Economic Life

Employment

The Westminster poll books contained the name, address and occupation of voters and thus offer a partial view of occupations in the parish, limited to the adult, male ratepayers who chose to cast their ballot. Despite the obvious limitations, this is the best occupational data available for the early period, gives some understanding of the geography of employment, and allows some comparison between the parish and the rest of Westminster. Here, the poll books from elections in 1749 and 1818 have been analysed.

1749				
	St George Hanover Square	per cent of total	Westminster	per cent of total
Agriculture	56	4	141	1
Building	176	12	884	9
Dealing	407	28	2975	32
Domestic Service	36	2	163	2
Industrial service	21	1	123	1
Manufacturing	270	19	3015	32
Public service/ Professional	61	4	388	4
Rentiers	387	27	1541	16
Transport	44	3	207	2
Total	1458		9437	

The migration of fashionable society into the new development in Mayfair has already been noted, with nearly a quarter of the House of Lords living on the Grosvenor estate by 1751. Titled residents were concentrated in the middle belt of the estate, particularly Grosvenor Square, Brook Street, Upper Brook Street, Grosvenor Street and Upper Grosvenor Street in the early years.[1] This pattern is reflected in the poll books, with a much higher percentage of voters classed as rentiers than the Westminster average. However, the rentier category is largely made up of gentlemen and esquires, with some knights and only 13 titled residents. As peers were not allowed to vote, they join female

[1] 'The Social Character of the Estate: Introduction', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 83-86. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp83-86 [accessed 25 February 2020].

heads of household as an important group in this area not represented in the poll books.[2] The categories of esquires and to a lesser extent gentlemen were undoubtedly wealthy, although encapsulating a broad range as measured by the rental value of their property.[3] Many esquires lived in the most exclusive areas, with 21 in Grosvenor Street alone, while the gentlemen were spread around Mayfair and beyond in the Five Fields, though none were to be found in the most exclusive address of Grosvenor Square.

Slightly more numerous than rentiers were those engaged in dealing. Of the 407, the largest numbers provided wines, spirits and hotels (168) or food (87). The former category is dominated by hostelries, with 145 victuallers and a further 9 innholders, scattered across the entire parish. Some of these made incursions onto the most fashionable streets of the Grosvenor estate, often taking corner sites.[4] But they were also found anywhere with the hope of passing custom, including shopping areas such as Bond Street (12 victuallers, 1 innholder), or places where travellers to and from the capital passed through, particularly Hyde Park Corner/Rd (11 victuallers, 5 innholders). Further hostelries could be found to the south, around Pimlico, the Five Fields and Chelsea. Of the 87 food dealers, the largest groups were butchers and grocers/greengrocers (both 21), and cheesemongers (12), but smaller numbers provided luxury goods including coffeemen, confectioners, pastry cooks, an orange seller and an oysterman. The foodsellers were also spread across the parish, though the largest number were to be found in Bond Street. The difference with a parish like St Clement Danes where the middling sorts predominated is marked.[5] There the food sellers easily outstripped the victuallers, presumably providing local residents, whilst the service economy of St George's provided for shoppers, travellers and richer locals. Another large group was the 45 chandlers.

The proportion of manufacturers in St George's was 13 per cent lower than in Westminster as a whole, although this remains a problematic category, as many small artisans also marketed their goods. An active policy was pursued on the Grosvenor estate to limit trades considered to be noxious. Building leases on the estate included a clause requiring the lessee to pay a premium on top of ground rent if any of a list of trades occupied the site, with brewers and tallow chandlers particular targets. In the principal streets the lists were longer, including the likes of butchers, and the premium payable three times more than the £10 per annum payable in lesser areas such as

[2] 'The Social Character of the Estate: Introduction', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 83-86. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp83-86 [accessed 25 February 2020].

[3] C.E. Harvey, E.M. Green and P.J. Corfield, 'Continuity, change, and specialisation within metropolitan London: the economy of Westminster, 1750–1820', Econ. Hist. Rev., 52, 2 (1999), 487.

[4] 'The Social Character of the Estate: Introduction', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 83-86. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp83-86 [accessed 25 February 2020].

[5] F. Boorman ed., *VCH Middlesex: St Clement Danes, 1660–1900* (2018), 29.

some agreements on Mount Street.[6] Some of the most numerous categories of manufacturer in the parish made dress (64) and dress sundries (31), the former mostly tailors and shoemakers, while the latter all made perukes (although one man preferred to call them wigs), no doubt for their fashionable near-neighbours. In a similar vein there were 32 furniture makers and 24 makers of coaches or related items, like wheelwrights, all of these surrounding the most fashionable streets, on, for example, Bond Street, Oxford Street Tyburn (Park) Lane, or Green, Mount and South Streets. Many also occupied mews including Brooks, Grosvenor or Reeves. There were 34 bakers and 25 men involved in drink preparation, i.e. brewers and distillers. Many of the brewers and distillers were based on less fashionable parts of the Grosvenor estate, such as Mount Street, Oxford Street and Park Street, or to the south of the estate on Hyde Park Corner or nearby to the east, for instance on Brick Street and Hamilton Street.

The proportion of voters engaged in building was three per cent higher than in Westminster as a whole, unsurprising considering the ongoing development of Mayfair. The most numerous categories of builder were carpenters (68), bricklayers (26) and masons (21), with lesser numbers of painters, plasterers, glaziers and joiners amongst others. Some builders occupied the houses they were working on and might therefore live on the most fashionable streets of the Grosvenor estate for long periods. But in general, they lived on similar streets to other tradesmen, with Mount Street again prominent, or in areas close to building sites, including Park Street and Duke Street on the Grosvenor estate, or near construction on Curzon land, for instance in White Horse Street.[7] Of those working in industrial service, 15 were labourers, probably in the building trade.

Agricultural employment was also three per cent higher than in Westminster. The largest category was the 29 gardeners, 26 of whom were based in the Five Fields or Neat Houses, which are explored further below. Seventeen farriers lived around the edges of the Grosvenor estate, no doubt tending to the horses of rich residents with coaches. The remaining number kept animals. A similar number of voters were professionals or engaged in public service, of whom 41 were medics, including surgeons, physicians, apothecaries and chemists. None categorised themselves as lawyers, although it is likely this is due to a preference for being designated a gentleman, seen as more respectable at the time.

The percentage of voters employed in transport was slightly higher than in Westminster, with 28 chairmen providing another service for the wealthy, as did the grooms and stable keepers. Similarly,

[6] 'The Development of the Estate 1720-1785: Building Agreements', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 13-16. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp13-16 [accessed 25 February 2020].

[7] 'The Social Character of the Estate: Introduction', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 83-86. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp83-86 [accessed 25 February 2020].

amongst the domestic servants, 19 were coachmen and 6 were cooks. Of course these were only the richest servants with their own households. Many more lived with their employers; Baron Conway (later Marquess of Hertford), had 22 servants living in his Grosvenor Street house in 1746.[8]

The London season and the coming and going of the upper classes created a seasonal economy that was a serious problem for those supplying goods or services to the nobility and gentry. In St George's the workhouse saw a rise in able-bodied inmates of 41 per cent between midsummer's day and Christmas Day in the early 1770s, far higher than the 15 per cent annual rise across 11 London parishes.[9]

1818				
	St George Hanover Square	per cent of total	Westminster	per cent of total
Agriculture	33	2	75	1
Building	189	9	821	8
Dealing	651	30	3482	35
Domestic Service	50	2	181	2
Industrial service	22	1	180	2
Manufacturing	486	22	3178	31
Public service/ Professional	170	8	739	7
Rentiers	558	25	1286	13
Transport	39	1	150	1
Total	2198		10092	

In 1818 the percentage of rentiers in the parish had fallen a little to 25, though not quite as large a drop as the 3 per cent in Westminster. The 299 gentlemen recorded in 1818 were still present around Mayfair but the growth in numbers is partly attributable to their colonisation of land in Belgravia, even though this was before the major development was laid out. There were 31 gentlemen on Belgrave Place, 14 on Eaton Street and 14 on Ebury Street. In fact 20 per cent of all voters lived on Hyde Park Corner or to the south and west in 1818, compared with 8.6 per cent in 1749, of whom 37.3 per cent lived in Hyde Park Corner itself, or on Knightsbridge. The few titled

[8] 'The Social Character of the Estate: Introduction', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 83-86. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp83-86 [accessed 25 February 2020].

[9] L.D. Schwarz, *London in the Age of Industrialisation: Entrepreneurs, Labour Force and Living Conditions, 1700–1850* (Cambridge, 1992), 111.

residents who voted remained in their traditional areas, for instance Lord Spencer in Arlington Street, Lord Howard in Grosvenor Street and Lord Walpole in Berkeley Square.

The percentage of dealers had risen to 30, still behind the Westminster total of 35 per cent. The increased total is mostly due to a huge rise in food dealers to 194, including 41 butchers and 57 grocers or greengrocers. Many of these were in areas that had been built up significantly since 1749, such as the 5 grocers and 8 butchers on Oxford Street. A fall in the numbers providing wines, spirits and hotels to 155 included a decreased 116 victuallers. A new group was the ten hotel keepers, with exclusive establishments in St James's Street, four in Brook Street and two in Grosvenor Street, explored further below. Many other categories of dealer increased, particularly sellers of consumer goods including 22 linen drapers, 25 hatters and 20 booksellers (10 of them in Bond Street), or newly emerging essentials, as with the 24 coal merchants. This diversification was part of a gradual trend across Westminster.[10]

Manufacturing saw an above average increase of three per cent. A huge increase to 172 makers of dress including 107 tailors, with many in the north east of the parish on streets such as Bond Street (8), Conduit Street (8), Molton Street (9) and Maddox Street (8). There were also 46 boot or shoe makers. There was a leap in numbers involved in making coaches to 63, including 27 saddlers. Furniture makers increased in number to 65, including 35 upholsterers. Manufacturers of new luxury goods brought greater diversity, including 11 watchmakers. Some occupations collapsed. Brewing and distilling accounted for only four men, the distillers far out at Millbank and Ranelagh Street. Changing fashions left only one peruke maker and one wig maker.

The percentage of builders fell to 9, as by 1818 the great wave of building in Mayfair had been completed and though sporadic building had begun in Belgravia, the estate based around Belgrave Square was yet to be commenced. There were 74 carpenters, a trade that could adapt to fitting or refitting completed houses. The number of bricklayers had fallen to 14. There were more builders who might be considered in professions rather than trades. The number of surveyors increased from two to seven, and they were joined by nine architects and a civil engineer. Of those in industrial service there were fewer labourers (12) and more accountants and clerks (10).

Numbers in agriculture fell to 2 per cent, with only 14 gardeners, 6 in the Neat Houses. The number of farriers had fallen to 10. The percentage of professionals had, in contrast, risen to 8, outstripping the Westminster average. The numbers engaged in medicine rose to 77, 37 of them surgeons. There were 22 men in the army, including 5 generals, and still only 10 men of the law, outstripped by the graphic arts (14).

[10] Harvey, Green and Corfield, 'The economy of Westminster, 1750–1820', 482.

Domestic service remained flat at 2 per cent, with a fall to only 8 coachmen, but 17 servants and 15 hairdressers with their own households. Of those in transport, 30 were keepers of stables or livery stables.

A survey of the working classes resident in the inner ward of the parish (Mayfair) in 1843 extends our understanding of employment and conditions beyond rate-paying householders. An agent visited 690 houses and 1,465 families, many in the mews, courts and yards, with Oxford Buildings singled out for example. These families lived in close proximity to the 'higher classes' and paid extremely high rents averaging 4*s*. 3*d*., over 2*s*. more than other Westminster parishes such as St Margaret's and St John's. Many families were unable to afford larger second or third floor rooms at these prices and were forced into cramped garrets. However there was an average of 2.3 persons to a bed, comparing favourably with 3 in St Margaret's and St John's. Much work was seasonal, relying on the presence of fashionable society, and some families pawned their furniture each winter when work was not available. Further confirming the seasonality of work, many journeyman tailors came to the area when the nobility and gentry were in town, leaving as soon as work dried up. Of heads of household, 34 per cent were coachmen, grooms, or otherwise in service, 13 per cent were employed in the clothing trades, 12 per cent were labourers or porters and 8 per cent were in the building trade. Twenty-eight per cent could not be classified and five per cent were unemployed. Most women, 66 per cent, were not engaged industrially, 22 per cent were engaged in domestic service and 12 per cent in needlework.[11]

Evidence from the 1851 census confirms the dominance of domestic service in parish occupation groups.[12] Amongst those aged 14 and over with an occupation listed, domestic service made up by far the largest category, accounting for 38 per cent of the total. 9 per cent were working or dealing in dress, 8 per cent in conveyance of men, goods or messages, 5 per cent in food, tobacco, drink or lodging, 5 per cent in building and construction and 5 per cent in professional occupations. 10 per cent gave an answer categorised as unoccupied.

As many as 60 per cent of adult women with stated occupations were engaged in domestic service. The next largest female occupation was production of clothing, predominantly dressmakers and milliners, making up 13 per cent of women. 3 per cent of women were in the medical profession, mostly nurses. 15 per cent of women who gave a response were considered to be unoccupied, over a third of whom had private means and over a quarter were wives or others engaged in household duties. Although the 1851 census has been found to be inaccurate regarding female employment, the overall impression of a very high proportion engaged in domestic service and restricted

[11] C.R. Weld, 'On the Condition of the Working Classes in the Inner Ward of St. George's Parish, Hanover Square', *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 6:1 (1843), 17–23.

[12] All census data and occupational categorisation from UK Data Service.

opportunities beyond that and clothes manufacturing applied not only to the 19th century but very probably to the 18th as well.[13]

The variation in male occupations was wider. Domestic service was still the largest category, but accounted for only 18 per cent of men. 15 per cent were engaged in the conveyance of men, goods and messages, mostly consisting of coachmen, grooms and stablemen. 9 per cent of men were engaged in building and construction, of which the largest subcategories were carpenters/joiners and painters/decorators. A further 8 per cent were undefined workers, mostly labourers. 8 per cent worked in food, tobacco, drink or lodging, including the three largest subcategories of butchers, bakers, and innkeepers, hotel keepers and publicans. 7 per cent worked or dealt in dress, mostly tailors and shoe or boot makers. Of the 6 per cent considered to be unoccupied, nearly half had private means. 5 per cent were professionals, with the largest numbers in law, followed by medicine and teaching. Government workers (3 per cent), including the largest subcategory of MPs, ministers and peers, and those engaged in 'defence of the country' (2 per cent) were categorised separately. Another 5 per cent dealt or worked in metals or machines, including significant numbers of blacksmiths. Lesser numbers were engaged in commerce (4 per cent), worked with wood or furniture (2 per cent), print and books (2 per cent) and in several other categories.

The 1901 census shows the changing picture of employment, again using only those aged 14 and over with a stated occupation. Domestic service still predominated at an even higher rate of 43 per cent. Those working and dealing in dress had fallen slightly to 8 per cent, while those working and dealing in food, tobacco, drink and lodging increased to 7 per cent. Professionals had increased their share of the parish labour market to 6 per cent, with those engaged in defence rising to 4 per cent and government workers to 3 per cent. Conveyance fell to 5 per cent, while those in commerce increased to the same figure. Employment in building fell significantly to 3 per cent.

Women's employment remained remarkably similar, with those in service increasing to 61 per cent and those producing clothing remaining on 13 per cent. Only 10 per cent were considered unoccupied and more than three quarters of them had private means. Board, lodging and drink (3 per cent) overtook medicine (2 per cent), with increases in lodging house keepers and barwomen leading the way.

Greater changes had occurred in the male workforce, which shifted even more towards the service sector. The proportion engaged in domestic service had increased to 24 per cent, although this can be entirely accounted for by a surge of nearly 1,500 domestic coachmen. At the same time there was a fall of around 500 non-domestic coachmen counted in the transport sector, suggesting either a reorientation of transport to private provision or simply a changing of categorisation. Whatever the

[13] Schwarz, *London in the Age of Industrialisation*, 14–22.

explanation the proportion of men engaged in the conveyance of men, goods and messages fell to 11 per cent. A slightly increased 9 per cent worked in food, tobacco, drink or lodging, with a shift from food processors, such as butchers, to service providers like waiters and barmen. A large increase in those engaged in the defence of the country to 7 per cent of men came with the construction of part of Chelsea Barracks within the parish. Professionals also rose to 7 per cent, with increased numbers of lawyers and musicians. Men employed in local or national government increased to 5 per cent, the largest categories being police, postal workers and officials in the East India service. Commercial occupations rose to 7 per cent, including large numbers of clerks and commercial agents. Building had fallen to 6 per cent of men as the amount of open land available dwindled. 4 per cent worked or dealt in metals and machines, a grouping which had diversified from blacksmiths to include more machinery makers. Men without specified occupations (4 per cent) and undefined workers (3 per cent) had both reduced their share. Several smaller categories included makers or dealers in wood or furniture (2 per cent), paper or prints (2 per cent), precious metals or jewellery (1 per cent) and oil or chemicals (1 per cent).

Markets

Grants for a cattle and sheep market to take place twice a week in Great Brookfield were made by James II. The rights for these passed to Nathaniel Curzon, who petitioned parliament with John Kent when the City of London attempted to have them suppressed, citing legislation of Edward III.[14] The City's efforts seem to have been successful, with no further mention made of the market in the early 18th century.[15] The market in Brookfield, on Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays, was reconfirmed by a grant of 1740, allowing the sale of any food including flesh, fish, fowl and herbs, save for live cattle, grain, bread, corn, seeds and hides.[16] This was obtained by Edward Shepherd, whose new market building was planned for opening on Michaelmas 1741.[17] In 1867 it was described as an 'elysium of retirement for prudent footmen and upper–housemaids into the genteel chandler's shop or greengrocery business', although '"market" is a sad misnomer.'[18]

An annual fair was held at the site of the market for 16 days from 1 May, with the first 3 days for live cattle and leather. Ready-built shops were available to let to tradesmen and visitors could enjoy 'the same Entertainment as at Bartholomew-Fair'. One Mr Pinkeman both offered a performance from atop an elephant and took enquiries for stalls and booths. This was the May Fair, which gave the

[14] LMA CLA/009/02/001.
[15] C.S. Smith, 'The market place and the market's place in London, c.1660–1840', (Univ. London, unpubl. PhD, 1999), 146–7n.
[16] TNA J 90/852; C 202/127/1, part 3.
[17] *London Evening Post*, 25–27 Jun. 1741.
[18] *The Builder* (1867), 796.

area its name.[19] Attempts were made to suppress the fair in the early 18th century, a presentment of the grand jury of Middlesex describing 'a notorious Assembly of dangerous, loose, leud and debauch'd People, of both sexes'.[20] The land previously occupied by the fair was laid out for building in 1721 and though the fair continued it was confined to the area around Shepherd's Market.[21] Local residents petitioned the vestry to suppress the fair in 1763 and when the earl of Coventry moved to Piccadilly the next year he hastened its abolition.[22]

Grosvenor Market was built in a triangular plot of land between South Molton Street and the northern end of Davies Street in 1785–6, when the original 60 year leases of small houses and stables on the site expired. The new development also included houses, shops, a public house and a slaughter house. Intended as a food market and paid for by Earl Grosvenor, Grosvenor Market suffered from the competition of nearby St George's Market and the few retailers were joined by a mix of servants, labourers and clothes makers. Many of the shops went unlet. In 1858–60 builder John Newson demolished part of the market and erected Oxford House, a small block of model dwellings, which was demolished along with the rest of the market buildings in 1889.[23]

St George's Market was established in exactly the same period of 1785–6, though without Earl Grosvenor's sanction. It was founded as a butchers' market by plumber and glazier Henry Tomlinson, who took a 35 year lease, erected 20 small houses and used a yard for stalls. Despite complaints and a petition to the earl from the inhabitants of Grosvenor Market, St George's Market continued to operate even after it was put up for sale in 1791. The expiry of the lease allowed for the removal of Tomlinson's houses, but a cluster of butchers and cheesemongers continued to operate in the area well into the second half of the 19th century.[24]

Inns, taverns and hotels

Inns, taverns and Public Houses

As the western approach to London, Piccadilly was bustling with coaches for mail and passengers, many starting from the hostelries there. Establishments such as the Three Kings on the corner with Berkeley Street were put up as part of the development of the old aristocratic houses on Piccadilly. The Three Kings was home to perhaps the first stage coach service to Bath, although the old style of

[19] *Daily Courant*, 28 Apr. 1704.
[20] *Daily Courant*, 18 Feb. 1709.
[21] *London Journal*, 27 May 1721; Phillips, *Mid–Georgian London*, 78–9.
[22] S. Rosenfeld, *The Theatre of the London Fairs in the 18th Century* (Cambridge, 1960), 120.
[23] 'Davies Street Area: Introduction', in *Survey of London: Volume 40, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 2 (The Buildings)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1980), pp. 68-69. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol40/pt2/pp68-69 [accessed 3 March 2020].
[24] 'Oxford Street: The Development of the Frontage', in *Survey of London: Volume 40, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 2 (The Buildings)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1980), pp. 171-173. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol40/pt2/pp171-173 [accessed 3 March 2020].

coaching inn, with balustrades, became antiquated by the 19th century.[25] The newer style of hostelry resembled private houses in the great squares, as evidenced by the Gloucester Coffee House next door, which sapped the custom of the Three Kings.[26] There were three inns called the White Horse on Piccadilly in 1750, popularised as the symbol of the House of Hanover, one of them an alehouse on the corner of the synonymous White Horse Street. The most important was across the road from Old Bond Street in St James's parish, though its wine and victualling operation transferred across the road to St George's becoming the New White Horse Cellars under proprietor Mr Hatchett.[27] A description of Hatchett's in 1802 read, 'Much frequented on account of its proximity to the villages westward of London. Good dinners, wines, and beds'.[28]

On the Grosvenor estate public houses provided an important source of revenue, especially in the early 19th century, when several major London breweries competed for the leases. There were 75 pubs on the estate in 1793, excluding those on Oxford Street, and the first earl was generally amenable to renewal of their leases. The second earl followed a similar policy, albeit unenthusiastically, until around 1815, when he consistently refused to renew leases in the best streets of the estate and occasionally did so in other areas too. However the number of licensed premises changed very little as hotels were established.[29] Building in the south of the Grosvenor estate began each area of housing by granting the lease for a public house.[30]

Upon the accession of the third marquess in 1869 there were still 47 pubs and beer shops on the Mayfair estate, though spurred on by new licensing laws instituted in the next few years, he achieved a dramatic reduction in licensed premises, in spite of the financial cost. He refused the renewal of leases, restricted opening times and imposed drab, domestic exteriors on pubs that were rebuilt. By 1891 there only 8 pubs left on the Mayfair estate.[31] Estate solicitor Henry Trelawny Boodle described reducing the number of public houses as 'so urgently necessary in promoting temperance' and testified that the upwards of 30 removed in the previous decade or so had come 'at a great pecuniary loss' to the duke.[32]

Due to leases expiring at later dates, closures were much slower on the southern Grosvenor estate, with only five pubs shut down under the third marquess by 1891 (comparing with the 39 in Mayfair),

[25] H. Phillips, *Mid–Georgian London* (1964), 83.
[26] Phillips, *Mid–Georgian London*, 275.
[27] Phillips, *Mid–Georgian London*, 275.
[28] *The Picture of London 1802*, appendix p.86 and 93–4.
[29] 'The Administration of the Estate 1785-1899: The Estate in Trust, 1785-1808', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 36-43. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp36-43 [accessed 18 March 2020].
[30] See 'Settlement'.
[31] 'The Administration of the Estate 1785-1899: The Estate Entailed, 1845-99', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 47-66. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp47-66 [accessed 18 March 2020].
[32] *Report from the Select Committee on Town Holdings* (Parl. Papers 1887 (260), xiii), p.389.

leaving 63 in Belgravia and Pimlico. These were spread fairly evenly, with no more than three on each street. Another five pubs were closed on the southern estate by the death of the marquess in 1899. Working for opposing aims, the Westminster and Pimlico Licenced Victuallers' and Beersellers' Trade Protection Association met in pubs around the area.[33]

Hotels

Hotels were becoming the more fashionable choice than coaching inns by the turn of the 19th century. A list of places 'Chiefly for the Accommodation of families' in 1802 included Lothian's Hotel and Coffee-house, 'One of the first houses for elegant accommodation', and the York Hotel and Coffee-house, 'Likewise an elegant house for genteel families', both on Albemarle Street. The Bath Hotel in Arlington Street was a 'large suit [sic] of rooms, where the public may be elegantly accommodated.'[34]

The growing market for short stays in the West End and the under-supply of furnished homes led to the establishment of exclusive hotels in Mayfair from the turn of the 19th century. Amongst the first was Kirkham's at 43 Brook Street, opened in 1802.[35] Kirkham's continued as a hotel under a number of names, including Lillyman's from 1856–78, and then Buckland's into the 20th century. Wake's was opened in 1806 at number 49, and known as Coulson's from 1812. Mivart's was established next door in 1812, soon expanding into further houses. In 1842 Mivart's was the London postal address for a number of the aristocracy, including Earl and Countess Shrewsbury and the Marquis of Blandford, when yet another hotel, Patterson's, was also listed on Brook Street. William Claridge and his wife Marianne ran a hotel in Grosvenor Street and took over Coulson's in 1853, soon expanding to manage Mivart's as well, under the famous name of Claridge's. Claridge died in 1882 and the hotel was taken over by Cesar Ritz over a decade later, completely rebuilding it in 1894–8.[36]

On the north side of Berkeley Square, Thomas's Hotel was established after adaptations were made to a house there whose previous occupant died in 1796. Also known as Bailey's Hotel, it was described in 1825 as one of the first Hotels in London, both for situation and accommodation.[37] It had a good reputation through most of the 19th century, expanding to the east in 1852. It came to

[33] Hazelton-Swales, 'Urban Aristocrats', 323, 326–9.

[34] *The Picture of London 1802*, appendix p.81.

[35] 'The Social Character of the Estate: A Survey of Householders in c. 1790', in *Survey of London: Volume 39, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 1 (General History)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1977), pp. 86-89. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol39/pt1/pp86-89 [accessed 12 March 2020].

[36] 'Brook Street: South Side', in *Survey of London: Volume 40, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 2 (The Buildings)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1980), pp. 21-32. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol40/pt2/pp21-32 [accessed 13 March 2020]. *London Post Office Directory* (1842), 118.

[37] *The Picture of London 1825* (23rd edn.), 345.

seem old-fashioned by the turn of the 20th century and was demolished soon after.[38] The Clarendon Hotel had frontages onto both Albemarle Street and Bond Street. It was demolished in 1870.[39] In hotel listings of 1825 it was part of a cluster of hotels north of Piccadilly, also on Dover, Berkeley and Conduit Streets. South of Piccadilly, six hotels could be found on Albemarle Street alone.[40]

The railway changed the nature of hotels in Britain, firstly by obviating the need for coaching inns.[41] But the provision of quicker travel to greater numbers of people also made London's hotels seem insufficient and antiquated, comparing unfavourably with other European and world cities. John Timbs may have been thinking of some Mayfair establishments when he wrote that 'A few private houses knocked somehow into one have been thought a large and grand hotel, for it is only within the last few years that the obvious necessity which existed for constructing a building specially for Hotel purposes has been slowly recognised in this country.'[42] In 1862 the *Building News* could similarly complain that 'Until within the last few years we have no hotels worthy of the name in London.' That situation had been changed by the erection of several railway hotels, in or near the London termini, of which the Grosvenor Hotel at Victoria was 'the latest and grandest'.[43] Purpose–built hotels in the West End emerged as a response to this new competition, the rebuilding of Claridge's being one example.[44]

The Wallace Hotel, which opened on the south side of Knightsbridge in 1858 on the site of the White Horse Inn was also considered to have a very convenient location and boasted a suitably aristocratic clientele. It was taken over by the Alexandra Hotel Company in 1863 with a board drawn from high society. The company purchased five adjoining houses and after alterations were made, reopened the next year. The enlarged hotel continued to operate successfully, although the managing director was removed after being exposed as a fraudster in 1897, following a widening scandal initiated by the exposure of an overcharging racket at the Grosvenor Hotel.[45]

Agriculture

Market gardens were prevalent in the south of the parish throughout the 18th century and their rental value may have held back development in the Five Fields and Neat House areas. It seems

[38] 'Berkeley Square, North Side', in *Survey of London: Volume 40, the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 2 (The Buildings)*, ed. F H W Sheppard (London, 1980), pp. 64-67. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol40/pt2/pp64-67 [accessed 16 March 2020].

[39] E. Walford, *Old and New London* IV (1878), 303.

[40] *The Picture of London 1825* (23rd edn.), 345–6.

[41] D.J. Olsen, *The Growth of Victorian London* (1976), 93.

[42] J. Timbs, *Curiosities of London* (2nd ed., n.d.), 441.

[43] *The Building News* IX (1862), 255.

[44] J. White, *London in the 19th century* (2008), 194.

[45] 'Knightsbridge South Side: East of Sloane Street, Hyde Park Corner to Wilton Place', in *Survey of London: Volume 45, Knightsbridge*, ed. John Greenacombe (London, 2000), pp. 21-28. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol45/pp21-28 [accessed 1 April 2020].

there was in fact some decline in rent received between 1767 and 1791 on the southern Grosvenor estate, a period in which housing was being erected in place of market gardens.[46] Nevertheless, the number of market gardeners did reduce; the poll book of 1749 listed 29, falling to 14 in 1818. Wholesale urbanisation of the southern section of the parish in the 19th century caused the number of agricultural workers to contract. The census of 1851 listed 250 agricultural workers in the parish, one per cent of the workforce. These included 66 cattle workers, 64 general farmers and 52 gardeners. In 1901 there were 186 people engaged in agriculture, including 67 nurserymen or florists and 46 cattle workers. Also see agricultural returns at TNA

Animal husbandry in and around Hyde Park became increasingly rare as the streets around it were built up, but the St George's poll books of 1749 still listed two assmen, 5 cow keepers, a drover and a hogman in the parish, mostly in streets directly east and south of Hyde Park. Milk remained a 'semi-luxury' and offering a very fresh supply encouraged proximity to the West End, although herds around Hyde Park reduced as streets were laid out nearby. Nevertheless, in 1818 eight cow keepers remained in the poll books.[47]

Horses were a significant presence in the parish. Several horse repositories were established in or near the parish in the late 18th century. Tatersall's was founded in 1766 at Hyde Park Corner and operated for the next 173 years, moving to Knightsbridge in 1865.[48] Hyde Park was a very popular location for riding and after the king had a new road built through it in 1735–6, the old route became a public riding parade, with the new route given over to the same use by the 1790s. Riding schools sprang up in the second half of the 18th century and the proximity of both Hyde Park and wealthy clientele made St George's an ideal location. Schools were founded in Curzon Street in 1765, Shepherd's Market in 1769, Chapel Street in 1778, and Park Lane and Hamilton Street in 1784. However, all but the last of these had closed by the turn of the 19th century.[49]

The large Royal Mews at Buckingham Palace, built by Nash in 1822–5, included houses for a vet and equerry and maintained the equine presence in the parish throughout the 19th century.[50]

Industry

As we have seen, manufacturing, particularly of luxury goods, was a feature of 18th century Mayfair. While the Grosvenor estate severely limited any industry considered noxious, some manufacturers

[46] M.J. Hazelton-Swales, 'Urban Aristocrats: The Grosvenors and the Development of Belgravia and Pimlico in the Nineteenth Century', unpublished PhD thesis, University of London (1981), 26.
[47] T. Almeroth–Williams, 'Horses and livestock in Hanoverian London', unpublished PhD thesis (University of York, 2013), 49, 51, 54.
[48] Almeroth–Williams, 'Horses and livestock in Hanoverian London', 241–2.
[49] Almeroth–Williams, 'Horses and livestock in Hanoverian London', 274–86.
[50] S. Bradley and N. Pevsner, *The Buildings of England, London 6: Westminster* (2005), 652–3. SEE ALSO Clifford Smith *Buckingham Palace* (1931).

set up on the fringe of the housing developments. In the 19th century, the southern section of the parish saw more industrial development, with brickmakers supplying the burgeoning building industry there and light industry lining parts of the Grosvenor canal. A string of manufactories and industrial sites were built along the Thames Bank from the late 18th century onwards and continued to dominate the area into the 20th century.

From around the beginning of the 18th century, a string of statuaries' yards operated along Piccadilly, between Park Lane and Half Moon Street, working with lead and stone. Proprietors included John Noast and John Cheere.[51] By Cheere's death in 1787, his yard had become a major London attraction.[52] In 1784 Joseph Bramah , the engineer and inventor of the hydraulic press amongst many other patents, moved to number 14 Piccadilly, where he manufactured his patent water closets and locks, and had a showroom which continued to operate into the 19th century.[53] The increasing residential development of Mayfair pushed heavier industries further out, and Bramah himself advertised his new premises in Pimlico from 1797.[54] Water transport on the Thames and later the Grosvenor canal were also a draw.

An 1843 work explaining industrial processes described the industry lining the Thames bank, with a section in the parish: 'after passing a gas-factory, we see the noble manufacturing premises of Messrs. Cubitt, the builders, with the chimney inclosed in a decorated square tower. Then we come to the London steelworks; beyond which is the Belgrave Dock; and westward of both are two tall chimneys, one of which points out the Chelsea Water works, and the other the distillery of Messrs. Octavius Smith and Co… the celebrated obelisk called 'Cleopatra's Needle' having been taken as a model in its construction'.[55]

The Chelsea waterworks had been operating on the bank of the Thames since 1727, installing two Newcomen engines in 1741–2 and later several built by Boulton and Watt.[56] The development of further industry along the riverside began in the late 18th century with Thomas Cooke and Co.'s white lead manufactory built on the Stanley estate, which first appeared in a London directory in 1783.[57]

[51] H. Phillips, *Mid–Georgian London* (1964), 76 and 270–1.
[52] ODNB, 'Cheere, Sir Henry, first baronet (1702–1781), (accessed 26 Mar. 2020).
[53] I. McNeil, *Joseph Bramah: A Century of Invention 1749–1851* (Newton Abbot, 1968), 45, 58; *St. James's Chronicle or the British Evening Post*, 7–10 Aug. 1790.
[54] *Morning Post*, 19 Sept. 1797; *Holden's Triennial Directory 1802, 1803 & 1804*, 42.
[55] G. Dodd, *Days at the factories, or, The manufacturing industry of Great Britain described and illustrated by numerous engravings of machines and processes* (1843), 41.
[56] See 'Chelsea Waterworks'.
[57] *The new complete guide to all persons who have any trade or concern with the City of London, and parts adjacent* (1783), 216.

The manufactory was joined by a malt distillery. Building was begun in 1794, then postponed in 1796 in response to legislation preventing distilling due to the high price of grain, but was nearing completion in the summer of 1797. It had the largest Boulton and Watt steam engine in England. A dock from the river was to be built, as was a road along the river as far as Belgrave House, and within the compound walls 2 a. of pig styes and 2 a. of pasture and garden.[58] The Thames Bank distillery was still operating at the turn of the 20th century, when it entered an annual cart horse parade in Battersea Park.[59]

In 1807 John Hunter and Joseph Bramah leased 15 a. of land to the east of the malt distillery and erected several factory buildings. Following Bramah's death, the leasehold was advertised for auction in 1816, including a manufactory with several of Bramah's own inventions, a dock, a white lead factory leased to Alderson's, a licensed tavern with garden, assembly rooms and several dwellings, some occupied and some unfinished.[60] John Johnson bought the lease in 1817 and planned a comprehensive development but eventually added little to the isolated site.[61] Johnson's Dock later became known as Belgrave Dock and also, for a period in the 1820s and '30s, Cubitt's dock.

Thomas Cubitt, the great builder of Belgravia and Pimlico, frequently moved his modest workshops to areas of greatest building activity in the early years of development in Belgravia, but by 1829 appeared to have established premises on the Thames Bank, next to the King's Scholars' Pond Sewer. He also probably occupied empty wharves and warehouses next to the Grosvenor Canal and Belgrave Dock, as well as having brickworks which moved through several sites, settling in 1843 to the east of the Grosvenor Canal, then moving out to Kent in the 1850s. In 1839 he began work on a new complex of workshops on 11 a. of land that would be bounded by St George's Square to the east, Denbigh Street to the west and Lupus Street to the north, with a new draw dock extending from the Thames to the south. Cubitt acquired the lease in 1842, when workshops and an engine house had been erected, and continued to add new buildings, in which worked teams of joiners, plasterers and engineers.[62]

Following Cubitt's death part of the site was taken on by his foreman George Dines, who kept it as a going concern until 1876.[63] The majority of the works, around 7 a., were leased to the War Department and became the Army Clothing Depot, a factory and store that opened in 1859.[64]

[58] *The Freemason's Magazine or General and Complete Library* (1793), 375–7.
[59] *Morning Post*, 23 May 1899.
[60] *Morning Chronicle*, 26 Mar. 1816.
[61] Hobhouse, *Cubitt*, 168–9.
[62] Hobhouse, *Cubitt*, 281–4, 292–4, 307–10.
[63] Hobhouse, *Cubitt*, 283.
[64] Mitton et al, *Mayfair, Belgravia and Bayswater*, 86; E. Walford, *Old and New London* V (1878), 40–1.

The Equitable Gas Light Company was formed in 1830 and its Millbank (later Pimlico) gasworks was operational by 1832.[65] Following provision made in the City of London Gas Act 1868, the Equitable Gas Light Company was amalgamated with the Gas Light and Coke Company in 1871.[66] The Pimlico gasworks were acquired by the London County Council in 1902 for conversion into an electricity-generating station for the tramways.[67]

The opening of the Grosvenor canal brought more industry further inland. The Grosvenor estate let many of the wharves around the basin to local builders. After this area filled, wharves began lining the canal to the east towards Chelsea. Thomas Cubitt took much of the ground, building some wharves himself and offering more on building leases, one to the east of Eccleston Bridge for John Joseph Bramah, son of the aforementioned Joseph, in 1834.[68] The family firm had become Bramah and Robinson, and its manufactory reportedly had an area of 200 by 60 ft. when it burned down in 1843.[69] Cubitt supplied another wharf to George Eugene Magnus, who had a patented technique to make slate appear like marble.[70]

Victoria station covered the canal basin and the railway lines covered most of one bank, but industry continued to occupy the other side and any unoccupied derelict land. Between the Grosvenor Canal and the railway lines, a sewage works called the Western Pumping Station was built in 1874–5.[71] In the 1890s, sandwiched between Buckingham Palace Road and the canal, the Pimlico Patent Wheel Works were next to Eccleston Bridge, followed by a succession of wharves, including Fremlin Brewery, Grosvenor and Baltic wharves. South of Ebury Bridge, further wharves, a saw mill and a timber yard were intermixed with some working class housing.[72]

[65] *The Times*, 14 Jun. 1830, 25 Jan. 1832.
[66] *The Times*, 30 Sept. 1871.
[67] *Report of the London County Council for the Year 1902*, 96.
[68] Hobhouse, *Thomas Cubitt*, 211.
[69] *Morning Post*, 21 Nov. 1843.
[70] Hobhouse, *Thomas Cubitt*, 211.
[71] Walford, *Old and New London* V, 41–2.
[72] OS London 1:1,056, Sheet VII.91 (1895) , Sheet XI.1 (1895), Sheet XI.2 (1895) and Sheet XI.11 (1895).