases did fall so much as they did between the 1850's and 1870's (Table 7.4). Again, improvement points to the provision of water; which in the case of Durham MB. was not provided by the Local Board of Health but by a joint stock company. (42) The Durham City waterworks at Shincliffe certainly filtered their water but their system was not perfect since they recognized the presence of organic matter in their subsidiary tank and filtered water and yet up to the 1890's they only tested water for chemical impurities. (43)

The fall in waterborne deaths may be attributed to piped and filtered urban water supplies. (44) Further falls, later in the century, may be attributed to the extension of joint-stock water companies using upland reservoirs of river water (Fig.49) and to local investigation of surviving private wells. In Durham MB. the Medical Officer of Health after 1886, the first who was not a miasmasist, conducted an analysis of all wells and spring in 1892 for both chemical and organic impurities (45) and carried out a policy of

closing polluted wells. (46) The work of the Local Board of Health was therefore negative, in polluting the river, and positive, late in the century, in investigating private water supplies. The balance of the positive and negative attributes depends on the importance of private wells in supplying water, a question for which there are no figures.

The tubercular diseases (47) showed a decline, as cause of death, over the county as a whole between the 1850's and 1870's with a marked decline in Darlington Union (Fig.50). This appears to have been independent of any medical expertise and any actions by the Local Boards of Health. In this period there was no effective medical treatment of these diseases (McKeown 1976:15) and therefore only two conclusions can be drawn about the trend; either it was an independent decline in these diseases or it was related to an improvement in the standard of living, diet, and housing conditions.

Table 7.5 Crowding in Durham MB. and Co.Durham,^a 1801 to 1901

Year	Persons/Inhb.House		Persons/House ^b .		% Houses Uninhabited	
	Durham MB	Co.Durham	Durham MB	Co.Durham	Durham MB	Co.Durham
1801	7.35	5.49	7.14	5.27	2.85	4.13
1811	8.53	5.69	8.32	5.52	2.51	2.97
1821	8.53	5.90	8.28	5.73	2.95	2.86
1831	7.86	7.20	7.68	6.93	2.28	3.71
1841	6.59	5.36	5.96	5.07	9.54	5.39
1851	7.46	5.67	7.23	5.43	3.02	4.21
1861	7.02	6.00	6.68	5.45	4.79	4.81
1871	6.13	5.96	5.95	5.69	2.93	4.72
1881	6.05	5.90	5.66	5.46	6.48	7.73
1891	5.66	6.03	5.79	5.80	7.05	3.97
1901	5.90	6.80	5.74	6.53	2.62	3.86

a. 'ancient county' b. inhabited & uninhabited houses

Sources : printed census volumes

The North East was, in general, a region of small dwellings and crowded housing conditions and remained so into the twentieth century (Mess 1928:35) but between 1801 and 1901 conditions of crowding did improve in Durham City; although there was some deterioration in the county in the 1890's (Table 7.5). This improvement in the City cannot be attributed to Local Board of Health policy but can be attributed to three other factors; a change in building style to single family houses (Chapter 5 page 259), a slackening population growth (Chapter 2 page 40) and a change in the census definition and usage of the term 'house' (Chapter 4 page 116). The Durham Local Board of Health recognized the poor quality of housing and especially the degree of crowding ⁽⁴⁸⁾ but they had no policy to combat this. Their actions were of a very limited scale; they regulated the Common Lodging Houses after 1851 ⁽⁴⁹⁾ and by 1919 they, themselves, had provided eleven houses. ⁽⁵⁰⁾

In contrast, smallpox was the subject of activity by vaccination and, from 1884 in Durham City, by isolation ⁽⁵¹⁾ and later by notification. ⁽⁵²⁾ Yet up to the 1880's there was an absolute rise in deaths from smallpox (Table 7.6). This was a national trend with a peak in 1871 and Lambert suggests that it was the more vigorous enforcement of vaccination after that year which was critical (1962). But the additional measures of isolation and notification cannot be ignored. Other 'crowd diseases', measles, scarlatina, diphtheria and whooping cough remained constant in their impact on mortality rates.

Table 7.6 Smallpox deaths, Co.Durham registration districts, 1851 to 1860 and 1871 to 1880

<u>District</u>	1851 to 1860			1871 to 1880		
	<u>smallpox</u> <u>deaths</u>	<u>total</u> <u>deaths</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>smallpox</u> <u>deaths</u>	<u>total</u> <u>deaths</u>	<u>%</u>
Auckland	143	9447	1.51	552	18724	2.95
Chester-le-Street	115	5034	2.28	208	8901	2.34
Darlington	61	4787	1.27	189	9111	2.07
Durham & Lanchester	222	14244	1.56	805	25370	3.17
Easington	64	4972	1.29	293	9414	3.11
Gateshead	154	13876	1.11	513	23099	2.22
Houghton	35	4376	0.80	191	7268	2.63
S.Shields	104	9680	1.07	745	21434	3.48
Stockton & Hartlepool	279	11562	1.79	534	31216	1.71
Sunderland	330	20072	1.64	1010	30201	3.34
Teesdale	18	3923	0.46	23	3940	0.58
Weardale	12	3235	0.37	24	3794	0.63

Sources HC.PP. 1865 xiii.383-388, 1884-5 xvii. 814-821

The second half of the nineteenth century saw a long term fall in mortality rates but incorporated a short term rise at mid-century but the main part of these trends cannot be attributed to Local Board of Health policy or later Urban Sanitary District and Rural Sanitary District policy. Demographic changes played a major role in changes in the crude mortality rate as did the provision of better water supplies, a trend to better housing conditions and, perhaps, a change in the nature of diseases. The last point is contentious but certain authors have postulated that diseases themselves are not immutable (McKeown 1971:60, Roberts 1971:37, 47-8) since diseases such as typhus appeared in waves (Rosen 1973). By the turn of the twentieth century

Sanitary District policies may have been a stronger influence as there had been an accumulation of experience and the addition of more detailed measures. In Durham MB. there had been a progression from drainage, the provision of Public Baths to improve hygiene⁽⁵³⁾, and the regulation of Common Lodging Houses at mid-century to isolation of infectious patients, notification of diseases, the regulation of dairies⁽⁵⁴⁾, which helped to combat scarlet fever and typhoid, and improvement of the drainage in the later part of the century. Such actions were compounded after 1875 by both urban areas and rural areas being administered for specifically sanitary purposes.

3. Influences on the development of the townscape

In the town of Durham the individual was never free to build completely at will since before 1849 there had been control of the building frontage lines by the hallmote courts and after 1849 there was effectively more detailed control of new building development. The latter was not the direct outcome of the provisions of either statute law, since the 1848 Public Health Act did not specifically enforce building standard controls⁽⁵⁵⁾, or of the 1845 local byelaws.⁽⁵⁶⁾ It was not even the outcome of byelaws made under the 1848 Act⁽⁵⁷⁾ since it was only in 1867 that building byelaws were formulated⁽⁵⁸⁾ and up to 1867 the only direct control concerned the width of streets; for which a policy had been formulated in 1853.⁽⁵⁹⁾ But there was a tradition of submitting building proposals to the Local Commission and, after 1849, when the Public Health Act was adopted, this tradition was continued, extended under

the terms of the 1848 Act to cover the vetting of sanitary arrangements of new buildings ⁽⁶⁰⁾ and effectively became a form of building development control.

Between 1849 and 1853 building plan proposals were submitted to the full board but in the latter year a plan committee was formed to advise the board. ⁽⁶¹⁾ Such an advisory committee existed at least up to 1914 though it changed its title over the decades. In 1860 it became the Finance, Estimate and Plan Committee, in 1865 the Finance and General Purposes Committee and in 1900 the General Purposes Committee. ⁽⁶²⁾ After 1853 the plans had to show both the plan and sections ⁽⁶³⁾ and from 1855 they had to indicate the position of adjacent buildings. ⁽⁶⁴⁾ When a plan was passed it was the duty of the Surveyor to inspect the building and, from 1856, to report on its completion. ⁽⁶⁵⁾ After 1859 the Surveyor had to certify a building as fit before it could be inhabited and then this had to be ratified by the Local Board ⁽⁶⁶⁾ but procedure was tightened so, from 1869, cases where the Surveyor approved the building but the Local Board disagreed the Local Board decision became the necessary step prior to habitation. ⁽⁶⁷⁾

In detail the Local Board modified the 'potential townscape', as proposed in building applications, in two ways. Firstly, in relation to areas of building, it quashed all applications to build on the Sands and, by enforcing minimum street widths, fossilized the development of some yards and delayed the development of some land behind the burgage plots. Secondly, it came to enforce detailed standards as to house layouts.

Whereas in other larger towns the curtilages of

burgage plots had been infilled by the mid-nineteenth century, for, in Liverpool (Taylor 1970) and in Nottingham (Chapman 1963) this had been in the eighteenth century, in Durham and its suburbs a large proportion of curtilages were undeveloped in 1856 (Fig. 1). Local Board of Health policy could therefore have been important, especially since much of the new building in the first half of the nineteenth century had been in such curtilages (Chapter 4 page 143). Indeed, after 1849 the Local Board aimed to block further yard infill. In that year George Moody was forbidden to build across the North end of Magdalene Street and his building activities there ceased with the street end half enclosed (Fig. 42) (68) but yard infill did not cease in 1849, as Table 7.7 illustrates. More plans for yard development were rejected after the adoption of the 1875 Public Health Act but by that date most plans submitted were for greenfield sites so the activities of the Local Board were not as critical as might have been expected. In addition there was a very fine distinction between development in yards such as Burdon's Yard (69) and Post Office Buildings (70) and developments in sidestreets of amalgamated burgage plots such as Neville Street (Fig.38), Mavin Street and West View.

Street widths were supposed to be a minimum of 30 feet, or 20 feet for side streets (71) but outcomes varied from site to site. In four streets, Ellis Leazes, Mavin Street, Neville Street and Ravensworth Terrace the street width, or access street width, was narrower than 30 feet (Fig.38) while, in contrast, in St. Nicholas parish in 1853 and in Baths Field, Framwellgate in 1854, street widths of 33 feet and 32 feet and 34 feet had been enforced. (72)

Table 7.7 Applications to build in yards, Durham MB,
1850 to 1915

<u>Years</u>	<u>Applications</u>	<u>Rejections</u>	<u>Further Applications</u> <u>(Location unclear)</u>
1850 - 4	5	1	13
1855 - 9	12	0	1
1860 - 4	15	0	2
1865 - 9	13	0	1
1870 - 4	5	0	3
1875 - 9	16	7	2
1880 - 4	18	1	0
1885 - 9	26	5	2
1890 - 4	14	7	0
1895 - 9	8	2	0
1900 - 4	4	1	1
1905 - 9	1	0	0
1910 - 14	0	0	0

Sources : DDPD. SR. D.City Boxes 43/5, 44, 45, 48, 49, 51/1,
51/2
Vols. 158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164,
165, 166, 167 & 168

Bylund Lodge, Durham, undeposited Building Registers
1900-1909 & 1909-1927

In Neville Street between 1855 and 1868, building was delayed at the southern end of the street by the Local Board rejecting plans.⁽⁷³⁾ But here, as in Pellaw Leazes, the delay was only temporary. Pellaw Leazes illustrates how subtle the interpretation of the byelaws could be. At the junction with Gilesgate it did not conform with the byelaws; access was a mere 18 feet wide, replacing a single building of 1856. Beyond the houses of the Gilesgate South row the street of Ravensworth Terrace, widened to 36 feet, thus complying with the byelaws. To the South, Pellaw Terrace was narrower than 36 feet but it complied with the byelaws since although it was only 24 feet wide it was less than 100 feet in length. ⁽⁷⁴⁾

Stricter interpretation of the byelaws appears to have been reserved for the activities of certain builders and in particular Robert Renny's development in Ellis Leazes. His earliest development in this area was of low value cottages in the 1850's ⁽⁷⁵⁾ and these were supplemented, in the 1870's, by the tunnel back terraces of Renny Street, Ellis Leazes and Mayorswell Street (Fig.38). He did not always build according to the plans submitted ⁽⁷⁶⁾, his houses were inhabited before they were certified ⁽⁷⁷⁾ and he laid faulty drainage. ⁽⁷⁸⁾ In reply the Local Board refused his applications ⁽⁷⁹⁾ or forced undertakings upon him. ⁽⁸⁰⁾ The largest clash concerned access to the streets. Access from Station Lane was a mere 15 feet (Fig. 38) but Renny was allowed to proceed since the actual terraces he built conformed to the byelaws. If this had not been agreed the potential building land behind the North row of lower Gilesgate would have been fossilized as there was a lack of access through the row to the area between the burgage feet and the river (Figs. 20,35). But then an independent action claimed the access road to be a private right of way. ⁽⁸¹⁾ Whilst discussion was proceeding the Local Board blocked further development but they also, out of economy, declined to cleanse the area. ⁽⁸²⁾ In other words they were prepared to act against the worst evaders of building regulation but their actions were not altruistic and there was a constant undercurrent of parsimony.

Formal action was not always taken when plans were not submitted and in most cases there appears to have been a policy of informal discussion. In 1849 a Mr. Coulson was building without a plan but he was allowed to proceed if he

submitted a plan in retrospect. (83) In 1851 a building in New Elvet, for which no plan had been submitted was passed when the plan was forthcoming (84) and similar cases occurred in 1855 (85), in 1871 (86) and even as late as 1902. (87) Test cases were made but they were extremely rare. Actions were taken in 1858 concerning building in Neville Street when the Local Board felt that the number of application evasions was increasing (88), and in 1893 when the North Eastern Railway Company claimed to be exempt from the jurisdiction of the Urban Sanitary District and refused to submit plans for houses in Green Lane. (89) It was more usual for the Surveyor to report on the problem and then for the case to be dropped. (90)

Building byelaws did not create new styles in dwellings but instead modified existing styles. Terraces forming streets which had been built during the first half of the century, without exception, had separate yards but no back lane access. In contrast those built within the borough in the later nineteenth century had both yards and back lane access (Figs. 41, 42, 43 & 44). But the building of terraced housing in streets in the second half of the century was far more common in the second half of the century than in earlier decades. Did the change, therefore, reflect byelaw regulation or a change in building with a shift to a higher standard of living and housing aimed at an artisan and middleclass market?

England and Wales as a whole saw a shift to higher average real wages in the second half of the nineteenth century. After slight setbacks in the 1850's and early 1860's this rise was continuous until the early twentieth

century (Mitchell & Deane 1971 : 343-4). Locally there is not the evidence on wages to corroborate the national trend or to break it down by occupational groups but certainly there appear to have been changes in the type of dwelling the middle classes and skilled working classes, to use general terms, would inhabit. The new terraces in the Avenue, Pellaw Leazes, Ellis Leazes and Crossgate Head were occupied by artisans and lower middle class in 1871 (Chapter 9 page 417) whereas in 1851 these groups had lived in cottages and shared houses in the old streets of the town (Chapter 9 page 421).

Also, when comparing terraces built within the borough to those built outside the borough in the period 1849 to 1875, years between the formation of the Durham Local Board of Health for the borough and the Rural Sanitary Districts for the surrounding area, a strong contrast does not emerge in housing styles. Instead the immediately adjacent areas show variety. At mid-century terraces were built without separate yards at Colpitts Terrace, Crossgate Head, or Cross View Terrace, Neville's Cross or Ernest Place, Gilesgate Moor. But even in that decade there were developments of larger terraced houses with back access on Western Hill (Fig. 41), where each house had a garden, and in later decades terraces tended to have separate yards and back access despite there being no byelaw control. Examples include the Avenue (Fig. 39) and Teasdale's Terrace, Gilesgate Moor (Fig. 45).

In the case of buildings being converted into dwellings and dwellings being partially rebuilt the Local Board of Health was not so successful since the building trend was not similar to the byelaws. Partial rebuilding had been common before 1849 (Chapter 5 page 255) and continued after

that date. Up to 1859 the Local Board had no remedy since their powers only covered new buildings⁽⁹¹⁾ but they recognized the problem and complained to the General Board of Health that

"...several persons have within the District of such Board converted Stables, Barns & Byers into Cottages without having given any Notice whatever of their intention to build or rebuild or of the situation and construction of the privies and cesspools to be used" (92)

The question was whether the rebuilding of the upper portion of a building including the roof and floor constituted a new dwelling or not. (93) The definition was made more precise in 1875. (94) In these cases the Local Board failed to control development but it is impossible to assess whether their comments on such cases⁽⁹⁵⁾ constitute the total of such cases, in which case it was a minor contribution to the new building stock, or whether their attention was drawn to a small proportion of sites and to certain builders, including Robert Renny.⁽⁹⁶⁾

4. Changes in administrative policy

The interpretation of powers by the Local Board, and later by the Urban Sanitary District, varied by decade. The trend in several types of decisions was for action or strict enforcement in the first few years of the Local Board's existence and then for activity to be cut back, for building plans of dubious quality to be allowed in the later 1850's and the 1860's and then for stricter control to be enforced after 1875. In the period 1849 to 1854 the Local Board were prepared to mortgage the rates in order to build a sewerage system⁽⁹⁷⁾ but in the following decade modifications to that system were small and piecemeal⁽⁹⁸⁾ and even minor street

improvements, as with the remodelling of Magdalene Steps, at the junction of Sadler Street and Elvet Bridge (99), or the appointment of a new Medical Officer of Health (100), were questioned.

Although building plan rejections are of limited value, since they depend not only on the administrative body but also on the proposer, this general fall and rise can be seen in the proportion of building plans rejected (Table 7.8).

Table 7.8 Building applications and rejections, Durham MB.
1849 to 1914

<u>Period</u>	<u>Applications</u>	<u>% Rejected</u>
1849 - 54	61	11.48
1855 - 59	88	3.41
1860 - 64	101	4.95
1865 - 69	127	3.15
1870 - 74	103	6.80
1875 - 79	201	28.36
1880 - 84	96	27.08
1885 - 89	89	17.98
1890 - 94	85	20.00
1895 - 99	101	16.83
1900 - 04	97	17.53
1905 - 09	44	11.36
1910 - 14	35	5.71

Sources : DDPD.SR.D.City Boxes 43/5, 44, 45, 48, 49,
51/1, 51/2
Vols. 158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164,
165, 166, 167, 168
Bylund Lodge, Durham undeposited Building Registers
1900-1909, 1909-1927

This did not reflect changes in statutory powers or byelaw powers but it does appear to have reflected changes in the members of the Local Board of Health. Hennock has suggested that in many towns a period of expenditure was followed by a period of reaction in which new men would be

voted in on the platform of economy (1963:217) and this appears to have been the case with the Durham Local Board of Health.

Over the period 1849 to 1914 the occupational composition of the Local Board of Health members changed. Between 1849 and the mid-1850's there was a preponderance of lawyers, gentlemen and capitalists, then, up to the mid-1870's there were more builders and a more mixed occupational structure (Appendix 7.3). From the mid-1870's to the mid-1890's tradesmen were numerically dominant with 'gentleman' increasing in number in the early twentieth century. From 1849 to 1910 there was at least one medical man on the board and Medical Officers of Health were either on the board, having been elected to the Town Council in their own right, or had been members at some period so having experience of its procedures. (101)

The occupational composition of the Board contrasts that of other towns. In the 1850's there were fewer large businessmen and more gentlemen and lawyers on the Durham Local Board than Hennock indicates for Birmingham (1973:27, 34) and there were fewer industrialists than at Leeds (Hennock 1973:203). Compared to Cardiff in the period 1884 to 1913 (Daunton 1977:152-3) there were more tradesmen. The differences, for example the lack of dominance by large businessmen in Durham Local Board of Health, can be attributed only in part to a local middle class occupational structure which included only a limited number of large employers since the trends, and the decades without any large employers on the Board, remain unexplained (Appendix 7.3)

Those employed in law, building and medicine tended to remain on the Board, or Corporation, the longest but gentlemen tended to rise on the Corporation from councillors to aldermen the most rapidly (Table 7.9). This was not influenced by the varied composition of the Corporation and Local Board from decade to decade since the speed of turnover of members was only slightly quicker towards the end of the century (Appendix 7.5).

Table 7.9 Durham Corporation and Local Board of Health.
Duration of office compared to occupation,
1835 to 1914

	<u>Gentle-</u> <u>man</u>	<u>Law</u>	<u>Trade</u>	<u>Build-</u> <u>ing</u>	<u>Med-</u> <u>icine</u>	<u>Drink</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>Profes-</u> <u>sional</u>	<u>Capit-</u> <u>alist</u>
Average years in office	8.15	15.88	10.49	12.87	11.13	8.75	7.38	9.00
Total members	13	17	57	15	8	20	13	5
% aldermen	0.15	0.41	0.21	0.27	0.25	0.05	0.08	0.40
Years in office before alderman	4.50	8.14	10.66	10.50	8.50	11.00	11.00	10.50

Sources : Appendix 7.4, Walker's Durham Directory and Almanac (annual)

The increase in the number of builders on the Local Board during the 1850's and 1860's (Appendix 7.3) does not explain the period of slacker activity and controls since firstly, builders were not the only building applicants (Chapter 4 page154) and secondly, other members of the Board made applications. In addition the voting patterns and policies of individual members of the Board were not determined by occupation. Between 1850 and 1915 28 sometime-members of the Board made applications, involving a total of 145 dwellings. Only five of these applicants were builders. The three cases where members of the Board made building

applications when they were actually on the Board were all refused (102) but all these occurred at the end of the century or early in the twentieth century so are not indicative of trends in the 1850's and 1860's. Indeed the largest property owners in the town tended not to be on the Board since in 1850 35 property owners had more than 10 rateable units but only four were on the Local Board and in 1870 only two of the 32 property owners with more than 10 rateable units were on the Board. (103)

Between 1849 and 1862 39 out of the 50 members of the Local Board proposed or seconded a building application. The members not directly concerned in this were not necessarily those who were only members for short periods (104) but no inactive members were builders. The builders on the Board tended to be active though they were not the most active members (105) (Appendix 7.6); the most active members were those who had already been nominated to the Plan Committee.

The most critical trend which affected Local Board of Health zeal appears to have been the election of more men who had previously been on the Paving Commission (Appendix 7.4). There was strong direct continuity for in 1850 12 of the 24 members of the Local Board had been Commissioners but several of these had been supporters of the adoption of the Public Health Act. In the early 1850's some of these men were not re-elected and the new members tended to be former Commissioners who had not supported the Act. In particular John Bramwell, who had been elected Chairman of the Commission by the anti-Public Health Act faction (106), was re-elected to the Corporation in 1851 and rose to be mayor

and therefore chairman of the Local Board, in two years; a meteoric rise. The tide turned again during the 1860's since these members grew older and by 1870 only three former Commissioners who had opposed the 1848 Public Health Act were still members of the Local Board (107). But shifts in membership from this group to younger men did not change attitudes back towards policies of greater expenditure. Throughout the decades up to the 1890's there was an undercurrent of minimum spending and the outlay in the 1890's for the purposes of redraining the town was not initiated by the members but by the county authorities. (108)

5. Comparison between Durham Local Board of Health and Durham Paving Commission

Compared to their potential activity the Durham Local Board of Health and later the Durham Urban Sanitary District were relatively inactive. There was a reaction against heavy expenditure and few new schemes were initiated after the early 1850's but this was not crucial since the town was not growing rapidly either in terms of population (Fig. 3) or area (Fig. 48). But compared with the pre-1849 Local Commission the Local Board, and its successor, appear to have been active; a feature which may, in the main, be attributed to a stronger financial position.

Other factors cannot be entirely excluded. The Local Board had a clearly defined administrative boundary; the municipal boundary, whereas the Commission had had its own illdefined area⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ which had confused both rating and control. Since the Local Board administered both the built up areas of the town and some of the surrounding open areas it could,

at least up to the 1870's, control the natural drainage outlets from the built up area and indeed investigated the pre-existing outlets onto the Racecourse and Paradise Gardens.⁽¹¹⁰⁾ In contrast the Commission had had jurisdiction only over the built up areas of the town.⁽¹¹¹⁾ By the 1880's however, some of this advantage had been lost since suburban growth to the west had overflowed the municipal area (Fig.48) and a boundary extension, suggested in 1881⁽¹¹²⁾ and 1896⁽¹¹³⁾ was not executed until 1904.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ The Freehold Land Society on Western Hill paid to join up their sewers, in 1853, to those of the Local Board⁽¹¹⁵⁾ but the Avenue estate was not joined up to the town sewers until 1884 despite the natural outlet being down through the town.⁽¹¹⁶⁾

In addition the Local Board could draw on a wider body of statute law and orders from the Medical Department of the Privy Council and the Local Government Act Office so did not need to incur the expense of local acts for any new ventures it might initiate. Also the Local Board had the advantage of being a smaller committee than the Commission since it was composed of the twenty four members of the town council while, in contrast, the number of Commissioners had not been fixed.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ This had made the Commission an unwieldy body and though its quorum was only seven⁽¹¹⁸⁾ its meetings were frequently inquorate. (Table 7.10). Attendance rose after the 1822 Local Amendment Act and again in the years 1848 and 1849 when the future of the body was in doubt; 87 Commissioners attending at least one meeting between August 1848 and August 1849.

Table 7.10 Attendance at Durham Paving Commission meetings,
1814 to 1849

	1814	1815	1824	1825	1834	1835	1843	1844	1848	1849
No.meetings	9	15	17+	13	13	12	12	13	13	9
Max.present	11	11	32	63	42	45	42	17	45	51
Min.present	7	1	13	13	10	12	10	9	14	4
Av. attend- ance	8.7	7.0	21.0	28.0	21.5	22.2	22.0	12.7	24.8	33.7

+ 1824 has no full list of attenders at November meeting
so calculated for 16 meetings

Sources : DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 121, 122, 123, 128

In detail, the finances of the Local Board of Health must be seen in terms of two main periods, from 1849 to the late 1850's and then the years following, but in general these finances were stronger than the Paving Commission in four respects. Firstly, they could raise more than one rate; they could raise both General District Rate and Special District Rate (119), secondly, they could mortgage the rates with the Public Works Loan Commission when the bank rate was high. (120) Thirdly, they were operating in decades when the bank rate was often lower (Mitchell & Deane 1971 : 456) and, fourthly, they had a higher rateable value per capita.

The Paving Commission had been able to raise a rate of up to 8d. in the pound on the Poor Rate assessment (121), a level which they deemed insufficient. (122) After the Local Amendment Act of 1822, and up to 1843, the rate of up to one shilling in the pound was based upon the Inhabited House Assessment (123) and thereafter reverted to the Poor Rate assessment. In 1848 they proposed that it was possible to drain the town on a rate of one shilling in the pound for

property over £5 in value, including Dean and Chapter property and 8d. in the pound for property under £5 in value (124) or just one shilling in the pound for four years (125) but their opponents suggested that this would be illegally based on Property and Income Tax and that it would be higher than a rate under the 1848 Public Health Act (126) which had been estimated at 5d. in the pound. (127) In other words the Paving Commission eventually weakened its case by suggesting schemes which relied on finances it had no power to raise.

Previous to 1848 the Dean and Chapter and the University were not rated (128), despite about one quarter of the houses in the town being Dean and Chapter property in the early nineteenth century (Chapter 5 fn. 117), and this property being of high value. The average value of the dwellings in the College in 1822, calculated from the Inhabited House Duty, was £32.4s.0d. compared to over £22 in the Elvets in 1815. (129) At Gloucester, Hereford and Bristol the prebendal houses were rated (130) but at Durham the plan, in 1822, to include the property of the Dean and Chapter was withdrawn (131) and instead the Dean and Chapter voluntarily agreed to pay £30 annually. (132) The bishop paid a token £5 for the Castle. (133) In contrast the Local Board rated both the Dean and Chapter and the bishop for their property, including the Hallgarth. (134)

The rates were supplemented by a major source of income from leases of toll bars at Stone Bridge, Framwellgate, Gilesgate, Hallgarth Street, Crossgate, Redhills and Butterby (135) (Table 7.11). In addition there was some income from letting the scavenging. During the 1840's the Commission

was faced with an income crisis which would probably have proved permanent if the Commission had continued to operate after 1848. Both income from letting the tolls and letting the scavenging fell. In 1835 the tolls were let for £1,086 but in 1843 they only realised £1,060 ⁽¹³⁶⁾ and the level in 1844 was even lower, being £822. The following year they only realised £624.19.9d. and in 1846 reached the nadir of £471.0.0d. ⁽¹³⁷⁾ Scavenging shifted from providing a slight profit in the years 1841 to 1845 to a deficit of £91.18s.10d. in 1848 when leasees could not be found and the work was conducted directly. ⁽¹³⁸⁾

Table 7.11 Income of Durham Paving Commission in 1845,
1846 and 1848

	1845		1846		1848	
Income Source	£.00	%	£.00	%	£.00	%
Rates	591.28	35.1	694.83	48.3	728.44	35.7
Tolls	624.99	37.1	598.12	41.6	814.45	39.9
Balance carried over	434.90	25.8	141.60	9.9	430.66	21.0
Other +	31.58	1.9	2.95	0.2	68.65	3.4
Total	1682.75	99.9	1437.50	100.00	2042.20	100.0

+ including scavenging

Sources : DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 122 pp. 123-5, 154-5,203

Reduction of income in the 1840's precipitated financial crises in 1844 and 1845; bills were held over from 1843 into 1844 and 1845 ⁽¹³⁹⁾, salaries were withheld ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ and the balance carried over from year to year was sharply reduced (Table 7.11). They also wished to reduce the rate of interest they were paying for the mortgage on the rates from 5% to 4%, in line with national trends (Mitchell & Deane 1971:456) but the mortgagee refused. ⁽¹⁴¹⁾ The largest items of expenditure were the interest on this mortgage, paving

and lighting (Table 7.12)

Table 7.12 Expenditure of Durham Paving Commission in 1845, 1846 and 1848

	1845		1846		1848	
	% of exp- enditure	% of income	% of exp- enditure	% of income	% of exp- enditure	% of income
mortgage	30.54	27.98	43.32	32.76	27.89	30.00
gas	24.61	22.55	6.02	4.55	14.82	12.22
paving	33.96	31.11	29.39	22.23	30.45	25.11
other	10.89	18.36	21.28	40.46	26.85	32.66
Total	100.00	100.00	100.01	100.00	100.01	99.99

Sources : DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 122 pp.123-5, 154-5,203
cf. Appendix 7.7

In comparison with other towns Durham Commission were not poor since the Assessed Tax Returns for the early 1840's indicate Durham City ranked sixteenth in payment per capita after London, spas such as Bath, Cheltenham, Brighton and Weymouth and certain country towns. (142) But they could not rate church property, they could not rate the local coal-mines since as the boundary moved outwards the pitshafts were resunk outside the new boundary (Fig. 48) and they had difficulty collecting in the rates. In addition, as has been described, they lost a large proportion of their income during the 1840's.

When the Local Board of Health was formed not all these financial problems were eliminated and Local Board finance must be seen in terms of the 1850's and the subsequent decades. Church property was rated but not the coalmines and there were still discrepancies in valuation assessment since each parish valued the property separately. (143) The Local Board also had serious difficulties during the 1850's in collecting the rates since it chose to rate the occupiers

directly rather than compound the rates on low value rateable units to the owner. Low value units predominated (Fig.51) and the ratecollector fell into arrears ⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ with resulting cash flow problems for the Board. ⁽⁴⁵⁾ Theoretically the Board had a higher income than the Commission but in practice, for the early years, it had similar financial difficulties.

Rates formed about half the income of the Local Board, (Table 7.13) ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ which was slightly higher proportion than in the income of the Commission (Table 7.11). This proportion rose even higher after 1874 when the toll houses were sold off. ⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Since such a large proportion of their income was derived from the rates the Local Board was assured of a stable income if, and only if, the rate could be collected.

Table 7.13 General District rates as a source of income to Durham Local Board of Health, 1865 to 1875

<u>Financial</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>Income</u> <u>£-00</u>	<u>% Rates</u>	<u>Financial</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>Income</u> <u>£-00</u>	<u>% Rates</u>
1865-6	4442.7958	54.34	1871-2	4194.2875	62.11
1866-7	4173.2625	61.55	1872-3	5857.0250	56.92
1867-8	4504.2333	57.24	1873-4	6442.0583	63.61
1868-9	3969.4583	69.39	1874-5	7235.2375	61.70
1869-70	4632.4167	54.16	1875-6	6026.5750	78.71
1870-1	4539.5625	53.56			

Source : DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 134

The bulk of the rateable value was made up from residential properties (Table 7.14) though this was probably exaggerated by the ratebooks which tended to compound residential and non-residential property of the same occupier in one rated unit. The 1886 ratebook indicates the scale of this compounding since it appears to show a sharp difference

in the composition of the rateable value when compared to the 1880 ratebook (Table 7.14). In reality the break was not so sudden; there was, instead, a different division of the rated units to separate dwellings from other adjacent buildings and shop premises.

Table 7.14 Sources of Rateable value, Durham MB.,
1850 to 1886

<u>Year</u>	<u>Rate £</u>	<u>% Dwellings</u>	<u>% Industrial</u>	<u>% Land</u>	<u>%Other</u> ⁽¹⁴⁸⁾
1850	24671.0	84.16	3.13	1.76	10.95
1860	30343.5	80.52	4.87	4.43	10.18
1870	34259.5	78.96	4.08	4.66	12.30
1880	47434.0	75.22	5.31	5.13	14.34
1886	46185.5	45.61	12.62		

Sources : DDPD.SR.D.City vols. 137, 140, 148 & 152.

For large projects the Local Board of Health raised mortgages, most of which were with local residents. Eighteen mortgages were taken out in 1853 and one in 1854 to fund the sewerage of the town, all of which were at an interest rate of 4%. ⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ This was higher than the current bank rate of $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ (Mitchell & Deane 1971:456) but was lower than the 5% previously paid by the Local Commission. ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ Later mortgages, in order to improve the sewerage scheme, were also raised with local men and were similarly at an interest rate of 4%. ⁽¹⁵¹⁾

There were two exceptions to this pattern of raising mortgages locally and both were for larger scale works. The first was to build the Public Baths in 1855 when a loan was taken out in the September with the Public Works Loan Commission. ⁽¹⁵²⁾ The interest rate on this loan was higher,

being 5%, but the Local Board were being cautious since in the latter half of 1855 the bank rate had leapt up from $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ in the June to 6 or 7% in the October (Mitchell & Deane 1971:456). Even so this mortgage was supplemented by one raised locally for £3,500 at 4%. (153) The second exception was in 1899 when the redraining of the town was financed by a mortgage at $3\frac{3}{4}\%$ interest from Huddersfield Corporation. (154) It is notable, therefore, that the Local Board and the Urban Sanitary District were paying lower interest rates than the Commission and that when the bank rate was rising they were able to avoid paying more than 5% interest by taking out a loan with the Public Works Loan Commission.

In addition they had a higher per capita rateable value than the Commission had had for while it may be estimated that the 1837 per capita rateable value had been £1.27 by 1851 it may be estimated at £1.97 and in 1880 at £3.18. (155) When current prices are taken into account these changes in the per capita rateable value of the Local Board fall into two periods. In the 1850's the increase did not keep abreast with current prices but then in the following decades it surged ahead with per capita rateable value continuing to rise contemporaneously to relative price decreases.

6. Conclusion

The structure and detail of activity of local government in Durham altered over the nineteenth century but was this the outcome of gradual change with the same personnel accumulating experience or was there a watershed, as Dicey suggested occurred nationally in the 1860's or 1870's (1905),

or in the 1840's, (Hennock 1957), the 1830's (Brebner 1948, Parris 1960), or even the late eighteenth century (Keith-Lucas 1953-4) ? Two temporal scales of change emerge and must be balanced against each other. Firstly, there was the long term structural change, described in Chapter 6, with new administrative bodies being added to the traditional ones in 1790 with the creation of the Local Commission, in 1849 when this was replaced by the Local Board of Health, in 1875 when this, in turn, was replaced by the Urban Sanitary District and in 1835 when the Corporation was reformed. Secondly, there were short term changes in attitude and financial powers for the Local Board of Health in the 1860's was not operating with the same objectives as had the same body in the early 1850's.

Though the forms of government changed the effects of local government did not change dramatically at these dates. In 1875 the Urban Sanitary District became stricter in its interpretation of building regulation (Table 7.7,8) but its policies were extensions from Local Board of Health policies. Again, after 1849, the Local Board of Health initiated a welter of schemes but town drainage had already been proposed by the Local Commission, building regulation was already in operation, though in a less detailed form, and the byelaws had already been initiated. The Local Board in Durham also drew upon the 1835 Corporation reform, since that elected body became the Local Board of Health, and it drew upon personnel from the Local Commission. Also parallel to these new bodies, were traditional bodies which only gradually shrank in role.

In one respect 1849 marked a watershed in that the local government, in the form of the Local Board of Health, was more closely tied to London, in the form of the General Board of Health. This marked a sharp break from the administrative isolation of the Local Commission. Although the influence of the General Board of Health, and later the Medical Department of the Privy Council and the Local Government Act Office, were not constant over the second half of the nineteenth century they were always influential to some extent. The correspondence of the Local Board of Health shows that the 1860's were not a decade of local isolationism as Dicey suggested but instead saw interchange of ideas between Durham and London. (156)

It would be mistaken to see local government activity in terms of a simple evolutionary progression, or in terms of a watershed. Instead there were surges of activity following the inauguration of new bodies and lapses into less activity. The Commission was inaugurated in 1790, sank into stupor, was restated in 1822 and again, lost its dynamism but, if its records can be taken as evidence, it was more active in the 1830's than it had been in the first two decades of the century. Similarly the Local Board of Health did not fulfil its early potential. It was not successful in reducing mortality since changes in water supply and the standard of living appear to have been more major contributors. But compared to the Commission it was more active since it continued to improve the drainage, remove nuisances, cleanse, pave, light and control building operations.

1. The Preliminary Inquiry was held on the petition of about one sixth of the ratepayers Clark G.T. Report to the General Board of Health on a Preliminary Inquiry ... of the Borough of Durham. London 1849. Section.3. It was not held on the initiative of the General Board of Health as allowed under the Public Health Act, 1848, 11 & 12 Vic. cap. 63 sec. viii where the crude mortality exceeded an average of 23/1000 over seven years. But the calculations of Dr. Shaw on the mortality of the town, D.S.St. 312/L11, were widely reported D.Adv. Fri.Nov. 3 1848 no. 1783 p.5 col.3, Fri. Nov. 10 1848 no. 1784 p.2 col. 3, Nov. 17 1848 no. 1785 p.2 col.1-2 and life expectancy and the associated main sewerage were cited as the great issues when the Board of Health was originally formed D.Adv. Fri. Nov. 24 1848 p.8 col. 3-4.
2. Calculating the crude mortality as the average of the number of deaths from 1846 to 1855 inclusive, divided by the 1851 population, and similarly for the 1841 denominator.
3. HC.PP. 1884-5 xvii. 435, 1853 Annual Report of the Registrar General p.149.
4. HC. PP. 1884-5 xvii. 449.
5. Mackenzie & Ross (1834i : 357) eulogised "the city, for public conveniences, neatness and cleanliness, is not now surpassed by any other in the kingdom."
6. D.Adv.Fri.Nov. 10 1848 no.1784 p.2 col.3, Fri.Feb. 2 1849 no.1796 p.4 col.1-2. Clark G.T. 1849 (op.cit fn.1) section 29.
7. D.S.St.312/L11 Average crude mortality calculated by Dr.Shaw for 10 years to 31st Dec. 1850:-
Total deaths 3,202. Crude mortality 25.0/1000
i.e. estimated population 12,800
But population in 1841 14,151 and in 1851 13,188
This estimate is lower than that given by Shaw to the General Board of Health in the previous year.
(Clark G.T. 1849 section 29) when he assumed a population average between 1841 and 1848 to be 10,350.
8. See Appendix 2.9, DDPD. SR.D.City Box 53 1/1/2 to 1/9
9. HC.PP. 1865 xiii 383-388.
10. HC.PP. 1854 xxxv.27.
11. Durham Registration District, 545, was split into Durham and Lanchester in 1875.
12. See Appendix 2.7.
13. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 47/352.

14. A Medical Officer of Health complained bitterly in 1883 about the standard of death certificates in the Durham and Chester-le-Street Unions. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 51/1/178.
15. DDPD.SR.D.City Box 53 1/2
It should be noted, however, that when the population of the town is standardized to the 1911 age structure the mortality does show an oscillation but that the nadir is in the 1860's and not during the 1850's
Standardized mortality 1841-50 23.14/1000
1851-2 22.65/1000
1851-60 20.32/1000
1860-9 23.08/1000
1868-70 24.65/1000
1884 20.89/1000
Based on D.S.St. 312/L11, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 53 1/9 to 1/17, 1911 printed census, Co.Durham summary volume, decennial census totals of Durham MB.population
The selection of years was constrained by sources giving age at death.
16. Medical Officer of Health Annual Reports.DDPD.SR.D.City Box 53.

1855-6	226.9/1000 births	1864-5	139.0/1000
1856-7	192.2	1865-6	250.0
1857-8	192.6	1866-7	153.0
1858-9	218.8	1867-8	191.0
1860-1	167.8	1884	121.0
1861-2	138.8	1886	142.9
1863-4	187.2	1887	127.6

These are the extant annual reports. Reports cited in the Durham Advertiser (see Appendix 2.7) do not give this detail.
17. DDPD.SR. search room Headlam AW.ed. 1871.
March 25 1566 to Feb. 6 1578, using whole years 1567, 1568, 1571, 1572, 1573, 1574, 1577, 1578, dated from January 1st., on account of obvious defects in the remaining years. Infant burials total 54, baptisms total 197. This excludes stillborns, and possible effects of migration. 'Aged' and 'infant' are not defined in the register but nominal linkage between the burial and baptism registers for sample burial years 1567, 1568, 1569 and 1574, a total of 30 'infant' burials, suggested that 14 were under 1 year since baptism and 6 were over 1 year, but were at maximum 5 years old. The remaining 10 could not be traced.
This is comparable to Hollingsworth (1957) on English ducal families where for 1480 to 1679 29% of females and 34% of males died before the age of 5 years.

18. The first non-miasmatist Medical Officer to Durham Local Board of Health, Dr. Vann, was appointed in 1886. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/19, and following.
19. He did give evidence to the Select Committee on the Public Health Bill and Nuisance Removal Bill HC.PP.1854-5 xiii. 432, 434, 435.
20. HC.PP. 1849 xxiv 97, 110, 121 "the cholera is not contagious", HC.PP. 1852 xix 141, to give two examples of their writings.
21. HC.PP. 1871 xxxv.15.
22. HC.PP. 1875 xviii. 2,6 Supplement to the 35th Report of the Registrar General.
23. It is difficult to justify this opinion since the rationale behind actions may differ from what may be inferred from actions. Certainly there was the use of hospitals, Durham having one from 1792 (Pigot 1834:148), and surveillance, as in the case of smallpox incidence in lodging houses.
24. HC.PP. 1849 xxiv 17-18. Durham Medical Officer of Health cited 16 deaths from diarrhoea during the cholera year of 1853. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/3, 1/4 Table 5.
25. These are, of course, modern groupings. Zymotic diseases were taken to be aphthae, croup, diarrhoea, diphtheria, erysipelas, fever (typhus, typhoid), hooping cough, influenza, measles, remittant fever, scarlatina and smallpox.
26. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/3.
27. The obituary of George Goundry, senior, in Walker's Durham Directory and Almanack, 1868 p.42-3, describes a choleraic attack in January 1867, from which he died in 16 hours.
28. HC.PP. 1868-9 xxxii 460-1 for comment on Gateshead, Kirby (1968:150, 167, 179-180) for comments on Bishop Auckland. Bishop Auckland untreated sewerage dated from 1856. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.161, 20th Aug. 1856 & 3rd Sept.1856.
29. Begun in April 1853, DDPD.SR.D.City vol.176 p.3r, in February 1854 they had to alter the plan vol.176 p.40, this was complete in May 1854 p.44r. The MOH Report for 1853-4 stated "The main sewerage is now completed... The house drainage is far from completion". DDPD.SR.D.City Box 53 1/3 p.45. In 1858 there was an investigation in Gilesgate concerning a cesspool since there was no sewer DDPD.SR.D.City vol. 161 p.124.

30. The Pant water pipes were in a poor state and there was a health anxiety as they were lead. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.262, D.Co.Adv. Fri Sept. 7 1855 p.3 col6, Fri. Oct. 26 1855 p.7 col. 2.
A complaint in 1854 stated that the Pant water was "so discoloured and impregnated with Iron as to be offensive and unfit for use and the undersigned have consequently been compelled to have recourse to river water as a beverage and for culinary operations". DDPD. SR. D.City Box 47/623.
31. Clark 1849 section 72. Waterworks opened May 1849, Fordyce 1857 i : 340.
32. D.S.St. 312/L11 80 cholera deaths in Durham MB.
HC.PP. 1867-8 xxxvii. 116. 241 cholera deaths in Durham Union.
33. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/3, 1/4, HC.PP. 1867-8 xxxviii 116.
34. HC.PP. 1867-8 xxxvii. 116. But see fn. 27 concerning Durham MB.
35. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 47/102. Reply to an inquiry by Ely LBH.
36. Kirby (1968 : 175) Comments on the quality of the water supply as a result of this.
37. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 p.224 7 Nov. 1888, p.456 7 Sept. 1892, vol.166 p.95 3 Jan. 1893. Action against soapworks.
38. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 178 p.12r, p.60, vol.161 p.102.
Cases of Houghall and Coxhoe collieries investigated by Durham LBH, 1857.
39. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/3 p.46. He called it "an elongated cesspool".
40. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 6 June 1866 p.167. This was probably a desperate measure.
41. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 167 6 Oct. 1897 p.173 Began by discussing filtration, vol. 168 5 Aug. 1903 p.609 summarized costs.
42. Fordyce 1857 i : 340.
43. Clark 1849 section 72, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 3 Feb. 1858 p.407-9. Yet Skeat notes that sand filters to remove suspended matter were first used in 1791 (1961 : 23).
44. In 1869, in Durham MB., the final public water supply from an unfiltered source, the Pant in the Market Place, was connected to the Durham City Water Company mains. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 50/327. Some private wells continued in use but all parts of the town were

supplied with water mains by 1860, DDPD. SR.D.City
vol. 140, while in 1850 only Elvet, St. Nicholas
and North Bailey had been so supplied DDPD.SR.D.City
vol.137.

45. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 pp.463-5..
46. DDPD. SR. C.Dity vol. 165 p.294, Box 53 1/19.
47. scrofula, tabes and phthisis.
48. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/1/1 p.8-9, 1850, Box 53 1/3 p.20,
1853-4. Persons/ House (Inhabited and Uninhabited),
Durham MB. as shown in the printed censuses for
1801 to 1881, inclusive, were as follows:-
- | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|
| 1801 | 7 14 | 1851 | 7.23 |
| 1811 | 8 32 | 1861 | 6.68 |
| 1821 | 8.27 | 1871 | 5 95 |
| 1831 | 7 68 | 1881 | 5.66 |
| 1841 | 5 97 | | |
- But the definition of 'house' changed. See Chapter
4 footnotes 11 and 12.
49. DDPD. SR. D.City vol.159, vol. 160 5th Feb. 1851.
50. DDPD. SR. D.City 1970 deposit. Ratebook 1919.
8 dwellings in Edward Street, Gilesgate Moor, 2 dwellings
on the Sands, and one dwelling at the sewage works
in Framwellgate.
Edward Street appears to date from 1903. DDPD. SR.
D.City vol. 168 p.522.
51. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 51/1/5-6.
52. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 p.285 8th Jan. 1890, motion to
adopt the Infectious Diseases (Notification) Act.
53. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 50/419, vol. 7 p.135a. Built in
1852. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p.374 they noted a
lag in the hygeine of the local population.
54. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 p.207-8, 4th July 1888.
55. 11 & 12 Vic. cap.63 only specified that no house was to be
built or rebuilt without drains (sec. xlix), or
without a watercloset, privy and ashpit (sec.li) -
depending on the distance from main drains. Also
14 days before foundations were laid written notice
was to be given to the LBH. giving the level of
cellars, lowest floors, privies and cesspools
(sec.liiii).
56. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 2 5/8.

57. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 pp.319, vol. 160 8th Jan. 1851, vol.162 p.25, vol. 161 p.144.
58. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 163 p.228.
59. These were to be thirty feet wide while back streets, or side streets, were to be twenty feet wide.
DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.205. These were described as 'somewhat antiquated' in 1880 D.CRO. M1/38.
D.Co. Adv. Fri. Sept. 3 1880 no. 3677 p.7 col.5.
60. See footnote 55.
61. DDPD. SR.D.City vol. 162 p.178.
62. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 178.
63. DDPD. SR.D.City vol. 161 p.413, vol.164 p.17, vol.165 p.160-1. They had to be of good quality as a plan of 1850 was rejected on the grounds of quality, vol. 160 2nd May 1850.
64. DDPD. SR.D.City vol. 162 p.271-4.
65. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.322-3, hence the building records in the Durham City collection are divided between the records of the LBH., the Surveyor, and Committees. A building register was only begun in 1900, Bylund Lodge, Durham, undeposited. The submitted plans were indexed, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162, pp.322-3 but this series of plans appear to have been destroyed. Personal communication, Mr.George, Bylund Lodge.
66. DDPD. SR. D.City vol.162 p.488-9.
67. DDPD. SR. D.City vol.163 p.278, 302.
68. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.160 12th Nov. 1849, Box 44 2 Oct.1849, vol.162 p.25. See Plate 18.
69. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.164 p.45,52. Also Black Swan yard, vol.162 p.276-7 and other such yards.
70. DDPD. SR. D.City vol.162 pp.410-11.
71. See footnote 59.
72. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.162 p.210-1, Jan.1854, vol.162 p.258-9, Dec.1854. Yet, in contrast, in discussion on Neville Street in 1862 the LBH. were willing to accept 32' though originally they demanded 36'.
D.Adv. Fri. April 4 1862 no.2482 p.8. col.1-2.
73. DDPD. SR. D.City vol.160 1 Nov. 1853, vol.162, p.271-4, p.276-7, p.410-11, vol.163 p.51.

74. Undeposited Building Registers, 1900-1909, 1909-1927.
Frontispieces.
75. 1857 building at 39 Gilesgate without a plan. DDPD.SR.
D.City Box 47/11, vol.162 p.393.
76. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.163 p.498, vol.164 p.85.
77. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.163 p.301 (1869)
78. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.163 p.304-7. 309-10, vol.164 p.85,
vol.161 p.471.
79. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.163 p.372, 395, 412, 415-6.
80. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.163 p.588-9 (1874).
81. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.164 p.321-2.
82. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.164 p.321.
83. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.162 p.10.
84. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.158 p.34r, vol.162 p.177.
85. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.161 p.40, vol.162 p.290.
86. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.163 p.451, 453.
87. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.168 p.371, 374.
88. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 162 p.417, 418, 421, 422.
89. DDPD. SR. D.City vol.165 p.489, 490, 501.
90. Only one case of demolition is known; a wooden shed in
1897. DDPD. SR. D.City vol.167 p.143, 152.
91. 11 & 12 Vic. cap. 63, see footnote 55. Building byelaws
were formed in 1859. See footnote 59.
92. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.161 pp.113-4, 18th Nov.1857.
93. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.161 pp.113-4. Letter to the GBH.
94. 38 & 39 Vic. cap.55 sec. 159.
95. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.162 pp.417-8, 421-2, 527-8, 532-3,
vol.164 pp.87-8, 161-2 (1849 to 1875).
96. See above, footnotes 75 to 80.
97. See below, footnote 149. Inquiry to GBH as early as
27th October 1849 vol.160, vol. 162, p.28.

98. 1857, to modify Water Lane DDPD.SR.D.City vol.178 p.16r.
1864, to sewer North Bailey DDPD. SR.D.City vol.163 p.88.
1866, to resewer the Mill Burn DDPD.SR.D.City vol.163.
p.148, p.361-4.
1869, to drain Castle Chare DDPD.SR.D.City vol.163 p.324-5.
1884, to resewer Chapel Passage DDPD.SR.D.City vol.164 p.559.
1888, to resewer Framwellgate Waterside DDPD.SR.D.City
vol.165 p.209.
Smith (1967:12) notes that ratepayers' associations were
formed in Newcastle, Durham, Stockton, West Hartlepool,
Bishop Auckland and Darlington between 1855 and 1857 to
combat expenditure.
99. D.CRO. M1/23 D.Co.Adv.Fri.April 6, 1860 no.2378 p.8
col.2-3 where it was described by a LBH member as
"robbery on the rates", Fri.May 11, 1860 no.2383
p.5 col.1, DDPD. SR.D.City vol.178 p.74.
100. In 1869. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.163 p.289, 296.
101. Dr.Oliver, Medical Officer of Health from 1851 to 1858,
had been on the Council from 1842 to 1849.
Walker's 1842 to 1849, annual, DDPD.SR.D.City
vol.6 p.176, 191, 216-7, vol.160 5th Feb.1851,
vol.161 p.123.
George Shaw, Medical Officer of Health in 1869 and 1870,
had been on the Local Board between 1849 and 1853
(Appendix 7.4).
102. 1. Geo.Hauxwell for an iron warehouse in Atherton Street
in 1883. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.164 p.521.
2. Ralph Charlton for a house in South Street in 1901,
when he proposed to use the old foundations. Bylund
Lodge, undeposited Building Register 1900-1909, no.9,
DDPD. SR.D.City vol.168 p.174.
3. John Shepherd for a new street off Gilesgate in 1907
for which he gave no proper section and whose entrance
was less than 20 feet wide. Bylund Lodge, undeposited
Building Register 1900-1909, no.169.
103. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.137, vol.142, Appendix 7.4
1850 Mark Jopling 12, H.J.Marshall 15, Geo.Robson
24, R.Tiplady & M.Smith 13.
1870 H.J.Marshall 11, Geo. Robson 24.
104. The non-active members in building proposal discussion
were:-
Members for one year=E.Beckwith, J.C. Bell, J.Fowler,
N.Oliver.
2 years = R.Tiplady, J.H.Veitch, T.White
3 years = R.Ferens, S.Rowlandson
4 years = G.Burdon
6 years = C.W. Lowes
9 years = J. Bramwell
11 years = R.Thwaites
None of these were in the building trade (Appendix 7.4)

105. Proposer and seconders of building applications to Durham LBH, 1849 to 1862.

Average proposal or secondary votes per annum on LBH.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Average Votes per annum</u>	<u>Builder</u>	<u>Dubious Plans</u>	
			<u>Support</u>	<u>Reject</u>
Colpitts J.	4.50	-		
Hutton T.	4.22		Yes	Yes
Rule R.	4.00	Yes	Yes	
Forster J.	3.78	Yes	Yes	
Blackett W.	3.50		Yes	
Heron E.	2.67	Yes		
Graddon G.	2.57	Yes		
Shaw G.	1.80			Yes
Ward J.	1.76		Yes	
Tiplady T.	1.60			
Monks J.	1.44		Yes	
Forster J.H.	1.27			Yes
Blackett W.C.	1.25		Yes	
Calvert T.	1.25			Yes
Peele E.	1.00		Yes	
Stevenson R.	1.00		Yes	
Thompson R.	1.00			Yes

Other voters had an average of less than 1.00 p.a.
Based on Appendix 7.5, and DDPD. SR. D.City vol.162,163.

106. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.210.
107. R.Hoggett, R.Robson and J. Ward - Appendix 7.3.
108. DDPD. SR.D.City Box 43/5/195 (1893).
109. D.Adv. Fri. Dec. 29 1848 no. 1791 p.2 col. 1-3.
110. DDPD. SR.D.City vol. 152 p.37r - 40, vol.160 9th Oct.1852,
Box 44 12th Sept. 1849, vol.158 p.27r, Box 44 12th
Aug. 1850.
111. 30 Geo. III cap.lxxvii did not define the area and the
RC. on Municipal Boundaries, 1837, commented upon this.
112. DDPD. SR.D.City vol. 164 p.345.
113. DDPD. SR.D.City Box 45/5/83.
114. Gee (1928 : 4) VCH.iii.
115. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.176 p.4-4r, 5-5r, Box 45 4th May 1853.

116. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 51/1/168-190, vol. 164 p.337,
Box 51/2 479-482.
117. 30 Geo. III c.lxvii and 3 Geo. IV c.xxvi stipulated no
number. Fordyce (1857i : 343) stated the number in
1849 to total 120. By no means were all Commissioners
active.
118. DDPD. SR.D.City vol. 123.
119. 11 & 12 Vic. cap 63 sec. lxxxvi, lxxxvii.
120. 9 & 10 Vic. cap 80, 11 & 12 Vic cap 63 sec. cviii.
121. 30 Geo. III c.lxvii sec. xviii.
122. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35 1/10/1, Draft Brief for supporting
Durham Paving Bill before the Lords. 1822.
123. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.42-3, 3 Geo.IV xxvi sec. xlii.
It was rarely levied above 8d. in the pound
March 1842 8d/£ DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.28,
D.Adv. Fri. April 4 1844 p.3 col. 2-3.
It was levied in June 1824, DDPD. SR.D.City vol.121 p.1.
124. D.Adv. Fri. Jan 5 1841 no. 1792 p.5 col.1-2.
125. D.Adv. Fri. March 23 1849 no. 1803 p.2 col.1-3.
126. D.Adv. Fri. March 30 1849 no. 1804 p.4 col.1.
127. D.Adv. Fri. Dec. 29 1848 no. 1791 p.2 col.3.
128. D.Adv. Fri. Dec. 29 1848 no.1791 p.4 col.1, exempt
under 30 Geo. III lxvii sec.xviii.
129. 1831 Census, Comparative volume 1801 to 1831
- | <u>District</u> | <u>£ Rateable Value, 1815</u> | <u>Houses +</u> | <u>Average</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Elvets | 8,546 | 384 | 22.26 |
| Gilesgate | 3,368 | 171 | 19.20 |
| St.Nicholas | 3,776 | 269 | 14.04 |
| Crossgate | 2,342 | 172 | 13.62 |
- + 'buildings', not 'dwellings'
130. DDPD. SR.D.City Box 35 1/18/8 .
131. DDPD. SR.D.City Box 35 1/2/2, 1/3/1, 1/3/2, 1/18/11.
132. DDPD. SR.D.City Box 35 1/18/12.
133. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.123-5, 154-5, 203.

134. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.162 p.191-2, inquiry in 1853. The Hallgarth had been rated during a financial inquiry in 1844, DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.86. The Dean & Chapter agreed to this voluntarily vol.122 p.19-20. The ecclesiastic property contained a tiny proportion of the town's population but had a relatively high rateable value.

<u>District</u>	<u>% of population</u> <u>1831</u>	<u>% of population</u> <u>1841</u>	<u>% of Watch Rate</u> <u>1844</u>
St.Nicholas	22.37	19.48	29.64
Elvet	28.8	23.63	24.95
Gilesgate	12.61	24.0	9.40
Crossgate	13.86	12.10	9.07
N.Bailey	4.95	2.18	8.48
Framwellgate	15.64	16.42	6.92
College	0.60	nk.	4.32
Castle	nk.	0.89	3.38
St.Bailey	1.26	0.7	3.25
St.Mary Magdalene	nk.	nk.	0.69
Total	10,125	14,151	

135. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.29.

136. DDPD. SR.D.City Box 35 2/66, vol.122 pp.47-9.

137. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.77, 124, 130
This may reflect a turn away from road transport with the advent of local railways but the Commission themselves weakened the tolls by exempting some major users. Messrs. Smith, Crozier and Harper, paper manufacturers, were exempt from Stonebridge and Ushaw Gates. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.127 p.35 5 Dec. 1837. Mr.Crozier was a Commissioner. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 The GPO.were already exempt 30 Geo.III lxvii, sec. xxxiii.

138. Scavenging contract receipts. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.10-11, 24, 44-5, 71-2, 93, 175.

139. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.84, 124.

140. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.81.

141. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.122 p.90-2. The bank rate dropped to $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ in March 1845 and remained at 3% or $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ until January 1847 (Mitchell & Deane 1971 : 456).

142. HC.PP. 1847-8 xxxix 233-236. Return of the Total Amount of Assessed Taxes. Compared to 1841 population.

Rank	£ payment/capita	Rank	£ payment/capita
1. Bridgnorth	3.41	9. Hastings	1.41
2. Andover	2.87	10. Ludlow	1.33
3. Westminster	2.35	11. Morpeth	1.27
4. London	2.18	12. Finsbury	1.21
5. St. Mary-le-Bone	2.04	13. Dorchester	1.16
6. Bath	1.77	14. Windsor	1.14
7. Cheltenham	1.70	15. Weymouth	1.12
8. Brighthelmstone	1.65	16. Durham	1.11

Reworked after Phillips and Walton 1975

143. DDPD. SR.D.City vol.160 10 and 24 April 1850. Complaint to GBH.on the differences between the 2 parishes and 5 parts of parishes using separate assessment bases. St. Nicholas parish had very low assessment D.Adv. Fri. Sept.1 1848 no.1774 p.2 col.3-4, Fri. May 4 1849 no.1809 p.5 col.1. They wanted their own scheme DDPD.SR.D.City vol.178 p.3-5, an idea which was refused, DDPD.SR.D.City vol.162 p.55-6. The administration of Poor Law rates was amalgamated in November 1914 (Walker's 1915:62).
144. The first collector for the LBH., George Goundry, had been collector for the Commission. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.162 p.2, D.Adv. March 30 1849 no.1804 p.2 col.1-3. He complained of unrated property, empty property and a low salary. DDPD.SR.D.City Box 44 2 July 1850. He was dismissed for embezzlement and charging arbitrary rates. D.Adv. Fri.March 28 1851 no.1908 p.5 col.2. His successor, Atkinson, struggled with Goundry's arrears, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 45 1st Feb. 1853, and bad health, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 44 27th Oct. 1852. He resigned in 1853, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 45 7th Feb.1853 and was quickly followed by his successor, Shadforth, who complained of the unpopularity of the rate, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 45 3rd March 1853 and 7th Sept. 1853. When Barnes was appointed in April 1854 the salary was raised from £20 to £50 per annum, DDPD. SR.D.City Box 44 2nd July 1850, vol.160 21st April 1854. Like his predecessors he was part time. Collection appears to have improved after these initial years but the collector continued to face difficulties in extracting small sums from a large number of properties. In 1878 the rate collector complained that he had called on some parties ten or twelve times. D.CRO. M1/36, D.Adv. Fri. Jan.4 1878 no.3501 p.7 col.4.
145. In January 1852 they were overspent, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 44 4th Sept. 1852 and in January 1854, DDPD.SR. D.City Box 47/657 and in August 1855, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 47/288A.

146. Accounts for the 1850's tended to be prospective rather than retrospective - only for 1851 and 1853 to 1854 are there details for complete years.
In 1851 58.2% of income came from rates. Fordyce 1857i : 344
In 1853-4 66.3% of income came from rates. DDPD. SR.D.City Box 47/657.
147. All the local tollroads were deturnpiked by 1875, DDPD. SR.D.City vol.164 p.187-9. The sale of the tollhouses was recorded in the account for 1874-5, DDPD.SR.D.City vol.134.
148. Industrial : bakehouse, brewery, brickworks, chandlery, coal depot, colliery, corn mill, dyehouse, enginehouse, factory, forge, foundry, gas works, malting, pipe shop, plant, printing office, quarry, sheds, slate yard, slaughter house, soda water manufactory, stoneyard, tan yard, timber yard, workshop.
- Land : close, garden, land, market garden, orchard, woodland
- Other : Rights : stallage, tithe
Outbuildings : barn, byre, coachhouse, college brewhouse, dining room, gighouse, granary, stable, surgery, waggon house
Public Buildings & Utilities : billiard room, castle, Chapter room, fire engine house, gas pipes, grandstand, library, Lodge rooms, 'long room', museum, old school, post office, railway property, school, stamp office, theatre, town hall, university property, water pipes, workhouse
Commercial : auction room, bank, cellars, office, shop, warehouse.
149. 6th July 1853, all at 4%, DDPD.SR.D.City vol.162 pp.171-2, 186-8, Dr.TL. Watkin, Gilesgate, £500, £500 & £200, Green & Carter, Framwellgate Colliery, £1000, £400 & £300, Elizabeth Bowlby, South Bailey, £200 & £200, Rev. GT.Fox South Bailey, £1,000, I. Bonomi, North Bailey, £1000, £1,000, £500 & £200, Burn & Hamilton £500, £500 & £200, Robert Waugh £500 & £500. 30th May 1854, at 4%, Rev. G.T. Fox £1,500 (for alterations to Claypath sewerage). DDPD. SR.D.City Box 47/531. Confirmed in an answer to a query by Leicester LBH. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.160, 31st May 1854.
150. See footnote 141, and DDPD.SR.D.City vol.162 pp.155-6, Box 47/211.
151. 1856 Swinburne & Shields £400, 1860 E. Davison £1000 @ 4%, TL.Watkin/ W.Marshall/ WP.Clark £1,000 and £1,000 @ 4%, 1864 Margaret Smith £400, Thomas Dobson of Claypath £400, Samuel Rowlandson of The College £400 all @ 4%. 1865 William Bulmer of Durham £200 @ 4%, Wm. G.Wright of Queen St. £350 @ 4%, Thos.

Heaviside £1,865 @ 4%. 1866 JR.Dickons of Durham £100 @ 4%, S. Dickons £500 @ 4%. 1867 I. Allan £300 @ 4%, 1868 J. Bramwell £700 @ 4% & 1872 J. Bramwell £300 @ 5%. All these were Durham residents . George Hudson of Sunderland 1860 £3,454 @ 4%. DDPD.SR.D.City Vol. 134 297-316, 321-4, Box 47/34.

152. DDPD.SR.D.City vol.134 p.320.

153. This is surprisingly low.

154. Advertised in the 'Financial Times', DDPD.SR.D.City vol.167 p.343.

155. 1837 Rateable value £16,382.5, DDPD.SR.D.City vol.6 p.49, 1831 population 10,125, 1841 population 14,151, estimated population 1837 12,943. 1851 Rateable value £25,157, Fordyce 1857i : 344, DDPD.SR.D.City Box 44, 1851 population 13,188. 1880 Rateable value £47,344 DDPD.SR.D.City vol.148, 1871 population 14,406, 1881 population 14,932.

The estimated rise in per capita rateable value was steady

<u>Year</u>	<u>Estimated Population</u>	<u>Rateable Value</u>	<u>Per capita</u>	<u>D. City Source</u>
1837	12,943	16,382.5	1.27	vol.6 p.49
1842	14,055	21,664.8	1.54	vol.6 p.168
1848	13,477	24,671.0	1.83	vol.46 p.3
1851	13,188	25,157.0	1.91	Box 44
1855	13,638	26,893.6	1.97	Box 47/196
1860	13,998	30,343.5	2.17	vol.160
1870	14,374	34,259.5	2.38	vol.142
1880	14,879	47,344.0	3.18	vol.148

156. The General Board of Health appears to have acted, in part, as a clearing house for information, passing queries from Durham on to other Local Boards of Health. By 1852 it had put Durham LBH.in contact with 19 other LBH's out of a total of 137 then in existence. HC.PP.1852 liii.26, DDPD.SR.D.City vol.160. Under the Medical Department of the Privy Council and the Local Government Act Office there was direct exchange of information between Durham LBH and others but there was also a constant flow of questions and reports to 'London'. Between 1860 and 1869 these covered topics of byelaws DDPD.SR.D.City pg.389,442, local acts p.395, mortgages p.316, land exempt from rates p.319, and their pavers. They inquired about compulsory purchase p.192, relations to turnpike companies p.194, how to certify buildings as fit for habitation p.259, overcrowding p.429, private hospitals p.357, and nuisances outside their area p.327. All vol. 163.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE SOCIAL CHARACTER OF THE TOWN

1. Introduction

When the Durham Advertiser wrote in 1846 ⁽¹⁾ about mortality and the diet of the working class it was not borrowing a news item ⁽²⁾; it was speaking in class terms about a local issue. The transition from a one class ranked society to a society in classes (Laslett 1965 : 23-54) had already occurred despite Durham being a market town; a group of towns which Briggs would have expected to retain old forms (1959 : 44), and despite it being a provincial social centre like Exeter where Newton suggested social and cultural attributes had survived from pre-industrial England (1968 : xi).

Can the social stratification be described more precisely, despite the limitation of local data and the impossibility of questioning the then residents and asking them to allocate themselves to classes? Was the town changing during the nineteenth century or had its nineteenth century social attributes been inherited from earlier centuries? Also, can class feeling be illuminated? Foster saw this as a method by which to classify towns (1968 : 281) while Perkin suggested that class feeling, in distinction to interests, occurred earliest in industrial towns and came later in traditional towns and rural areas (1969 : 176-80). Was Durham a 'traditional' town with interest groups and a deferential working class or was it more complex, being both a market town and an industrial town, by analogy to Newcastle-upon-Tyne where Langton has commented on the role of the coal trade (1975 : 21)? Information is biased to surviving comment in sources such as the local newspaper but certain aspects can be explored. The nature of social activities and institutions, outlined as a

measure of social reaction by Meller (1968 : 18-19), is documented as is the nature of the leadership of such institutions.

For a nineteenth century town it was relatively small, the population in 1851 being 13,188 and the population was surprisingly mobile with both out-migration (Appendix 2.7) and in-migration (Figs. 7, 8 and 9). A detailed analysis of social interaction as constructed by questionnaires in modern settlements, an example being the work by Williams on Gosforth, Cumberland, (1956), cannot be attempted but some assessment can be made of who knew whom bearing in mind firstly, that the building applicants appear to have been known to the local authority without their addresses being recorded (3) and secondly, that by analogy to the town of Banbury in the 1930's, which had a population of about 13,000, all the residents did not know every other resident (Stacey 1960 : 11).

2. Identifying classes and social trends

Class, in distinction to rank, implies economic characteristics, prestige and political power (Benoit - Smullyan 1944). Social class is not identical to occupational class (Hall and Jones 1950 : 47), though occupational classes appear to play a role, for in addition there are questions of lifestyle, which may reinforce the occupational grouping but cut across stratification on the criterion of wealth as Stevenson noted in the case of clergymen (1928 : 209). There are questions of household cycles from young adults through to old age; there are questions of political interests as stressed by Neale (1972) and there are questions of inherited

wealth (Bottomore 1965 : 16). In addition the dimensions of firstly economic characteristics, secondly prestige and thirdly, political power do not necessarily coincide (Hatt 1950, Owen 1968 : 26-7).

Some form of class stratification was perceived at the time; the terms were used locally and discussion on the subject was quoted from the London press. ⁽⁴⁾ Yet parallel to this Walker's Directory was listing local 'gentry', a term of social rank, separately from other individuals ⁽⁵⁾ which suggests a complex appraisal of stratification. Ultimately it is impossible not to evaluate the local situation in terms of pre-conceived ideas of social stratification since classifications cannot be tested 'in the field'. Also, it may always be impossible to avoid simplification since the actual nets of face-to-face contacts for the inhabitants of Durham in the nineteenth century cannot be reconstructed with any accuracy. There are, for example, no known diaries of residents with which to assess social contacts. ⁽⁶⁾

Modern studies of social stratification have used a range of class divisions, some of which have been used in studies of the nineteenth century. Not all of these appear to be relevant to this town and others, though stimulating in terms of ideas, are impossible to apply. The two fold division of Marx into bourgeoisie and proletariat appears too simple to be useful since Durham not only had large employers; the carpet factory, certain coal mines and certain building firms being large even in national terms ⁽⁷⁾, but also a multitude of small employers (Appendix 3.4). This is not to then classify it as a backward small town with pre-industrial socio-economic attributes since, as Briggs has pointed out, the characteristic

size of firm in Birmingham in the 1840's was from 6 to 30 workers (1950 : 69) and Birmingham was certainly not an economic backwater.

Even if a three fold division is employed; a division into landowners, capitalists and workers, the classification does not seem suitable. Again there is the factor of small employers and there is the factor that artisans were seen as distinct from labourers. The Urban Sanitary Authority commented on the inhabitants of Framwellgate in 1890 saying that many had very small incomes of 10s. or 12s. per week except for the mechanics. (8) The difference between casual employment and skilled regular employment was important so 'the workers' cannot be seen as a meaningful category. Neither can the group, 'the landowners', whose income was based at least in part on rent, be seen as a homogeneous category since it was a characteristic of Durham that ownership of property in the town was widespread. (9) Landowners, therefore, ranged from a large number of people who owned a little property (Appendix 4.4) to people who owned large amounts of land even on a county scale. (10) The three groups, landowners, capitalists and workers, were not necessarily distinct and within each group was a great deal of variety. In addition there was a substantial group, those in professional occupations (Table 3.3, 6) (11) who do not fit into the three fold division.

Briggs used a simple three fold division into upper, middle and lower classes in his study of Birmingham (1950) but surely this is too simple. Perkin quotes an 1868 commentator who divided the middle class into two parts so

the lower middle class included clerks, shop assistants and small dealers and so the manual workers were divided into higher skilled, lower skilled, unskilled and agricultural, and paupers (1969 : 419-420). Also Neale has raised the question of whether classes should be seen as conflict groups and whether the middle class should be seen in terms of radicals and the rest, and the working class in terms of degrees of deference. By his suggestion the upper class and middle class should be seen as separate from a 'middling class' and two types of working class, a deferential and a non-deferential (1968, 1972).

Certainly the persons in Durham who would be intuitively classified as middle class did not form a single political group. One demonstration of this is the establishment of two local newspapers, the 'Durham Advertiser' in 1814 and the 'Durham Chronicle' in 1820 (Birkbeck 1971) ⁽¹²⁾; the editor of the latter being radical enough to be tried for libel against the cathedral clergy in 1822 (Williams 1823). There was feeling against the Church of England; the Corporation petitioned Parliament against Anglican privilege in education in 1843 ⁽¹³⁾. But it is impossible to tell from such traces whether there was really a middle class and a radical middle class, or whether it was the outcome of local factions and personalities, or whether it was older men against younger men.

Neale's five fold division is, therefore, of great interest but cannot be applied with any certainty since data on the middle class in the town is sketchy and data indicating whether the working class did divide into deferential

and non-deferential does not exist. There is material illustrating social aspects of the town but it is not comprehensive on questions of individual attitudes or on life styles; information which is crucial to Neale's analysis.

It is occupational data from the 1851 and 1871 censuses (14) which provides the most complete basis from which to assess social differences. The Registrar-General's classification, for use in the 1921 census, devised by Stevenson, was somewhat arbitrary but the author argued that it was an improvement on the industrial classifications utilised in earlier censuses (1928 : 21) and that it did relate closely to mortality and to infant mortality (1928 : 211). Its five fold division into I upper and middle class, II intermediate, III skilled, IV intermediate and V skilled has the disadvantage of not comparing to any other classifications of occupational classes but is no more arbitrary since none can be checked against the perceptions of people in the period under study. It has other faults; it lays stress on the occupation of the head of household to the exclusion of other household characteristics, it implies that occupational uniformity can be equated with cultural uniformity, an idea refuted by Black (1973 : ix), and it does not differentiate clearly between artisans and other workers. But, in its favour, it has been used by others, and especially by Armstrong (1972), so has the merit of comparability.

Over the nineteenth century average and real wages in the United Kingdom tended to rise (Mitchell & Deane 1971 : 343-4) but with variations by region; Scottish wages, (15)

Southern English (Macdonald 1976) and London wages ⁽¹⁶⁾ tending to differ, and with variations by occupation. Agricultural wages were lower than factory wages (Frazer 1950 : 51), carpenters and joiners would expect different wages from cabinet makers, coopers or millwrights ⁽¹⁷⁾ and then different grades within a trade would expect different wages. So even in dealing with occupation as a means by which to classify a population into classes a great deal of variety is being ignored.

Local evidence of wages is a necessary adjunct to using an occupational classification but is remarkable only in terms of its paucity. References to wages are separated across the decades and from occupation to occupation so no overall local pattern can be assembled. Instead pieces of evidence can be related to national and regional information. Agricultural wages appear to have been lower than wages in the carpet factory, being respectively 1/4d. per day and 1/6d. per day in 1797 (Eden 1797 : 179). This supports the division of the carpet weavers into Class III and agricultural labourers into Class IV (Armstrong 1972 : 222).

By comparison to Bowlby's data, quoted both by Frazer (1950 : 51) and by Mitchell and Deane (1971 : 344), local agricultural wages appear to have been higher than the national average. The wages cited by Eden for 1797 are as high as those cited by Bowlby in 1824 ⁽¹⁸⁾ and are slightly higher than those for an ostler in St. Nicholas parish who earned 9s. per week which together with his wife's earnings for spinning gave the household an annual income of £23.16.8d. (Eden 1797 : 180). An ostler, like an agricultural

labourer, is Class IV in the Registrar-General's classification (Armstrong 1972 : 222) so the similarity of the wages substantiates the classification but there is no means by which to assess whether the case cited by Eden is typical or not. Indeed as Eden was fact finding in order to stress the problems of the poor it may be suspected that it was not typical.

Wages of casual labourers are scarcely known at all either as rates or as amounts of the year a labourer would work. A single piece of evidence relating to the building of part of the Henderson factory in 1859 suggests that there was variety. Wages recorded averaged $2/11\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day but ranged from $4/6d.$ per day to $7d.$ (19) Security of wage was probably a critical divide between manual workers but then health could play a role in determining income for any workers.

Within Class III there was variation in wages. Those for coalminers varied by grade and pit to pit. At Framwellgate pit alone, in 1874, a hewer was paid $4/3d.$ per shift while a mason's labourer was paid $3/6d.$ per shift. (20) Pay for police constables in 1840 was only 17s. per week, with the uniform (21), which was low pay compared to Bowlby's national figure for artisans, even in 1833, of 22s. per week (Frazer 1950 : 51). Again in Classes I and II there was variation. One of the richest men in the world, Joseph Love (Mulhall 1884 : 315) was a resident but so too were clergy. (22) The income of professional people is totally undocumented so cannot be compared and only one example of a full time salaried official's income is known, that of the chief constable of police in 1914. He had £200 per annum raised during that year to £220. (23)

These local examples of wages are not full enough to strongly substantiate or criticise the Registrar-General's classification. But they do indicate something of the level of wages in the nineteenth century which is important when discussing housing and rent in the next chapter. Any classification must be a simplification, and these examples make that point, but they do not suggest that the Registrar-General's classification is misleading and inappropriate.

Over the period 1851 to 1871 the distribution of heads of household between the five socio-economic groups of the Registrar-General altered (Table 8.1). Class I declined in size while Class II, III and V increased and Class IV was steady.

Table 8.1 Socio-economic status of heads of household,
Durham MB., 1851 and 1871

<u>Registrar-General</u> <u>Socio-economic</u> <u>class</u>	1851		1871	
	abs.	%	abs.	%
I	195	7.14	133	4.21
II	452	16.55	590	18.66
III	1156	42.31	1377	43.56
IV	418	15.31	414	13.10
V	171	6.26	274	8.67
residual	331	12.42	373	11.80
Total	2,732	99.99	3,161	99.99

Sources : D.CRO.M3/17 & 18 (PRO.HO. 107/239), M 18/27-30
(PRO. RG. 10 4962-4968).

Durham had been a minor provincial social centre even in the early eighteenth century, as had been Shrewsbury and Bury St. Edmunds (Defoe 1724-7 : 398). This had been more limited in scale than the major provincial centres such as Exeter and Lincoln, as described by Newton (1966,1968)

and Hill (1966, 1974) but there had been a winter season and county families such as the Bowes (Kynaston & Johnson 1969) and the Chaytors had had townhouses on the Bailey and the cathedral clergy had been in seasonal residence (Hughes 1940-1).

The town offered a variety of facilities. A theatre had been built, by subscription, in Sadler Street in 1791, and the North Bailey contained Assembly Rooms. ⁽²⁴⁾ A subscription library and newsroom had opened on Sadler Street in 1802 (Brayley & Britton 1808 : 70) and by 1827 a second subscription library was operating from the City Tavern in the Market Place (Parsons & White 1827i : 181-2). Again on Sadler Street was located the Long Room used for banqueting ⁽²⁵⁾ and races were held on Swallow Leazes beyond Old Elvet ⁽²⁶⁾ (Fig. 31). Another indication was the publishing of two newspapers. Durham was not the earliest town in the region to have a newspaper ⁽²⁷⁾ since Darlington had a newspaper from 1772 and Newcastle from 1710 (Birkbeck 1971) but the Durham newspapers antedated those at Sunderland, Gateshead and North Shields, which commenced in the 1830's, and those at Bishop Auckland, Barnard Castle, Chester-le-Street, Hartlepool, Morpeth, Stockton and Tynemouth which commenced in the 1850's (Birkbeck 1971).

During the nineteenth century the town remained the meeting place of many county societies including the Horticultural Society, the Durham Agricultural Society (Parsons & White 1827i : 182) and the Athenaeum. ⁽²⁸⁾ There was also an active masonic lodge. ⁽²⁹⁾ But many features of the town as a provincial social centre faded; the winter season declined,

races eventually ceased in 1888⁽³⁰⁾ and the townhouses of the gentry were sold to the expanding university. ⁽³¹⁾ Its social functions remained but were more circumscribed.

One feature remained into the twentieth century, namely that the town had a large number of professional men in relation to its size ⁽³²⁾ and a large number of resident public figures. Jamieson listed 576 persons of note resident in Co. Durham and Northumberland in 1906. These covered 96 places of which only seven places had more than ten residents mentioned. These were Sunderland, Durham, Darlington, Stockton, Bishop Auckland, South Shields and Barnard Castle. Sunderland headed the list with 106 residents mentioned but Durham had 50 so mentioned compared to 46 at Darlington, 9 at Gateshead and 7 at Hartlepool and, in addition, there were residents on the outskirts of Durham at Dryburn and Croxdale.

For the period 1851 to 1871 the census shows that heads of household of Class I fell in number (Table 8.1). This must be attributed to the general decline of the town as a social centre rather than to any differences in census data compared to any social season since it is also reflected in a decline in the number of households with resident servants (Table 9.7) and in the number of 'gentry' listed by Walker's Directory (Table 8.2). The term 'gentry' separates out certain residents from professionals and tradesmen but it was not a term used in the technical sense of the College of Arms since it included some manufacturers and some magistrates. Rather it is a contemporary appraisal

of esteem. It was a smaller group than those grouped as Class I by the Registrar-General's classification. In 1851 it equalled 78.0% of the latter and in 1871 88.7%.

Table 8.2 'Gentry' listed in Walker's Durham Directory,
1857 to 1907

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total resident Durham MB.</u>
1857	111	102
1867	109	99
1877	116	105
1887	108	67
1897	112	63
1907	82	23

Source : D.CRO.and Du. L.C. Walker's Directory, annual.

Classes II, III and V increased both relatively and absolutely over the period 1851 to 1871; trends already indicated to some extent in Chapter 3, when the employment structure of the whole workforce was discussed. But here it is the occupation of the head of household which is under discussion and not the occupational structure of the whole workforce. Also, the classification of the Registrar-General and that of Booth are not identical despite both being based on occupational descriptions. Hence Booth's category PP, professional and public service, increased over the period 1841 to 1861 (Table 3.1), suffered a setback in 1871 (Table 3.3) and then continued to increase at least up to 1911 (Table 3.4). This, in general, mirrors the increase in Class II but is not identical; firstly since the former discusses total workforce and the latter discusses heads of household and, secondly, since Booth's category, PP, overlaps Classes I and II (Armstrong 1972 : 215-223, 296-310). It

was in the lower grades of the professions that increases were occurring and especially in local government so despite the town becoming more professionally and service orientated in terms of total employment it was Class II which was increasing and not Class I.

Changes in Classes III, IV and V are not so significant since no strong changes emerge to make contrasts between them. Instead Classes III and V increased absolutely, as did the total number of households (Table 8.1) and Class IV remained virtually unchanged.

3. Durham as a traditional town

In a number of respects social relations in nineteenth century Durham do not appear to have corresponded to those in certain large manufacturing towns. As has already been commented, employment structures did not sharply divide the population into employers and employed. Instead large firms existed alongside workshops and domestic industry and several of the larger employers, including the Hendersons of the carpet factory and Coulson the iron founder and machine builder, had had very small beginnings. Yet each industry was not represented by enough firms for divisions of interest, such as the coal interest, to appear in the town.

Neither was the population sharply divided into property owners and property occupiers since although the overwhelming majority of households rented their dwellings a surprisingly high proportion of the population owned some property. Between 1850 and 1919 between 20% and 17% of rateable units were owner occupied (Table 8.3), with the exception of

1919 where a larger number of owners were trustees.

Table 8.3 Owner Occupation, Durham MB., 1850 to 1919,
for selected years

<u>Year</u>	<u>Rateable Units</u> (a)	<u>Owner Occupied</u> (b)	<u>%</u>
1850	2,027	350	17.02
1860	2,135	443	20.75
1870	2,296	412	17.94
1880	2,564	449	17.51
1919	3,550	538	15.16

Sources : DDPD. SR. D.City vols. 137, 140, 142, 148,
1970 deposit of 1919 ratebook.

(a) excluding land and pipes.

(b) excluding persons of the same surname but with different initials and excluding executors of wills.

Between 1850 and 1880 there was a trend towards less concentration of ownership. In 1850 4.9% of the total population owner a dwelling or dwellings but in 1880 this proportion had risen to 5.2% (Table 8.4). Certain streets built in the early nineteenth century; Cross Street, Pit Row and Colpitts Terrace were wholly tenanted but other new streets were partly owner occupied and partly tenanted. In addition there was no rise in the number of large property owners. In 1850 42.3% of owners had only a single dwelling. This rose to 51.2% in 1880. Similarly, in the earlier year, 79.1% of owners had only property in one township and this rose to 89.7% in 1880 (Appendix 4.4). Only 5.4% of owners in 1850 had more than ten rateable units and in 1880 the proportion was lower, being 4.5%.

But wide ownership, and landlords resident in the town, cannot necessarily be equated with more personal

Table 8.4 Proportion of population owning property,
Durham MB., 1850 to 1880

<u>Year</u>	<u>Property Owners</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>% population owning property</u>
1850-1	645	13,188	4.9
1860-1	568	14,088	4.0
1870-1	735	14,564	5.1
1880-1	779	14,932	5.2

Sources : DDPD. SR. D.City vols. 137, 140, 142, 148. Printed censuses 1851, 1861, 1871 and 1881.

relations between landlord and tenant. This is difficult to judge since little evidence on property management survives and that which is extant may reflect the extreme; the point of breakdown when one party, as a last resort, made a complaint to the local authority. Certainly evidence suggests that subtenanting existed. When the census enumerators' books are matched to the ratebooks more households appear than are listed as owner occupiers or tenants and, in the case of "Recaby's Yard", New Elvet, Rickerby was named in 1852 as the landlord by the other residents but the ratebook of 1850 suggests that he himself was a tenant. (33) So not all tenants would have necessarily known the property owner, despite it only being a small town.

On more political issues the town did divide but not into working class and the rest. In the case of the public health agitation in 1848 there were two sanitary associations, the workingmen's and the main one but both coalesced to present petitions and to aid the General Board of Health inspector. (34) A class divide existed but the great split was between the supporters and opponents of the

legislation. Within the Local Board of Health and later the Urban Sanitary Authority there was a divide between those willing to spend and those unwilling (see Chapter 7 page 339) and this was not a class divide. Rather the parsimonious faction was backed by the Ratepayer's Association.

In obituaries the members of the Corporation, and thereby the Local Board of Health or Urban Sanitary Authority, were described as Conservatives or Liberals with older members at mid-century being distinguished as Tories. Again, the divide was not one of class and, indeed, none of the members can be seen to have been working class prior to the Great War (Appendices 7.3, 7.4). Although men in trade were elected, and especially from the mid-1870's, these were shopkeepers or employers and not artisans. Obituaries also show that these men were either Anglican, Non-Conformist or Methodist. The first Roman Catholic mayor was inter-war (Doyle 1977 : 11).

There were working class institutions; friendly societies, the Co-operative Society, the Mechanics' Institute and others but many of these were led by committees composed of men who were not working men. The Freehold Land Society started as a means by which to widen the electorate but on a national scale quickly evolved into a middle-class society rather like a building society (Gaskell 1974 : 115). No papers for the local society have survived but some details are known from oblique references to it. Land was laid out and houses built on Western Hill (Fig. 20) after 1851. The census of that year indicates a single house was yet built in the future Victoria Terrace ⁽³⁵⁾ but by 1861 63 houses had been built, including the older Field Houses ⁽³⁶⁾ (Fig. 41)

and by 1871 the estate comprised 79 households. (37) In 1861 all houses were inhabited by a single household and 55.6% of households were either Class I or Class II. In 1871 this proportion had risen to 77.2% (Table 8.4) and those households who are described as Classes IV or V were resident in the older Field Houses.

Table 8.5 The Socio-economic class of heads of household in Western Hill, Durham 1861 and 1871

Year	Total households	Socio-economic class (%)					nk.
		I	II	III	IV	V	
1861	63	17.46	38.10	19.05	11.11	1.59	12.70
1871	79	16.46	60.76	12.66	8.86	0.00	1.27

Sources : D.CRO.M9/10 (PRO. RG. 9 3738)
D.CRO.M18/27-30 (PRO. RG. 10 4962-4968)

This local branch of the society did not help to increase the working class electorate but it did increase the number of electors.* In 1853 none of the electorate lived on Western Hill (38) but by 1874 the total electorate of the town had risen from 1,122 to 2,059 and, of these, 48 voters were registered for property in Western Hill. (39) In 1853 voters equalled 40.2% of separate occupiers; in 1871 they equalled 43.9% but these figures are confused by non-resident Freemen.

Friendly Societies are mentioned in the 1790's by Eden (1797 : 152, 154) but increased in number in the nineteenth century as Parsons and White cite seven (1827i : 181). These were concerned with financial provision for burial and for sickness. (40) Obituaries indicate that the leadership of these societies, at least in the second half of the

nineteenth century, was the province of tradesmen and minor professional men ⁽⁴¹⁾; men who were active on the Corporation and in other institutions such as the Penny Bank. ⁽⁴²⁾

The short lived Workingmen's Sanitary Association of 1848 and 1849 was a contrast since it appears to have been led by workingmen to some extent. ⁽⁴³⁾ But even in this case the Chairman was the Mayor. ⁽⁴⁴⁾ The Mechanics' Institute, founded in 1825 ⁽⁴⁵⁾, was supported from its inception by professional men ⁽⁴⁶⁾ but in details, such as membership of its committees, this cannot be ascertained until 1849. In that year its patron, president and vice-presidents were five gentlemen, a solicitor, a surgeon, a professor of the University and a tradesman. It was the minor posts which were filled by artisans; the treasurer was a craftsman and of its secretary and two librarians one was a linen weaver and two cannot be traced. ⁽⁴⁷⁾ In 1874 the structure had changed but professional dominance persisted. The nine patrons were the Dean of Durham, three gentlemen, the coalowner, Joseph Love, the Henderson brothers of the carpet factory, the Mayor, who that year was a draper, and another man. The President was a surgeon, the vice-president was a draper and the committee of eleven was composed of a gentleman, a teacher, a brewer, three shopkeepers, two craftsmen, a builder and one other who could not be traced. The officials were a draper and an accountant. ⁽⁴⁸⁾ Nine of these were on the Corporation at some date. ⁽⁴⁹⁾

Only the Durham Co-operative Society appears to have been a working class institution, initiated and run by working men. It began as a small society, sharing premises in Claypath with the Railway Inn in 1865, but it rapidly expanded both its

premises and its activities. In the following year the grocery and provisions store was supplemented by an Institute. (50)

The premises continued to be shared with a succession of houses and offices, including those of the Mendicity Society in 1869 and 1870, but in 1875 it took over the adjoining property and in 1877 both the original property and that adjoining were in the sole use of the society. Up to 1871 such societies were legally unable to buy or sell houses (Gaskell 1971, 1974 : 152) but after this the Durham Co-operative Society diversified its interests into property; building houses (51), a laundry and soapworks (52), as well as having cultural activities. (53)

4. Durham as a small town

There was great overlap between men elected to the Corporation, trustees for institutions such as the Blue Coat School, the School of Art and the Mechanics' Institute, committee members and shareholders of Durham Gas Company and Water Company, members of the Surtees Society, Church vestries, Methodist local preachers, superintendents of Sunday Schools, magistrates and Guardians of the Poor.

The town was being led by a relatively small number of families in trade and the professions who appear to have known each other: at least to the extent of rarely referring to each other in detail in official correspondence. To a large extent the university remained uninvolved except through societies such as the Durham Athenaeum and occasional trusteeships. How these families who were involved in public life intermarried has not been explored (54) but it appears from obituaries that in many cases younger men had served articles

with older men who were involved in public life, or the younger men had been apprenticed to such an older man as a surgeon or in a trade. It was the surgeons who had been apprenticed locally who tended to be involved in local administration in the middle decades of the century rather than the physicians who had been trained in London or Edinburgh.

Were these men all local or had they come into the town? Obituaries give no indication for about half the members of the Corporation but of the rest there was a three way divide between those born in the town, those whose father moved into the town and those who moved into Durham during their working life. This indicates that those involved in public life were not a closed group. Just as in the population of the town as a whole there were both those locally born and those who had moved into the town so too both local men and newcomers rose to local eminence.

5. Conclusion

Although Durham never showed class polarization; employer against employee, landlord against tenant, it would be a mistake to see it as a fossil community in the nineteenth century; a relic of pre-industrial social relations. Certainly no trace emerges of a radical working class. There was radical feeling but it was amongst the tradesmen and professional men; manifesting itself in terms of Non-Conformity ranging from chapel membership to anti-clericalism. Certainly older terms were in current usage; apprentices and journeymen were enumerated ⁽⁵⁵⁾ and Walker's Directory listed 'gentry' but these terms were hiding change.

Whereas in the late eighteenth century it may have been more true to regard Durham as a town led socially by the county gentry and the clergy, in the nineteenth century leadership was passing to local tradesmen and professional men. Durham in the 1890's with its horticultural societies, cricket club, amateur dramatics and Urban Sanitary Authority, or even in the 1850's with its Mechanics' Institute and Local Board of Health, was not the same town, in social terms, as that of about 1800 with its theatre and assemblies.

So in comparison to a town such as Oldham it could be seen as traditional but in comparison to itself it was a changing nineteenth century town.

1. D.Adv. Fri. May 15, 1846, no. 1654 p.3 col. 2.
2. See Chapter 6 fn. 156.
3. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 43/5, 44, 45, 48, 49, 51/1, 51/2, Vol.158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 177 and 178.
Bylund Lodge, Durham, undeposited Building Registers, 1900-1909 and 1909-1927.
See also Chapter 4 section 5c, and Appendix 4.3.
4. D.Adv. Fri Jan. 30, 1846, no. 1639 p.1 col. 7 'The Upper, Middle and Lower Classes', quoting Mr. Mackinnon MP.
5. See Table 8.2 below and discussion.
6. That of James Losh, who was not actually resident in the town, is extant and has been published for the years 1811 to 1823, SS. 171 1956 as has that of Jacob Bee in the early eighteenth century, SS.124 1914. Neither can be used to assess social contacts within the town.
7. See Chapter 3 section 3.
8. D. Co.Adv. Fri Feb. 7, 1890, no. 4074 p.7 col. 3.
9. Chapter 5 footnote 122.
10. PP. 1873 Owners of Land, Co. Durham. An example of a large owner was George Townsend Fox.
11. See Chapter 3 footnote 11, on doctors.
12. The 'Durham Advertiser' is available on microfilm at D.CRO. The 'Durham Chronicle' was not available.
13. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 6 Minutes p.184.
14. The 1861 census was virtually illegible and was damaged.
D.CRO. M9/10 (PRO. RG. 9 3738).
15. D.CRO.D/Ma 9 'Leeds Mercury' 25th April 1885. 'The World's Labourers. Their wages and cost of living' compiled by US. consuls.
16. PP. HC. 1908 cviii. Board of Trade. Cost of Living of the Working Classes.
17. See fn.15.

	England	Scotland	
carpenters and joiners	35/-d.	32/6d.	week
cabinet maker	30/10d.	34/-d.	
cooper	29/3d.	24/5d.	
millwright	30/-d.	30/-d.	
18. From details given by Eden (1797) a weekly wage appears to have 9/5d. Bowlby, cited by Frazer (1950 : 51), gives 9/6d. as a weekly wage in 1824. Later data only refers to women and juveniles.
Female, Northumberland, 1842 £9 p.a.(Macdonald 1976)
Youths able to plough, 1914 (Walker's 1915:46) up to £17.10.0d.

19. D.CRO.D/Ma 4 wages per day :- 5 @ 7d. 1@ 8d. 4 @ 9d. 1@ 1/2d. 1 @ 1/6d. 1 @ 1/8d. 18 @ 2/6d. 1@ 2/10d. 12 @ 3/6d. 5 @ 3/8d. 2 @ 4/-d. 1 @ 4/1d. 5 @ 4/6d.
20. D.CRO.Durham Coal Owners' Association.Wages and Trade Customs, 1874. Newcastle 1875. Mitchell & Deane (1971) do not have data for earlier years.
21. D.Adv. Fri 18 Sept. 1840, no. 1359 p.1 col. 1.
22. The Cathedral canons had been known as the 'Golden Canons' in the late eighteenth century on account of their great wealth derived from land and coal. See Hughes (1952,Chapter 7) and Appendix 5.6. Their incomes were limited by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners estate by estate as each canon died and new ones were appointed. There was,therefore,a period of transition between 1841, 6 & 7 Vic. cap. 37, and 1859 when the 3rd canon came to an agreement with the Commission. They, however, contrasted the income of curates and incumbents of small parishes.
23. Walker's 1915 p.54.
The salaries of other officials are known but these were part time officials.
24. Parson & White : 1827 : 182.
A list of the subscription library committee and members is extant for 1840. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 35 1/16. There was also one in the Market Place. Du LC. Proceedings and Poll, at the Durham City Election ... 1835, frontis. One was still operating in 1880 (Walker's 1880 : 49).
25. Obituary to John Thwaites, Walker's 1880 : 49-50.
26. Parson and White 1827 : 182.
27. Jacob Bee's chronicle mentions the death of a newsmonger Oct. 18th 1700, SS.124 1914 p.153. The earliest paper known, the 'Durham Courant' of the 1730's, failed (Birkbeck 1971).
28. Walker's Durham Directory and Almanack, annual.
29. Built in 1810 in Old Elvet (Parsons and White 1827 : 181).
A great number of obituaries to men in local public life mention that they were Freemasons.
30. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 165 p.81-2. Minutes 7th March 1888.
31. Greenslade 1947-8, Kynaston & Johnson 1969. The deeds of the University of Durham confirm this and I am grateful to the University Surveyor for allowing me access to these deeds.
32. See Chapter 3 footnote 11.
In the specific case of doctors Durham MB. had 25 doctors for 14,863 population in 1891-4 compared to 11 doctors for 33,675 population in Jarrow. The Medical Directory for 1894, 1891 census.

33. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 44 nd. (sequence 1852). Signed Oliver Malle, Thomas Dunlary et al.

<u>1850-1 (3:11e)*</u>	<u>1852 equivalents</u>
11. Rickenby "houses", tenant	J. Recaby
12. Dawson	
13. Hall	
14. Walker	Mary Walker
15. Innes	
16. Maddison	
17. Malley	Oliver Malle
18. Ryan	
19. Dunley	Thomas & Mary Dunlary
20. Gannon	M.Gonagh
21. Riley	
22. Gowland's public house	
10. Sharp's public house	

*D.CRO. M3/17 & 18, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 137.

34. Clark GT. Report to the General Board of Health on a Preliminary Inquiry. 1849.
35. D.CRO. M3/17 (PRO. HO. 107/239) 3.10d. with sequence Shaw Wood, North Road, Fieldhouses, Springwell House, Springwell Cottage, Whitesmocks.
36. D.CRO.M9/10 (PRO. RG. 9 3738). St. Oswald 14c. The houses are not differentiated apart from Uncle Tom's Cabin, no. 55, and Mount Beulah nos. 64 and 65. But nos. 32, 33 and 34 appear to be Fieldhouses since Jane Dagg of Fieldhouses was resident both in 1851 and 1861.
37. D.CRO.M 18/27 to 30 St. Oswald 20.
38. Du. LC. The Poll at the Contested Election for the City of Durham, June 25th, 1853. Durham 1853.
39. Du. LC. The Register of Persons Entitled to Vote in any Election of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament for the City of Durham ... during the year commencing on the first day of January 1874. Durham 1873.
40. In 1859 there were two lodges, the 'Shakespeare' and the 'Star of the North', representing the Independent Order and the Manchester Order (Walker's 1859 p.35, 1864 p.60-1, 1865 p.41-4). To this day the Shakespeare Hall, North Road, is teetotal.

The five mentioned in St. Nicholas parish were life clubs by which £3 was allowed for funeral expenses and £8 to the nearest relative. That in St. Margaret's parish was specifically Anglican but its benefits were similar; £8 to the nearest relative of a deceased member and £2 for a member's wife. Sick members were paid 6s. weekly for up to 20 weeks. The meetings were held every sixth week with payments of 1s. together with 3d. to be spent in beer (Eden 1797). Local benefit clubs appear to have been supplanted by national ones by mid-century; Orders of Oddfellows, Free Gardeners, Shepherds and Foresters. But the local records of these orders do not appear to be extant so no further comments can be made.

41. Walker's Directory, from 1850 to 1915 mentions the following leaders of local friendly societies in obituaries:-
Atherton, Sir William 1865 (barrister), Carnes J. 1870 (surgeon), Jerrems J.* 1868 (chemist, druggist, spirit & porter merchant), Oliver N.* 1859 (surgeon), Robson G.* 1874 (chemist), Smales H. 1861 (independent), Taylor J. * 1875 (mason & builder), Tiplady T. * 1863 (tailor), Tyler E. 1872 (surgeon), Watson J* 1882 (attorney)
* on Corporation at same date (see Appendix 7.4)
42. Henry Smales, advocate of Odd-Fellowship, founded the Penny Bank in the 1850's (obituary Walker's 1861 p.41-2).
43. Represented by John Andrews, J. Dogherty and J. Dickinson in committee with the Durham Sanitary Association. D.Adv. Fri. Nov. 24, 1848, no. 1786, p.5 col. 4. These men cannot be traced as professional or tradesmen so it may be presumed that they were working men.
44. D.Adv. Fri. March 10 1848 no. 1749 p.3 col. 4.
45. First located in the Market Place (Walker's 1846 p.49) but with new premises built in Claypath 1849 (Fordyce 1857i : 210). It was earlier than most others in the county since those at Darlington, Hamsterley, Sunderland and Stockton, Yarm and Norton were founded in 1825, that at Chester-le-Street in 1826 and that at Bishop Auckland in 1828 but most in the county dated from the 1840's and 1850's (Kelly 1955).
46. Obituaries in Walker's Directories record support by individuals:-
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Brown F. bookbinder original trustee | d. 1878 (Walker's 1879) |
| Coward E. chemist on Committee | d.1873 (" 1874) |
| Elliot JF.Landowner patron | d.1880 (" 1882) |
| Forster JH.bank agent President | d.1867 (" 1868) |

Hutchinson W.	secretary	secretary	d.1865 (Walker's 1866)
Oliver N.	surgeon	'supporter'	d.1858 (" 1859)
Shipperdson E.	landowner	'supporter from the beginning'	d.1855 (" 1857)
Waddington Dr.	Dean	'supporter'	d.1869 (" 1869)

47. Due to name repeats. Appendix 4.1 indicates how likely it was for a name to be traced on surname alone without initials, Christian name, occupation or address.
48. On the evidence of matching Walker's 1849 p.4 and Walker's 1875 p.5 where officials are listed to the trade directory of those respective years.
49. Boyd W., Fenny S., Ferens Mr., Forster G., Fowler M., Gradon JG., Hodgson W., Hutton T., Pratt J.
50. Walker's 1863 No. 6 Claypath - the Railway Inn
1865 No. 6 Claypath - the Railway Inn and Co-op.
store
1866 No. 6 Claypath - the Railway Inn, Co-op store
and Institute.
51. See Chapter 4 section 5c page 156
52. D.Adv. Aug. 7 1891 no. 4152 p.3 reporting on the meeting of the Urban Sanitary Authority. This discussed the problem of disposing of waste from the Co-operative Wholesale Society soapworks.
53. Du. LC. Bookplate in Durham Election Polls, 1868-71, "Durham Co-operative Library. Established 1866".
54. Marriage for these families could have been traced through the advertisements in the Durham Advertiser. The registers were not open to inspection.
55. See Chapter 3, footnote 33.

CHAPTER NINE

SOCIETY AND HOUSING

1. Social Area Analysis of Nineteenth Century Towns

It has been usual, when studying larger nineteenth century towns, to describe the distribution of social groups in terms of areas within the town and to make inferential links between physical distance and social relations. The framework of area analysis was employed for York (Armstrong 1967, 1974), for Sunderland (Robson 1966, 1969) and later for studies such as those of Edinburgh (Gordon 1970), Hull (Tansey 1973), Cardiff (Daunton 1974), Liverpool (Lawton & Pooley 1975) and Wigan and St. Helens (Jackson 1977). Such studies have been strongly framed by the enumeration districts into which census data is grouped, partly on account of comparability with Armstrong's experimental work with mid-nineteenth century enumerators' books, partly through a necessity to sample data in large urban areas and partly by analogy to work on modern urban residential patterns. (1)

Studies of morphological areas, the fabric of towns, have largely been the work of other writers such as Ward on Leeds (1960, 1962) or Forster on Hull (1968, 1972). Yet the provision of houses, decisions taken on building and inherited landownership blocks may be a key issue since even in London Olsen has commented on internal homogeneity on the Grosvenor, Bedford and Cadogan estates and how marked contrasts appeared at estate boundaries (1976).

Perkin has made a general comment that social segregation was increasing during the nineteenth century (1969 : 118, 172) but it has not been demonstrated adequately whether this was directly linked to social changes or whether society could change and yet not be spatially segregated.

Whether it was social change that was critical, or pre-existing landownership patterns together with changes in the scale of building during the nineteenth century, remains unknown.

In this investigation of Durham City use of enumeration districts is made only for comparative purposes. There is no necessity to use the framework of enumeration districts, since it was a relatively small town, so each household of 1851 and 1871 is compared to the dwelling which it was inhabiting in 1850 and 1870 by means of matching the census enumerators' books and ratebooks by nominal linkage (Appendix 4.1). The sample is one hundred per cent. It is assumed that there is a logical relationship between household characteristics and dwelling type, though this may not be apparent at the level of the enumeration districts.

This approach recognizes the possibility of using the census material at a household level in a small town rather than having to sample from great volumes of data as in a large town. It also recognizes that social area analysis by sample may be statistically invalid in a small town, as Herbert pondered on his own study of Newcastle-under-Lyme (1967 : 43-4) and, most importantly, it is a deliberate attempt to break away from area description and ecological analogies as to processes.

2. The Character of Enumeration Districts in Durham MB. in 1851 and 1871

Heterogeneity appears within each enumeration district of the town in 1851 and 1871; marked heterogeneity in terms of the socio-economic status of heads of household⁽²⁾,

of other household character indicators and of rateable value of dwellings. Certainly there are subtle differences between the districts since the Peninsula parishes have no heads of household in either 1851 or 1871 ⁽³⁾ who are Class V and since North Silver Street with Back Lane and Gilesgate Moor districts ⁽⁴⁾ have no heads of household, in 1871, who are Class I but these variations are minor in relation to the overall impression of spatial social mixing (Appendix 9.1).

The Registrar-General's socio-economic classification, into five classes I to V, is not satisfactory since it is an anachronism, since it groups various grades of skill into Class III and since it demarcates boundaries between socio-economic classes whilst in reality there would be a subtle gradation within types of occupation. It is also simplistic to use one household characteristic, the occupation of the head of household, to describe a household but even if other characteristics were added, including the occupations of other members of the household, unknown factors would remain. There is no data on household budgets or on 'respectability' so important factors must always remain unassessed.

One weakness of the classification, that of the boundaries between socio-economic classes, can be removed by grouping adjacent-classes in pairs; I with II, II with III and so on, to form four groups A,B,C and D where I with II forms 'A' and IV with V forms 'D'. Then a qualitative assessment can be made of the enumeration districts by using ranking of heads of households in these four groups A,B,C and D. High ranking in A and B and low in C and D gives one type of district Type 1, low ranking in A and B and high

ranking in C and D gives Type 2, high ranking in A and D and low in B and C gives Type 3, the converse of high in B and C and low in A and D gives Type 4 and medium ranking in all groups gives Type 5 (Table 9.1). It is a means to describe the subtle variations between heterogeneous enumeration districts.

Table 9.1 Types of enumeration district, Durham MB., 1851, by ranking socio-economic characteristics (5) of heads of households

		Socio-economic group				District Type	Households Residual (6)
<u>Enumeration District</u>		<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>		
3.9a	rank :	6	8	9	8	5	2
3.9b	rank :	11	11	4	2	2	4
3.10a	rank :	12	9	3	1	2	3
3.11d,e	rank :	8	10	5	3	2	5
4.1,2,3	rank :	1	12	12	10	1	1
4.4a	rank :	3	6	11	4	3	6
4.4b	rank :	5	3	7	7	5	9
4.4c	rank :	2	1	10	11	1	12
4.4d	rank :	9	2	2	12	4	10
4.5a	rank :	7	7	6	6	5	8
4.5b	rank :	4	5	8	5	5	11
4.5c	rank :	10	4	1	9	4	7

Total 12

Sources : See Appendix 9.1 (For table using Classes I to V see fn. 7)

The Peninsula parishes, 4.1, 2, 3, and the South side of Silver Street, 4.4c, from Sadler Street to Broken Walls (Figs. 20, 52), showed a tendency towards higher class heads of household, partly because these districts included town houses and clerical residences but more on account of property being in commercial use and shopkeepers living over their shops. The higher class character was contributed more by Class II than Class I. (7) Crossgate South row,

3.9b, Framwellgate, 3.10a, and Elvet, 3.11d and e, had a tendency towards low class households while South Claypath, 4.4a, was unusual in having both strong representation of high class and low class. It was, like other districts, composed of shops on the street front with resident shopkeepers, which accounts for its higher class household heads, but the cottage property behind, in the yards, (Fig. 43), appears to have housed more heads of household in Classes IV and V than cottage property elsewhere in the town.

The newly built district of Gilesgate Moor, 4.5c, (Figs. 42, 45), was more homogeneous in terms of the socio-economic class of its heads of household as was the North side of Silver Street with Back Lane, 4.4d. The latter was, like Claypath South row, composed of shops on the street front with dwellings above and cottages behind but the cottages were largely inhabited by workers at the carpet factory (Fig. 46) who are designated by occupation as Class III. This left North Crossgate, Millburngate, North Claypath and North and South Gilesgate as districts which had no tendency either to low class or high class. Each had both street front property and cottage property in the yards behind (Figs. 41, 42, 43) and a mixed household composition.

In 1871, on the evidence of the same method of analysis ⁽⁸⁾, there were no areas of contrast, Type 3, and only North Silver Street with Back Lane, N.24, remained as of middling socio-economic character. All the districts of Types 1 and 2 in 1851 remained those types in 1871 (Table 9.2) and North Crossgate, North Gilesgate and South Gilesgate remained Type 5 but Gilesgate Moor, 4.5c, had become more

mixed, North Claypath, 4.4b, had altered from a mixed character towards higher class and South Claypath, 4.4a, which had been of contrasting character in 1851 had become more mixed. This indicates that at least on a district level there was no trend towards greater segregation of socio-economic groups in the period 1851 to 1871. (9)

Table 9.2 Types of enumeration district, Durham MB., 1871,
by ranking socio-economic characteristics of
heads of households

<u>Enumeration</u> <u>District</u>	socio-economic group				<u>District</u> <u>Type</u>	<u>Households</u> <u>residual</u> (6)
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>		
Os. 10	9	5	5	7	5	9
Os. 11	12	10	1	1	2	6
Os. 14	8	9	6	3	2	8
Os. 18,19	10	11	8	2	2	4
N. 1	1	12	12	6	1	2
N. 10	5	6	10	12	5	1
N. 11	6	4	7	4	5	11
N. 12	11	7	4	8	5	5
N. 21	4	8	9	11	5	3
N. 22	3	3	3	10	1	7
N. 23	2	2	11	9	1	10
N. 24	7	1	2	5	4	12

Sources : See Appendix 9.1 (For table using Classes I to V
see footnote 10)

Robson, in his study of nineteenth century Sunderland (1969), and its social areas, employed specific indicators, pawnbrokers and lodging houses, to compound the evidence of low class areas. Walker's Directory ⁽¹¹⁾ lists pawnbrokers in Durham but these were scattered through the town in each decade. The two in existence in 1851 were in Allergate and Gilesgate, both Type 5, or districts with no particular socio-economic tendencies. These two still existed in 1871 but were joined in the 1850's by one in Providence

Row off Claypath North row (Fig. 20), again a Type 5 district. The latter moved in 1859 to Claypath itself. The four pawnbrokers in the 1890's were in Claypath and Crossgate and the same streets were the location of the pawnbrokers in the first decade of the twentieth century. In the next decade they were joined by an additional pawnbroker in Framwellgate. None were in high class districts of the 1850's or 1870's but neither were they in those districts which were more strongly low class. Framwellgate had the highest proportion of casually employed heads of household in 1851 and 1871 (Table 9.3, Figs. 20, 52) yet had no pawnshop until early this century.

Lodging house location was more strongly associated with Type 2 districts in both 1851 and 1871 but their location was licensed by the Local Board of Health ⁽¹²⁾ and it is not known whether applications were refused. ⁽¹³⁾ In September 1853 there appear to have been forty nine lodging houses ⁽¹⁴⁾, a total which fell to thirty nine by 1857. ⁽¹⁵⁾ Twelve were in Elvet alone and eight in Framwellgate, both Type 2 districts in 1851. North Crossgate and Gilesgate both had five lodging houses but were mixed, Type 5, areas. The 1882 total of lodging houses in the town was eight; two in each of Elvet, Gilesgate and Millburngate and one in each of Framwellgate and Crossgate. ⁽¹⁶⁾ This represented both a fall in the total number of lodgers allowed ⁽¹⁷⁾ and a concentration in location into the Type 2 districts of 1871. So these two indicators do not give weight to the character of any enumeration districts; the general impression remains that they were heterogeneous in terms of socio-economic

characteristics of their heads of household and that although there was some variety between them this was subtle.

This heterogeneity can be described using different indicators. If the occupations of the heads of household at the extremes of the socio-economic range are taken; those in professional occupations and those in casual employment (Appendix 9.2), in order to eliminate the problem of dividing the skilled and the semiskilled, it is striking that the majority of enumeration districts in both 1851 and 1871, held similar proportions of heads at both extremes of the socio-economic range. The exceptions were the Peninsula parishes, 4.1, 2, 3 in 1851 and N.1 in 1871, where heads of household were more strongly weighted to the professions and Framwellgate, 3.10a in 1851 and Os. 18 and 19 in 1871, where the heads of household were more strongly weighted to casual employment. Only in Gilesgate Moor, 4.5c in 1851 and N.12 in 1871, was there an absence of either extreme of the range and in this case it was an absence of casual labour in 1851 and the professions in 1871, it being a coal mining district (Table 9.3).

In all districts except South Claypath, N.21, North Claypath, N.22, West Silver Street with Back Lane, N.24, and South Gilesgate, N.10, there was greater imbalance between the two extremes of the socio-economic range in 1851 than 1871. All districts showed a mix of socio-economic groups but each district was tending either to the higher and middle of the socio-economic range or to the low end and middle of the range ⁽¹⁸⁾; a trend not seen when using all the Registrar-General's socio-economic classes.

Table 9.3 Professionally and casually employed ^{a.} heads of household by enumeration district, Durham MB., 1851 and 1871

<u>1851</u>				<u>1871</u>			
<u>Enumer-</u> <u>ation</u> <u>District</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>House-</u> <u>holds</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Prof.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Casual</u>	<u>Enumer-</u> <u>ation</u> <u>District</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>House-</u> <u>holds</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Prof.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Casual</u>
3.9a	199	7.5	9.6	Os.10	281	3.2	9.6
3.9b	222	9.9	12.6	Os.11	232	6.0	16.4
3.10a	402	4.7	13.7	Os.18,19	662	4.1	17.0
3.11d,e	683	9.7	10.4	Os.14	281	6.9	12.7
4.1,2,3	91	29.7	1.1	N.1	107	35.5	0.9
4.4a	124	10.7	7.9	N.21	130	8.5	7.7
4.4b	190	5.8	6.8	N.22	188	5.9	5.3
4.4c	174	5.2	4.0	N.23	146	3.4	8.9
4.4d	136	2.9	6.6	N.24	98	3.1	6.1
4.5a	183	9.8	8.2	N.10	199	6.5	4.5
4.5b	233	6.6	10.0	N.11	263	2.3	13.3
4.5c	109	3.7	0.0	N.12	146	0.0	8.2

Sources : as Appendix 9.1. a. See Appendix 9.2

When the middle of the socio-economic range is examined and an attempt is made to identify artisan heads of household, the skilled manual heads of household, it is the Peninsula which again stands out as unusual. In 1871 it had very few artisan heads of household (Table 9.4). Sadler Street, N.23, part of Framwellgate, Os.18 and West Silver Street with Back Lane, N.24, emerged as having few artisans when the category was redefined, as Type II, to exclude possible shopkeepers, labourers, large employers and unskilled factory workers (Appendix 9.3).

The basic weakness of using the occupation of head of household is not overcome by any of the previous analyses of enumeration districts in 1851 and 1871 but the use of a variety of classifications, the Registrar General's

Table 9.4 'Artisan' heads of household, Durham MB., 1871,
by enumeration district

<u>Enumer-</u> <u>ation</u> <u>District</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>House-</u> <u>holds</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Artisan (I)</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Artisan (II)</u>
Os.10	281	34.9	25.6
Os.11	232	36.2	29.3
Os.14	281	24.6	18.2
Os.18	477	20.8	14.7
Os.19	185	34.6	28.1
N.1	107	3.7	3.7
N.10	199	26.1	24.1
N.11	263	29.7	26.6
N.12	146	27.4	26.0
N.21	130	34.6	26.9
N.22	188	41.0	26.1
N.23	146	17.8	13.0
N.24	98	37.8	16.3

Sources : D.CRO.M 18/27,28,29,30 (PRO.RG.10 4962, 4963,
4964, 4965, 4966 4967 4968)

Artisan Categories based on Appendix 9.3

socio-economic classes (19), these classes grouped in pairs to remove the sharp class boundaries (Tables 9.1 and 9.2), professional and casual occupations (Table 9.3) and artisan occupations (Table 9.4) shows that the heterogeneity of each district is no accident of the classification. Each classification in turn shows this characteristic; that most enumeration districts were heterogeneous in socio-economic terms. This is confirmed by the use of different household variables.

House sharing, as shown by separate occupiers per 'house' (20), varied by parish (Appendix 9.4) but the variation between parishes was small and the most marked feature is the lack of house sharing in parts of the Peninsula, South Bailey and the College, where there were 1.00 households

per house right through from 1801 to 1891. These parish averages actually disguised variety from street to street.

Women were not usually heads of household and were not usually employed in the North East of England, although in the town of Durham more women were employed than was usual elsewhere (Rowe 1973 : 127). In total 24.4% of household heads in the borough were women in 1851. These divided into single women, widows and those whose husbands were absent and their distribution, as shown by enumeration districts in that year (Table 9.5), showed no clear relationship to the area 'types' suggested in Table 9.1.

Table 9.5 Female heads of household and working wives,
Durham MB. 1851, by enumeration district

<u>Enumeration</u> <u>District</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>House-</u> <u>holds</u>	<u>% female</u> <u>heads</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>wives</u>	<u>% wives</u> <u>working</u>	<u>Area</u> <u>Type</u> *
3.9a	199	27.7	115	6.1	5
3.9b	222	34.2	124	8.9	2
3.10a	402	25.1	249	5.6	2
3.11d, e	683	16.5	435	6.2	2
4.1,2,3	91	18.7	39	0.0	1
4.4a	124	18.6	83	10.8	3
4.4b	190	20.5	129	8.5	5
4.4c	174	19.5	112	3.6	1
4.4d	136	17.7	99	10.1	4
4.5a	183	18.6	121	5.0	5
4.5b	233	20.6	154	1.3	5
4.5c	109	14.7	79	2.5	4

Source : D.CRO. M3/17 & 18 (PRO.HO. 107/239)

* See Table 9.1

In the case of working wives in 1851 (Table 9.5), few wives were working in the areas designated Type 1 in Table 9.1, areas which were tending towards higher socio-

economic class for their heads of household, the Peninsula and the South side of the Market Place, and, in addition, Gilesgate Moor where there was a high concentration of men employed in coal mining. Higher proportions of wives were working in those districts which had high concentrations of carpet factory workers (Fig. 46). But, again, the use of enumeration districts disguised variety by street within districts (Appendix 9.5).

Households containing 'visitors' (21) showed no clear pattern by enumeration district in 1851 since high proportions of households in both Type 1 and Type 2 districts had such 'inmates', to use Laslett's term (1972a : 86-8). This probably disguises two types of visitor, firstly the visitor to the household in the Peninsula, district 4.1, 2 and 3, and the Market Place, district 4.4c, and secondly the overnight lodger for the cattle fair in Elvet, 3.1ld and e, and Framwellgate, 3.10a (Table 9.6). These two types of district divide out clearly when households with 'lodgers' (22) are compared by district and when numbers of visitors per household are compared (Appendix 9.6b).

It was resident servants which showed great variety from 74.7% of households on the Peninsula having at least one resident servant in 1851 to no households having a servant at Gilesgate Moor (Table 9.7). The range was almost as dramatic in 1871 with these two areas again forming the extremes. There was some variety between the other districts but it was not dramatic. Most districts saw a fall in the proportion of households with resident servants between 1851 and 1871, the exceptions being in Claypath South row,

Table 9.6 Household 'inmates', Durham MB., 1851, by enumeration district

<u>Households with visitors</u>		<u>Households with lodgers</u>	
%	district	%	district
17.2	3.11 d	12.5	4.4 d
13.2	4.4 c	12.2	4.9 c
11.4	3.10 a	11.6	4.4 b
11.1	3.11 e	10.5	4.4 a
11.0	4.1,2,3	9.4	4.5 b
9.8	4.5 a	9.3	3.11 e
9.6	4.4 d	8.3	4.5 c
9.2	4.5 c	7.1	4.5 a
8.0	3.9 a	7.0	3.9 a
7.3	4.5 b	4.7	3.10 a
7.3	4.4 a	2.2	4.1,2,3
6.3	4.4 b	1.2	3.11 d
3.6	4.9 c	1.2	4.4 c

Sources : D.CRO.M3/17, 18 (PRO. HO. 107/239)

Sadler Street and Back Lane where the reverse trend may be attributed to increased commercial use of parts of property and a lack of clear distinction between domestic servants, shop assistants and innservants.

Table 9.7 Households with resident servants, Durham MB., 1851 and 1871, by enumeration district

		<u>Total</u>	<u>1851</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>1871</u>
<u>Enumeration District</u>		<u>House</u>	<u>% with</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>% with</u>
1851	1871	<u>holds</u>	<u>servants</u>	<u>holds</u>	<u>servants</u>
3.9a	Os.10	199	13.1	281	10.0
3.9b	Os.11	222	10.8	232	8.6
3.10a	Os.18,19	402	8.7	662	6.8
3.11d,e	Os.14	683	18.3	281	20.6
4.1,2,3	N.1	91	74.7	107	62.6
4.4a	N.21	124	23.4	130	19.2
4.4b	N.22	190	15.3	188	14.4
4.4c	N.23	174	35.6	146	42.5
4.4d	N.24	136	14.7	98	15.3
4.5a	N.10	183	18.6	199	9.6
4.5b	N.11	233	13.3	263	8.2
4.5c	N.12	109	0.0	146	1.4
			<u>17.4</u>		<u>14.3</u>

The presence of resident servants was a variable utilised by Charles Booth in his survey of London (1902), in Durham the variable clearly divides off the Peninsula and Gilesgate Moor as distinct but it is the number of servants per household which shows differences between districts more sharply (Table 9.8)

Table 9.8 Numbers of resident servants in households
with resident servants, Durham MB., 1851,
by enumeration district

Maximum number of servants resident						
0	1	2	3	4	5	10
4.5c		3.10a		3.9a		3.11d
		4.4d		3.9b		4.1,2,3
		4.5a		3.11e		
		4.5b		4.4a		
				4.4b		

Based on Appendix 9.6a
For locations see Fig.52

Other earlier evidence confirms the impression that variations between different parts of the town on the scale of townships were subtle with the exception of the Peninsula which, time and time again, had a distinct character. As early as 1641 the Protestation Returns indicate that the North Bailey and the South Bailey on the Peninsula had a higher rank of population than the remainder of the parishes. The returns list men over eighteen years

old and, in some cases, describe them as servant, labourer or by trade, or merely give their name and title. The overwhelming majority, 86.7% out of 1057 names, were listed by Christian name and surname but 8.99% were described as knight, Esquire, gentleman, Mr., or yeoman. In the parish of St. Nicholas this proportion was 8.7%, in St. Giles 5.3%, in Elvet 5.0% and in St. Margaret 3.8%. But in North Bailey the proportion was 26.7% and in South Bailey the proportion was 26.3%. (23)

During 1800 a large proportion of households in the town, perhaps nearly 30%, were receiving charity from the City Charitable Stock in addition to those aided by the Poor Rate. (24) The exception was, again, the Peninsula (Table 9.8). A total of 575 persons received aid from the City, 13.4% of which were widows and a further 139 of which were women who may have had husbands in the army. This cannot be verified but the total of 500 men in the army was cited in 1798. (25) When arranged by township and compared to the numbers of households in 1801 nearly 30% of households may have been aided in 1800 but whereas in St. Giles parish over 40% may have been aided, in the two parishes on the Peninsula the proportion was nearer 6% and in the College none were aided.

Table 9.9 Persons aided by City of Durham Charitable Stock,
by township, Durham City, 1800

<u>Township</u>	<u>Population</u>		<u>Households</u>	
	<u>Total 1801</u>	<u>% aided 1800</u>	<u>Total 1801</u>	<u>% aided 1800</u>
Ba iley,N.& S.	631	0.95	99	6.06
College	106	0.00	16	0.00
Crossgate	1201	7.16	361	23.82
Elvet	1827	9.03	520	31.73
Framwellgate	1071	8.68	246	37.81
St.Giles	940	10.64	249	40.16
St.Nicholas	1754	7.13	439	28.47
Total	7530	7.64	1930	29.79

Sources : 1801 census, D.CRO. MB/Du 169

Social attributes show again and again only subtle variation between districts, whether enumeration districts or townships, with the exception of the Peninsula, and, later in the nineteenth century, the new district of Gilesgate Moor. The same is true of housing attributes. Taking rateable value as a surrogate for rent ⁽²⁶⁾ each enumeration district had a range of rateable values for dwellings and most showed a skewed distribution of values in both 1850 and 1870 (Figs. 47, 51). Unfortunately the unit used as the rateable unit varied from parish to parish so there is some distortion from the inclusion of dwellings with shops, workshops and outbuildings in one rateable unit and from the grouping of a tenemented house as one rateable unit or subdividing it so each tenement is listed separately. In addition assessments of valuation were not standard from parish to parish. ⁽²⁷⁾ The exception was, again, the Peninsula which had dwellings of higher value and lacked the preponderance of low value units.

The other townships are so heterogeneous within and so lacking in contrasts between each other as to beg the

question whether they were perceived as having distinct characters by contemporaries. Certainly township names were used. John Bramwell, making a complaint about a proposed grease manufactory next to his house in Framwellgatespoke in terms of a district saying

"Framwellgate was almost a rural suburb of Durham" (28) and the report on the siting of the public baths in 1853 grouped the whole of Gilesgate together when discussing access for poor people. (29) Hutchinson picked out the Peninsula in the late eighteenth century remarking that

"The two Bailies are inhabited by people of the first fortune" (1787:292).

but, significantly, others saw differences street by street and even within streets. Walker's Guide (nd:7) describes New Elvet as "generally ill-conditioned" whereas North Road had

"numerous respectable dwelling-houses which now nearly fill it, and are continued in the new suburb named Western Hill".

Dr. Oliver's reports from 1852, as Medical Officer of Health, pick out parts of townships. He discussed mortality and sewerage street by street distinguishing Water Lane and Court Lane from New Elvet (Fig. 20) instead of grouping all those streets and Old Elvet together as did the census enumerators (Fig. 52). (30) Allergate and Grape Lane were discussed separately from Crossgate, Paradise Lane separately from Claypath and Back Lane separately from the Market Place. In addition he distinguished parts of streets; 'the lower part of Claypath' and 'the lower part of South Street' (31) as having distinct characters.

3. Streets and parts of streets

Foster's interesting analysis of who lived next door to whom in Oldham and South Shields (1974:125-7) cannot be easily executed in Durham since few streets were simple terraces and households would have neighbours possibly either side but also possibly behind or in front, since some yards had been built up, and possibly below or above since some buildings were tenements. Instead, analysis of Durham City will deal firstly with small areas, streets and parts of streets, and then with each household and its dwelling.

Within each enumeration district here was variety in the proportion of wives who were working in 1851 (Appendix 9.5). There was a tendency for the back streets such as Back Lane and the side streets such as Water Lane and Court Lane to have a higher proportion of wives working but this was not always the case since Grape Lane and Broken Walls had none. There was also a tendency for the developments of the 1830's, King Street, the Sands and Freeman's Place to have more yet this was not so strong along New North Road so general type of street and age of street do not show simple relationships to this social criterion.

Also within each enumeration district there was variety in the proportion of households with resident servants in 1851 (Table 9.10). Court Lane and Old Elvet, grouped together, and with part of New Elvet in district 3:11d (Figs. 20, 52) had respectively 6.3% and 48.2% of households having resident servants while district 4:4d ranged from 0.0% in Back Lane to 52.0% in North Silver Street. Such

divergence was repeated in most enumeration districts but it was not always the case that fewer households living in back lanes had resident servants. In the case of Crossgate South row and Grape Lane, the back lane (Fig. 20), Grape Lane had 14.3% of its households with resident servants while Crossgate South row had 9.9%. In general, however, in 1851 back lane dwelling households, were less likely to have resident servants and it was the case that households living on the older streets, those of medieval origin, were more likely to have servants resident than those living in streets built during the early nineteenth century.

Table 9.10 Proportion of households with resident servants, by street, Durham MB., 1851

<u>Enumeration Districts</u>	<u>Total Streets</u>	<u>% households with resident servants</u>					
		0-	15-	30-	45-	60-	75+
3 : 9a	5	4	1	0	0	0	0
3 : 9b	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 : 10a	3	1	2	0	0	0	0
3 : 11d	3	1	1	0	1	0	0
3 : 11e	5	5	0	0	0	0	0
4 : 1,2,3	7	0	0	1	2	1	3
4 : 4a	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
4 : 4b	3	2	1	0	0	0	0
4 : 4c	6	3	0	1	1	0	1
4 : 4d	5	3	1	0	1	0	0
4 : 5a	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
4 : 5b	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
4 : 5c	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

Source : D.CRO. M3/17 & 18 (PRO. HO. 107/239)

For location of enumeration districts see Fig.52.

Differences between the front and back streets (32) and between older streets and newly built streets emerged in the occupations of the residents in 1851 and 1871. The old

streets tended to contain heads of households ranging from socio-economic group I to group V while the streets built during the nineteenth century tended not to have the full range from I to V but only part of the range (Appendix 9.7). The exceptions amongst the older streets which were without heads of household in 'casual' occupations (Appendix 9.2) in 1851 were North and South Bailey on the Peninsula, the west side of the Market Place and Gilesgate Moor. Streets without heads of household who were in the professions (Appendix 9.2) were all back and side streets; Grape Lane, Water Lane, Church Lane in Elvet and Back Lane. Certain other back streets, together with the South side of the Market Place, had neither professionally nor casually employed heads of household. These included Dun Cow Lane and Bow Lane on the Peninsula, Broken Walls and Freeman's Place. Other streets were more mixed but with orientation towards more professional heads of household, as in Old Elvet or towards more casually employed heads of household in Millburngate and Framwellgate.

In the 1850's the Irish were viewed as a separate group and a police report compiled on their distribution in the town in 1853 ⁽³³⁾ suggests that they were concentrated in Framwellgate and in certain back streets, notably Water Lane and Court Lane. Barke has suggested that they tended to have distinct areas (1973:259) and this has been confirmed by Cooter's work on North East England (1972:20) and even in this small town. In Durham MB. the majority appear to have entered England since 1840. The Irish in 1851 tended to be married to Irish, if they were married at all. Of the 171 Irish born heads of household 36.3% were unmarried and 56.1%

had an Irish born spouse. (34) Yet even in 1871 the proportions were similar. Of the 215 heads of household 36.7% were unmarried and 44.2% had an Irish born spouse. The Irish increased numbers of the Roman Catholic community in the town (35) and an additional church, St. Godric's, was built in Castle Chare, immediately adjacent to Framwellgate where large numbers of Irish were living.

In 1871 there were more streets which had not both heads of household in professions or in casual employment. To those streets of 1851 where there were no casually employed heads were added Old Elvet, Church Lane in Elvet, Sadler Street with Fleshergate and the West side of Silver Street. As in 1851 streets lacking heads in professional occupations were back and side streets; Grape Lane, Chapel Passage, Court Lane, Oswald Court, Paradise Lane, Broken Walls, Back Lane and Freeman's Place. Allergate also fell into this category in 1871. Older streets were changing character; New Elvet in the early nineteenth century had been where the assize judge, James Losh, lodged (36) but in 1871 all the barristers enumerated; the census coinciding with the Assizes, were lodging in Old Elvet. (36)

Fewer streets in 1871 contained both professionally and casually employed heads of household. The older streets were changing and new streets were being added during the nineteenth century which were never so heterogeneous in socio-economic terms. The new streets tended to lack any casually employed heads of household as in Neville Street, Sutton Street, John Street, Flass Street, Waddington Street, Mowbray Street, North Road, Atherton Street, Palmer's Terrace, Moody's Buildings, Station Lane Gilesgate and Magdalene Street. An

exception was Lambton Street, a short terrace of cottages in a hollow under the railway viaduct. Other new streets had neither casually nor professionally employed heads of household as in Colpitts Terrace, Cross Street, Bridge Street, Lindsley's Yard North Road, Providence Row and Kepier Terrace.

This suggests that Sutcliffe's hypothesis that socially homogeneous areas were the outcome of landlord policy in new areas is correct. The older streets were heterogeneous in ownership and in type of property and it was these streets which were heterogeneous in terms of socio-economic characteristics. However, even between 1851 and 1871 some differences can be seen in character with the older streets either becoming more professional or more casual in employment. It was the newer streets which were more homogeneous in terms of fabric and of socio-economic characteristics and the exceptions, those early nineteenth century developments which were more heterogeneous in terms of fabric, such as Reform Place, were also more heterogeneous in terms of socio-economic characteristics.

Some older streets displayed sub-sections with distinct socio-economic characteristics. North Claypath was one such street in 1871. The lower part of the street, from Claypath Gates to Providence Row, had both professionally and casually employed heads of household. It also had a large number of skilled workers employed in the carpet factory directly to the North (Fig. 46). On the street front were commercial properties (Walker's 1871) and behind were cottages in the yards (Fig. 43). Further up the street, between Providence Row and lower Gilesgate were fewer yard properties.

There were no casually employed heads of household and the professionally employed heads tended to be more clustered here (Fig. 53). Clustering also appeared in Framwellgate. The west row south of Castle Chare and sloping down into the Millburn valley had no professionals at all in 1871 (Fig.53) while the East row and the North end of the West row had some. These professional men tended to be neighbours.

One critical factor appears to have been whether the curtilages had been infilled with cottage property since casually employed heads of household in Framwellgate in 1871 tended to inhabit yard properties or subdivided buildings on the street front whereas professionally employed heads of household inhabited street front dwellings and, in Framwellgate, those which still had their gardens. An analysis was made for Framwellgate in 1871 matching the 1871 census ⁽³⁸⁾, the 1870 ratebook ⁽³⁹⁾, Walker's Directory and the 25 inch and 10 foot Ordnance Survey plans ⁽⁴⁰⁾ by the method outlined by Holmes for Ramsgate (1974) (Table 9.11).

Table 9.11 Dwelling type and occupation of heads of household, Framwellgate, 1871

<u>Dwelling Type</u>	<u>Total Households</u>	<u>Professional</u>	<u>Casual</u>	<u>% hh in dwelling type</u>	<u>% prof.in dwelling type</u>	<u>% casual in dwelling type</u>
Front	61	7	15	17.48	100.00	11.28
Back	94	0	40	26.93	0.00	30.08
Tenement	194	0	78	55.59	0.00	58.65
Total	349	7	133	100.00	100.00	100.01

4. Households and their dwellings

The Framwellgate example should not be taken as indicating simple relationships between one socio-economic indicator of household type and dwelling type but rather that

the relationships between households and their dwellings are clearer by analysis of each household in turn than by filtering the information through enumeration districts or even separate streets.

Techniques of 'nominal linkage', 'record linkage' or 'house repopulation' are becoming more widely known and recent papers and articles have illustrated their use in a variety of different topics and places ranging from studies in historical demography (Stevenson 1977, Wrigley 1973:1-16) to studies of specific groups such as the middle class in Leeds (Morris 1976) and studies of very small towns such as Ashbourne in Derbyshire (Henstock 1973, 1978) or villages (Mills 1976, 1978). As has already been commented upon in Chapter 4, in connexion with tracing building applicants, the records for the town of Durham are of sufficient quality to be able to trace individual households. The censuses of 1851 and 1871 are legible, the ratebooks exist for the years 1850 and 1870, are organised according to the direction of walk of the ratecollector and not by owner ⁽⁴¹⁾ and give each occupier as the rates were not compounded to the owner. ⁽⁴²⁾ Households could be traced by the surname and initials of the head of household together with additional information such as occupation, for which Walker's Directory was used as an additional check (Appendix 4.1).

Not every household could be matched with its dwelling in either 1850-1851 or 1870-1871 for a variety of reasons. The census used rulings to indicate new 'houses' but did not always give addresses and the ratebooks allocated each rateable unit a number but did not state its address beyond giving the

/ street heading. In practise matching the two sources did not present great problems except with respect to shared houses. Some townships listed each tenement and their occupiers separately, in which case matching names to the census was easier than in those townships where the whole building was treated as a rateable unit and where the 'occupier' may not have appeared in the census at all. In such cases the household may have moved between April 1850 and March 1851 or between May 1870 and April 1871 or the 'occupier' may have been a middleman. Household movements between the compilation of the ratebooks and the census nights added another factor in not being able to match each household to its dwelling.

In 1850-1 64.8% of households listed in the census for the Municipal Borough were matched to their dwelling with less successful matching down the Registrar-General's five socio-economic classes (Table 9.12). In 1870-1 the repopulation was more successful in every socio-economic class except Class V. Again it was more successful for the higher classes.

Table 9.12 Success rate in matching households and dwellings, Durham MB., 1850-1 and 1870-1

<u>Socio-Economic Class</u>	1850-1		1870-1	
	<u>Total households</u>	<u>% not matched</u>	<u>Total households</u>	<u>% not matched</u>
I	221	16.74	172	12.79
II	449	23.45	635	17.48
III	1171	38.69	1299	34.41
IV	496	41.94	518	38.61
V	350	42.57	225	50.67

In the Framwellgate example, which just used heads of household in professional and casual occupations, it was

the casually employed who dwelt in tenements (Table 9.11) but over the town as a whole, using the five classes of the Registrar-General for heads of household, the picture was more subtle. There was certainly a tendency for a smaller proportion of Classes I and II to be in shared 'houses', meaning buildings divided into tenements, but some were in such dwellings (Table 9.13). Over the two decades single family houses became more important in each socio-economic group. This general trend reflects the type of housing being added to the housing stock; single family houses ⁽⁴³⁾ rather than some buildings which were single dwellings and some which were tenements. This affected Classes II and III, managerial and artisan households, directly and indirectly affected Classes IV and V by reducing sharing in older property.

Table 9.13 Dwelling Type and Socio-Economic Class ^(a) of Households, Durham MB., 1850-1 and 1870-1

<u>Socio-Economic Class</u>	<u>Total Households</u>	<u>1850-1</u>		<u>1870-1</u>		
		<u>% in single house</u>	<u>% in shared house</u>	<u>Total Households</u>	<u>% in single house</u>	<u>% in shared house</u>
I	221	67.9	32.1	172	81.6	18.4
II	499	53.3	46.7	548 ^(b)	77.9	22.1
III	1171	20.0	80.0	1299	58.4	41.6
IV	496	18.4	81.6	518	56.8	43.2
V	350	14.0	86.0	225	42.1	57.9
nk.	43			247		
Total	2730			3009		

(a) Registrar-General's classification for head of household

(b) Excluding Barracks

In comparison Gateshead, in 1851, had 4,367 households. In each socio-economic class a larger proportion of households

occupied single family houses (Table 9.14a) and in West Hartlepool, in the same year, even higher proportions of each socio-economic class occupied single family houses (Table 9.14b). The former town had a medieval kernel but had grown rapidly in size during the early nineteenth century (Fig. 3) and the latter town was a new town that century so both contrasted Durham in terms of their type of housing.

Table 9.14 Dwelling type and socio-economic class of households,
a) Gateshead, 1851

<u>Socio-Economic Class</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% in single house</u>	<u>% in shared house</u>
I	129	76.0	24.0
II	564	71.6	28.4
III	2,328	32.9	67.1
IV	614	42.2	57.8
V	463	25.7	74.3
nk.	269	30.9	69.2

Source : D.CRO. M3/35 (PRO.143 HO.107 2402)

b) West Hartlepool, 1851

<u>Socio-Economic Class</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% in single house</u>	<u>% in shared house</u>
I	1	100.0	0.0
II	28	85.7	14.3
III	121	79.3	20.7
IV	21	80.9	19.1
V	48	72.9	27.1
nk.	8	50.0	50.0

Source : D.CRO. M 3/6

The most usual form of house sharing in Durham in 1850-1 was for two households whose heads were of the same socio-economic class to be occupying the dwellings. But in that year 50.4% of shared houses in the town were being occupied by more than two households, many shared houses were heterogeneous in terms of the socio-economic class of the heads of household living there. Also as the number of households in a house increased so did the socio-economic range (44) (Table 9.15).

Table 9.15 Socio-economic heterogeneity within shared houses, Durham MB., 1850-1

	Households sharing a house			
	2	3	4	5
Total houses	189	102	52	38
Socio-economic				
Range				
0	37.0%	14.7%	11.5%	0.0%
1	33.9	39.2	23.1	18.4
2	23.3	39.2	42.3	55.3
3	3.7	2.9	9.6	15.8
4	0.0	2.9	3.9	7.9
nk. (a)	2.1	1.0	9.6	2.6

(a) occupation of one or more heads of household not known

Gateshead in 1851, on the evidence of the census enumerators' books alone⁽⁴⁵⁾, had a larger proportion of shared houses where the heads of household were of the same socio-economic class, here scored as 0. Socio-economic heterogeneity was reduced in all sizes of shared house (Table 9.16).

By 1870-1 all shared houses in Durham MB. were tending to be less heterogeneous with fewer containing a full range, score 4, from Class I to Class V. (Table 9.17). In

Table 9.16 Socio-economic heterogeneity within shared houses,
Gateshead (46), 1851

	Households sharing a house			
	2	3	4	5
Total houses	359	158	148	50
Socio-economic				
Range				
0	43.7%	22.8%	18.2%	8.0%
1	25.1	24.7	25.7	22.0
2	17.3	22.8	39.2	40.0
3	1.1	1.3	2.0	2.0
4	0.0	1.3	1.3	4.0
nk.	12.8	27.2	12.7	24.0

addition there were, in total, fewer shared houses. But a detailed comparison with 1850-1 is not useful since lodgers were treated differently. In 1851 they tended to be enumerated within other households, even when lodgers included nuclear families, while in 1871 lodging families were scheduled separately. In addition Class V was less easy to match to its dwellings in 1871.

Table 9.17 Socio-economic heterogeneity within shared houses,
Durham MB., 1870-1

	Households sharing a house			
	2	3	4	5
Total houses	117	41	23	11
Socio-economic				
range				
0	32.5%	12.2%	4.4%	18.2%
1	29.1	22.0	26.1	9.1
2	14.5	22.0	26.1	18.2
3	4.3	9.8	8.7	9.1
4	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0
nk.	19.7	34.2	30.4	45.5

Booth's indicator of household status (1902), resident servants, shows that in 1851 very few households in shared houses in Durham MB. had resident servants. If all persons enumerated as servants are counted 2.5% of households sharing houses in the town had resident servants but if servants appear from children enumerated to be 'common law wives' (47) this proportion falls to 2.0% (Table 9.18). This is still higher than in another ten towns in the county where very few households sharing houses had resident servants. The towns with the highest proportion after Durham are interestingly, Barnard Castle and Bishop Wearmouth; Barnard Castle, like Durham, having been described as having a 'Scottish style' of dwelling in the 1840's. (48)

Table 9.18 Households with resident servants compared to housing in eleven towns of Co. Durham, 1851

<u>Town</u>	<u>Total Households</u>	<u>Total hh. + servant</u>	<u>Shared House % hh. + servant (a)</u>	<u>% hh. + servant (b)</u>
Barnard Castle	1,013	11.8	1.2	1.2
Bishop Auckland	1,093	14.1	0.5	0.5
Bishop Wearmouth	3,743	7.9	1.5	1.3
Chester-le-Street	462	11.9	0.4	0.2
Gateshead	5,263	7.1	1.0	0.8
Darlington	2,556	14.2	0.5	0.5
Durham	2,789	16.4	2.5	2.0
Hartlepool	1,979	10.7	1.0	0.7
Stockton	2,224	11.8	0.2	0.2
Sunderland	8,014	2.4	0.6	0.5
W.Hartlepool	228	11.4	0.5	0.4

(a) all servants (b) probable servants

Sources : D.CRO.M 3/1,2,5,6,7,9,12,24,27,29,35,36 and 37.

Within Durham MB. in 1850 rateable values were skewed

towards lower values. The lowest valuation of a dwelling in that year was 10s., 61.9% of dwellings out of a total of 1,794 were assessed at less than £10 per annum and 83.7% were assessed at less than £20 (Appendix 9.8). By 1870 there had been an upward revaluation so, for example, in 1850 Leazes Place in St. Nicholas' parish was valued at one dwelling @ £8, eight dwellings @ £9, one dwelling @ £11 and two dwellings @ £13 ⁽⁴⁹⁾ while in 1870 the same houses were valued as one dwelling @ £6.10.0d, five dwellings @ £12, one dwelling @ £14, one dwelling @ £15, two dwellings @ £16, one dwelling @ £20 and one dwelling @ £23. ⁽⁵⁰⁾ The revaluation did not affect the skewed distribution of assessed annual values and in 1870, out of 1,986 dwellings, 47.1% were valued at less than £10 per annum and 76.4% at less than £20.

How did rateable values relate to socio-economic characteristics of each household, if an analysis is conducted household by household? Foster, in his study of Oldham (1974:256) suggested that in the late 1840's working class housing would have been that under £10 in value. This suggestion is not discussed in any further detail. For Cardiff, in the late nineteenth century, Daunton suggested that less than £12 rateable value could be taken as pertaining to semi-skilled and unskilled, £12 to £20 for artisans and clerks, £20 to £35 as middle class and £35 and over as professional and merchants (1977:106). In contrast, this analysis of Durham does not assume the rateable values of socio-economic classes but instead asks how rateable value corresponded to socio-economic classes. Do they compare to these suggestions by Foster and Daunton?

Matching each household to its dwelling in 1850-1, and bearing in mind those which could not be matched (Table 9.12), the picture emerged that there were no clear divides between socio-economic classes if the occupation of head of household is taken to indicate socio-economic class. Instead the skewed distribution of rateable values was apparent in each socio-economic class (Table 9.19). Thus 54.5% of Class V dwelt in rateable units of less than £30 assessed value, or all of Class V who could be matched to their dwelling, but so did 60.00% of Class I. It was the ceiling, the highest rateable value for each socio-economic group which was more striking since none of Class V exceeded £29 rateable value and none of Class III exceeded £59. Some of Classes I and II had higher rateable values, as did some of Class IV, which may be explained by the inclusion of lodging houses.

Table 9.19 Distribution of socio-economic classes by assessed rateable value of dwellings, Durham MB, 1850-1

<u>Rateable Value</u>	<u>Socio-Economic Class</u>					
	I	II	III	IV	V	nk.
Under £15	38.57	52.45	61.11	57.09	54.14	68.00
£15 - 29	21.43	16.33	3.15	2.56	0.32	0.00
£30 - 44	10.48	7.35	0.17	0.39	0.00	16.00
£45 - 59	10.00	1.63	0.17	0.20	0.00	8.00
£60+	6.67	0.82	0.00	0.39	0.00	8.00
nk.	12.86	21.43	35.40	34.37	45.54	0.00
Total	100.01	100.01	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00%

The predominance of Classes I and II among the higher valued dwellings is striking if the distribution of rateable values across the socio-economic classes is examined (Table 9.20).

Under £29 in annual assessed rateable value Class III dominates as it is the largest socio-economic group but then in the £30 to £44 range Class II dominates and above £45 Class I.

Table 9.20 Distribution of assessed rateable values of dwellings by socio-economic classes, Durham MB., 1850-1

<u>Rateable Value</u>	<u>Socio-Economic Class</u>						% Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	nk.	
Under £15	5.28	16.77	46.84	18.92	11.09	1.11	100.01
£15 - 29	25.57	45.46	21.02	7.39	0.57	0.00	100.01
£30 - 44	33.33	54.55	3.03	3.03	0.00	6.06	100.00
£45 - 59	61.77	23.53	5.88	2.94	0.00	5.88	100.00
£60 +	63.64	18.18	0.00	9.09	0.00	9.09	100.00
nk.	3.03	11.79	46.69	22.45	16.05	0.00	100.01

Within each socio-economic class in 1850-1 there was a clear division between the valuation of dwellings which were single houses and valuation of dwellings in shared houses (Table 9.21) but then the range of rateable values for each socio-economic class overlapped. Within each socio-economic group the rateable values of dwellings were skewed to lower values but though their ranges overlapped their median rateable values showed a progression, with higher values in higher socio-economic classes.

Class III, the largest group, then showed trends in rateable values according to other household characteristics. The class was divided into five sub-groups; A, young head of household, under 50 years of age, with no children resident, B, married or widowed head of household with dependent children, or other relatives, C, married or widowed head of household with

Table 9.21 Socio-economic classes and rateable values of dwellings, Durham MB., 1850-1

Rateable values in £.00

<u>Socio-economic Class</u>	<u>Quartile</u>	<u>Single Dwelling House</u>	<u>Shared House Dwelling</u>	<u>All Dwellings</u>	<u>Range</u>
I	lower	10.00	2.30/2.50	8.25	
	median	20.00/20.75	5.0	17.0	0.56/83.25
	upper	40.00	6.50/6.63	35.25	
II	lower	8.00	3.00	4.00	
	median	12.00	4.50/5.00	8.25	0.50/82.00
	upper	20.00	10.00	20.00	
III	lower	3.50	1.50	1.69	
	median	6.00	2.06	3.00	0.25/46.00
	upper	10.00	3.75	6.00	
IV	lower	3.50	1.50	2.00	
	median	6.00	2.25	3.00	0.50/83.25
	upper	10.00	3.25	6.00	
V	lower	3.50	1.13	1.67	
	median	8.00	2.00	2.33	0.13/90.00
	upper	37.50	3.00	5.00	

both dependent and working children, D, married or widowed head of household with working children and E, head of household over 50 years of age and no children resident. The ranges of rateable value showed no trends; that for group A being £0.16.0d. to £25.0.0d, that for group B being £0.5.0d. to £46.0.0d, that for group C being £0.6.0d. to £25.0.0d., that for group D being £0.6.0d. to £13.5.0d. and that for group E being £0.5.0d. to £45.15.0d.

But the quartile and median values of the groups showed trends. These values fell slightly between group A and group B, comparing young people without children to households with children who were all dependants. The values then rose slightly in group C where some children in each household

were working, and were even higher in group D where all children resident were working (Table 9.22). The rateable values of group E showed no clear relationship to those of the other groups but then this group was composed both of people still working and of elderly people living alone.

Table 9.22 Household types within socio-economic class III
and rateable value of dwellings (a), Durham MB.,
1850-1

<u>Group</u>	<u>Lower Quartile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Upper Quartile</u>
A	£1.10.0d.	£3. 0. 0d.	£5. 0. 0d.
B	£1.10.0d.	£2.10. 0d.	£3.10. 0d.
C	£1.15.0d.	£3. 0. 0d.	£4.10. 0d.
D	£2. 0.0d.	£3.10. 0d.	£7. 0. 0d.
E	£1.13.0d./£1.15.0d.	£3.10. 0d.	£8.0.0d./£8.5.0d.

(a) all dwellings

In 1870-1 there was still overlap of rateable value ranges, still skewed distributions of rateable values for each socio-economic group and still differences between rateable values of shared houses and single dwelling houses for each socio-economic group (Table 9.22). The median values for all dwellings in each socio-economic group were more widely spaced than in 1850-1 but the rise in assessed annual value appears to have affected the upper end of the housing stock rather than the cheaper end.

Table 9.23 Socio-economic classes and rateable value of dwellings, Durham MB., 1870-1

Rateable value in £.00

<u>Socio-econ-omic Class</u>	<u>Quartile</u>	<u>Single Dwelling House</u>	<u>Shared House Dwelling</u>	<u>All Dwellings</u>	<u>Range</u>
I	lower	13.50	5.50	10.00/10.67	1.50/250.00
	median	25.00	8.25	19.00	
	upper	41.75	12.50	37.50/40.00	
II	lower	10.00	3.25	6.50	0.58/108.00
	median	14.00	5.00	12.50	
	upper	20.75	7.00/8.00	20.00	
III	lower	5.00	2.00	3.00	0.50/210.00
	median	6.50	3.00	4.50	
	upper	8.50	4.50	8.00	
IV	lower	4.00	2.00	2.29	0.50/100.00
	median	5.00	2.75	3.25	
	upper	10.00	4.50	4.17	
V	lower	3.25	2.00	2.00	0.50/20.00
	median	4.00	2.50	3.00	
	upper	5.00	3.50	4.67	

5. Conclusion

Throughout this analysis the selection and application of classifications has resulted in the loss of detail. Ultimately this cannot be avoided. All classifications must show some features more clearly at the expense of obscuring others and this must be borne in mind in assessing the use of the Registrar-General's socio-economic classes. Yet the latter does help to illustrate, in Tables 9.21 and 9.22 how there does appear to be a relationship between a single household characteristic, occupation of head of household, and two housing characteristics, single or shared house and rateable value. The classification may obscure the boundaries but it illustrates an overall pattern.

This pattern is in itself aspatial. It cuts across the enumeration districts, since in analysing them only the Peninsula and the new district of Gilesgate Moor emerged as distinctive (51), and to a lesser extent it cuts across individual streets. But at the level of streets a distinction must be made between the older streets with more heterogeneous fabric and those streets built during the nineteenth century which tended to have more homogeneous fabric.

1. Following the Chicago School ideas through 'natural areas' to 'social areas' American writers such as Anderson and Egeland (1961) have employed census tract data as a quarry of information. The nearest equivalent for English workers has been census enumeration districts and examples of work using these include Gittus (1964a, 1964b), Colli son on Oxford (1960) and Morgan on Exeter (1970, 1971). Few workers have attempted to delve below the scale of enumeration districts, an exception being the work by Williams and Herbert on Newcastle-under-Lyme (1962) and work on urban fabric. The use of enumeration districts hinges on their being so small as to be relatively homogeneous (Herbert and Evans 1974 : 173).
2. Using the Registrar-General's classification after Armstrong (1972).
3. 1851 4.1,2,3 and 1871 St. N. 1 (The title page of the census enumerators' books for this district do not give the number of the district and neither does the index to the census at Durham County Record Office). See Fig. 52 for locations.
4. St. N. 24 and St. N. 12. See Fig. 52 for locations.
5. Using the Registrar-General's classification after Armstrong (1972).
6. Annuitants, heads absent and 'not known'.
7. Enumeration districts, Durham MB., 1851, ranked by percentage of heads of household in each socio-economic class.

<u>Enumeration District</u>	<u>Socio-Economic Class</u>					<u>Households Residual</u> (a)
	I	II	III	IV	V	
3.9a	7	6	8	8	9	2
3.9b	3	11	9	1	7	4
3.10a	10	12	5	3	1	3
3.11d,e	4	9	7	2	10	5
4.1,2,3	1	8	12	5	12	1
4.4a	6	2	11	11	3	6
4.4b	8	3	4	7	6	9
4.4c	11	1	10	10	8	12
4.4d	12	5	1	12	5	10
4.5a	2	10	3	9	2	8
4.5b	5	4	6	6	4	11
4.5c	9	7	2	4	11	7

(a) see fn.6

Sources : as Appendix 9.1

8. Duncan and Duncan's index of dissimilarity cannot be applied (1957:283-96) since the enumeration districts are of such different sizes. The 1841 standard was for enumeration districts to be up to 200 households and to average 100 households (Taylor 195) but in 1851 they ranged, in Durham MB., from 402 households in Framwellgate to 91 in the North and South Baileys and in 1871 they ranged from 477 households in Elvet to 98 in Silver Street North Row.

9. Comparison of enumeration districts and Types 1 to 5, 1851 and 1871. For locations see Figs. 20 and 52.

<u>District</u>		<u>Type</u>		<u>District</u>		<u>Type</u>	
1851	1871	1851	1871	1851	1871	1851	1871
3.9a	Os.10	5	5	4.4b	N.22	5	1
3.9b	Os.11	2	2	4.4c	N.23	1	1
3.10a	Os.18,19	2	2	4.4d	N.24	4	4
3.11d,e	Os.14	2	2	4.5a	N.10	5	5
4.1,2,3	N. 1	1	1	4.5b	N.11	5	5
4.4a	N.21	3	5	4.5c	N.12	4	5

Based on Tables 9.1 and 9.2

10. Enumeration districts, Durham MB., 1851, ranked by proportion of heads of household in each enumeration district classified in the five socio-economic classes of the Registrar-General.

<u>Enumeration District</u>	<u>Socio-Economic Class</u>					<u>Households Residual</u> (a)
	I	II	III	IV	V	
Os.10	7	7	4	6	9	9
Os.11	6	12	5	1	5	6
Os.14	2	9	9	3	7	8
Os.18,19	3	11	10	5	1	4
N. 1	1	2	12	2	12	2
N.10	4	5	7	12	11	1
N.11	9	4	6	7	2	11
N.12	11	10	2	8	4	5
N.21	5	3	8	10	8	3
N.22	8	8	1	9	6	7
N.23	10	1	11	11	3	10
N.24	11	6	3	4	10	12

(a) see footnote 6

11. Du. LC. Walker's Directory, 1850-1915, annual.
12. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 160 5th Feb. 1851.
13. The information on lodging houses is divided between D.CRO Durham MB. deposit and DDPD. SR. D.City so is unlikely to be complete.
14. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 45 6th Sept. 1853. Report on Nuisances by William Robson, Superintendant of Police.
15. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 47.8 'List of Registered Common Lodging Houses Borough of Durham' 4th November 1857.
16. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 164 4th Oct. 1882.
17. 1857 total 360 lodgers allowed, 1882 total 212 lodgers allowed. In 1853 the report suggested that trampers were fewer in number (see Samuel 1973 and Hobsbawm 1964 : 34-63 on trampers) and that lodgers in the Common lodging Houses in the town tended to be regulars. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 45 6th Sept. 1853.
18. Middle range is not shown. By using percentages some changes between 1851 and 1871 are the outcome of absolute changes in the numbers of professionally and casually employed heads of household.
19. Armstrong (1972).
20. See Chapter 4 footnote 13a.
21. The census enumerators' books distinguished visitors, lodgers and boarders.
22. The term 'lodger' appears to denote a person of more permanent residence. Some people enumerated as lodgers in 1851 were permanent enough to be listed in Walker's Directory at that address. For example Mr. Hargreaves in Neville Street, a solicitor.
23. Wood HM. ed. Durham Protestations. SS.135 1922 pp.118-130.

	<u>North Bailey</u>	<u>South Bailey</u>	<u>St. Giles</u>	<u>St. Margaret</u>	<u>St. Nicholas</u>	<u>Elvet</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Total names</u>	75	19	132	317	333	181	1057
knight						1	1
Esq.	2		1				3
Gent.	18						18
Mr.		5	6	12	29	8	60
yeoman	13						13

	<u>North</u> <u>Bailey</u>	<u>South</u> <u>Bailey</u>	<u>St.</u> <u>Giles</u>	<u>St.</u> <u>Margaret</u>	<u>St.</u> <u>Nicholas</u>	<u>Elvet</u>	<u>Total</u>
profession	3						3
trade	23				11		34
labourer	3						3
servant	5						5
name only	7	14	125	305	293	172	916

The high proportion resident on the Peninsula was still evident in the nineteenth century when it is illustrated by the lists of "gentry" in Walker's Directory. (Table 8.2).

24. D.CRO. MB/Du 169.

25. VCH.ii : 50 quoting The Gentleman's Magazine lxix : 1079. The Bishop appealed for a soup kitchen on account of this and a poor harvest.

26. Rent is a very difficult attribute to discover. In this analysis assessed annual rateable value was taken as a surrogate but evidence suggests that the Poor Rate valuation, on which assessed value for the General District Rate was based, would have been a better surrogate.
In the 1870 General District Ratebook, DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 142, no. 986, owned by the executors of Richard Thompson was listed as having a Poor Rate valuation of £28 and an assessed value of £23.5.0d. The same property was described in evidence of a court case, Thompson v. Ward, Court of Common Pleas vol. vi 1870-1, Easter Term 1871, 34 Victoriae p.327-9. It was a house of nine rooms in six tenements.

<u>Occupier</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Rent p.a.</u>
W. Peacock	2 rooms	£5.10.0d.
Mrs. Elliott	2 rooms	£5.0.0d.
W. Robson	2 rooms	£5.0.0d.
G.Herbert	1 room	£4.10.0d.
T. Smith	1 room	£4.10.0d.
Mrs. Bowlby	1 room	£4.0.0d.
	Total	£28.10.0d.

The assessed value was rather low in comparison. This is confirmed by a second brief piece of information about Moody's Buildings, Gilesgate, in c. 1850 when the residents petitioned for a lamp in the yard. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 50/ 343.

14 residents stated their rent and their rate assessment

<u>Rent</u>	<u>Rate Assessment</u>	<u>Occupiers</u>
£9.0.0d.	£7.10.0d.	1
£5.10.0d.	£4.10.0d.	2
£4.10.0d.	£3.10.0d.	10
£2.10.0d.	£2.0.0d.	1

In addition it must be noted that in the mid-nineteenth century it was claimed that low rent houses were rated rather high. D. Adv. Fri. Nov. 24 1848 no. 1786 p.8 col. 5.

27. D.Adv. Fri. Sept. 1 1848 no. 1774 p.5 col. 2. See also Chapter 7 footnote 143.
28. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 50/323. Letter from John Bramwell to William Marshall 31st Aug. 1869.
29. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 7 p.171 23rd March 1853.
30. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/1/1, 1/1/2, 1/3, 1/4.
31. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 53 1/1/2 p.10.
32. Back streets :- Back Lane, Church Lane, Court Lane, Grape Lane, Paradise Lane and Water Lane.
33. DDPD. SR. D.City Box 45 6th Sept. 1853. Water Lane, in 1853, was said to contain 14 Irish households whereas the 1851 census had totalled only five households in all.
Comparing the 1853 report to 1851 household totals; Crossgate, New Elvet, Church Street and Gilesgate had less than 5% of their households being of Irish origin, St. Nicholas' parish had between 5 and 9%, Hallgarth Street and Court Lane between 10 and 19% and Framwellgate and Water Lane over 20%.
34. D.CRO. M3/17 and 18 (PRO. HO. 107/239)
Families in 1871 which had children, show, from the birthplaces of the children, the date after which they moved from Ireland and the date before which they arrived in Durham MB. Only a small proportion of the Irish can be so enumerated since then, as now, they included a large proportion of single adults.

	1821 -30	1831 -40	1841 -50	1851 -60	1861 -70
Date after which moved from Ireland (a)	2	1	5	5	7
Date before which arrived in Durham MB.	-	1	3	39	39
Date after which arived in Durham MB.(b)	-	-	-	3	9

(a) Children born in Ireland

(b) Children born elsewhere in Britain

This indicates that the Irish were migrants of the Famine period and after.

35. Doyle has noted how the congregation of St. Cuthbert's grew in the mid nineteenth century (1977 : 4).
36. Hughes E. ed. The Diaries of James Losh vol. 1, 1811-1823, SS. 171 1956. Durham 1962.
37. D.CRO. M 18/27,28,29 and 30 (PRO. RG. 10 4962 to 4968)
38. as footnote 37.
39. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 142. This gives no addresses but fixed points could be ascertained from 8 public houses and scattered workshops.
40. Durham xxvii. 1 1856, 1896
Durham xxvii. 1.8 1860-1 DDPD. SR. search room.
It was impossible to match these to modern properties as the street has been completely demolished. No records of the demolished properties were kept (City Engineer's Dept., Personal communication).
41. DDPD. SR. D.City vols. 137, 142.
42. See Chapter 7 footnotes 143 and 144.
43. See Chapter 7 sec. 3 and Figs. 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.
44. The range was scored by the extreme socio-economic classes present as heads of household.

<u>Score</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Minimum</u>
0	I	I	2	I	III
	II	III		II	IV
	III	III		III	V
	IV	IV		I	IV
	V	V		II	V
1	I	II	4	I	V
	II	III			
	III	IV			
	IV	V			

This reduces the accuracy of estimating rateable value of dwellings when more than one household in the census were sharing a rateable unit listed in the ratebooks. A simple division of the rateable value by the number of occupying households was used rather than weighting the division in any way.

45. D.CRO.M 3/35 (PRO. HO. 107 2402)

46. Enumeration Districts G.G. 1 to 18a inclusive and 23.

47. A resident servant was counted as a servant if

- 1) the household head was female, or had a resident wife.
- 2) the servant was described as a lady's maid and the household contained a female resident.
- 3) the servant was more than ten years older than the head of household in cases not covered by case (1)

48. HC.PP. xxvi : 22, 417 (Poor Law Commission 1st and 2nd reports) Flinn (1965:94) Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain. 1842 (HC. PP. 1842 xxvi)

49. DDPD. SR. D.City vol. 137 no. 934 to 939 and 941 to 946.

50. SSPD. SR. D. City vol. 142 no. 457 to 462 and 464 to 469.

51. Birthplaces again show this. See Chapter Ten below.

CHAPTER TEN

PROCESSES OF CHANGE

1. Points for discussion

In the previous nine chapters the nature of Durham, a small nineteenth century town, has been investigated by means of analysing specific themes. These have been its population growth, its economy, building and townscape, its administration, its society and the social characteristics of districts, streets and houses within the town. In this chapter these separate themes will be drawn together in a series of discussions, both by presenting conclusions already stated in the earlier chapters and by adding some further analysis. The discussion will centre around a theme; how the case study of Durham relates to existing models of nineteenth century towns. Conclusions based upon this discussion, together with further implications of the study will then be presented in Chapter Eleven.

Study after study of nineteenth century towns has suggested that those towns possessed social areas. Their rich and their poor tended to be resident in different areas and these areas, it has been argued, were so disposed within a town that typical intra-urban patterns, can be identified. Identification of these areas has been based, in virtually every study, upon enumeration districts and has involved the description of their residents in terms of their socio-economic class, their age, their place of birth, the proportion of women working and, using sources other than the censuses, their educational attainment.

Robson has argued that the identification of social areas may only be applicable in large, rapidly growing

nineteenth century towns (1969 :90) since it was this type of town, in a North American context, that was utilised in the original work on social areas. Other writers have been less circumscribed. Indeed in some urban case studies the nature of social areas has been utilised as a criterion by which to identify its industrial or pre-industrial character. But such studies have not examined in detail how smaller and slower growing nineteenth century towns related to the larger and more rapidly growing towns. This question will now be discussed in the context of the case study of Durham.

Durham was one town which cannot be described in terms of social areas even as late as the 1870's. This has been commented upon in Chapter Nine. In most enumeration districts, and indeed in most streets and even within shared houses there was a great social range; and this must be explained. On the other hand there was also some social homogeneity in two enumeration districts, Gilesgate Moor and the Peninsula, and in new streets built during the nineteenth century; both on greenfield sites and on kernel sites. This homogeneity must also be explained.

Durham is only a single town, a case study, but it raises questions which have wider applicability. These are, firstly, whether the general social heterogeneity at various area scales implies a lack of social and economic change during the nineteenth century. Secondly, is the limited social homogeneity of certain areas together with the social heterogeneity of most areas the outcome of slow economic and social change that is still only incipient by the mid-nineteenth century? Thirdly, can small towns be expected to

contain social areas or is there a scale factor involved? Or, fourthly, should quite different explanations be sought? These four questions will now be discussed.

2. The role of social and economic change

Studies of industrial towns have, like Wirth (1957) inferred the processes through which social areas have arisen. Social and economic change have been noted as approximately synchronous with the development of social areas and an inferential link has been made between the two. But in the case of Durham it may be argued that the town was already an industrial town by the mid-nineteenth century. In Chapter Three it has been described how the workforce was industrial, how the largest employment groups were in textiles, metals and mining and how large employment units, large even on a national scale, co-existed alongside domestic-scale industry. Although by the early twentieth century there was a move away from employment in manufacturing industry and towards employment in services this followed an increase in manufacturing employment during the nineteenth century. In terms of employment structure, size of firms and the management of firms, Durham was a nineteenth century town, albeit a small industrial town.

So too, in terms of society, Durham cannot be described as pre-industrial. Chapter Eight has argued that society was class based not rank based and that although it was relatively traditional, compared with a town such as Oldham, its society and social relations were not static.

The general lack of social areas in the town cannot,

therefore, be explained as the outcome of its social and economic nature. It remains to be discussed, however, whether social and economic change preceded the development of social areas and whether the few social homogeneous districts and new streets show the very beginnings of new residential patterns.

3. The development of social areas

Chapter Nine has already illustrated the social heterogeneity to be found in virtually all enumeration districts in both 1851 and 1871 (Tables 9.1, 9.2), in the older streets (Appendix 9.7i), and even within houses (Table 9.15) but the same chapter illustrated how the new district of Gilesgate Moor, 4.5c, on the Eastern outskirts of the town, was more homogeneous in terms of the socio-economic class of its heads of households (Tables 9.1, 9.2) and how the new streets in both the kernel and on the outskirts of the town were socially more homogeneous (Appendix 9.7ii). An analogy may be drawn with Manchester in the late eighteenth century in order to ask a question. At Manchester Rodgers suggested that social areas were beginning to emerge and that before areas emerged a first stage was the creation of homogeneous streets (1962 : 5).

The question to be asked is namely whether Durham in the mid-nineteenth century exhibited a stage in socio-spatial relations that had been reached in earlier decades by the larger towns? Did Durham exhibit both the remnants of older urban forms and the beginnings of new social areas? If this was indeed the case, the processes which have been identified in other towns as leading to the development of

social areas should be identifiable in Durham in the mid-nineteenth century.

Apart from the role of social and economic change, a theme already discussed, transport and the possibility of longer journeys-to-work have been identified by Boal as one such factor leading to the development of an industrial town (1968). Another factor identified has been the buying power of the various social classes and sorting processes as the rich move into newer houses. This is closely linked to the ideas of Alonso (1960) that land use is the outcome of the various land users outbidding each other according to the locational utility of any site, its accessibility and linked value. Thirdly, other sorting processes have been identified by which established households may be expected to move into newer properties and new-comers to move into older properties which are being vacated. These ideas have been reviewed by Ward (1975 : 139).

Durham is a suitable town in which to attempt to identify processes which may be summarised succinctly as 'filtering'. Although it was a small town it had a full socio-economic range and it had both inflow and outflow of population. Lawton has illustrated the strength of migration in the country as a whole (1968) but such movements did not only involve industrial areas and new or rapidly growing towns but also involved rural areas, as Darby has illustrated for Cambridgeshire (1943), and involved smaller and long-established towns. Armstrong has illustrated this for York (1974 : 88) and Constable for Salisbury. In the latter case, on the evidence of a 10% sample, over half the heads

of households in 1851, 1861 and 1871 appeared to have been born outside the town (1977 : 35).

Similarly in Durham, in 1851, at least 60% of the heads of households had been born outside the town (Appendix 10.1) and the birthplaces of the population in 1851 and 1871 (Figs. 7, 8 and 9) and the comparison of the total population at each census with the demographic events in the intervening years (Appendix 2.7) indicate the great scale of in-flow and out-flow which was taking place. Chapter Eight has already discussed the role of persons born in Durham and persons born outside Durham in local government. Now the question will be extended beyond local government in order to investigate where households were living.

Firstly, the question of socio-economic class, newcomers and households with heads born in the town of Durham and travel-to-work will be discussed in relation to the socially more homogeneous district of Gilesgate Moor. Then, the socio-economic class and origins of households will be discussed in relation to the more homogeneous streets. Finally, in this section, features will be discussed in order to see whether Durham exhibited any aspects of a pre-industrial town. Amongst these features the nature of the Peninsula, the high status area in the centre of the town, already mentioned in Chapters Eight and Nine, will be discussed.

a. The emergence of homogeneous districts

Gilesgate Moor, enumeration district 4.5c in 1851 and N.12 in 1871, was socially more homogeneous than most

other enumeration districts in the town since the classes of its heads of households tended to avoid the extremes of Classes I and V (Tables 9.1, 9.3). Its work-force was primarily engaged in coalmining and compared to other enumeration districts in the town it had few working wives (Appendix 9.5).

It may be argued, therefore, that it was fortuitous that this relatively socially homogeneous area should have formed a new suburb of the town. Rather it should be described as a sprawling new pit settlement (Fig. 45), or series of settlements, that happened to be built in close proximity to the town. It does not illustrate outflow from the town of higher socio-economic classes to new houses and neither does it illustrate the outflow of Durham City born heads of households. Instead it has many analogies to other pit villages in the country such as Hetton-le-Hole which has been scrutinised by Sill (1974).

Appendix 9.1 illustrates how in both 1851 and 1871 Gilesgate Moor was dominated by heads of households in Class III, not by Classes I and II. Also Appendix 10.1 illustrates how the heads of household in the district had not been born in Durham City. Both in 1851 and 1871 the proportion of heads born in the town was low compared with other enumeration districts in Durham. In 1851 the highest proportion of heads of households born in the town was Crossgate South row and South Street, 3.9b, with 45.05% born in the town. Gilesgate Moor, in comparison, had 18.35%, then 45.87% from the rest of Co. Durham, 22.32% from the remainder of the North of England, namely the

counties of Yorkshire, Westmorland, Northumberland and Cumberland and only 6.12% from the rest of England and Wales. It was drawing less on the town and more on the whole of the North of England than the rest of the borough of Durham. This could be expected for a mining settlement.

A final, and minor, point in relation to Gilesgate Moor is that its homogeneity as a suburb had nothing whatever to do with transport. The town never had any trams and though it had a bus to Gilesgate Station ⁽¹⁾ and carriers through Gilesgate Moor (Fig. 14) the journey-to-work patterns of the working population were not focussed on the town. Instead the working population was journeying even further outwards each day to pits on the former moorlands surrounding the town. There was, indeed, some lengthening of journey-to-work distances for coalminers over the second half of the nineteenth century but, as has been discussed in Chapter Three, this was not through suburban dwellers journeying into town but through coalminers being forced to reside in the town through a lack of accommodation near the pits on the former moorlands.

b. The emergence of homogeneous streets

When the socio-economic classes of heads of households in the streets built during the nineteenth century are examined it is clear that the new streets were occupied by Classes II and III for the most part (Appendix 9.7). These new streets were composed of terraced houses and not villas and they were never occupied by the wealthiest sections of the town's population. As in other towns there was not simple filtering of dwellings down the social scale

but, instead, the lower middle and upper working classes were side-stepping into new property. This was a new feature for the nineteenth century and Durham showed this feature just as clearly as larger towns. Hence the proportion of artisan households was not any higher in streets built in the early nineteenth century than in streets built in the middle decades of that century (Table 10.1).

Table 10.1 Artisan heads of households in 1871 and the age of streets built between 1800 and 1870, Durham MB.

<u>Date of Building</u> (2)	<u>Total households</u>	<u>% households artisan</u>	<u>% households artisans</u> Type II (a)
1800 - 30	66	54.55	37.88
1830 - 40	82	32.93	24.39
1840 - 50	130	50.77	43.85
1850 - 60	8	62.50	62.50
1860 - 70	339	27.14	24.48
Total	625	36.16	30.40

a) See Appendix 9.3

Sources : D.CRO. M 18/27 to 30 (PRO. RG. 10 4962 to 4968), Walker's Directory and Almanack, annual.

The side-stepping of Classes II and III into new houses cannot be demonstrated in detail since the first occupiers of each house are not known. Walker's Directory was annual and although it could be expected to indicate most first occupiers there is no certainty that it did do so. Indeed it did not list every household but was biased against some occupational groups (Appendix 4.1). But since, over the town as a whole, socio-economic class of the head of household did appear to relate to rateable value, and thereby to rent, as has been demonstrated in Chapter Nine,

and since the rateable value of dwellings in the new streets tended to be in the middle ranges of rateable value, as a comparison of details given on page 468, below, and Figures 47 and 51 indicate, it could be expected that these new houses would be occupied neither by the very rich nor by the very poor.

The professional heads of households were found on certain new streets, such as Western Hill, by 1871 (Fig. 53) but their distribution, as a whole, in both 1851 and 1871 was of concentration in Old Elvet and on the Peninsula and of small groups in the other old streets. Many of the houses occupied by professional men in 1851 were still occupied by professional men in 1871 (Fig. 53). By 1871, however, they were more strongly represented on the new streets for 20.2% were, by then, resident on such streets compared with 13.7% of all household heads. In 1851 the proportion had been 8.5% compared with 9.6% of all household heads.

The professional workforce was large in relation to the total workforce, as has been illustrated in Table 3.6, and, as has been discussed in Chapter Eight, it was tending to become Class II rather than Class I. It was Class II rather than Class I which was moving into houses in the new streets; Class I remained in the old streets to a large extent.

As an interim conclusion, therefore, the professional and artisan households may show signs of filtering. There may be the first signs of sorting that has been seen in earlier decades in larger towns. But it was not a simple

process for Class I was not involved and therefore it could not just be a question of buying power but also of house provision. If, indeed, Durham does show an early stage of social sorting this should be verified by an analysis of where Durham born households were living and where newcomers were living.

If house filtering was occurring and if new houses were being added to the housing stock, as indeed was the case in Durham as Chapter Four has indicated, it could be expected that the new streets built during the nineteenth century would tend to fall in status as they grew older. That, as households came and went, there would be a trend in a street towards lower class households. This was indeed the case in certain new streets by 1871 but it was not the case in all new streets.

Leazes Lane and Station Lane in Gilesgate fell in the class of their heads of households as the dwellings became older (Appendix 9.7). Broken Walls, however, (Fig. 20), increased in range so it kept its higher class households but gained lower classes. This could be interpreted as the first stage in a downward trend. Ellis Leazes and Oswald Court contracted in social range so again there was a trend towards lower classes (Appendix 9.7). But other streets form a contrast since they sustained the same socio-economic range over the period 1851 to 1971. Neville Street, the Sands and Magdalene Place were three such streets. Leazes Place, Sidegate, Chapel Passage, King Street and Moatside Lane actually rose in class and lower class household heads actually appear to have been

replaced by higher class ones. They do not, therefore, appear to fit the model of house filtering.

Instead it must be noted that these new houses were single family dwellings, in contrast to the older tenement housing. Classes II and III dominated the households resident in the new streets but, at the same time, over the town as a whole their absolute numbers were rising as Table 8.1 has indicated. The stability or rise in status of some of the new nineteenth century streets as they grew older may, therefore, mark a fine balance between the number of dwellings within a certain range of rateable values in the town and an increase in the number of potential occupiers of Classes II and III. Again, this interim conclusion points towards the important role of housing provision since Classes II and III were not exclusively the occupiers of housing in all new streets (Appendix 9.7) but in certain new streets they replaced lower class households some time after the streets were built.

If the birthplaces of heads of households in the new streets (3) are assessed it appears that in both 1851 and 1871 they were drawn from the Registrar General's Northern region, the North Midlands, the North West and Yorkshire (Tables 10.2, 10.3). They reflected the composition of the heads of household in the town as a whole (Figs.7,8, Appendix 10.1).

In 1851 those heads of households who had been born in the town formed 20.23% of household heads in the new streets. This proportion was slightly low since they formed 28.30% of household heads on the old streets. This

Table 10.2 Origins of heads of households in old and new streets, (4) Durham MB., 1851, arranged by Registrar-General's regions

<u>Region</u>	<u>Old Streets</u>	<u>New Streets</u>
London	0.79%	0.00%
S. East	0.91	0.38
S. Midlands	0.95	0.00
East	0.60	0.00
S. West	0.32	0.00
W. Midlands	1.19	1.15
N. Midlands	0.87	2.29
N. West	1.23	1.53
Yorkshire	8.28	9.54
Northern	73.28	79.01
Wales	0.08	0.76
Scotland	3.45	0.76
Ireland	6.66	3.05
Other	1.37	1.15

Source : D. CRO.M3/17 and 18 (PRO. HO.107/239)

weighting contrasted that shown in the same census by heads of households born in Co. Durham who formed 69.47% of heads on the new streets and 66.23% of heads on the old streets. Heads of households born in the town were still a slightly low proportion of all heads in the new streets in 1871. In that census they formed 20.04% of heads in the new streets compared with 25.58% of heads in the old streets.

If house filtering had been occurring by 1851 or by 1871 it would have been expected that those born in the town would have been more strongly represented on the new streets than, in fact, they were. Not only was there no balance in their favour but the balance was

Table 10.3 Origins of heads of households in old and new streets, (5) Durham MB., 1871, arranged in Registrar-General's regions

<u>Region</u>	<u>Old Streets</u>	<u>New Streets</u>
London	0.69%	0.65%
S. East	0.94	0.22
S. Midlands	1.32	1.53
East	1.14	1.09
S. West	0.56	1.31
W. Midlands	2.29	1.96
N. Midlands	1.14	0.87
N. West	1.21	1.53
Yorkshire	9.67	9.59
Northern	68.60	69.06
Wales	0.28	0.22
Scotland	3.29	4.14
Ireland	7.83	6.32
Other	1.04	1.52

Source : D.CRO.M18/27 to 30 (PRO. RG. 10 4962 to 4968)

adverse to them in both 1851 and 1871. The distribution of heads of households born in the town over the socio-economic classes should have reinforced the expected movement of locally born into the new streets in both 1851 and 1871. In the former year 40.03% of all household heads had been born in the town and 40.04% of heads in Class II had been locally born and 51.73% of heads in Class III. They were under-represented in Classes I and IV where the proportions were 34.87% and 35.65% and over-represented in Class V where they formed 52.63% of heads. Since Classes III and II dominated the households in the new streets and since the locally born heads were either in proportion to all households of over-represented in these two classes it is interesting to note

that the locally born heads were, as a whole, under-represented on the new streets.

A similar pattern emerged in 1871. In that year 37.11% of all household heads had been born in 'Durham City' or 'Durham' and although these locally born were slightly under-represented in Class II, where they formed 36.6% of heads, they were over-represented in the larger Class III where they formed 46.4% of heads. Again the two aspects; birthplace and socio-economic class could have been expected to reinforce each other but this did not, in fact, happen.

By 1871 the locally born heads of households, in other words those born in Durham City or 'Durham' were over-represented in Class I, where they formed 42.11% of heads and were under-represented in Class V where they formed 20.80%, a very low proportion. This was in contrast to 1851 where they had been under-represented in Class I and over-represented in Class V. As a general interpretation it may be suggested that, as Chapter Two has indicated, the early part of the century saw rapid growth of the town's population and in-migration which is shown by the birthplaces of the population in 1851 (Fig. 9). But though in-migration continued this was synchronous with strong out-migration in the second half of the century (Appendix 2.7). By analogy with the building trade where, as Chapter Four has discussed, the long established firms tended to persist more successfully than the firms initiated in the second half of the century, it may be suggested that this effect was more general, that there was a second-generation effect where sons of families

already resident in the town had an advantage over many, but not all, new-comers. As Chapter Eight has argued, this was not firm division into locally born and new-comers in the case of men involved in local government but it may be suggested as a trend in terms of social classes.

It is surprising, therefore, that the locally born heads are not more strongly represented in the new streets. Indeed the only group to conform to the expected model of new-comers residing in older dwellings and established households in better dwellings were the Irish born who were clustered into the side streets of the town's kernel, as has been described in Chapter Nine.

There remains, however, the necessity to point out certain problems associated with the use of birthplace data. Birthplaces can unite an occupational group, as in the case of the paper workers who had been locally born (Fig. 11) or the migrant carpet weavers (Fig. 10), or it can cut across the social classes, as has been illustrated for those born in Durham City. In addition, even if the censuses do record accurately the place where each person has been born, there remains the problem that length of sojourn in the town cannot be deduced from the birthplace. Neither can the length of sojourn be calculated with any accuracy from the birthplaces of children since the censuses make no indication of children who are deceased or who are non-resident. The birthplaces of children may also understate the actual series of places of residence for any household. Bearing these problems in mind, the question of why Durham born heads of household were not moving out to new streets as much as would have been

expected from their class composition will now be discussed.

As dwellings were added to the housing stock over the period 1850 to 1870 the proportion of rateable units which appear to have been owner occupied remained steady (Table 8.3). The majority of dwellings in the town were rented but between 17 and 18% were owner occupied. Between 1850 and 1870 the absolute number of owner occupied dwellings rose by 15.05% but the outcome was that there was more owner occupation in the old streets than in the new streets of the kernel or the new streets on greenfield sites. In 1850 to 1851 only 5.86% of households in new streets appear to have been owner occupiers and in 1870 to 1871 only 8.68%. Tenure may, therefore, cast some illumination on the processes underlying the residential location of households.

10.57% of heads of households born in the borough of Durham appear to have been owner occupiers in 1850 to 1851 compared to 12.55% of all households in the town. This low proportion was repeated in 1870 to 1871 when 10.70% of Durham born heads of households appear to have been owner occupiers compared with 12.67% of all households in the town. But when the new streets in 1850 to 1851 are examined 9.19% of the Durham born heads of households appear to have been owner-occupiers compared with 4.31% of heads of households born outside the town. In 1870 to 1871 there was again a high proportion. 12.40% of Durham born heads of households appear to have been owner occupiers compared with 7.48% of heads of households born outside the town.

This may appear an anomaly until it is recognized that, as Chapter Eight has already noted, owner occupation

varied from new street to new street (Appendix 4.8). Streets such as Pit Row or Providence Row were wholly tenanted in this period whereas Leazes Place was more strongly owner occupied. The general tendency was for new streets to be tenanted but in detail there was some variation. Some new streets had no Durham born heads of households, such as Alma Terrace in 1871. In contrast the Sands, an area built piecemeal before the Local Board of Health intervened (see Chapter Seven) had four of its nine dwellings in owner-occupation and all of its Durham born heads were owner-occupiers.

There was no perfect relationship between tenure and the birthplace of the head of household but tenure did add complexity to the patterns of where different types of households were living. It points to another interim conclusion; that not only was the difference between the old and the new streets important but also that the differences between new streets cannot be ignored.

C. The possible survival of pre-industrial features

If there was indeed a time lag effect so the town was slowly moving towards the development of social areas it could be expected that it would exhibit earlier socio-spatial features such as a high status centre and occupational districts. These facets will now be examined.

Vance has argued that occupational districts can be linked to domestic work and social districts can be linked to larger scale employment units or factory work (1966). He has also argued that occupational areas were a feature of

medieval and early modern cities (1967 : 97) but these hypotheses do not appear to be verified in the case of Durham. Figure 46 indicates the close clustering of most carpet weavers around the carpet factory on the Sands. In 1851 the clustering was predominately in Back lane, beside the factory, while in 1871, despite some spreading out over the town, there was still a strong cluster on the North side of Claypath, again adjacent to the factory. Ironically this clustering was amongst a factory based workforce. The trades which were still organized on a workshop or even domestic scale such as ropemaking, nailmaking or dressmaking showed no clustering either of their places of work or of their workforces.

The area of the town was so small that it could have been expected that the workforce for any place of work in the town could have lived anywhere in the built up area and walked to work. But, instead, there was the clustering of the carpet weavers, which has already been described, and, in addition the paper workers tended to be resident on the west side of the town and thereby nearer to the paper mills in the Browney valley to the West (Fig. 54). Many of the carpet weavers had been long distance migrants, as has been discussed in Chapter Three and their clustering may reflect introductions made between later migrants and the landlords or middlemen by earlier migrants or by carpet weavers born in the town. This must remain conjecture since it is not documented. But in the case of the paper workers the group tended both to have been locally born (Fig. 11), and not to be heads of households but wives or children. The mills were

drawing on the population which was already living in those parts of the town which were closer to the mills.

Occupational clusters existed but bore no resemblance to occupational areas expected in pre-industrial towns. Indeed there is little evidence to suggest that Durham ever had trade areas. Certain street names suggest trades; Sadler Street, the part of modern Sadler Street once called Fleshergate (Appendix 5.2), a former vennel by Elvet Bridge called Souther Peth and part of Back Lane once called Walkergate may recall leather workers, butchers, shoemakers and fullers but there is no evidence from the early modern period to suggest clusters of such tradesmen in these streets. Indeed, since the trade guilds of the town, by the sixteenth century, were amalgamations of trades (Appendix 3.5) it could be argued that each distinct trade was too small to form its own guild and to sustain a distinct occupational area. Whether such areas existed in the medieval period has not been investigated. It is instead argued that since they did not exist in the early modern period they are irrelevant to the discussion of the nineteenth century town.

The Peninsula was central to the town (Fig. 20), it was socially homogeneous and it was high status, as has been described in Chapter Nine. It could be explained as a relic from a pre-industrial distribution of social ranks in the town and it could be inferred that the change from gentry resident in season to university use of the houses was an example of house filtering. But these explanations must be examined more closely. Firstly, how did the area evolve and persist and, secondly, was there migration to the suburbs;

a change from a high status centre within the town to a high status periphery?

Two influences appear to have underlain the evolution of this high status area. One is tenuous but the other may not only explain why the area evolved but also why it persisted as high status.

In Chapter Five it has been discussed when the street plan and plot plan of the town emerged. It has been illustrated that the early occupation of the Peninsula cannot be proved or disproved to have been Norman, later Saxon or earlier. But it has also been mentioned that the property on the Peninsula was held for 'castle-ward'. There are traces of it having been a stronghold in the late Saxon period when the congregation of St. Cuthbert arrived and although the plots in the area may not date from this period the involvement of the nobles of the region in defending the mound may. The Earls of Northumbria were involved with the early community of St. Cuthbert (Gee 1928:9) and later the houses included town-houses of the Earl of Westmorland (Gee 1928 :23) and the Bulmers (Gibby 1958), among other barons of bishopric. There may be parallels with the Southern English burhs described by Loyn (1962) and Finberg (1974) in terms of a relationship between stronghold, nobles and region, if not in terms of layout.

If this was the case it may be argued that the Peninsula was not high status because it was centrally placed in the town, though in fact it was adjacent to the market place (Fig. 20), but instead it was high status for ancient strategic reasons. The form, therefore, fits the model of

the pre-industrial town, but the explanation does not.

A better documented explanation, which by no means contradicts the previous one, is that the Peninsula was one area where the Prior and Convent came to acquire properties. This property then passed to the Dean and Chapter (Fig. 28). As Chapter Five has discussed, the Dean and Chapter did not maximize their income from urban property, the houses were treated as freehold by their tenants but since they were actually church leasehold they were never subdivided and their curtilages remained open as gardens. They, therefore, contrasted much secular property which tended to be subdivided and infilled by the mid-nineteenth century.

The Peninsula must, therefore be interpreted as one high status area amongst several. Old Elvet was also high status in the nineteenth century as the concentration of professional heads of households indicates (Figs. 20, 53). This was again an area where the Dean and Chapter had owned much property up to the early nineteenth century (Figs. 27, 28). Old Elvet cannot be interpreted in terms of the model of a pre-industrial city since it was not central. It could be argued that it was central to the Borough of Elvet but this borough never appears to have had a strong urban identity, as has been discussed in Chapter Five. Rather explanation should be sought through the distribution of church property in the town.

This did not only involve former Dean and Chapter property, as was the case in Old Elvet and the Peninsula. A cluster of professional households in lower Gilesgate in 1851 and 1871 (Figs. 20, 53), already noted in Chapter Nine,

appears to relate to property of the parish church. As has been argued in Chapter Five, lower Gilesgate was probably a medieval addition to upper Gilesgate. The plots were guild property, and these passed to Gilesgate church, at the Reformation and then were dispersed through parochial mismanagement. Clusters on South Street (Fig. 53, Appendix 9.7) also appear to have related to church property as did the surprisingly high status Grape Lane (Appendix 9.7), which formed the back lane to Crossgate (Fig. 20). Grape Lane was higher status than the Framwellgate yard property in terms of its classes of heads of households, its lack of working wives and its households having resident servants, points illustrated in Chapter Nine. The Framwellgate yards tended to be occupied by casually employed heads of households (Table 9.11). The only clear difference between the Framwellgate yards and the back lane of Grape Lane was that the latter had been, in part, Dean and Chapter property (Fig. 28).

The majority of the households were tenants of their dwellings. This was the case for most dwellings in the new streets and in the old streets. (Appendix 4.8, Table 8.3). But the sale of the Dean and Chapter property in the early nineteenth century did allow for some owner occupation to be scattered through the town. Not all former church property was owner occupied but a proportion was so, again, there was an effect. Heterogeneous ownership in each street in the middle ages and the piecemeal acquisition of an urban estate by the Prior and Convent coupled with strict post-Reformation church leases appears to have had a long term influence on socio-spatial relations in the town.

To return to the question of change in the status of the Peninsula during the nineteenth century, the loss of the gentry and the use of the houses by the university; the trends may be specific to Durham. There was no demonstrable movement to the suburbs around the town. The Peninsula was losing Class I; the suburbs were tending to gain Classes II and III. A handful of villas were built on Elvet Moor in the first half of the nineteenth century but the residents were not drawn from the Peninsula but from other parts of the town and from elsewhere. Cail, as mentioned in Chapter Four, lived at Elvet Villa (Plate 15) but was from Newcastle. The Wilkinsons of Mount Oswald and Oswald House were from Old Elvet and the Rev. J.B. Dykes of Hollingside House was also from Elvet.

The season did wither, as has been described in Chapter Eight, and the gentry moved away from the town altogether. How far other small nineteenth century towns which had had a social season lost their gentry altogether rather than to their suburbs cannot be commented on. There may be a whole category of towns for which this was the case.

In conclusion to this discussion of whether Durham exhibited an early stage of the development of social areas it must be commented that there are some indications that social sorting was beginning. New streets were being occupied by Class II and Class III heads of households. But birthplace data indicates that the processes involved may be complex and that although there is a striking difference between the socially heterogeneous old streets and the more homogeneous new streets there was also variety between the new streets.

This suggests that the processes of building those different new streets must be scrutinised.

In addition, the town demonstrates that processes cannot be inferred from form. The socially homogeneous sububan district of Gilesgate Moor had its own distinct character and should be interpreted as separate from the rest of the town in terms of households and housing. Also the occupational groupings and high status central area could not be explained by the simple model of a pre-industrial town.

It remains now to comment on the size of Durham, the effects of it being a small town and then to investigate processes of building in relation to where different types of households were living.

4. Durham as a small nineteenth century town

Before dealing with additional factors which help to explain the complexity of Durham's socio-spatial structure in the nineteenth century the third question will be dealt with. Was Durham, as a small town, too small for classic social areas to emerge? Is a scale factor important? Two aspects will be discussed. Firstly, there is the question of social relations in a small town and, secondly, there is the question as to whether social areas have been identified in other small towns.

By analogy with other work, Durham, with 13,188 population in 1851 was too large for every household to know every other household (White 1951 : 9, Williams 1956, Wirth 1957). It has been noted that those in public life

knew each other to some extent (Chapter Eight) but they were a relatively small group. It has also been argued that the employees did not necessarily know their employers personally since there were large firms with managers and clerks (Chapter Three) and that the tenants did not necessarily know their landlords (Chapter Eight). It may be argued, again, that this was an urban community not a rural one and that it was only relatively small, not absolutely small, a point discussed in Chapter One.

Again, it may be argued by using work done in other towns that the social areas expected by Gaskell (1974) and Vance (1971) certainly do appear in large towns of the nineteenth century such as London (Bell & Bell 1969 : 59-60, Olsen 1964), Manchester (Rodgers 1962) and Sunderland (Robson 1969) but they also appear in certain small towns. St. Helens is one example (Jackson 1977). Yet social areas are not found in other small towns as Henstock found for Ashbourne, Derbyshire, in 1851 (1978). But the divide is not between large towns and small towns but between large towns and some small towns on the one hand and other small towns on the other hand. This must be explained.

5. The role of nineteenth century building

Four questions were raised in this chapter as possible explanations for patterns of where households were living in the borough of Durham. From Sections Two and Four it is clear that the patterns cannot be explained in terms of the type of society or local economy nor in terms of the size of the town. Section Three has asked whether

there was a trend towards the development of social areas. Some features have supported this idea; Classes II and III were tending to live in new streets. But other features have suggested that there was complexity that remains unexplained. There was a contrast between the old streets, on the one hand, and the new streets in both the kernel and on greenfield sites on the other hand, but there was also subtle variation between the new streets. These subtle differences will now be examined.

Bushee has argued that rateable value is an inexact index for social class on the basis of a study of Boulder, Colorado (1945 : 223). Chapter Nine has verified this proposition to some extent since, as Tables 9.19, 9.20, 9.21 and 9.23 have indicated, there was no clear dividing line in rateable value between the socio-economic classes. But Chapter Nine has illustrated that there was some relationship between class and rateable value and between rateable value and rent and the same chapter has indicated that if households within one class can be described more precisely their relationship to the rateable value of their dwelling becomes clearer. Ultimately all factors in the relationship cannot be taken into account. Wages are unknown, regularity of wages are unknown and factors such as health and household budgeting cannot be taken into account. But despite these shortcomings it may be argued that there was a logic as to where households were living since household heads of a certain class tended to be living in a dwelling within a certain range of rateable values.

This feature is extremely important since in the old streets of Durham there was a great range of rateable values and dwellings of very diverse rateable value were juxtaposed. This heterogeneity (Appendix 9.7), as has already been discussed, appears to stem from medieval heterogeneous ownership (Chapter Five). In contrast the new streets built during the nineteenth century tended to have more circumscribed ranges in rateable values.

In the 1919 ratebook, ⁽⁶⁾ in St. Nicholas parish, Providence Row and Finney Terrace were homogeneous in rateable value. These were both streets built during the nineteenth century (Figs. 20, 43). Other new streets showed some degree of homogeneity. Wanless Terrace fell into three subsections, each with its own level of rateable value and Leazes Place ranged from £16 to £24. In Elvet, of the eight new streets clearly indicated, Gladstone Villas (Plate 17a) had homogeneous rateable values while the other streets were in subsections but had small ranges of values. The dwellings in Anchorage Terrace ranged between £20 and £24, Highwood View between £12 and £19, Highwood Terrace between £12 and £14, Boyd Street between £9 and £15, Mavin Street between £8 and £10 and Green Lane had values of £12 and £10. Mountjoy was slightly more varied, its range was from £13 to £26.

Crossgate had eighteen new streets indicated by name. Back Sutton Street, Mitchell Street and Wardell's Terrace were homogeneous in their respective valuations. New Street, Allergate Terrace and Reform Place only showed internal ranges of £1. Atherton Street East had a range of £2, John Street of £4 and Lambton Street of £4. The rest had

larger ranges, the largest being Sutton Street with a range of £23 but these streets, in many cases, were distorted by one higher value property, usually a dwelling with a shop, on the street corner. If the highest value in each street is excluded from the calculations of range each street contracts to a range of £5 or less.

Similar degrees of homogeneity are found in the six new streets clearly listed under Framwellgate, the thirteen new streets listed under Gilesgate, the eight streets listed under Gilesgate Moor, the six streets of the Chapman and Forster estate (Fig. 39) and the Dean and Chapter's estate of Summerville. (7)

When these ranges are compared to the total rateable value range of each township (Fig. 51, Appendix 9.8) the marked reduction in range for the new streets can be appreciated. As has already been noted in this chapter, the new streets also showed smaller socio-economic ranges than the older streets (Appendix 9.7). Therefore, concluding on a question raised in Chapter One, it can be argued that indeed the balance between the dwelling stock in the kernel and the dwelling stock in the accretions mattered. This goes some way to explaining the variety between small nineteenth-century towns.

But this is not an all embracing conclusion since new streets were also built within the kernel during the nineteenth century. Peele's Buildings, Leazes Place, Neville Street, Chapel Passage and Mavin Street (Fig. 20) fall into this category as do the dwellings which were rebuilt and the separate or small groups of dwellings which

continued to be built in yards as in the case of Burdon's Yard or Post Office Buildings, mentioned in Chapter Seven. In addition Chapter Seven has already illustrated that although the Local Board of Health and its successors did not welcome the infill of gardens they drifted towards lax attitudes in certain decades. In addition rebuilding and remodelling is not only a key to understanding the nature of the older fabric in the town, as has been discussed in Chapter Five, it was also one type of building activity in the second half of the nineteenth century. This was not only the replacing of dwellings in the centre of town by buildings which were part commercial and part residential. It also involved the conversion of outbuildings to dwellings, a point noted in Chapter Seven, and the remodelling of dwellings.

So, it must be noted, nineteenth century building in Durham was not only in homogeneous streets, the new format of the century in this town, but was also in yards and on the sites of older buildings. This raises an interesting question for, if as Parker has commented, buildings can be expected to reflect the society which is building them (1970 : 3), why should both homogeneous streets and piecemeal building be built in the same decades? The emergence of homogeneous streets could be interpreted as the first stage in the development of social areas but the more piecemeal building does not fit this model.

Influences on building will now be discussed; firstly, land for building, the influence of estates since this has been seen to play a role in other towns, and, thirdly, building finance. This discussion will draw upon data

presented in Chapter Four.

In his study of Leeds Ward noted the influence of landownership and how there was a trend from the eighteenth century to the twentieth century from using gardens in the kernel to using closes and then whole fields or groups of fields (1960, 1962). Certainly in Durham the later nineteenth century saw the utilization of groups of fields as in the Cail estate (Fig. 41) and the Avenue (Fig. 39) whereas the early nineteenth century had seen, in the main, garden infill. But this gives too simple a picture for Durham. Unlike Leeds, Nottingham, Manchester or other large mid-nineteenth century towns Durham still did have gardens which were possible building sites (Fig. 1) and the later nineteenth century saw building not only on groups of fields but also on single fields, in closes and in gardens all in the same decades. There was no temporal scale from small building layouts to large but instead the early nineteenth century saw small building layouts and the later nineteenth century saw both small and large.

The role of estates in managing the development of building land as other towns spread outwards over former rural estates has already been discussed in Chapters Four and Nine. The case study of Durham can neither verify nor negate findings of Chalklin(1968), Sutcliffe (1972)and others on this topic since the town never grew enough for building to take place on the Londonderry, Salvin or Liddell estates to the East, South and North (Fig. 29). Instead it must be noted that this influence is absent and, since the town was and is generally freehold, there was little control

even from small landowners. In general, as has been discussed in Chapter Four, landowners tended not to be involved with building. So explanation for the homogeneity of new streets of the nineteenth century must be sought in other factors.

The final factor to be discussed is building finance. Chapter Four has already outlined how there was some trend towards larger building firms but how too the long established firms survived. At the same time it outlined how, like other towns, there were many building applicants who made relatively few applications. Many of these applications were never acted upon or were stored and acted upon after some time.

One interesting feature of the town was that building land was available, but the progress of building new streets was often slow. There was no rush to take up building opportunities except in certain years, such as 1876, when the whole of the North East was affected by a mass desire to build. Changes in society were, therefore, not leading to the development of homogeneous streets and separation of classes by street. Rather investment opportunities were taking up possible building sites and only at a later stage were relatively socially homogeneous streets created; after the houses were let.

Homogeneous streets of artisan housing were a new building form for the town in the nineteenth century. They were not the outcome of byelaw legislation. This, as has been discussed in Chapter Seven merely tidied up some early nineteenth century styles of building. But homogeneous streets were only one form of nineteenth century building

and must be seen in context.

Nineteenth century building of dwellings can be divided into six types in this town. There were homogeneous streets on greenfield sites such as Wanless Terrace, there were relatively homogeneous streets on greenfield sites, such as Highwood View, there were both homogeneous and relatively homogeneous streets on kernel sites such as Wardell's Terrace and Mavin Street, there was piecemeal building on kernel sites such as in Moatside Lane and there was rebuilding on kernel sites such as No. 50, South Street.

Chapter Four indicated quite clearly that although most applicants for buildings in the period 1849 to 1914 must be described as small applicants, amongst these were very small applicants making only one application. Such a group has not been identified in other studies but at Durham their activities were different to the remainder of applicants. They were undertaking piecemeal building and their applications were not synchronized with the building application booms which the town experienced. In addition Chapter Four has indicated that applicants for building sites in the kernel were a distinct group from those applying for greenfield sites.

This is important for piecemeal building in yards and rebuilding reinforced heterogeneity of rateable values in the kernel. At the same time single builders were engaged in building the homogeneous new streets in the kernel, though this could be over a period of years. Similarly, homogeneous streets on greenfield sites were developed and built by single applicants, as in the case of Wanless

Terrace or New Street, built by the Co-operative Society. The remainder of streets on greenfield sites were more homogeneous in rateable value than the older streets but were not perfectly homogeneous. Either they contained properties such as corner shops, which increased the range of rateable values, or they had histories of development which were relatively complex.

There was no clear division between persons who were developers, persons who were builders and persons who were building applicants, a point discussed in Chapter Four. Instead the combinations of people and roles in respect of building varied from site to site. Many streets, as Appendix 4.7, has indicated, had both their block plans altered and many building applicants. The block plan would frame the dimensions of each building on the estate but the details of each building remained open to subtle variation initiated by each applicant. These subtle variations, in turn, gave rise to subtle variation in rateable values.

There was in Durham, as has been discussed in Chapter Four, no trend towards larger building applicants over the second half of the nineteenth century. Instead there were two scales of activity. At one scale were larger applicants who tended to be more active in the years when, in the town and in the region, there were more building applications. Building boom years and larger applicants were concerned more with greenfield sites. At this scale there was a trend towards professional builders making a larger proportion of the building applications. In contrast there was also the scale of the small applicant who tended to be building in the kernel. They tended to own the new

building right through from the stage where an application was made to the stage where a certificate of completion was granted and therefore they contrasted some of the greenfield development where property changed hands between the stage of application and the stage of completion. In addition these smaller applicants tended to be building both in years when there was little building activity and years which can be described as boom years.

These scales of building activity are linked to the contrasts between the 'kernel' and the greenfield 'accretions'. Nineteenth century building activity was changing in scale but since this case study town illustrates that an old style and a new style could both exist in the later nineteenth century, and that these could lead to different types of development, it can again be argued that nineteenth century urban development should be appraised in terms of its type of building activity. Durham may be unusual in that it had two contrasting scales in the later nineteenth century or, instead, the larger towns may be interpreted as an extreme situation where the smallest scale activity was channelled into large scale developments.

1. The Gilesgate bus is portrayed in an illustration by Edward Bradley in his series under the pseudonym Cuthbert Bede and supposedly showing Oxford undergraduate life. "The Adventures of Mr. Verdant Green, an Oxford Freshman ... With numerous illustrations ... by the author". Nathaniel Cooke, London, 1853. These were reprinted in 'Punch'.
2. 1800-30 : Chapel Passage, Providence Row, Oswald Court, Oswald Yard, Sands, Union Place, Wanless Lane.
1830-40 : King Street, North Road, Reform Place.
1840-50 : Bridge Street, Burton Yard, Church Street Head Colpitts Terrace, Kepier Terrace, Magdalene Street, Moody's Buildings, Neville Street, Palmers Terrace, Robsons Buildings, Station Lane, Tenter Terrace. 1850-60 : Alma Terrace, Alma Villas.
1860-70 : Atherton Street, Castle Chare, Cross Street, Ellis Leazes, Flass Street, Lambton Street, Lindsleys Buildings, Maynard Row, Mowbray Street, Red Hills Villa and Cottage, Sherburn Road, Sidegate, Sunderland Road, Sutton Street, William Street and Young Street.
3. New streets : Bakehouse Lane, Chapel Passage, Freeman's Place, Gilesgate Moor, King Street, Leazes Place, Magdalene Place, Neville Street, North Road and Railway Lane.
4. As in footnote 3. Old streets : all the remaining streets within the borough.
5. New streets : Bakehouse Lane, Cail Estate, Chapel Passage, Ellis Leazes, Freeman's Place, Gilesgate Moor, King Street, Leazes Place, Magdalene Place, Magdalene Street, Neville Street, North Road, Oswald Court, Railway Lane and Western Hill.
Old streets : all the remaining streets within the borough.
6. DDPD. SR. Surveyor's Deposit. 1919 Ratebook.
7. DDPD. PK. D. & C.D. Bill of Quantities, July 1892, Building Ground, Margery Lane.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCLUSIONS

Nineteenth century Durham had socially heterogeneous streets together with a limited number of socially homogeneous streets. If it was to be argued that urban form reflects society and economy it could have been concluded that Durham, a small nineteenth century town, a market and cathedral town was indeed a relic from a pre-industrial past. It would be possible to infer from its urban form, the high status area in the centre, the Peninsula, and the small area covered by new suburbs that it was pre-industrial or, was in the first stages of becoming a typical nineteenth century town.

This argument, as this study has attempted to illustrate, would totally misrepresent the social and economic nature of the town even by the mid-nineteenth century. It would also misinterpret the processes by which households of certain social attributes came to be resident in certain locations in each street.

Instead certain conclusions must be presented. Firstly, it is not useful to interpret this particular nineteenth century town against the model of a rapidly growing nineteenth century town and to conclude that because it was not composed of social areas it was not nineteenth century in nature. Instead it must be concluded that this town was socially and economically industrial and that to make an appraisal of its nineteenth century employment structure retrospectively from a modern vantage is less than useful.

The seed of decline in manufacturing employment was already present in the mid-nineteenth century town; its

wealthy residents appear to have had investment interests elsewhere rather than in the town itself. In addition, since the town was small each industry was only represented by a small number of employers so the town was prone to changes in its industrial structure if even a few employers moved to premises elsewhere, as some did. But it was a small industrial town and its industrial nature at mid-nineteenth century raises questions as to the social and economic nature of hundreds of small nineteenth century towns. These questions cannot be answered by a case study of one town, Durham, but the case study does suggest that further analysis is required.

Secondly, it must be concluded that urban form may not give an accurate indication of processes leading to that form. Inferred processes drawn from the work of Wirth that social and economic change are synchronous with the development of social areas have been demonstrated as unsuitable. This is important since if Wirth's hypothesis is rejected studies of towns can no longer seek to identify the degree of industrialization from the stage of development of social areas.

Thirdly, analysis of the case study of Durham has suggested that there was some trend towards building homogeneous streets rather than piecemeal building on small plots. This in turn led to the creation of socially homogeneous streets. The development of land outside the kernel area and the balance between the proportion of housing stock in the kernel and the proportion on greenfield sites was important. But at other towns large estates often played a

role in controlling developing greenfield sites and it may be suggested that they are the key to socially homogeneous areas in large nineteenth century cities. Those large cities are interpreted here as one end of a spectrum which ranged from towns where their kernel had been infilled by the nineteenth century or during the early nineteenth century and where nineteenth century building progressed on former rural estates to towns, like Durham, where their kernel had not been infilled and where infill continued simultaneously with greenfield development.

Whether other towns were similar to Durham in that they had both new building in their kernels as streets, yard infill or rebuilding and new building on greenfield sites remains to be investigated. Durham, however, illustrates by its different types of building that it was building finance rather than the nature of its society that underlay what was built and therefore the location of dwellings of different rateable values. If the difference between applicants in the kernel and applicants for greenfield sites had not been isolated it could appear as a town which was slowly progressing towards social areas. But as there were different types of building applicant, and different types of building site available in Durham it can be interpreted as exhibiting a fuller range of building possibilities than larger towns. The larger towns may be interpreted as an extreme case where small building plots were no longer available and where the very smallest applicants had either been eliminated or were channelled into large estate developments.

Finally and fourthly, Durham had a landownership legacy which was of vital importance in understanding the patterns of where different classes of household were living in the kernel, and especially the upper classes. These patterns could not be explained in terms of access but could be explained in terms of the fossilizing role of church ownership. This has not been commented upon in other urban case studies but deserves further investigation.

The use of the whole population of Durham in 1851 and 1871 and all rated properties allowed different questions to be raised and different conclusions to be reached. A sample should represent the total population but a sample cannot allow different types of documentary source to be linked together. It is suggested that such use of whole data sets and the use of nominal linkage is of more than methodological interest and should be employed in other studies.

The questions which are raised tend to frame the answers which are achieved. Some factors are assessed as relevant and others are ignored but by ignoring a factor it is implicitly treated as a constant in any relationship between factors. This is critical for urban geography for Geography, like every other discipline, has its topics of study and its integrating concepts. It also has its factors which it does not discuss and thereby treats as constants. Amongst these have tended to be land ownership, legal controls and the mechanisms of building.

On the basis of this case study of Durham it may be suggested that such factors are important and can no longer be ignored. They formed influences in this particular

nineteenth century town which underlay the balances of continuity and change.

