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ABSTRACT

The image of the Victorian workhouse is one of a "bastille": a building designed to be a deterrent without consideration of style, beauty or comfort. But is this a true picture? This thesis does not attempt to destroy the image or myth, but to examine it in an analytical way to discover what factors determined the design and construction of a union workhouse, and to what extent ideology shaped the architecture and embodied the social purpose of the Commissioners. Examination of the buildings as architecture within their social contexts is where this thesis departs from previous research.

Work has been limited, to date, on the subject of workhouses. Norman Longmate has written a general history of the workhouse, Anne Digby has made a local study of the Poor Law and its attendant workhouses in Norfolk, Margaret Crowther has examined them as a social institution and traced the process of change from 1834 to 1929, and most recently Anna Dickins has written a Ph.D. thesis on the architects and the union workhouse.

Among the sources investigated for this paper were the Report from H.M. Commissioners on the Administration and Practical Operation of the Poor Laws, and their subsequent Annual Reports. Contemporary opinion has been sought from magazine articles and books, together with the opinions and experiences of the architects involved. Boards of Guardians'
Minute Books, plans and specifications have also been studied and visits to a number of workhouses which have not been too drastically altered, have added to the printed word, insight, and a "feel" for the building. Comparisons have also been made with other institutions and housing, using where possible, the opinions of contemporary architects and builders, in order that the workhouse may be criticized in the context of Victorian architecture. In order to discover how the 1834 workhouse related to earlier institutions, contemporary surveys and pamphlets concerned with pre-1834 workhouses have been studied.

No neat and concise conclusion emerges from this study. Although the Poor Law Commissioners fervently believed in Jeremy Bentham's principle of "less eligibility" and wished to incorporate it into the design of these new workhouses, this was only one of many elements that influenced their design. The Boards of Guardians who were ultimately responsible for financing workhouse building were moved not only by ideology but by, among other things, considerations of civic pride, economy and local tradition. Ideology, and the desire to erect an impressive public institution incorporating the technological advances that occurred throughout the century, which in turn lent prestige to the Boards of Guardians, was reconciled by the sharp contrast between interior and exterior. The elaborate façade belied the utilitarian interior, which was planned to satisfy the "principles of separation and classification" laid down by the Commissioners, and reflected an attitude toward building for the poor which was evident in other contemporary buildings. We find that workhouse design had much in common with other contemporary
institutions, housing for the poor, and surprisingly enough, a link with country house architecture. Pressure from local magnates to build aesthetically pleasing structures in the vicinity of their houses also influenced the architecture, and was encouraged by architects who were concerned to enhance their own reputation, rather than being associated with a "prison-like" building. Union workhouses were not completely new and innovative, they reflected a similar ideology and therefore similar principles of planning, to workhouses established before 1834 and both aroused critical comment. Consequently, there was both continuity and change at work in these institutions.

We find, therefore, that the design of union workhouses resulted from an amalgam of diverse influences, both ideological and practical, and it is simplistic to assume that they were built purely as the "bastilles" of popular legend. Instead, they represent one more example of Victorian architecture - complex and full of conflict and incongruity.
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Introduction

Anti-Poor Law propaganda, Doré's engravings, Dickens' writings, a continual stream of horror stories from The Times, all have contributed to form the image of the Victorian workhouse as "bastille": a building designed to be a deterrent, without consideration of style, beauty or comfort. The Poor Law Commissioners themselves were convinced of the wisdom of Jeremy Bentham's "less eligibility" principle and wished to embody it in the design of these institutions. That way, they believed they could ensure that the conditions of the inmates would be less eligible than those of the industrious labourer. Assistant Commissioners like Edwin Chadwick and Sir Francis Bond Head expressed these ideas unequivocally, untroubled by doubt or conflict. Yet when we begin to examine more closely examples of Victorian Poor Law institutions, it is evident that the deterrent factor represented just one of a number of often conflicting elements expressed in the architecture. Local Boards of Guardians influenced the designs and were moved by, among other things, civic dignity and prestige, local tradition, economic restraints, notions about aesthetics, architectural harmony and the influence of local magnates, or simply eccentricity. The architect attempted to incorporate a number of often conflicting criteria into his design, while at the same time satisfying his own aesthetic ideas and thereby enhancing his reputation. These institutions were also subject to the ideas of classification and morality.
which were incorporated in other contemporary buildings and to the technological changes that appeared throughout the century.

We will, therefore, examine the factors that afforded these contrasts: the ideology of the Commissioners and the circumstances that governed the actual design and construction, the conflict between the Guardians' pride in an impressive civic building incorporating the latest technical achievements, and their attitude toward building for the poor. We will also see that the union workhouse was not completely new and innovative. It owed much to earlier designs and reflected contemporary building ideology. Criticism of the workhouse did not begin after 1834: early workhouses were also vulnerable to critical comment. There had always been an interest in how the Poor Rates were spent as well as a concern for the condition of the poor, and this represents a continuity of attitude rather than an abrupt change. But Poor Law policy was not static throughout the century and workhouse architecture provides the tangible evidence of these changing attitudes. It is, therefore, simplistic to believe that the nineteenth century workhouse was built purely as the "bastille" of popular legend. Instead, the workhouse represents yet another example of Victorian architecture - complex and full of conflict and incongruity.
Chapter 1

The intentions of the Commissioners and contemporary design ideology

Following the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 there was an immediate building programme which scattered the countryside with new institutions to accommodate the poor. There was a combination of factors which resulted in this new wave of construction. Increasing poor rates, the agricultural labourers' revolts of 1830 and the obvious widespread distress had prompted the government to appoint a Royal Commission for inquiring into the administration and practical operation of the Poor Laws. Nassau Senior, who directed the investigation, and Edwin Chadwick were the two most active members and together they were responsible for the Poor Law Report; it was in response to this report that the government passed the Poor Law Amendment Act. The Commission's objective was to provide necessary relief without encouraging pauperism. They, therefore, proposed that relief should be available only in the workhouse, and that the principle of "less eligibility" should apply whereby the recipients' "situation on the whole should not be made really or apparently so eligible as the situation of the independent labourer of the lowest class." They also recommended that relief afforded to each class of pauper should "as far as may be practicable be uniform throughout the country." However, they believed that there should be a definite distinction between the different classes of pauper and their treatment and they intended that there should be not one large
institution, but separate types for the aged and infirm, for the children, for able-bodied women and the able-bodied men. 4

"For the children it would provide separate schools away from the influence of the depraved paupers; for the old and infirm institutions of the character of almshouses; for the sick, hospitals." 5

Despite the general condemnation of mixed workhouses found in the Commissioners' Reports and both Chadwick and Senior's personal bias in favour of classification through separate buildings, the plans for the new institutions published in the Annual Report of 1835 recommended one consolidated workhouse. According to the Webbs:

"In no Special or General Order, in no Circular or published Minute, can we find any recommendation that a board of guardians should carry out the emphatic recommendations of the 1834 Report in favour of classification by institutions..." 6

and they appear to believe that "the most energetic subordinate of the Central Authority", 7 Sir Francis Bond Head, supported by Boards of Guardians who were concerned with the expense of maintaining a series of separate institutions, converted their superiors to this change in policy. 8

We find no ambiguities in the architectural intentions of Sir Francis Bond Head who was the Assistant Commissioner responsible for Kent. His ideas were clear and doctrinaire and he expressed the principal of "less eligibility" in its purest form. He drew up the first of the suggested plans, (fig.1) one for a rural workhouse for five hundred persons,
and showed clearly on the plan his concern that those in receipt of aid should not be more comfortable than those supporting them:

"Both plans are founded on the principle that in the construction of a Rural Workhouse, the height of the rooms, the thickness of the walls etc. should not exceed the dimensions of the cottage of the honest hard working independent labourer; well built substantial rooms being a luxury as attractive to the pauper as food and raiment." (fig.1)

Since rural housing for these independent labourers was generally dilapidated and overcrowded, Head certainly did not intend that paupers should enjoy spacious accommodation, and his plans called for inmates to be housed eight to a room 15ft by 10ft. There was to be just one basic division between male and female, and, therefore, it was obvious that young and old, lunatic and healthy must have been intended to live together. Head's plan did not provide for the sick, and we can only presume that the inmates were to use the halls as dayrooms for work or schooling.

It is unfortunate that Head does not provide an elevation of his design, but from the plan there appears to be no windows on the exterior walls of the building: and, as he specifies cast iron gratings on the interior walls for ventilation, one wonders how large the windows overlooking the yards were to be, and whether they were capable of opening. In any event, the inmates were effectively cut off from the outside world and forced to look inwards, and perhaps by extension, encouraging
them to reflect inwardly. The institutional nature of the building and the principle of inspection was emphasized by the bow window over the gateway, which he pointed out "commands a view of the whole establishment."

Head's instructions to the builder restricted the height of the dormitories, no doubt for reasons of economy; yet he specified a 12ft high wall 14 inches thick, regardless of cost, to separate the sexes in the courtyard. He was obviously using bricks and mortar to emphasize the idea of "less eligibility", for it was the separation of families that caused the greatest hardship and acted as the strongest deterrent to entering the workhouse.

The influence of Malthus is also evident: the fear that without a physical barrier the pauper would not practice self restraint, but continue to breed in the workhouse and be a further burden on the rates. This was not merely a theoretical conjecture but was supported by evidence presented in the First Annual Report, where it was cited that two families were admitted to Bulcamp house of industry and produced children who were born and raised in the workhouse. At the age of thirteen these children were apprenticed by the corporation. After serving their time, the sons married and returned, with their wives, to the workhouse. The process was repeated and there were, at the time of the report, three generations of these paupers in the house of industry.
Head expressed his personal convictions in an essay on "English Charity", by conducting a fictitious interview with a labourer, who asked why he should be separated from his wife and five children. After repeating the usual argument that Members of Parliament, soldiers and sailors are of necessity separated from their families, he continued:

"...If you were able to provide for Elizabeth, if... you were able to provide for the children you already (in italics) possess, no person would have any disposition, indeed there exists nowhere any power, to separate you:..." 10

Again in the essay he reiterated the necessity of the deterrent aspect of the workhouse, since he was skeptical that the poor would practice self restraint without a strong incentive.

"as soon as workhouse life shall become per se wholesomely repulsive, the rude amorous ploughman will pause a little before he contracts a marriage which must ere long make him its inmate;..." 11

Head clearly believed pauperism to be the result of idleness and vice:

"Again, if the robust, well disposed peasant does not like poorhouse fare for himself, neither will he like it for his aged Mother: and he will consequently prefer the pleasure of labouring for her support to the drunken enjoyment of Government beer shops." 12

and it was this opinion that influenced his plans. His design concentrated solely on the idea of "less eligibility" and was meant to deter the idle, and although several workhouses were built to this plan in Kent 13 it was not favoured at all outside his Kent jurisdiction. 14
The Commissioners' objectives were undoubtedly expressed most fully by their own architect, Sampson Kempthorne, but at the same time his own abilities and the restraints of time and economy affected his designs. His appointment as official architect to the Poor Law Commission was a simple case of patronage: his father was a friend of George Nicholls, the Chief Poor Law Commissioner, but in 1835 Kempthorne was only twenty-six and recently set up in practice. According to George Gilbert Scott, who was a friend, once Kempthorne was appointed, he realized his inexperience and

"called in the aid of his old master, Mr. Voysey who though a clever and ingenious practical man, had not one spark of taste, and took a very exaggerated view of the necessity of economy." It is, therefore, ambiguous whether financial restraint was imposed by the Commissioners or was a personal quirk of Voysey. The Assistant Commissioners recommended Kempthorne's employment which meant that he had "a vast practice thrust upon him before his experience had fitted him to conduct it, while he embarked with a set of ready-made designs of the meanest possible character, and very defective in other particulars." Scott's complaint was that the determining factor of these designs was economy where "everything had been cut down to the very quick". However, he did express some understanding of the problem because he had designed churches during the "'cheap church' mania" in which "...all decency of architectural finish and construction was ground down to the very dust,..."
It would, therefore, appear that what had seemed like pure ideology was complicated by considerations of economy when put into practice by the Commissioners' own architect, Kempthorne.

The intellectual force behind the principle of "less eligibility" was Jeremy Bentham, and the contemporary press made the connection between the Commissioners' recommended plans and Bentham's Panopticon. *The Architectural Magazine* of 1835 described them as "being arranged more or less on the panopticon principle..." Yet, on careful examination of both plans it is questionable whether a close comparison with Bentham's design can be made. The Panopticon's central organizing principle was inspection and its main feature was a circular building with cells occupying the circumference and an inspector's lodge in the centre from which the inmates could be observed twenty four hours a day with the aid of a specially invented lantern (fig.2). Kempthorne's plans were not circular, but radial, and although he sited the Master's accommodation in a central core, his ability to observe was limited to the view of the yards from his windows. (fig.3). Thus, the principle of inspection was recognized and utilized by Kempthorne to some extent, but to nothing like the degree envisaged by Bentham. Sir Francis Bond Head was also influenced by such an idea in planning a window over the gateway "to observe the whole establishment" and George Gilbert Scott designed the principal entrance of a number of his workhouses
to be through an arched gateway leading into an open court in order that the Master might have "the opportunity of seeing from his window every person who is admitted at the gate by which means the conduct of the porter is placed under his control." Bentham's idea of power through architectural design to facilitate surveillance is clearly expressed, but it is limited in its application.

Bentham believed that the Panopticon or inspection house principle was applicable to a variety of establishments including penitentiary houses, poor-houses, workhouses, mad-houses, lazarettos, hospitals and schools, and according to Robin Evans, it was Bentham who emphasized the connection between social purpose and architectural forms. Bentham believed that the combination of the physical Panopticon system with an administrative system or "Plan of Management" would have a reforming effect on its inmates, resulting in "Morals reformed - health preserved - industry invigorated - instruction diffused - public burthens lightened - economy seated, as it were, upon a rock - the gordian knot of the Poor Laws not cut, but untied - all by a simple idea in Architecture!"

This was an attractive theory to men faced with the problems of increasing poor rates and Bentham's friendship and influence on Chadwick is well documented. However, Bentham's explicit design for 250 houses of industry to accommodate 2,000 inmates is less well known. They were intended to be "distributed over the face of the country as equally as may be" and he calculated that the average distance between each house would be 10 2/3 miles. Robin Evans has distilled the essence of
Bentham's plans in his new book *Fabrication of Virtue*. These institutions were to be identical "twelve sided polygons framed in iron and sheathed in glass in order to effect 'universal transparency' within for the sake of inspection. Mirrors were to be fixed up around the centre to direct extra light into the governor's apartments and to give him unusual views of the paupers at work. The external skin of small glass panes was held in a network of iron leadings, mullions, transoms, columns and lintels, with not one inch of walling." It was an ingenious use of modern materials to enforce a principle and "an essay in the engineering of behaviour through the manipulation of architectural form."29

However, Bentham's avant garde design was ignored in favour of the well known and accepted classical, tudor and gothic styles which were familiar and did not utilize the medium of glass as a tool for obtaining power in this way. Nevertheless, although Bentham's specific Panopticon system was not executed as a workhouse, his belief in the power of architecture to control behaviour was apparent in the concept of classification and separation as a means to prevent contamination of one group by another. The preoccupation to classify and separate was not confined to paupers or even to the poor, but included the insane, prisoners, the sick and even the residents of a country house. Classification was intended not only to prevent contagion, both moral and physical, but to act as an agent in improving the lives of
those it affected, and this contemporary ideology determined the designs of workhouses, lunatic asylums, prisons, hospitals and country houses.

Samuel Tuke believed that asylums should be designed to ensure complete separation of the sexes, classification of patients according to their state of mind, and easy superintendence of patients and attendants by their superiors. Patients at the Retreat near York were also divided into classes according to their property and each used appropriate dayrooms and courts. In this respect there is a marked similarity between these conditions and those of a workhouse.

Robin Evans writes of prisons that "the classification of prisoners into groups and the isolation of those groups from one another by means of architectural separation was commonly practiced in the eighteenth century." However, the drive to sub-divide prisoners into classes increased from the beginning of the nineteenth century when there were only four prisons containing ten or more wards; until 1843 when there were fifty of them. Solitary confinement was rejected because it was inhumane and difficult to enforce and was replaced by classification which was intended to prevent prisoners from corrupting one another. "Evil spread like disease and classification was the means of assuaging the epidemic."

The concern to arrest the spread of disease was instrumental in changing the design of hospitals from traditional blocks to the pavilion type which was best illustrated by the Royal
Naval Hospital at Stonehouse near Plymouth, opened in 1762. This contained a central building which included the chapel and was surmounted by a turret and two pavilions on each side, with a further six added symmetrically along the main axis at a later period - all of which were connected by an arcade.  

Strict attention to separation and classification was found in most Victorian country houses. There was a concern to separate the sexes to prevent any undue temptation and this was expressed in the practical arrangements of the house. Robert Kerr wrote an influential book entitled *The Gentleman's House* in which he explained the classification of apartments. The primary classification was that of family and servants, but these groups were further subdivided and the servants' section contained nine different areas which were grouped according to male and female functions. Kerr's principles were plainly illustrated in the plan of Bear Wood, the home he designed for John Walter, with its separation of functions, special women's staircase, and men's corridor. Male and female sleeping quarters were naturally located in different parts of the house and the same segregation applied to servants and single guests. (fig.9) Bear Wood lacked a family chapel, but these became prevalent in country houses in the nineteenth century and attendance at a religious service was, therefore, not only expected of the inmate of a workhouse, but also of the occupants of a country house. And while the workhouse was
intended by the Benthamite Commissioners to reform the morals of the pauper, the designs of country houses were intended by their architects and patrons to maintain moral standards.

We have seen the influence of classification on a variety of buildings which underlines the point that the workhouse cannot be treated in isolation as a separate architectural form, but was subject to the ideology of contemporary building.
Chapter 2
The Problem of Application

The most interesting and complex feature in the design of union workhouses is the dichotomy between theory and practice, between eloquently expressed principles and bricks and mortar. The design was influenced not only by ideology but by, among other things, the individual architect, local magnates, guardians, and financial considerations. Although the recommendations expressed in the Commissioners' Report were clearly stated, the legal powers to implement these principles were limited and a diverse series of factors affected their practical application.

In their First Annual Report of 1835 the Poor Law Commissioners provided plans to the local boards for workhouses of different sizes. (figs. 3,4,5,6,7,) They did not insist that the plans be adopted so long as the building had "the requisite provisions for the classification of the workhouse inmates".\(^{38}\) The Guardians were free to select their own architects and plans, although the Commissioners in their Annual Report of the following year did mention that the official "plans have been found to be effective and have been very generally adopted," and were superior in "cheapness and completeness of arrangements."\(^{39}\)

The new act directed parishes to combine and form unions governed by Boards of Guardians and elected by the ratepayers. The Guardians raised the money for the workhouse while the
Commissioners only had the power to compel them to spend up to a limit of £50 or one-tenth of the average Poor Rate for the past three years on new buildings. The Commissioners, therefore, were forced to rely on persuasion to get built the kind of institutions they favoured.

The plans submitted by Kempthorne, the Commissioners' architect, are characteristic of the "total institution" concept described by Goffman in *Asylums*. The pauper surrendered his identity on entry in the searching room, was then classified, and sent to the appropriate receiving area to be cleansed and issued with the workhouse uniform, and from there, to the adjacent workroom. Men and women were further sub-divided into areas for the first class - those unable to work and second class - the able-bodied. Walls separated the yards in the hexagon plan and the radial arms of the building did so in the square plan. As with Head's design, all visual contact with the outside world was excluded, in this case by the continuous perimeter service building. The Commissioners and Guardians appeared to regard pauperism in the same light as a contagious disease and, therefore, believed that paupers should be isolated from the industrious population in order that the industrious should not be contaminated by the idle and vicious. The Commissioners expressed this sentiment in their First Annual Report when they rejected the idea of employing paupers outside the workhouse, since such contact would familiarize the industrious labourer with "pauper feelings and habits."
Conditions in Kempthorne's buildings were crowded, and as Anna Dickens points out, the architect allowed more than twice the number of beds in a room than would be allowed under "present day standards". However, it must be remembered that overcrowded houses were a contemporary problem, and Lord Ashley used as evidence for his Common Lodging House Bill in 1851 an account by a city missionary who reported "27 male and female adults, 31 children, and two or three dogs, making 58 human beings breathing the contaminated atmosphere of a close room" which was 18ft by 10ft. This was not an isolated case, but one of 270 such rooms in the missionary's district.

Kempthorne's plan was by no means perfect and Dickens draws attention to the unfortunate siting of the girls' bedroom next to the lying-in ward on one plan and next to the boys' on another. Moreover, it was probably not by chance that the refractory cells, which were used for solitary confinement, were situated next to the dead house and that the two dead houses flanked the rear exit. How many unfortunate paupers were convinced that this was the only exit they would ever use?

It is difficult to know whether financial restraint, Benthamite ideology or speed made necessary by the pressure of work took precedence and governed Kempthorne's designs. But there is little ambiguity in the case of George Gilbert Scott, who was possibly the only architect of note to design workhouses, and who came to be "widely regarded as the most successful architect of the nineteenth century". He also appears to be the only one who has left a record of his experiences in carrying out
this work, and in his autobiography, he is disarmingly frank about the shortcomings of his early work and his motives and methods of obtaining workhouse commissions.

In 1834 he was twenty three and a young, aspiring architect, when Sampson Kempthorne offered him work as an assistant in designing union workhouses. Scott stayed with Kempthorne only two months when his father died, and he decided to set up in practice for himself. Moreover, his family was not wealthy, and he needed an income. He, therefore, wrote to every influential friend of his father begging their patronage, and applied to become the architect to the Union Workhouses in the district where his father was known. Both steps met with success. Scott then invited a former fellow student, William B. Moffatt, to assist him in this work, and they later became partners. He describes Moffatt in dynamic terms: an aggressive, self-confident, industrious young man as opposed to the quieter, more retiring Scott. They both spent their time "union hunting" and Scott extolled his friend Moffatt's exertions as "almost superhuman". "Union hunting" was a very arduous and exciting business and Scott thoroughly enjoyed it; with Moffatt, he produced over fifty workhouses in the ten years from 1835.

However, Scott complained that Kempthorne's plans were so economically priced that there was little an architect could do to radically improve the plan, for the work would be lost if the estimate offered greatly exceeded what the Commissioners had led the Guardians to expect.
"Architecture and good finish or even any great improvements in arrangements, were at the time hopeless and one was driven to the wretched necessity of viewing one's profession as represented by one's chief works, merely as a means of getting a living..." 49

Competition was the means by which improvements were effected:

"Variety became necessary, or where was the ground-work for competition? Thus improved arrangements began to be aimed at. Perspective views were naturally regarded as attractive elements in a competition and to give them any interest there must be something to show, so that external appearance began timidly to be thought of, and estimates stealthily to creep upwards,..." 50

Competitions gave young and unknown architects like Scott and Moffatt the opportunity to advertise their talents and aesthetic taste. A bleak "bastille-like" design would not enhance their reputation and they would naturally attempt to induce the Guardians to give greater priority to the exterior design.

According to Scott, the competition system was "open in every sense" with the competitor being "at liberty to take any step he thought good" and he describes how he and Moffatt worked the system:

"On the day on which the designs were to be examined the competitors were usually waiting in the ante-room, and were called in one by one to give personal explanations, and the decision was often announced then and there to the assembled candidates.

Moffatt was most successful in this kind of fighting, having an instinctive perception of which men to aim at pleasing and of how to meet their views and to address himself successfully to their particular temperaments. The pains he took in improving the arrangements were enormous, communicating constantly with the most experienced governors of the workhouses, and gathering ideas wherever he went. He was always on the move. We went every week to Peele's coffee
house to see the country papers, and to find advertisements of pending competitions. Moffatt then ran down to the place to get up information. On his return, we set to work, with violence, to make the design, and to prepare the competition drawings, often working all night as well as all day. He would then start off by the mail, travel all night, meet the Board of Guardians, and perhaps win the competition, and return during the next night to set to work on another design." 51

It is clear that the architect's powers of persuasion and the individual idiosyncrasies of the Guardians had a profound effect on the choice of design. The Dunmow Workhouse of patterned brickwork (fig.10) and the Amersham Poor Law Institution (fig.11) of flint and brick, which was a favorite medium for Scott, demonstrate the increased interest in the attractiveness of the exterior and provide examples of cases where aesthetic values came into conflict with utility.

In his autobiography Scott does not appear to hold an ideologue's position; his architectural conversion (by Pugin) to the gothic style came after he had given up workhouse commissions. It would seem that he simply wished to succeed as an architect, designing aesthetically pleasing buildings. Yet in the Explanatory Remarks on a design for a workhouse for the Newton Abbot Union by Scott and W.B. Moffatt they cite as their general objectives:

"In the arrangements of the Building the strictest regard has been paid to the most full and perfect classification of the Paupers and to affording to the Master and Mistress every facility for the most effectual supervision while on the other hand it has been made an object to avoid giving a Prisonlike appearance to the Building, and to placing unnecessary restrictions on those classes (as the
sick and infirm) to whom the Establishment would be less a place of restraint than an Asylum rendered necessary by misfortune."

It is not known whether Scott or Moffatt wrote the document but in all probability these were the terms of reference which they received from the Guardians and the Assistant Commissioner responsible for Newton Abbot and we cannot be sure whether or to what extent they reflected Scott's personal views. However, Scott and Moffatt paid serious attention to the need for "perfect classification". They included separate lying in wards "that respectable women may be distinguished from those of bad character", and separated males and females in the chapel by a partition six feet high. As each class was effectively separated throughout the day and night, the architects preferred not to use the chapel as a general dining room, but rather to follow the practice of the principal workhouses in London and use the separate Day Rooms as Dining Rooms since:

"It will be seen from the Commissioners' regulations that out of four hours rest allowed to the Able bodied paupers during the day, three are occupied by their meals, and thus after all the shew of classification and separation, the Able bodied of Both Sexes would spend three fourths of their unemployed time together." 52

An additional reason was that to combine the use of dining room and chapel made necessary a chapel of disproportionate size.

Scott was also influential in removing the infectious wards from workhouse buildings and at Newton Abbot he recommended "that the infectious wards be built in an entirely detached situation". 53 The separate infirmary adopted by Scott was copied by other architects and in 1867 the Metropolitan Poor Act stated that the sick were to be housed in separate pauper
hospitals on sites away from the workhouse.  

A significant factor which improved the design of workhouses was the influence of local magnates. In many cases their overriding concern was not based on questions of economy, function, or the principle of "less eligibility", but was a conscious wish for beauty: they did not wish to live in the neighbourhood of a prison-like institution. Their solution was to build in the same manner as the surrounding country houses and in the Second Annual Poor Law Report an Assistant Commissioner describes such an example:

"I generally found the House of Industry a substantially built and sometimes a handsome structure. The Stow Hundred house had so palatial a character, that I was tempted to inquire whether any peculiar concurrence of circumstances had occasioned the erection of an edifice, the appearance of which seemed to me so little in unison with the wants of the houseless and necessitous poor... My inquiry soon elicited information that the character of the structure had been usually attributed to the circumstance that it was situated in the immediate vicinity of the country seats of some of the directors, who were naturally inclined to adorn rather than to disfigure the landscape. The future subject of chagrin had not been anticipated; the Hundred-house eclipsed some of the neighbouring mansions." 55

The siting of the Dunmow Union workhouse caused considerable local controversy because John Barnard, the Vice Chairman of the Dunmow Board of Guardians, had bought the land opposite the proposed workhouse for £10,000. He objected to the proposed site on the grounds that it was unhealthy and because of the injury the building in that situation would do to his property, his house being a quarter of a mile from the field. The building would be directly opposite his house, obstruct his view and he claimed that the inmates would
be walking about his grounds and be a nuisance to him. He collected nine letters from medical men who supported his opinion that the field was unhealthy, but an independent arbiter, Dr. Southwood Smith, overrode these objections and pronounced the site healthy and suitable for construction. Nevertheless, Smith whose dedication to the principle of "less eligibility" was equalled only by Chadwick's, was prepared to compromise his ideals and recommend that as the building might "interfere with a favorite prospect, it is but right that as far as regards the form of the building, etc. it should not be rendered an unsightly object..." Scott obliged accordingly with an attractive Tudor style entrance. (fig.10)

The influence of local magnates was considerable and W.J. Donthorn designed nine workhouses, although he held no official post in the counties involved. Donthorn was primarily a country house architect and his patrons turned to him when they assumed their duties as Guardians under the 1834 Act. He had designed Hillington in 1822 for Sir William B. Folkes, who became Chairman of the Gayton Union, and Watlington in 1830 for C.B. Plestow, at Downham. Unlike the competitive business atmosphere described by Scott, Donthorn operated in an atmosphere of patronage. He composed prayers for the inmates of Downham, and sold the site which he owned, and produced the design for the Swaffham workhouse. His plans were utilitarian, but his elevations were impressive and reflected his country house specialty. Individual observers make different comparisons:
Anne Digby in *Pauper Palaces* points out that "Aylsham Workhouse is reminiscent of nearby Blickling Hall" (fig. 12) built in the seventeenth century, whereas Roderick O'Donnell compares it to Donthorn's own work at Highcliffe Castle.

Large transomed windows running through a number of storeys were characteristic of Donthorn and also appear on the central block of the workhouse at Ely. (fig. 13) However, here the castellated roof line and simulated towers reflect the city's cathedral. (fig. 14). Comparisons may vary but these impressive building designs follow the pauper palace tradition begun in East Anglia during the previous century.

The individual stamp of an architect is hard to suppress and similar comparisons can be made between Scott's workhouses and his country house designs. There is a relationship between the Windsor Poor Law Institution and Kelham Hall, despite the fact that Scott designed the latter in a heavily gothic style, (figs. 15 and 16) and Anna Dickens compares it with Losely Park in Surrey, built 1562-68. She also makes the point that Scott's new workhouses were "with the exception of the ward blocks, domestic in scale and non-institutional in feeling", which perhaps reflects his personal bias.

Not only were the exteriors of these new workhouses designed to be in harmony with local landmarks, but they were also constructed using materials traditionally employed in the various regions. At Rye when Foden, the architect, asked the
Guardians how they would like the brickwork faced, they decided on stucco using the local chalk lime, (fig.17) which is a common exterior finish in the area, while at Battle, the relationship between Battle Abbey and Battle Workhouse is principally due to the similarity of material used. (fig.18)

Less affluent unions could not afford such attention to landscape, architectural tradition or taste. There the pressures of economic restraint decided what type of building would be erected. The Rye Union experienced some problems in raising the money for a new workhouse and Assistant Commissioner Parker suggested altering the existing Rye workhouse to accommodate the old and infirm while altering Brede workhouse to house the remaining paupers. This expedient was unworkable, as both were full and more space was required. Therefore, after some consideration, the Commissioners sanctioned the borrowing for a new workhouse and a two storey building was erected, designed by Mr. Foden for half the usual architect's fee. The Guardians also appeared to have paid close attention to the building costs in the case of the Caxton workhouse and insisted that the architect, W.T. Nash, justify every feature of his proposal which might be considered architectural rather than strictly utilitarian. Such examples support the contention that Kempthorne was required to be rigorously cost conscious.

Although financial responsibility was considered of paramount importance, the principle of "less eligibility", which Head declared should extend to the fabric of the building, was
not always put into practice. Head estimated the cost of his design to be £4,300. whereas the first workhouse built for five hundred paupers at Abingdon, and designed by Sampson Kempthorne, the Commissioners' recommended architect, cost £8,500. Such an outlay would imply that the quality of the structure was far superior to that specified by Head. Scott, who had criticized the "meanness" of Kempthorne's specification added to his own Explanatory Remarks that, "though economy would be to a certain extent be kept in view it would in no case be allowed to interfere with the strength and durability of the Building and nothing but the very best materials of their several kinds would be admitted." W.J. Donthorn, also specified that the "best quality" bricks and gravel and "good sound Baltic timber and English oak" be used in the construction of Ely Union Workhouse and by 1868, this type of quality construction was recommended by the Poor Law Board in a circular letter to the Boards of Guardians.
Chapter 3
Civic Pride vs. Ideology

The Boards of Guardians exerted considerable influence over the type of workhouse that was built and they were undoubtedly moved by civic pride and the prestige that they incurred by building an impressive public institution. From among the elaborate union workhouses that were constructed we will examine the City of London Union Workhouse (fig.19), the Kensington Union Workhouse, (fig.21) and the Birmingham New Workhouse (fig.22). The engravings of these workhouses depict substantial buildings which in the case of the London workhouses are richly ornamented, denying the fact that they are pauper institutions.

There is an obvious contrast between these buildings and, for example, the Abingdon Workhouse (fig.24) which was so stark and earned Kempthorne such derision. However, despite the imposing facades, there are still features of the design which could be seen as deliberate attempts to control the behaviour of the inmates. The City of London Workhouse in the Italian Romanesque style is surrounded by a wall, which appears at least six feet high, (even allowing for the unreliable perspective), together with imposing entrance gates. While this would create an impression of order and substance in a private house, it was undoubtedly intimidating to any approaching pauper. Similarly the facade of the Kensington Union Workhouse is carefully
detailed, and ornate, and here open railings replace the solid wall of the City of London establishment, but it is nevertheless a high fence with spikes, effectively controlling access.

"Those gates and locks, and all those signs of power; It is a prison with a milder name," 70

Clock towers are a feature of the design of all three workhouses, and the City of London Workhouse boasts two. Again, it is possible to consider them in different ways. They were costly architectural additions, found in large country houses and in such substantial civic structures as town halls, intended to add prestige and dignity to the building. In a workhouse, however, there was the unpleasant connotation of the discipline of time-keeping:

"That large loud clock which tolls each dreaded hour." 71

However, they could also serve a useful function, providing a modern convenience to the building. The central tower at the City of London Workhouse may well have been built to accommodate a water tank, if piped water was provided, since a steam engine was situated in the immediate area.(fig.20)

The architect of both the City of London and Kensington Workhouses set aside the more open and ornate side of the building at the front, overlooking the road, for the aged, the infirm and in the case of the City of London building, for children under age seven. These are the categories of the deserving poor for whom there was some sympathy, whereas the Guardians emphasized
the disciplinary nature of the institution toward the able-bodied and younger classes by keeping them "more immediately under the eye of the master and matron."\textsuperscript{72}

We can see that there was a definite similarity in the architectural styles of both workhouses and country houses: there is a prevalence of both the rural-Italian and Tudor styles, and in later buildings we see the gothic influence. The Tudor style was felt to be truly English; it evoked the image of generous hospitality on the part of the country gentleman, whereas the gothic style was associated with Christianity and truthfulness following the writings of, most notably, Pugin and Ruskin.\textsuperscript{73} These sentiments coincide with a workhouse as refuge for the old and sick, and as a morally uplifting environment for the able-bodied. If this was the sole criteria of the Guardians, there would be little else to say, but their dilemma was that they were divided in their desire to provide a haven for the deserving, while at the same time furnishing living space that would act as a deterrent to the idle, able-bodied pauper. It was this conflict that was expressed in the elegant exterior facades and austere interior plans.

The architects of these metropolitan workhouses were no longer using the hexagon and radial plans produced by Kempthorne. Instead, they followed much more complex designs, while retaining certain Poor Law principles. There was a strict system of classification, with each group including the unruly, given their own airing ground. In the City of London plan, (fig.20)
the architect made provision for five married couples' rooms, although this was a very small proportion of the twelve hundred residents. These rooms were also obviously intended for the aged, since they were positioned at the front of the building next to the accommodation for the infirm. The idea of central inspection was no longer apparent, but the rooms for the assistant master and matron overlooked the section for the unruly. A dining hall of impressive dimensions 100 feet long and more than 50 feet wide, with an open timber roof was built to accommodate 1200 persons and the illustration of a similar dining hall (fig.25) translates these measurements into three dimensions. Romanesque arches provide a decorative element to the end wall, echoed in the clerestory windows. The light fixtures are not plain but of ornamental wrought iron, denying the principle of "less eligibility", yet the atmosphere is still bleak.

In these London structures size made rational planning necessary and this rational planning took principle into account. On the other hand, architects and authorities were mindful that such imposing structures would form part of the urban landscape in the capital city.

Civic pride expressed itself in philanthropy, and philanthropy helped to build institutions including workhouses and influenced their design and facilities. The Birmingham New Workhouse was the object of considerable local philanthropy, undoubtedly increasing the donor's prestige. The principal feature was the separate chapel in gothic style, complete with central tower,
and "fitted up with open seats and two small galleries in the transepts for children." The Guardians, Officers of the workhouse and the Contractors donated three stained glass windows for the chancel and aisles. The contractor presented two other one-light windows and Mr. Minton and the architect gave encaustic tiles for the chancel, aisles and nave. It is, perhaps, rather cynical to add at this point that the contract price for the construction was £29,000 exclusive of fixtures, furniture and fittings: certainly it was a handsome contract to win in 1852. Nonetheless, these donations represented a concern for the moral welfare of the poor.
Inside vs. Outside

The Guardians reconciled their civic pride and ideology through the contrast between inside and outside: between the internal planning and finish and the external appearance. In this way they could take pride in constructing a building which not only enhanced the environment but was also a model for how deterrence and social control might be embodied in the architectural layout.

The Birmingham Workhouse may have presented an attractive façade and The Builder praised the local architect J.J. Bateman for providing the town with a "very creditable structure", obviously something the town could be proud of, something which by extension would enhance the reputation of the Guardians and all those responsible for its construction. But the magazine also made a point of expressing its approval of their priorities:

"the principal features of the design are the isolation of each from the other, of the workhouse, the infirmary, the tramp department, and the asylum for the children, and of the perfect separation of the classes in each department." (underlining by AS) 75

These are the same priorities which the Architectural Magazine approved of in Kempthorne's plans in 1835:

"these plans appear to us, from a cursory inspection, excellently arranged; and it is most gratifying to see the attention that has been paid by the architect to the principles of separation and classification, to cleanliness, to ventilation, and to general conveniences... the wards and all parts of the building that require warming are heated by hot water pipes or steam. There are baths, infirmaries,
nurseries for children, schools, and in short, everything that can be required for health, and for keeping those inmates who are able to work, constantly employed." 76

There was, therefore, a continuation of the basic values which had been expressed over the years. The belief in the necessity of inspection also remained:

"the Main building, comprising the workhouse department, has an open corridor throughout, 10 feet wide, and open from the second floor to the roof, with iron galleries at each floor, for supervision by the officers only. This arrangement gives great facility for effective ventilation, and inspection." 77

However, such an arrangement is also reminiscent of the interior of a prison, and the inspection galleries of the Panopticon, and contrasts dramatically with the gothic style and medieval grouping of the buildings which in the past expressed Christian charity, not the threat of punishment.

A contemporary writer, J.M. Granville, described this conflict between interior and exterior in another institution: Colney Hatch Lunatic Asylum, which opened in 1851, a year earlier than Birmingham Workhouse. It also provided accommodation for a large number: one thousand patients, as opposed to sixteen hundred paupers.

"Its facade, of nearly a third of a mile, is broken at intervals by Italian campaniles and cupolas and the whole aspect of the exterior leads the visitor to expect an interior of commensurate pretensions. He no sooner crosses the threshold, however, than the scene changes. As he passes along the corridor, which runs from end to end of the building, he is oppressed with the gloom;... The staircases scarcely equal those of a workhouse; plaster there is none, and a coat of paint or whitewash does not even conceal the rugged surface of the brickwork. In the wards, a similar state of affairs exists: airy and spacious they are without a doubt, but of human interest they possess nothing." 78
The use of whitewash on bare brickwork presents a stark contrast to the ornateness of the exteriors of these buildings, and its use was universal:

"In new country workhouses the walls of these sick rooms are commonly of stone - not plastered, but constantly whitewashed - and the floor not seldom of stone also." 79

Such a utilitarian interior reconciles the idea of civic pride, and financial responsibility in public spending. The taxpayer can enjoy with pride the sight of a dignified and impressive public institution knowing that priority has been given to the facade rather than to luxurious interior appointments for the less deserving.

Also, whitewash provided instant cleanliness, and dirt, according to the Victorians, was essentially disorder and disorder must not be tolerated.

"In chasing dirt, cleaning and washing we are positively re-ordering our environment, making it conform to an idea, separating, tidying and ultimately purifying." 80

This sounds remarkably close to Bentham's idea of reform through the beneficial effect of the environment. It also reinforced the idea that different values were at work on the inside and the outside of the building; the exterior being style and the interior, sterility.

Although the interior walls may have appeared cold and bare, it should, in fairness, be added that, through their architects, the Guardians paid considerable attention to providing these institutions with the latest in contemporary conveniences, as the description of the Birmingham workhouse illustrates:
"From a high-pressure steam boiler, placed in a central situation, hot supplies for baths, lavatories, hospitals, wash-houses, drying house, kitchen, sculleries, and for warming the infirm wards, dining hall, and other parts of the building are obtained... Every room will be lighted by gas." 81

There was also considerable interest paid to obtaining optimum ventilation, particularly in rooms intended for the use of the sick and the Commissioners published a letter by Sampson Kempthorne in 1835 recommending a particular system by Dr. Arnott for Warming and Ventilating. 82 The advantages of the warming apparatus were its exceeding cheapness and simplicity of construction (which increased its reliability), and although Kempthorne had not seen the ventilation system in operation, he was convinced of its commendability. Central heating, hot water and gas lighting were not found in many luxurious private houses and certainly not in the homes of the poor and the Guardians could be justifiably proud of the modern technology that they had utilized in the building's construction. It is also evident that we have diverged a long way from Head's plan with its very basic amenities and its sole emphasis on "less eligibility".

However, the design of buildings intended for the poor, whether institutions or housing, reflected the Victorian attitude to poverty. Samuel Tuke pioneered a new enlightened treatment for the insane which was based on specially designed institutions. Yet, in their description of the Pauper Lunatic Asylum in Wakefield, both he and the architects, Watson and Pritchett felt compelled to make special reference to the fact that this
was an institution designed specifically for paupers, clearly believing that the inmates should not be indulged with beauty in the design of their habitation.

"the magistrates displayed the most enlightened liberality and prudential economy; the former by acceding to every thing that was suggested as likely to contribute to the comfort and cure of the patients, and the latter by forbidding everything that appeared like unnecessary ornament." 83

and "No attempt has been made in these elevations, at architectural display. Neither the magistrates nor the architects forgot that the building was a Pauper (in italics) Lunatic Asylum. In the elevations, their sole endeavour was to preserve simplicity, and to obtain as much general effect as possible, without sacrificing internal comfort and convenience, or unnecessarily expending the public money." 84

Theoretically, the tension between the Victorian desire to make buildings suitable to the environment and complementary to the taste of the sponsors, yet deterrent to malingerers, could be solved by allowing façade and interior to be in radical contrast or conflict. On the other hand, the exterior of every building is a symbol and the symbol most obviously appropriate for a building to house indigent working people was simplicity, if not stern warning.

We can appreciate the Victorian attitude to poverty because it extends to the present day, and according to Robert Sommer, who discusses prison and public architecture, is based on the premise that if you provide good architecture for public tenants they will not appreciate it and if you give mental patients anything attractive they will not take care of it. 85 While Tuke is conscious of "unnecessarily expending the public money"
Sommer writes in the twentieth century that the taxpayer does not want to believe that people living in public housing are better off than he is. It is a modern version of the principle of "less eligibility".

Workhouses were monumental and symbolic whereas worker housing was not monumental, although it was symbolic. In housing for the poor, "simplicity" is the symbol which allowed the reformer to improve but not, at the same time, "indulge" the poor. The simple, often stark, clean lines of the new housing blocks intended for the poor represented the attempt to clear away the disorder of overcrowding and replace it with order, discipline, and moral improvement. Housing was recognized as a social issue during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Philanthropic bodies attempted to alleviate the problem but they made small impression on the chronic lack of affordable housing. Their efforts were directed toward providing improved housing for artisans who had a regular source of income, and the problem of securing decent housing for the strata of indigent poor remained unsolved.

The Victorian attitude to poverty was reflected in the style of architecture that emerged, and these housing units shared several elements in common with the workhouse. The housing blocks that Henry Darbishire designed for the Peabody Trust and Angela Burdett-Coutts were grim and utilitarian, (fig 26) without any pretension to style or beauty, while the endless rows of new houses built in industrial towns were plain, drab and monotonous. (fig. 27) Yet, they were a vast improvement
over the squalid, overcrowded rooms which were the lot of the majority of the working class population.

As with workhouses and other institutional planning, architects and builders paid special attention to the importance of sanitation and ventilation to prevent the spread of disease, keeping in mind the cholera outbreaks of 1832 and 1848. Internal courtyards were a common feature, designed to be used as safe playgrounds for the children but compared to the workhouse yards they appear no more cheerful, being generally devoid of vegetation, benches or even a modest swing.

The Peabody Buildings were also railed off from the surrounding streets with gates that were locked at night. This separation was deliberate and set the occupants of these buildings apart, and somewhat above the surrounding community, away from "contamination" by the lower classes. There were also a number of regulations which the tenants were obliged to follow, which gave the housing societies a measure of control over their tenants, even if it was of a benevolent nature.

Inside these buildings

"finishes were spartan; all the walls were left unplastered to minimize the risk of vermin and wallpaper was forbidden." 87

Again, this reflects an attitude to the poor; housing must be designed to protect the poor from themselves in the belief that they are naturally dirty, and cannot or do not deserve to appreciate beauty.
However, the attitude toward designing housing for the poor differed from designing workhouse accommodation for paupers. We have seen that there was often a conflict in workhouse design between an elegant exterior and a spartan interior. In housing, the exterior and interior were in harmony: the simplicity of both facade and interior was intended to promote the same benefits of health, moral well-being and contentment with one's lot. Yet these new housing blocks aroused mixed reactions and were labelled "barracky and bastille like" with rather more justification in some instances than the workhouse. But the philanthropic nature of these buildings doubtless prevented too virulent an attack by critics on their construction. Attitudes toward building for the poor changed little over the years: the first Peabody building was not built until 1864, thirty years after the Poor Law Amendment Act, and this slow evolution of ideas concerned with housing the poor was equally apparent in workhouses.
Chapter 5
Continuity or Change

1834 is often treated as a watershed: harsh attitudes, less eligibility, the terror of the well regulated workhouse, stress on institutional treatment and inspection, obsession with classification and separation, belief in architecture as an instrument of reform, concern about "contagion" and the dangers of density. These factors cannot be denied, yet 1834 does not represent a complete departure from all previous practice: the rules of management compiled by the Commissioners are evident in many of the earlier workhouses and demonstrate a continuity that has often been overlooked. There were "bastilles" before 1834 and "pauper palaces" afterward; there was diversity in form and purpose before and still some diversity afterward. There was a marked similarity in the values expressed by Sir Frederic Eden who surveyed the country's workhouses in the late eighteenth century and those of the Commissioners of 1834.

One feature of the old workhouses, largely absent in the new, was the belief that the poor could work profitably to make the workhouse self sufficient, and this is evident in the plans of earlier workhouses where the priority given to space allocated to workrooms was considerable. A number of schemes were devised over the years whereby the poor were to be engaged in some form of manufacturing, with the benefit accruing to the parish. However, none of these plans was
successful because it was found that when trade was good, an average workman could find employment, and when it was bad, there was no market anyway for the goods that he produced. Nevertheless, the buildings continued to be designed to accommodate workrooms.

Sir Frederic Eden in his report on *The State of the Poor* published in 1797, described the Bristol workhouse, built in 1696, which illustrates this type of arrangement, and Assistant Poor Law Commissioner Captain Chapman brought this information up to date in 1832. Chapman wrote that it was intended

"that a spacious workhouse be erected at a general charge, large enough for the poor to be employed therein, and also for room for such as being unable to work, are to be relieved by charity." 89

The inmates originally were one hundred girls who were taught to spin worsted yarn purchased through an arrangement with a manufacturer. But it was soon found that the wage rates for coarse work were too low to pay for the support of the girls, and the Corporation purchased new equipment to enable them to do fine work. When this became profitable the workhouse accepted one hundred boys and subsequently the "ancient people of the city", whom they put to "such employment as were fit for their ages and strengths." 90 Although this was successful for a while, Eden identifies the problem, which was the usual downfall of such schemes:

"As soon as the Poor came to do anything tolerably well, they went off to sea, or were apprenticed in the city, and they made nothing perfect or merchantable from their work, but only spoiled the materials, so that instead of lessening the charge of maintaining the Poor they only increased it." 91
The inmates of Bristol Workhouse were still employed when Assistant Commissioner Captain Chapman made his report in 1832. Infirm men were making laces and plaiting straw and women were knitting and winding worsted, but workshops for the purpose were hired in the town, while the able bodied were employed outside the house as stone breakers.

Eden also described the extensive facilities offered by the House of Industry built at Newport, Isle of Wight, almost a century after Bristol. It was capable of accommodating seven hundred people and boasted workshops "for the manufacturers and mechanics", "a master weaver's room and spinning room, 96 ft. by 18, with storerooms over it;... shoemaker's and tailors' shops, with a spinning room, 150ft by 18, with weaving rooms and store-rooms over". These workshops produced a profitable return on the work undertaken. However, it is not known whether profitability was consistent through the years or whether it fell victim to the same problems recorded at Bristol.

The priority given to workshop space was still apparent in the new workhouse built in the Parish of Boldre, Near Lymington in 1793. Here the plan was very simple: the ground floor was divided into a workroom on the right of the entrance, and a kitchen and back kitchen on the left. The Master's Room, which doubled as a Committee Room was in the centre and had "a window on one side, inspecting the workroom; and another on the opposite side inspecting the kitchen". Here is an example of the architecture being used expressly to carry out the principle of inspection. Upstairs the sleeping chambers
were separated as below, but as there were generally more women than men resident in the house, a sick room with a separate staircase was divided off from the men's room. Concern for the inhabitants' well-being and the contemporary obsession with ventilation as a means of preserving health were also expressed in the description of the site as "elevated, dry and airy", and "built of brick, single, that the air may have free passage through it."94

This was a small workhouse which accommodated only nine or ten men and women and between twenty and thirty children in May 1793, and we see from the plan that there was no provision for the separation of the sexes or the different classes of poor during the day. Neither were there separate courtyards walled off from each other, but instead:

"the ground between the house and the road, which is a falling space of about sixty yards is divided, first into a dry convenient play yard for the children; and the remainder, about half an acre, running down to the road is a garden. The larger garden, which is about an acre, lies behind the house."95

Workhouses were expected to be self-sufficient in garden produce and the garden mentioned was probably used to supply vegetables for the inmates.

The solution to the alarming increase in the Poor Rates was still believed by some to be a self-sufficient workhouse. The author of an account of workhouses first published in 1732 and reprinted in 1786 believed that workhouses
"under a prudent and good management will answer all the ends of Charity to the Poor, in regard to their Souls and Bodies; and yet at the same time prove effectual Expedients for encreasing our manufactures, as well as removing a heavy burden from the Nation." 96

His position conveniently salved his Christian conscience because "idleness and sloth are Immoralities" while at the same time promising to ease his taxes.

This belief that the workhouse could be a profitable establishment was abandoned before 1834 and, consequently, the priority given to workshops in the workhouses we have discussed was not repeated later. We see that these early workhouses differed considerably in their size and the complexity of their facilities, and while Union workhouses also varied in size, they were generally larger because incorporation into unions meant that each institution served a wider area. In a small establishment like Boldre, separation into classes as well as sex would have been unworkable; yet, in common with 1834 workhouses, the principle of inspection and the belief in a healthy environment through the benefits of ventilation were implemented. There was, therefore both continuity with the past and change at work.

The belief in the importance of work was expressed in the concern for training children. If they could be "religiously and carefully educated and be taught and accustomed to work and labour" they could be prevented from growing up to perpetuate the cycle of pauperism, and, therefore, reduce the
burden of the Poor Rate. This principle was enacted in the plan and organization of the workhouse in Bishopsgate Street, London.

The house was divided into two parts: the Steward's side and the Keeper's side. Poor children were taken into the Steward's side and were employed spinning wool or flax or else sewing or knitting and were taught to read, write and "cast accompts". To prevent any contamination of the children by the disreputable poor, these inmates were housed separately in the keeper's side.

"Vagabonds, Beggars, Pilferers, lewd, idle and disorderly Persons committed by two of the Governors" were given "such relief as is proper for them, and are employed in beating Hemp for twine spinners, Hemp dressers, Linnen-weavers, shoemakers, and other trades; and also wash linnen for the children on the Steward's side." 98

In order to accommodate these functions

"the workhouse (exclusive of the Chapel and Prison Part) contains above 200 feet in length, has three rooms one over another, about 150 feet in length; the lowest of which is the Work-Room for Boys, the second for Girls and the third Room has two wards for lodging the boys. The girls ward is over the Chapel which separates the workhouse from the Prison-side." 99

This arrangement not only stressed the importance of work, but the belief in the danger of contagion by association which necessitated classifying and separating the deserving and undeserving. The Bishopsgate Workhouse began operating in 1701 using these rules and illustrates the continuity of perception and practice.
While workrooms were of prime importance in a number of workhouses, in towns like Carlisle, little work was done because "few that can work will come in" or as in East Grinstead, the men refused outright to do any work. The belief in a profitable or even self-sufficient institution was abandoned before 1834, although work was required of the inmates to prevent idleness and was in some cases carried out on a commercial basis. Consequently the size and variety of workrooms began to disappear from the plans and in many cases such a space was called simply the dayroom.

Complete separation of the sexes was considered preferable but frequently in eighteenth century workhouses there was no separation during the day. Often the workhouse was quite small, as the one described in Hamsted, Middlesex where "a large convenient old house" was hired to accommodate "twenty in Family of which eight or nine are children". Here there is no mention of segregation and the use of the word "Family" suggests a communal atmosphere. Obviously, without the intense interest in the particular principles of separation and classification that came in the nineteenth century, many buildings of diverse plan could be used as workhouses. Nevertheless, there is a similarity between a large institution like the Newport House of Industry and the City of London Workhouse, where in both institutions separate rooms were set aside for married men and wives. However, in such early workhouses as those in Bristol
and Bishopsgate Street, there would appear to be a greater concern to separate the decent, and particularly the children, from the morally degenerate in order to prevent contamination.

Eden, through his criticism and descriptions of various workhouses, indicated the contemporary opinion of a well run workhouse and this included the necessity for restraint, segregation of sexes, classification to prevent contamination and the need for institutional rules. He criticized the Oxford workhouse because:

"The boundary walls were insufficient to confine the paupers; the garden yard and offices lay open, and in common with each other; the windows and doors of the house without proper bars or fastenings; no regular wards appropriated to the sick, aged or infirm, nor nurseries for the children; the sexes strangely intermixed in their eating and sitting rooms and also in their shops and exercise grounds; nor any separation between their wards and sleeping rooms." 102

In addition, the Master's and Matron's apartments were in one corner of one of the wings "out of sight and hearing of every part of the house where their attention was more particularly demanded." 103 As a result, alterations, improvements and repairs were made to the house to make it what a House of Industry should be:

"a comfortable asylum for the aged and infirm, a place of useful employment for those who are able to work and a House of Correction for the idle and profligate." 104

Institutional rules were also not a new innovation of the union workhouse: Eden describes the facilities at Shrewsbury where new inmates surrendered their own clothes and were washed.
"Adjoining the house are two ranges of buildings, one of which contains apartments to which the Poor are sent on their admission to be stripped and washed and infectious cases are dealt with till cured." 105

It is not surprising, therefore, that Eden reports that there was generally a terror of the workhouse and that few able-bodied entered one unless forced by adverse circumstances to do so. 106 "The terror of a well-run workhouse" was not an invention of 1834.

Nevertheless, a new harshness toward the poor did appear in the early nineteenth century. Perceiving an increase in pauperism, certain parishes attempted to reduce the numbers on relief and consequently the poor rate. Notable among them was the parish of Bingham, where the Rev. Robert Lowe was magistrate. He changed the system to refuse all relief in kind or money and sent every applicant and his family at once into the workhouse. In addition, "the applicant who entered the workhouse on the plea that he was starving for want of work was taken at his word, and told that these luxuries and benefits could only be given by the parish against work...". 107 He was then required to break a specified number of stones in the yard.

Workhouse discipline was intended to act as a deterrent and strict separation of man, wife and children was insisted upon, together with workhouse uniform, no beer, tobacco or snuff, regular hours and no communication with friends out of doors.
These were conditions that were later deplored as inhuman in the 1834 workhouses, although they demonstrate a continuity rather than a break with the past.

The principle of "less eligibility" pervades the reports of the Poor Law Commissioners and they were extremely sensitive to the fact that they believed paupers were enjoying a more comfortable life than the industrious poor. In the East Grinstead workhouse, Assistant Commissioner Majendie was indignant to find that "there is a show of some restraint by placing a porter at the front gate, which is locked; but as the back of the premises is open to the fields, the men get out when they please." They are, therefore, in no way cut off from friends and relations, and as they refused all work, they were very comfortable. Majendie pointed out a common abuse of the workhouse in Uckfield, where a glazier and his wife and five children lived. The man was sent out to work and his earnings of 12s per week were paid to the parish, but the cost of keeping the family exceeded £60 whereas out of the workhouse, an industrious labourer with a wife earning 2s and qualifying for allowances for his children would take home only £48.2s per year. Such a worker would, therefore, fare harder than the inmate of the workhouse. These, however, were Majendie's own calculations, and doubtless were cited to strengthen his argument.

Perhaps the pre-1834 workhouse which came closest to the model design of Sampson Kempthorne and the recommendations of Sir Francis Bond Head and the Commissioners was the Thurgaton
Hundred Incorporated Workhouse which was completed in December 1824. The plans were by The Rev. John Thomas Becher, based on the "Principle of Classification and Management" and conforming to the system adopted at Southwell. They were, however, more sophisticated than the Southwell plans (fig.28) where, as we can see, there is a simple division of the sexes, each having their own day room, with individual staircases to their dormitories. The only ancillary accommodation was the Governor's room and office, the kitchen, pantry and school room. Certainly the most imposing feature of the building was the large oval governor's room which would undoubtedly intimidate those requesting relief. In addition, stout walls indicated the promise of restraint which the workhouse offered. It was architecture reinforcing a principle.

The Thurgaton Workhouse is much more complex than Southwell. From the plan, (fig.29) the entrance appears intimidating; high walls line the walk to the entrance porch and again the Committee Room is of imposing dimensions. This room was to be used occasionally as a chapel and could be combined with the school room by means of folding doors. A strong sense of classification allowed two day rooms for each sex, one for those of good character and one for the idle, immoral and improvident. In the right wing these were combined with the kitchen and back kitchen and in the left wing with the governor's and secretary's rooms. Priority was no longer given to workrooms and these were now called day rooms, even if some menial employment was carried on
in these areas. Any conviction that the workhouse could be self sufficient has obviously been abandoned, despite the fact that the institution was designed as a model of efficiency and organization.

There were separate staircases for each class to their dormitories, together with a separate courtyard with privacy for each class. Ancillary buildings including the washhouse, laundry, wards for persons afflicted with contagious diseases, reception rooms and strong rooms for punishment were situated in the backyard and completed the institution. According to Becher "the whole system is conducted upon the Principles of Salutary Restraint and Strict Discipline" and the building was designed to put this into practice.

When compared to Kempthorne's plan, the Thurgaton Workhouse appears to be a rather awkward design, undoubtedly because Becher was an amateur architect, but there is a definite correlation between the two, which perhaps is inescapable when we consider the principles upon which they were organized.

The most obvious factor that emerges from these reports is the lack of uniformity in both the buildings themselves and the management of the individual workhouses. They ranged from a small building in Skipton where eight people were maintained under the charge of a Matron, through a "tolerably neat and convenient" workhouse in Blandford, Dorset where two paupers took care of the institution and its thirty six inmates in the absence of the overseers, to the large, complex House of Industry at Newport on the Isle of Wight capable of accommodating seven hundred people, and the Thurgaton Workhouse conducted
upon the "principles of Salutary Restraint and Strict Discipline". 114

There was a perceptible change over the years: the idea of profitably employing the poor so that the workhouse was self sustaining was found to be unrealistic and workshop space was diminished, or disappeared altogether. With the increase in the number of paupers and the poor rates at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, there was a harsher attitude toward the poor. However, this did not happen instantly in 1834 but clearly began with the earlier experiments of the Rev. Robert Lowe and the Rev. John Becher. Lord Sherbrooke claimed that the New Poor Law was based on the principles that his father had established at Bingham 115 and in practice it would seem that the Poor Law Commissioners were not at all innovative in their rules of management. These rules were in operation in more than one pre-1834 workhouse and represent a greater degree of continuity than has generally been accepted.

There was also continuity in the practice of workhouse management because of the breakdown in some of the principles recommended for the administration of union workhouses. The Principle of National Uniformity which had been one of the cherished aims of the Commissioners in 1834 was not enforced and local authorities were left to devise their own policies. 116 The system of strict classification of inmates was also eroded
because paupers were expected to do the household work and care for the sick in the institution, with the result that within each sex there was an indiscriminate mixing of every class of pauper. 117

Another element of continuity is also evident in the criticism levelled at workhouses. Before and after 1834 workhouses were the object of public interest, and often disapproval. The poetry of the Rev. George Crabbe, was widely read and his poem "The Village" published in 1783 included a description of the parish Poor House:

"Theirs is yon House that holds the parish poor,
Whose wall of mud scare bear the broken door;
There, where the putrid vapours, flagging, play,
And the dull wheel hums doleful through the day;-

In contrast to this mean establishment he described, but with the same critical tone, a far more imposing workhouse in 1809:

"Your Plan I love not; - with a number you
Have placed your poor, your pitiable few:
There, in one house, throughout their lives to be,
The pauper-palace which they hate to see:
That giant building, that high-bounding wall,
That large loud clock, which tolls each dreaded hour,
Those gates and locks, and all those signs of power;
It is a prison with a milder name,
Which few inhabit without dread or shame." 119

Horror stories were not confined to the union workhouse, as James Neild testified in his "Remarks on Norwich Workhouse" published in The Gentleman's Magazine, October 1805. 120 He described a filthy, squalid building which was overcrowded and insanitary. No dayrooms were available and the inhabitants
lived, ate, as well as slept on their beds. Smallpox had taken an unnecessary toll because inmates had not been vaccinated and there was no attempt to isolate those who had contracted the disease. Consistent with the insanitary condition of the house, deaths averaged approximately one in every five inmates. Most shocking to Neild was the sight of a twelve year old boy who had an iron collar with four projecting prongs round his neck and a strong iron ring fastened near his ankle, which was attached to a chain at the end of which was a log of wood weighing altogether twenty-two pounds. The boy's punishment was to last six months as a result of his being "incorrigible" and upon investigation Neild effected his release.

The new Poor Law stirred an emotional response in many who felt compelled to write of its alleged inhumanity. The supreme example of this type of literature was G.R. Wythen Baxter's *The Book of the Bastiles* published in 1841. It was a virulent compilation of horror stories of the ill treatment experienced by paupers in union workhouses, and although many of the accusations were found to be inaccurate or false, they added fuel to the anti-poor law campaign.

Mrs. Trollope in 1844 wrote *Jessie Phillips*, a sentimental novel about the cruelty of the new Poor Law and the new union workhouse. Her contention was that the flaw in the 1834 measure was lack of heart, of attention to the human element. She noted
that the Assistant Commissioners and the Guardians were still able to offer outdoor relief at their own discretion, but that they were often unable to identify the deserving cases because the union covered so large an area. Jessie Phillips experienced the indignity and torment of a combined workhouse, where no distinctions were made between the deserving and undeserving, young or old, sane or insane. The hardships that Mrs. Trollope described were not innovations of the union workhouse: they were an intrinsic part of life in many workhouses prior to 1834, a fact which she does not point out.

A.W. Pugin also believed that the commendable values of the past, of charity, benevolence, and concern for beauty, had been renounced in the nineteenth century, and in 1836, he published *Contrasts or A Parallel between the Noble Edifices of the Middle Ages and Corresponding Buildings of the Present Day; shewing The Present Decay of Taste.* The Title explains both the content of the book and Pugin's bias toward the middle ages and when he contrasted the residences for the poor, he obviously based this drawing on Kempthorne's hexagon plan, underlining its bleakness and severity. (fig.30) This is a mute but eloquent criticism of the new poorhouses.

Clearly there is evidence that there was both continuity and change in the design and management of workhouses throughout the centuries, as well as in the perceptions of those in authority who were interested in the condition of the poor and the cost of their maintenance.
Conclusion

The significance of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 should not be underestimated, because although in practice it was difficult to enforce, it represented an attempt to deal with the problem of poverty on a national scale. Poor Law policy was not static throughout the remainder of the century, but developed slowly until it came closer in certain areas to the spirit of the Commissioners' Report of 1834.

It is true that the principle of national uniformity had failed: "...the Poor Law Commissioners had failed to embody this in their Orders even with regard to able-bodied men; and had by 1847, wholly abandoned it in regard to other classes." However, by 1865 workhouses were recognized as being mainly the home of the helpless and innocent and the central Authority changed its attitude to workhouse construction and regimen. According to the Medical Officer in 1867:

"able-bodied people are now scarcely at all found in them during the greater part of the year... Those who enjoy the advantages of these institutions are almost solely such as may fittingly receive them viz the aged and infirm, the destitute sick and children. Workhouses are now asylums and infirmaries." Consequently, the commitment to "less eligibility" was greatly modified. In 1853 the Poor Law Board believed that paupers should have good medical attention and this automatically meant that they would be better cared for than would an independent labourer who often could not afford any medical
attendance. The qualifications of the Poor Law Medical Officers were "to be such as to ensure for the poor a degree of skill in their medical attendants equal to that which can be commanded by the more fortunate classes of the community."  

The change in attitude on the part of the Central Authority resulted in a continued effort to improve the workhouse and this effort was reflected in a closer attention to architectural specifications. Workhouse buildings were to be arranged in separate blocks or pavilions for reasons of hygiene and as a precaution against fire. Blocks were to be sufficiently far apart to ensure the free passage of air and light and were not to be connected at a right angle or an acute angle. Minimum space requirements were given and sufficient ventilation was to be ensured throughout the building. Hot and cold water was to be provided in the bathrooms and sickrooms with a suitable kitchen and sculleries provided in connection with infirmary wards. The walls of all sick wards were to be plastered internally. One general dining hall was recommended, indicating some relaxation in the principle of classification. The yards for the children, sick and aged were to be enclosed with dwarf walls and palisades rather than high solid walls, with covered play sheds to be provided where there were a large number of children. All of these concessions represented a more humane approach toward the deserving poor. Discipline for the able-bodied was, however, not relaxed and in 1891 their yards were still enclosed by walls of six or seven feet and concern for discipline was given as the reason for not allowing windows on boundary walls. This does sound like an echo of
Sir Francis Bond Head, yet there were efforts to make workhouse interiors more comfortable and cheerful and food more nourishing and varied. However, these improvements were left to the discretion of the six hundred Boards of Guardians. By 1871 the Central Authority began to recommend classification by institution, reverting to the proposals in the 1834 Report. But again, they were dependent on the Boards of Guardians who considered the cost prohibitive; and ultimately such classification proceeded only for children and the sick. The wheel had turned almost full circle.

Since complexity, continuity and ambiguity have been our theme, no neat and concise conclusion should be expected. The workhouse building boom was concentrated in the twenty years after the passing of the 1834 Act and our discussion has illustrated the variety of workhouse designs. "Less eligibility" and economy, the passion of Head, Chadwick and Southwood Smith sometimes shaped the exterior as well as the interior of buildings but, particularly as time went on, the passion ebbed. Some unions, and not simply urban ones, built elaborate, ornamental and costly institutions, tributes to the taste and civic pride of their sponsors. Head's original estimate was for a workhouse to cost £4,300, whereas the City of London Workhouse cost in excess of £38,000 only fourteen years later, which at a time when inflation was not a relevant factor, was a vast increase, and demonstrates conflicting values.
Workhouse architecture was not only influenced by the ideas of the Poor Law Commissioners, but by the Guardians and architects and evolved as a result of contemporary design practice in other institutions as well as buildings specifically for the poor. Before we judge it too harshly, we must remember, as David Roberts points out in his article "How Cruel was the Victorian Poor Law", that the age was a harsh one, full of cruelty and suffering and the workhouse should be seen in this environment. Contemporaries believed that they were guided by humanitarian principles and were fulfilling the needs of the poor, as a contributor to the Penny Magazine wrote: "in many respects the workhouse is preferable to the dwellings of the labouring population in general." Certainly all workhouses were not built as prisons and they were, in many instances, far more attractive than housing designed for the independent labourer. The Victorian workhouse formed part of the architectural scene, expressing a complex mix of ideas, and must be judged in a nineteenth century context.
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APPENDIX (A) No. 10

PLAN OF A RURAL WORKHOUSE, FOR 500 PERSONS

BY SIR FRANCIS BOND HEAD.

---

This Workhouse for 500 Persons with tanks, drains, gutters, &c complete, every thing to be of the best materials has been now erected for an outlay of £2,500. The plans of this house are similar to those of the Workhouse at Kent, for the sum of £1,230. Both plans are founded on the principle that in the construction of a Rural Workhouse, the height of the rooms, the thickness of the walls, the building in stone for the sum of £1,230.

Broad plans are founded on the principle that in the construction of a Rural Workhouse, the height of the rooms, the thickness of the walls, &c should not exceed the dimensions of the cottage of the houses for such working independent labourers, with built-in air-tight rooms being a luxury as attractive to the pauper as food & rest.

NB. If the six cottages are be omitted the building will then only contain 448 persons.

---

[Plan of a rural workhouse with annotations and measurements]
A General Idea of a PENITENTIARY PANOPTICON in an Improved, but as yet, (Jan. 23d, 1791) Unfinished State.

See Postscript References to Plan, Elevation, & Section (being Plate referred to as No. 2).

EXPLANATION.

A. Cells
B & C. Great Semicircular Sky Light
D. Cell Galleries
E. Entrance
F. Inspection Galleries
G. Chapel Galleries
H. Inspector's Lodges
I. Dome of the Chapel
K. Sky Light to D
L. Store Rooms, with their Galleries, situated within the outer wall and round place, for circular Colon. Q
M. Floor of the Chapel
N. Circular Opening in it: (open except at 1st Store) to light the Inspector's Lodge
O. Annular Wall, from top to bottom, for light and separation.
HEXAGON PLAN of a WORKHOUSE.
TO CONTAIN 300 PAUPERS.
N°1 GROUND PLAN
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Sampson Hampthorpe, architect
Carlton Chambers
12 Regent Street
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HEXAGON PLAN OF A WORKHOUSE.
TO CONTAIN 300 PAUPERS.

NO 2. ONE PAIR PLAN.
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HEXAGON PLAN OF A WORKHOUSE
TO CONTAIN 300 PAUPERS.

No 3. THE PLAN.
113. Panopticon House of Industry, Samuel Bentham and Samuel Bunce, 1797.
Fig. 21. Bear Wood. The plans (these plans are to 87\", scale of the other plans).
6 Dunmow Poor Law Institution, 1838. Entrance. A late example with Tudor details and patterned brickwork — red with blue diaper and gault quoins: a contrast to the austere Kempthorne drawing.

8 Amersham Poor Law Institution, 1838. View. A characteristic use of flint and brick.
Pl. 31a Aylsham Workhouse, Norfolk. The Entrance Wing

Blickling Hall, by Robert Lyminge, c. 1616–27
Fig. 14 - Ely Cathedral

Fig. 13 - Ely Union Workhouse
7 Windsor Poor Law Institution, 1838. View

Fig. 15

Fig. 16
Rye Union Workhouse
Fig. 18 Battle Union Workhouse

Battle Abbey
Fig. 20
City of London Workhouse - Block Plan

References:
A. Porter's lodge and committee rooms.
B. Brewhouse.
C. Master's office.
D. Master's room.
E. Matron's room.
F. Stores.
G. Assistant master.
H. Assistant matron.
I. Infirmary men.
J. Married couples' rooms.
K. Arrears.
L. Unruly men.
M. Able-bodied men.
N. Stores.
O. Isolated wards.
P. Able-bodied women.
Q. Unruly women.
R. Infirmary women.
S. Children's wards.
T. Workshops.
U. Drying room.
V. Laundry.
W. Musglove.
X. Workshops.
Y. Central linen store.
Z. Staff-rooms.
a. Scullery.
b. Kitchen.
c. Pantry.
d. Male infirmary.
e. Female infirmary.
f. Fever wards.
g. Washhouse.

Inferior couples' airings ground.
Inferior men's airings ground.
Inferior women's airings ground.
Children under 7 years.

Fig. 20
City of London Workhouse - Block Plan

References:
A. Porter's lodge and committee rooms.
B. Brewhouse.
C. Master's office.
D. Master's room.
E. Matron's room.
F. Stores.
G. Assistant master.
H. Assistant matron.
I. Infirmary men.
J. Married couples' rooms.
K. Arrears.
L. Unruly men.
M. Able-bodied men.
N. Stores.
O. Isolated wards.
P. Able-bodied women.
Q. Unruly women.
R. Infirmary women.
S. Children's wards.
T. Workshops.
U. Drying room.
V. Laundry.
W. Musglove.
X. Workshops.
Y. Central linen store.
Z. Staff-rooms.
a. Scullery.
b. Kitchen.
c. Pantry.
d. Male infirmary.
e. Female infirmary.
f. Fever wards.
g. Washhouse.
VIEW OF THE KENSINGTON UNION WORKHOUSE.
MR. ALLOM ARCHITECT.
BIRMINGHAM NEW WORKHOUSE.—Mr. J. J. Bateman, Architect.
Columbia Square, the street elevation of one block.

Columbia Square, the courtyard.
Saltaire, a street of cheaper housing.

Wolverton, a railway town, started 1849.
GROUND PLAN of the INCORPORATED WORKHOUSE of the Hundred of THURGARTON.
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MODERN POOR HOUSE

CONTRASTED RESIDENCES FOR THE POOR

ANTIENT POOR HOUSE.