Light, Airy and Open: the design and use of the suburban public-house garden in England between the wars

Fiona Fisher and Rebecca Preston

Abstract

From the late nineteenth century, breweries, customers and the influence of an emerging public-house reform movement helped shape a new kind of bright and airy public house and garden whose heyday and location was the English interwar suburb. Imagined as a place for families, the new suburban pub and its garden projected an image of innocent leisure that would have been unthinkable fifty years earlier. Our article focuses on how ideas about the garden as a healthy, recreational family space translated into the commercial landscape of the improved public house. We suggest that while public-house gardens were undoubtedly designed to modify behaviour by a range of agencies with sometimes competing aims – among others, social and temperance reformers, the state, the local police and licensing authorities and, in turn, breweries, publicans and their architects – individual designs and customers' experiences complicate any simple notion that these were didactic spaces.

Introduction

We probably now think of the pub garden as an English institution, a convivial space comprised, perhaps, of a terrace and, in less congested areas, lawns with tables for leisurely open-air eating and drinking.[1] But in the Victorian and Edwardian periods the outdoor spaces of licensed sites, especially those in urban districts, were often viewed with suspicion as places where illicit activities might take place out of sight of the licensee. At the same time, those of many city pubs, including spaces used for popular games, came under pressure from development, or were built over to provide new indoor facilities.[2] Another significant influence on licensing practice and the location of public houses was that of the Temperance Movement.[3] This is particularly clear in the case of the provision of public refreshment places to serve new estates. For example, the suburban Park Estates, built by the Artizans', Labourers' and General Dwellings

Company in London (from 1872), banned pubs; the London County Council (LCC) prohibited the sale of alcohol at all its parks and open spaces; and, as Helena Chance has previously discussed, wider temperance landscapes of work and leisure were also created, such as the gardens and leisure grounds surrounding the Cadbury Chocolate factory at Bournville, Birmingham.[4]

From around the mid-nineteenth century, the garden was championed as an agent of social and sanitary reform by a range of organisations and individuals. What S. Martin Gaskell terms 'the propaganda for gardening' was a middle-class response to pressure upon open space and curtailment of popular outdoor leisure activities through increasing industrialisation and urbanisation.[5] By the early 1900s, the garden was seen not only as 'a source of moral and physical regeneration, but also claimed as the expected birthright of all free-born Englishmen'.[6] This conviction underpinned the work of Cadbury, Rowntree and others, and subsequently the garden city movement and state housing policy, as discussed further below. As a result, the interwar suburban garden became a phenomenon that was much remarked on at the time.[7] Thus it was claimed that the 'small gay gardens of the multitude' were making England 'the greatest gardening country in the world'.[8] Gardening formed a focus for efforts to instil habits of positive recreation among residents of England's new municipal suburban 'cottage estates'. In the late 1920s the National Gardens Guild, an organisation with paternalistic roots in poor inner-city areas, became a national arbiter of gardening schemes in municipal suburbs.[9]

On the face of it this landscape of gardens and gardeners would seem an ideal environment for the improved public house. Pub gardens were not, however, mentioned in the Guild's magazine, *The Guild Gardener*, and rarely appeared in the gardening press.[10] Nor were they included in the Guild's 'propaganda' drives to create gardens for public institutions such as schools, prisons, factories, and petrol stations. This was perhaps a diplomatic measure to appease temperance supporters within the organisation, whose membership also included early advocates for the improved public house.

To remedy the ills of the pub, the view that England should have 'fewer and better' public houses gained support in the lead up to the First World War and in the interwar years cooperation between breweries and licensing justices saw the idea adopted as local licensing policy. Its impact can be seen in the many 'improved' public houses that were built in the suburbs that ringed English towns and cities in the 1920s and 1930s, and on main roads and in tourist destinations. The term 'improved' generally referred to a modernised pub in which food, non-alcoholic drinks and recreational opportunities were provided. We take the term as it appeared in the Public House Improvement Bill of 1924, which, although unsuccessful, set out a definition of the 'improved' pub that was generally understood:

> Where licensed premises are not merely places for the consumption of intoxicating liquors but contain adequate provision … for the supply of other refreshments and are airy, commodious and comfortable, and have proper seating and sanitary accommodation, and contain provision for suitable recreation, the licensing justices shall, when the application for the grant of renewal of the licence is heard, issue a certificate to the effect that the premises form an "improved public house".[11]

The terms light, airy and open were frequently attributed to the interiors and gardens of improved public houses. Watchwords of Victorian sanitary and moral reform, they held their resonance in institutional contexts in the twentieth century and were often also associated with the kinds of garden 'propaganda' noted above (figure 1). As this article will show, although 'light, air and openness' are often associated with architectural modernism,[12] they also shaped less avant-garde building and landscape design, while the new pub gardens chimed with the wider aims of the open-air movement.[13] Photography was used to demonstrate the space and brightness afforded by the garden, and the general air of modernity, within as well as outside the new pubs (figure 2).

Openness, together with visual, material and spatial references to respectable sites of public and private leisure, were, however, also intended to signal to customers and the authorities that

these were orderly and easily supervisable spaces. The sociologist Michel Foucault argued that the use of surveillance, or disciplinary power, to control people extended from the prison to other institutions and through society more widely, and was intended to promote self-discipline.[14] His theories have been heavily debated and questioned, especially in relation to how this worked in practice; nevertheless, the idea that discipline is spatial has been widely influential.[15] Public houses are not of course reforming institutions in the usual sense of the word, and since as businesses they had to respond to competing reforming and commercial pressures, there was never a single authority in control. Yet their design was intended to promote self-policing among customers, as well as supervision by staff.[16] Implicit and explicit in the sympathetic commentary surrounding the improved public house was the understanding that improvements were designed to promote moderate drinking and respectable behaviour. This was to be achieved through architectural and landscape design, good management, and the encouragement of social interaction. As the *Brewers' Journal* reflected in 1946, people went to pubs for company: 'they learned civil behaviour towards each other and they learned to mix. That was the social value of the licensed house'.[17] Although occasional evidence of resistance can be found, customers were perhaps more often indifferent to, or accepting of, these improved environments.

John Greenaway has identified the interwar years as a key period in the modernisation of the licensed trade and its 'transformation into a modern manufacturing and retailing business'.[18] Around 5,900 pubs were built or rebuilt in England between the wars, with activity concentrated in the second half of the 1930s.[19] Together, England's leading breweries spent £6.8 million building 667 pubs at an average of £10,200 per project.[20] Taking advantage of inexpensive land in expanding suburban areas, they created pubs with substantial gardens, and sometimes playgrounds, sports greens and shelters. The garden was an essential component of what was 'better' about the improved public houses in the suburbs. As the writer Thomas Burke reflected, 'In contrast to the old dark and dingy late-Victorian places, they are large and open and airy, with no partitions and with daylight all around them. … They have a children's room, a games room, a

garden, a dining-room and no bar. They are built as places to which the whole family may decently go, and they appear to be successful'.[21]

Although gardens have been identified as a defining characteristic of England's interwar public houses, there has been no detailed research into the role of the garden within early twentieth-century public-house reform.[22] And while a relationship between the improved pub and improved housing has been acknowledged,[23] little attention has been given to the ways in which domestic gardens and gardening may have informed the improved public-house garden. Building on recent work on the design and culture of the interwar public house, especially that by Emily Cole, David W. Gutzke and Stella Moss, our article seeks to address this by considering the garden's role in improving the pub and shaping customer behaviour. Were pub gardens didactic landscapes, intended, to borrow Moss's phrase, to '*inculcate* new standards of respectable recreation'?[24] If so, how is this evidenced in their design, management and use? Moss makes this observation specifically in relation to the model 'licensed refreshment houses' built for new outlying London County Council (public) housing estates and emulated elsewhere. Did it also apply to the public houses built across the interwar suburbs? Were there other motives for providing pubs with gardens? What did customers think about these new social settings and how might that have conflicted with the improving and commercial intentions that underpinned their designs?

In its attention to the pub garden as a social space, our aim is to contribute to our understanding of the interwar suburb as a landscape with a shared public and commercial life, rather than being purely private and domestic in character.[25] In addition to examining how the public-house garden aimed to support moderate alcohol consumption and behaviour in a sociable environment, we also highlight regional variations in their form and function. Shaped by national licensing legislation, local licensing policy, commercial aims and consumer tastes and preferences, public-house gardens negotiated and served a range of competing requirements. Tensions between the potentially conflicting aims of commerce and control, and consumer choice and freedoms, are particularly evident in the case of pubs on local-authority estates

where there were specific concerns about working people's access to drink. Most public-house gardens were designed by brewery architects. In some ways these professionally designed spaces fit the pattern observed by Helena Chance in relation to factory gardens: they were driven by a belief in the value of gardens and parks to advertising, corporate identity and public relations, in the sense that they helped to represent the brewers as civic-minded and socially responsible.[26]

The following section traces the background to the licensing and other changes that led to the rehabilitation of the pub garden from the 1890s to the end of the First World War and sets out the social and geographical context of the new suburban public houses of the interwar years, which were usually located in or near low-density residential areas provided with generous green space.[27] It then turns to the ideal function of the pub garden between the wars, and its part in 'improving' the public house and by extension its customers. The article then examines how the gardens were organised in practice in London, Birmingham and Bristol, where different approaches informed the provision and design of licensed sites for new centres of population; and where, unlike in some other English cities, a limited number of licensed premises was allowed on public housing estates. Consideration is given to contemporary responses to the interwar pub, and the limits of the light and open environments in moderating behaviour.

Public-House Gardens and Public-House Reform, c.1890-1919

The place of drink in English national and social life was highly contested throughout the nineteenth century. Concerns over public-house density and the potential for license reductions in urban areas featured prominently in late nineteenth-century political debate.[28] In 1891, the right of licensing justices to refuse applications for new licenses and license renewals was established in law, supporting efforts to reduce public-house numbers.[29] In the same decade, an emergent public-house reform movement began to address the drink question through models of philanthropic, disinterested, or municipal management.

As Robert Thorne has indicated, these attempts at reform played an important role in shifting the terms of the debate on drink by bringing it back to 'the subject of the pub itself'.[30] Alistair Mutch also finds that reform efforts to shape consumer behaviour 'tended to take a physical form'.[31] In the early 1900s, reforming organisations such as the People's Refreshment House Association (est. 1896) and the Trust Houses (est. 1901) began to consider the pub's outdoor spaces in recreational terms.[32] As one north-eastern newspaper reported, in 1904, 'In most, if not in all, of these model public-houses, there are recreation rooms, games, and tea gardens, and the moral effect upon their patrons is very noticeable'.[33]

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, suburban tavern and tea gardens, sometimes attached to spas, formed part of Londoners' 'normal *locale*' for sport and relaxation.[34] Similar suburban environments, where drinking took place in pleasure gardens, could be found around other English towns and cities and in coastal resorts. By the mid-nineteenth century they had fallen out of favour and were closing due to poor reputation, alternative attractions, and pressure from urban development.[35] Thus, at this time, gardens did not necessarily equate with healthy or improving leisure, and those that were the scene of persistent carousing or political agitation were re-ordered as public parks.[36] From the mid-nineteenth century, the parks movement sought to provide a source of rational urban leisure.[37] As H. L. Malchow shows, public parks had clear didactic functions that were promoted with arguments from medical and moral reformers; thus the light and air of the park would help cleanse the city, create easily policed spaces that provided an alternative to the public house, and bring the poor into visual contact with the respectable middle class.[38] However, as Carole O'Reilly writes, although the didactic function of the Victorian public park 'was an important element of the gospel of "rational recreation"', using the park did not necessarily mean that the working classes spent less time on other pursuits.[39] And, as has been observed in relation to nineteenth-century arboretums, the complex relationships between the design, management and consumption of the landscape ensured that the image promoted of 'rational, objective science and appropriate behavioural responses', was contested and subject to appropriation.[40]

Nevertheless, the idea that green space, and especially designed landscapes, were key to urban reform persisted. In the late nineteenth century, organisations involved with turning derelict urban burial grounds into gardens and playgrounds for the poor believed that 'well-maintained green space would not only improve public health, but also reduce antisocial and illegal behaviour'.[41] The mantle of green-space reform was taken up in the early 1900s by the London Gardens Guild and, later, by the National Gardens Guild which coordinated the activities of the growing number of regional guilds; as noted, these organisations were active in suburban council estates between the wars.[42]

Some organisations were alert to the potential to improve city pubs and their customers by creating outdoor spaces, but opportunities were limited. In 1910, Edwin Pratt recommended roofing over yards to create winter gardens, where 'patrons seated in groups around small tables placed amid shrubs in boxes … would adapt themselves to the environment of a place where a man could well be accompanied by members of his family'.[43] The idea was taken up by architects in the interwar years to create outdoor space on restricted sites. Some model licensed premises on LCC estates, for example, had roof gardens on top of their recreation halls.[44]

Although Public House Trusts and other voluntary organisations helped shape the idea of the public-house garden as a morally improving environment, often including tea gardens to signify the respectability of their businesses, magistrates were resistant to the service of alcoholic refreshments out-of-doors.[45] Pratt drew attention to the 'absurdity' of a licensing system that allowed customers to carry their drinks outside, but prevented a landlord from serving there and suggested that a more relaxed approach would assist in the 'humanising of the public-house'.[46] Continental ideals informed new approaches to outdoor service. Pratt favoured the German beer garden – a 'delightful resort' for the whole family, where 'no one would suggest that it is "not respectable" to be seen', while others looked to the European café.[47]

Another influence on the development of the outdoor spaces of the public house was The Children Act of 1908, which banned those aged under fourteen from the bars. However, although it aimed to protect children from the pub's harmful influence, it was widely flouted.[48] Children left at home, banished to the pavement outside the pub, or parked in prams in public-house yards while mothers drank inside, drew condemnation from those involved in child welfare.[49] In the interwar years greater consideration was, as we will show, given to the accommodation of children and families by breweries and architects, often through the provision of gardens and outdoor amenities.

In summary, efforts at public-house reform from the mid-1890s to the lead up to the First World War saw the outdoor spaces of the public house come under scrutiny in connection with their use by women and children and in conjunction with ideals of moral and environmental improvement advanced by organisations such as the Public House Trusts. Yet, as contemporary commentaries show, breweries faced hurdles in developing the outdoor spaces of their pubs for commercial use and reformers made little progress in cities, where the drink problem was most acute.

State Management and the First World War Garden

Under a scheme of state management, which was established in Carlisle in 1916, breweries and licensed premises in key areas of munitions production were brought under state control to support the sobriety of the workforce.[50] This wartime efficiency measure stimulated various improvements to pubs in state-managed areas to secure 'air, light and publicity' – the use of 'publicity' referring, here, to ease of supervision.[51] Outdoor amenities, principally bowling greens, were important elements in the programme of change. In 1920 Arthur Greenwood described the state-managed pubs at Carlisle as 'clean, bright, airy and healthy', noting the Globe Inn at Longtown, with its bowling green and space for refreshments, as 'a worthy example of what places of public resort should be'.[52] State management was also claimed as a public health success. 'Family life, and public health and order, gained substantially under the policy of

Liquor Control', wrote temperance reformer Henry Carter, while the War had shown the need for 'new centres of human fellowship'.[53]

Housing Policy and the New Suburban Public-House Gardens, 1918-1939

Between the wars, the garden and green space became central to political debate and enshrined in town planning. In response to the Tudor Walters report of 1918, which drew upon garden city ideals, 'cottages' set in private gardens, amid parks, greens and other open spaces in outlying districts, became the dominant model for local government housing schemes.[54] Cottage estates were intended to create a hygienic village landscape of light and air, to foster community activity and encourage outdoor leisure and play, while vegetable plots and allotments were to supplement family incomes. Ninety percent of the 1.1 million dwellings built by local authorities between 1918 and 1939 were cottages with front and back gardens and housed some 4.5 million people.[55] Suburban estates of modest houses with gardens and, ideally, greens, verges and other open spaces, also became the primary form of development in the private sector and formed around three-quarters of the four million homes built by 1939.[56]

As noted above, parks, and gardens and allotments, had long been hailed as counter attractions to the public house. From the 1920s, cross-political commentary claimed that improved housing was in fact raising expectations of what an ideal public house should be. Rear-Admiral Sir W. Reginald Hall (conservative MP and a director of Barclay Perkins brewery) observed how little had been said about the *public* counterpart to domestic reconstruction after 1918, arguing that the nation's community life should harmonise with its home life, and thus that the pub and its setting should measure up to improved housing.[57] Similarly, in *Drink: An Economic and Social Study* (1951), Herman Levy reported on the competition that pubs faced from improved domestic circumstances – he named gardening in particular – and from access to radio, cinema and sport. Public-house improvements were then not only driven by licensing conditions and contemporary social ideals of what a pub should and *should not* be, but a wider context of improved living standards and leisure.[58] Attractive gardens might, therefore, have been

calculated to attract customers as much as to improve their behaviour, which, according to Levy and others was already substantially changed in respect of sobriety.[59]

As Levy indicated, the public park was another competitive spur to the improved suburban pub garden. In this period, O'Reilly argues, the Victorian didactic element of the park decreased, 'along with the early twentieth-century emphasis on citizenship, emblematic of the shift from recreation to entertainment'.[60] The improved public-house garden follows a similar trajectory, from the moralising approach of early reformers, to the more liberal and commercial perspective of leisure-oriented brewers, who viewed their businesses within this expanded competitive field. Thus, while the architectural press acknowledged the need for architects to produce designs that were acceptable to the licensing justices, it was also candid about the garden's commercial function. The well-known public-house architect, E. B. Musman, for example, acknowledged the garden as 'a very considerable asset' to a business, writing in 1938, 'Pleasant lawns, banks of flowers, a loggia, terraces and so on, all tend to encourage out-of-door drinking in fine weather, and the business of the house will be considerably increased'.[61] By the mid-1930s, as Musman indicates, there appears to have been some consensus on the form of the garden. Brewery architect Bertram Wilson offered a similar view: 'the most suitable development is on the lines of paved spaces and laid out gardens so that under suitable climatic conditions patrons can take their refreshment in the open if they prefer'.[62]

In 1938, an article 'In Praise of Beer Gardens' by the writer Horace Shipp, linked the 'introduction' of the public-house garden with a series of social changes, including a realisation that 'we are open-air people', a greater tendency to socialise outside the home, and the arrival of the 'architecturally worth-while public house' of the brewers. His ideal pub garden was based on the sense of familiar comfort of the German beer garden but planned with an 'intimacy in the layout' in acknowledgement of 'English psychology' by which he appears to mean an English preference for privacy.[63] Shipp was not interested in controlling behaviour, which, like Levy, he considered already improved, but in creating comfortable spaces with a sense of seclusion to appeal to English customers.

Another contemporary arena in which public-house gardens were discussed was the social survey, which usually focused on working-class housing developments at this time. Most reported that there were too few pubs in the new estates,[64] causing levels of overcrowding, which compromised their open and airy planning. *The New Survey of Life and Labour in London* (1930-35) found that the 'so-called Model Public Houses' around the city were numerically unimportant, and thus that they could not influence behaviour on a significant scale.[65] Other critics said the new pub gardens were in the wrong place. The 'industrial drink problem' was not, as one national newspaper complained in 1929, 'found in new housing estates, but in crowded manufacturing towns, where there is barely room for a back alley or a window-box, and certainly none for cafés standing in large grounds, with a bowling-green, thatched summer-houses, rose beds, and paved spaces for teak garden seats and tables'.[66] Meanwhile, as Peter Scott writes, citing the example of Liverpool, some councils barred public houses from new estates for fear they 'might encourage "reckless" expenditure and behaviour by tenants', despite the Ministry of Health's recommendation that licensed premises should form part of the amenities.[67]

Finally, although gardens, sports areas, and intermediate spaces such as terraces, were a defining feature of the interwar suburban pub, they were never an essential component of the improved public house per se, since brewers also rebuilt pubs along improved lines in urban areas where there was no outdoor space. Nevertheless, the pubs that were built demonstrate a strong belief in the improving nature of spatial arrangements and good design on behaviour and social relations at this time, while the presence of an attractive garden, often with facilities for games, increasingly satisfied a range of temperance reforming, social, and commercial needs.

Fewer and Better

The ideal of 'fewer and better' public houses informed licensing policy and practice in the interwar years, leading to the surrender of many inner-city licenses in order that pubs might be built on the periphery of expanding towns and cities. Contemporary architectural literature

listed dozens of such suburban pubs in England and Wales and surveys by David W. Gutzke and Emily Cole have identified many more. As Gutzke states, attractive, spacious gardens were favoured by progressive brewers as they were already associated with upmarket hotels and because of the longstanding belief in 'an improved environment's capacity for elevating character'.[68] Lawn-sports greens and playgrounds added to the idea of the pub as a family space. In his talk on 'English Inns' in 1932, architect Basil Oliver listed some of the facilities that now formed part of the design of improved public houses: recreation and assembly halls; winter gardens, garden pavilions, bowling greens, formal gardens, loggias, terraces, pergolas, and putting greens; car and lorry parks; skittle alleys; pram shelters and children's playgrounds; and club rooms.[69]

Inside and out, the improved public house was designed as a space in which alcohol might be consumed in moderation but need not be drunk at all. And, 'if insobriety occurred', reflected *The Brewers' Journal* in 1946, 'it was in the open, where it could be seen and dealt with'.[70] We will now look closer at how this worked, through examples in London, Birmingham and Bristol, which illustrate model practice in the case of the 'refreshment houses' built for municipal cottage estates, and the approach of designers of 'ordinary' pubs intended principally for the residents of speculatively financed developments or for mixed and passing trade.

As noted above, the general movement of building and people was outwards after 1918, as towns and cities expanded into surrounding areas. By 1939 one-third of the total increase in population of England and Wales was found in Greater London.[71] The South East as a whole grew by one fifth.[72] Birmingham and Bristol also expanded, following a similar pattern of inner-city clearance and suburban growth.[73] Suburban and satellite municipal estates formed a significant part of this expansion. Between 1919 and 1942, for example, the LCC built nearly 60,000 cottages, the metropolitan boroughs providing a smaller number of similar homes.[74] By 1939, Birmingham had built its 50,000th council house.[75] In Bristol, around 15,000 dwellings were built in nine main estates on the fringes of the city before 1939,[76] with development after 1932 centring on two large outlying estates, at Southmead and Filwood Park (known later as

Knowle West). In addition to those built by local authorities, housing estates were also constructed by speculative builders around these and other English town and cities; both kinds of development needed recreational facilities such as pubs, and the brewers were eager to oblige.

Licensing policy for the new estates varied over time and according to location and tenure. From the 1920s references to proposed gardens can be found in licensing applications. In March 1924, for example, Mitchells & Butlers had several requests for new licenses refused but were granted a license for a new pub to be built in the Birmingham suburb of Hall Green, 'which counsel suggested would be so beautiful with its grounds that it would be another Garden of Eden'. The license was granted on condition the pub's assembly room would be 'available for teas in other than permitted hours', which suggests that although gardens were often viewed as welcome additions to new businesses, refreshment spaces for the service of non-alcoholic drinks were more of a priority.[77] Architectural plans of the 1930s show that gardens were generally considered as part of the initial planning to support the licensing process in a more integrated way than was previously the case, while articles in local newspapers demonstrate the garden's significance in representing the modern pub to the public.[78] As Yorke observed, in 1949, 'well-laid out gardens' informed licensing decisions.[79]

In London, the LCC initially decided not to include pubs on its municipal estates, which prompted much public discussion,[80] before permitting a few 'licensed refreshment houses' on the larger estates, in the 'tradition of the Carlisle experiment'.[81] In Birmingham and Bristol the licensing authorities began to allow breweries to surrender city licenses for new licenses in areas of suburban population growth.[82] Basil Oliver attributed 'the excessive size and sumptuousness' of Birmingham's new suburban pubs to this successful policy of decentralisation,[83] and hoped that pubs elsewhere might be brought up to the same standards, 'where housing schemes go hand in hand with public-house improvement and where the brewers are not only successful men of business but also civic benefactors'.[84]

Under the leadership of Sir Sydney Nevile, who championed environmental improvements as a support to sobriety and increased trade, Whitbread established the Improved Public House Company Ltd. in 1920 to operate its large new pubs, built mainly in the London suburbs and also at Welwyn Garden City.[85] As model premises, with 'delightful gardens' and an emphasis 'much more on the community facilities' than the supply of drink, such pubs were influential.[86] Other breweries were also building model public houses in London and the South East from this time, for more mixed-tenure suburbs as well as municipal estates, as discussed below. In Birmingham, Mitchells & Butlers brewery led the way in public-house building, completing eighty-four new pubs in the interwar years.[87] By 1936 the brewery had 130 pubs with bowling greens.[88] Mitchells & Butlers, the foremost designer of 'lavish pub gardens' in the city, regularly awarded prizes to winners of the city's municipal housing garden awards,[89] and often selected keen gardeners to run its businesses.[90] In Bristol, Georges & Co was a leading builder of improved public houses, which in the suburbs were provided with gardens intended for families. By 1938 it controlled nearly a thousand pubs in Bristol and the West of England.[91]

By 1937, thirteen licensed refreshment houses had been allocated or built for six of the largest LCC cottage estates, six of them at Becontree, a new town laid out to the east of London in 1921-1935, and which comprised over 25,000 homes with a population of 115,000.[92] Five of the Becontree houses had relatively large gardens. The Robin Hood was the most reported of these, and had, in addition to bars and lounges, a concert hall with a winter garden, a tea room, space for open-air dancing, a formal garden, and a children's playground with its own sweetshop and lavatories (figure 3). According to Oliver, such 'facilities for safely "parking" children' had 'put an end to the unedifying sight of unhappy youngsters waiting outside the door of inns while their parents are inside refreshing themselves'. He found the garden illuminated and in full use on fine summer evenings.[93] The Round House had gardens that fanned out behind its circular plan, which provided 'excellent central service and supervision', with a club room and indoor bowling green in an annexe to one side and a children's shelter to the other.[94] But the Church Elm had a tea room and no garden. At both the Church Elm and the Fanshawe Tavern, which did have a garden, Mass Observation noted that prams were left outside, 'and small children dart in and out

of the doorway', suggesting that the facilities for 'parking' children were either not available or ineffective in some Becontree pubs.[95] And in south London, one former resident remembered that The Downham Tavern had a 'little tea place' next to the hall where parents could leave children, and that it had 'French doors which opened onto a beautiful rose garden. I used to feel like a film star at the Tavern as it really had atmosphere'.[96] Some customers were apparently content with the supervisory and improving aims of the organisations involved.

Problems of Scale: Overcrowding, Intimacy and Openness

Very soon, architectural and other commentary began to complain that the LCC pubs were far too big.[97] Even so, they tended to overcrowd at peak times, since, as was also the case around the country, other free forms of sheltered recreational space were slow to appear. When Terence Young surveyed Becontree in 1933 he found that the new pubs, with attractive gardens, did provide 'the Estate people with food and drink in comfortable surroundings', but that overcrowding undermined the improved system in all the licensed premises.[98] The lack of supervision obtainable in Becontree's pubs, Oliver noted in the 1940s, was ironic given the 'grandmotherly notions of control' of the Council and licensing justices.[99] Clearly the gardens were neither ameliorating the overcrowding, nor assisting in the supervision.

In some locations, the amount of space set aside for the service of non-alcoholic refreshments exceeded local demand and was another cause of overcrowding. At the Venture Inn at Filwood Park, a Georges' pub modelled on LCC lines and the first built on a Corporation estate in Bristol, most of the plot was planned as indoor facilities, including an assembly hall, a café and a skittle alley.[100] The brewery was, however, keen to stress the presence of a garden, albeit relatively small, and hoped the pub would become a social centre for the estate which customers could enjoy without, unless they wished to, drinking a single glass of beer.[101] By 1938 the café was little-used, while the licensed bars tended, like the LCC pubs, to be overcrowded at peak times. Customers had begun to drink outside at the front, which was unlicensed, to which the police were alerted, and perhaps felt more comfortable outside, in the open and facing a green.

Tenants were not, of course, confined to the pubs on their own estate and could and did resort to those outside. Meanwhile Young noted that several of Becontree's pubs had 'nicely kept gardens in which people can sit at tables in the summer' but observed widely varying patterns of use. Despite 'encouragement' few would use the garden of the Cross Keys, a recently modernised sixteenth-century inn, whilst the lawn of the new Cherry Tree was 'crowded in the summer'.[102] The Cherry Tree's garden was the smaller of the two and had no spirit license, but its popularity may lie in its convenience for the bus route, its newness, and perhaps by the fact that the Cross Keys was overlooked by the church and rectory. Some customers of the Cherry Tree were alleged to be 'incredibly mischievous and unappreciative of all that has been so well provided for their comfort'.[103] Here we have a hint that, whatever the aims of the local authority, the brewery or the bench, customers could to a certain extent please themselves in the pubs and perhaps more so in their gardens.

As Andrzej Olechnowicz emphasised in his study of community life at Becontree, it would be wrong to assume that the pub remained or had ever been the centre of leisure for all tenants.[104] Some avoided it through religious conviction, others on grounds of thrift or, in the case of male residents, because they were 'family men'.[105] Sometimes even those tenants who did frequent public houses did not want one on their estate.[106] The improved nature of the public houses and the presence of gardens evidently had little bearing on these decisions. Ewart Culpin, architect, garden city advocate and Labour councillor (and, later, Chairman of the LCC and Secretary of its Garden Society), complained that the licensing justices had refused the LCC's applications for more licensed refreshment houses on its estates.[107] Thus even improved designs, with gardens and other family orientated facilities, were not enough to guarantee that a public house was built.

An example of a new pub built in an area of more mixed tenure housing can be found in Tottenham where the White Hart was opened by the Improved Public House Company in 1927 to serve a growing area ten miles north of central London.[108] 'More than appeared reasonable for a commercial enterprise' was spent on the pub,[109] and the site was levelled to create a

'spacious garden', lit by electric light and overlooked by the saloon bars.[110] Photographs show that this was laid mostly to lawn, through which paved paths were cut at right angles, with beds filled with flowering shrubs and herbaceous plants. However, while it was undoubtedly important to the creation of a light, airy and attractive space that also put some distance between the pub and nearby houses, the garden appears to have taken second place to the large dance hall and refreshment room which adjoined the pub to one side, seen in figure 1.

Suburban pubs were also built to serve areas with a higher proportion of private housing. In a 1938 article on public-house gardens, Harold Shipp discussed four recent examples in the Middlesex suburbs. It was published in *Landscape and Garden*, the journal of the Institute of Landscape Architects, and reflected its interests in all aspects of landscape design including roads and other civic projects.[111] His observations related principally to the creation of greater comfort and intimacy for customers. Thus, while the Fountain at Twickenham had a well-designed, open approach from the road, the garden should, Shipp reckoned, have been broken up with creeper-covered trellis and shrubs, and with varied levels.[112] As an example of good practice, he included the Hop Bine at Wembley, where a recreation room opened onto a garden in which 'grass, paving and pillars are used in pleasant proportion' (see figure 4).[113] Likewise, although Shipp praised the Rest Hotel, Kenton, for its fine arcading that united the house with a lower terrace, sunk to give a feeling of intimacy, he thought that, overall, the expanse was too open.[114] It seems likely that, in addition to cost, these open gardens were, as Yorke indicated, designed to meet the approval of the licensing magistrates.[115] Shipp's desire for greater intimacy thus ran counter to concerns to keep the gardens relatively open, while perhaps betraying concerns with the privacy of gardens in more middle-class districts. Similarly, at the Five Alls, Chippenham, a roadside West Country pub, a tea garden gave 'opportunities for privacy and rest' – the idea of privacy in outdoor space once again apparently running counter to the general thrust of licensing policy, which favoured openness.[116]

Family Use, Outdoor Service and Supervision

In *The New Public House* (1924), Ernest E. Williams reported visits in Birmingham and Coventry, where he found pubs with 'pretty' gardens, bowling-greens, and comfortably furnished verandahs in which customers could take their refreshments.[117] At the Bulls Head, Stechford, he observed an 'unfortunate' notice banning children from the bowling green by order of the licensing magistrates.[118] This was later removed, perhaps pointing to some ambivalence over family use at that time. By the 1920s, publicans in resort areas had begun to provide facilities for trippers to allow them to visit in the company of their children.[119] As Moss suggests, 'brewers doubtless were inspired by more than just progressive principles. With children occupied and content, parents were more inclined to relax, spending more time and therefore more money in the pub'.[120]

According to Gutzke, in the 1920s Birmingham brewers pioneered facilities such as 'playrooms, playgrounds, nurseries, and even roof gardens' which became standard in the improved public houses of the 1930s.[121] As we have seen, the Robin Hood, Becontree, had a playground by 1929. At the Humber, a large Coventry pub, Williams was pleased, in the early 1920s, to find 'a lawn for the general use of customers, instead of confining it to the uses of a bowling-green, which in the nature of the case is monopolised by a very few persons'.[122] This comment on 'general use' perhaps suggests a shift in commercial perspective, from games to broader family use, which was realised more fully in the 1930s.

Oliver's description of Birmingham's improved public houses likewise emphasised the provision of outdoor spaces and he noted, 'Plenty of draw-up space for parking cars; a good garden, including usually a bowling green', 'garden service, and no stupid inhibitions about alcohol being served there' along with a 'separate garden for children to play in'.[123] His comments on garden service attest to the different approaches of local licensing authorities and the more restrictive approach that was taken in other parts of the country. London's model pubs, for example, did not have outside dispense-bars to serve and keep them supervised. The Downham Tavern in south London came closest, with a bar in the main building with direct access to the garden.[124] In Leicester, bar staff were prohibited from serving outside.[125]

The Bristol brewery Georges & Co. aimed to create pubs into which a man might take his wife 'without fear of debasing conditions, for the force of public opinion and good surroundings are the greatest safeguards against excess, possibly the greatest agent working for temperance this country has ever known'.[126] Gardens with space for 'rest and recreation' and 'special parts' for children played an important role in creating such surroundings. 'Many', claimed the brewery, were 'really ornamental and a joy to the town dweller who delights in well-kept lawns and flower beds'.[127]

Those built by the firm in the 1930s show that the architect was responsible for the design of the building and the garden, and that the plans for both were often realised as originally conceived. Many detailed only the materials and layout of the spaces closest to the pub and this may suggest that magistrates were most concerned with the immediate relationship between the bars and lounges and the garden. The rest of the site was typically labelled as 'garden' with lawns indicated, perhaps awaiting a clearer sense of the demands of local customers for possible future additions such as children's facilities or a skittle alley. Newspaper reports suggest that this was also driven by the need for pubs to open quickly, ideally with some garden space laid out as indicated to the licensing magistrates. Depending on location, such unplanned areas could also act as overspill spaces, particularly in tourist destinations. At the huge Severn Beach Hotel (1937), on the banks of the Severn Estuary north of Bristol, the loggias alone reportedly held 200 people and the wider garden hundreds more.

Although many pubs intended as locals for the resident population were designed with gardens, those on or near main roads were often also intended as destination pubs, or places to break a journey. Pubs with large gardens often advertised lunches and teas to summer charabanc parties – sometimes rowdy – hence separate garden service could be a benefit in terms of supervision, overcrowding, and efficiency of service.[128] In Birmingham, where outdoor service was allowed, breweries were able to include garden 'dispense bars' at the Black Horse at Northfield and at the Brookhill Tavern at Alum Rock (as seen in figure 5). As Oliver indicated,

with reference to the Black Horse, these 'quite separate and self-contained' bars were used 'more especially for char-à-banc parties which need not thus invade and congest the licensed rooms of the house'.[129]

In the 1930s, Georges developed suburban public-house gardens in distinctive form. Two pubs at Henleaze, the Beehive (1935) and the Eastfield Inn (1934), exemplify the brewery's approach to the design of the garden as a series of interlocking spaces, which included courtyards, lawns and paved areas edged with flower borders and seating, with spaces for games, for eating and drinking, and for children to play. Both pubs had refreshment rooms which opened onto a loggia and the wider garden, encouraging its use in inclement weather (see figure 6).

Plans of May 1934 show the ground floor of the Beehive with a public bar and a smoking room to the front of the building, and a refreshment room/lounge opening onto a garden at the rear. The small garden is shown as two connected spaces: a square paved area next to a verandah and a raised lawn linked by a flight of stone steps. The large area marked 'garden' at the extremity of the plot was omitted from the initial plan. By 1936, however, the architect had cut a new entrance, which was designated 'adults only', to the larger garden beyond, which became a 'public garden for adults and children' with a service store and counter and separate toilets for men and women. Moss has indicated that 'numerous trade groups argued in favour of the expansion of separate children's facilities and dining amenities to make licensed premises more welcoming to families'.[130]

The varied garden designs of Georges & Co, including the separation of outdoor facilities for different customers, suggest greater attention to the needs and preferences of users than those of supervision. At the Beehive, a gate to the side of the building gave access to a courtyard garden, with a central pond surrounded by raised beds.[131] The Eastfield Inn had a similar layout, but with a flower bed in the centre, surrounded by dwarf walls and a border. In general, Georges promoted its new pubs as classless, family environments, emphasising their recreational aspects and facilities for children and non-drinkers (see figure 7).[132] 'In any of them', it was

reported in 1934, 'the working-man having his evening pint will be as much at home as the man of means who calls in with his family in need of rest and refreshment during a long motor journey. There are lounges for ladies, gardens for family parties, and sand pits where small children may play in safety'.[133]

However, to some, the new pubs seemed 'more remote and less homely',[134] and one Bristol resident recalled being told that when the Venture Inn first opened 'you even had to wear a dinner suit'.[135] Others found the new suburban pubs *too* homely. To Thomas Burke, those around London had 'become rather domestic than convivial centres' – because they had a 'children's room, a games room, a garden, a dining-room and no bar'.[136]

Conclusion

Gardens were an important aspect of the suburban public house between the wars. For breweries, gardens helped present a new vision for pubs as modern and respectable leisure environments, expressing values of publicity and openness that spoke to the desires of the local licensing authorities, and created more airy and healthy environments for drinkers. While this certainly changed the way people used the pub at this time, other factors, such as the success of wartime licensing measures, including reduced opening hours and increased prices, also played a significant part in shaping the pub and its customers. However, although many welcomed the gardens as an amenity, others feared the effect of the 'new modern houses', with their 'bowling greens and rockery gardens to attract people to them'.[137]

As we have shown, for some people all public houses remained off limits, and they were thus not party to the new pubs' improved or improving environments. Some people were drinkers but did not want a public house on their estate, while others used the new pubs alongside a range of other licensed establishments. Others again found the improved pubs too formal and so returned to their old haunts. In some suburban areas, especially municipal estates where concerns about drink were magnified, licensed premises were banned altogether. Meanwhile, most municipal suburbs had restrictions on the number and size of pubs, meaning that any

impact of the light, airy and open environments hoped for by reformers and their architects was often seriously compromised by overcrowding. The public houses built on municipal estates probably came closest to the idea of a didactic space. Ironically, however, the imperative to provide indoor spaces for entertainment where alcohol need not be consumed meant that recreation rooms often took up much of the plot.

The new suburban pub gardens were designed to be comfortable for customers and with some privacy, but open and easily supervised. With significant areas of hard landscaping, greens, and other professional input they were akin to the gardens seen at exhibitions and nursery grounds and perhaps felt more like display gardens than a comfortable home-from-home.

Conservatories, loggias, covered walks, summer-houses, and shelters certainly corresponded with the contemporary vogue for sunlight and air, but they were also a practical and relatively inexpensive way of maximising the time that the gardens could be used and extending the drinking space. These structures were usually either glazed or only partially enclosed and belonged to an array of measures designed to increase supervision from the bar that had been pioneered in the early improved public houses and were rolled out elsewhere: glazed doors, raised floors behind the bar, through-ways from front to garden at the back and, outside, separate gardens for children, and male and female smoking shelters.[138] However, the size of many of the gardens, the fact that they were open at night in the summer, and the partially obscured spaces some contained, militated against total supervision and thus complicate the idea of the new pub garden as a fully controlled space.

---

[1] This is an English, rather than a British phenomenon, shaped by English licensing legislation and urban and public-house geographies, and by differing attitudes to the public consumption of alcohol, among others.

[2] In 1890 it was observed, for example, that tavern gardens and lawn billiard grounds had 'all but disappeared within five or six miles of London'. Lawn billiards, an outdoor summer game, was played in and around London from the 1830s. See, *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette and Hotel Courier*, 21 November 1890, p. 330.

[3] Brian Harrison, 'Pubs' in H.J. Dyos and Michael Wolff (eds), *The Victorian City: Images and Realities*, Vol. 1 (London: Routledge, [1973] 1999), pp. 160-190, on p. 183; Brian Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England, 1815-1872* (London: Faber & Faber, 1971).

[4] Helena Chance, 'The angel in the garden suburb: Arcadian allegory in the "Girls' Grounds" at the Cadbury factory, Bournville, England, 1880–1930', *Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes*, 27/3, 2007, pp. 197-216.

[5] S. Martin Gaskell, 'Gardens for the working class: Victorian practical pleasure', *Victorian Studies*, 23/4, 1980, pp. 479-501.

[6] Ibid., p. 479.

[7] For the interwar suburban garden, see Matthew Hollow, 'Suburban Ideals on England's Interwar Council Estates', *Garden History*, 39/2, Winter 2011, pp. 203-217; Rebecca Preston, '"Our Chief Hobby": The Design and Culture of English Suburban Gardens, 1920-1940', unpublished MA dissertation, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1994; Judith Roberts, 'The Gardens of Dunroamin', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 1/4, 1996, pp. 229-37; Sophie Seifalian, 'Gardens of Metro-land', *Garden History*, 39/2, 2011, pp. 218-38; Peter Scott, *The Making of the Modern British Home: The Suburban Semi and Family Life Between the Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), Chapter 8.

[8] A.J. Macself, *The Gardener's Enquire Within* (London: Collingridge, 1934), p. 11.

[9] Founded in 1927, the National Gardens Guild was a development of the London Gardens Guild, which had been set up just before the First World War. The London Guild had grown out of the London Gardens Settlement, which was founded by Noel Buxton (later Lord Noel-Buxton), a director of the brewers Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co., at the turn of the twentieth century. The National Guild was formed to coordinate the work of the increasing numbers of regional Guilds founded from 1926, those in Birmingham and Bristol being among the first outside London.

[10] See the monthly editions of *The Guild Gardener*, 1926-39, edited initially by the gardener, writer, landscape campaigner and founding member of the London and National Gardens Guilds, Richard Sudell.

[11] Cited in Ernest Selley, *The English Public House As It Is* (London: Longmans, 1927), pp. 109-110.

[12] Paul Overy, *Light, Air and Openness: Modern Architecture Between the Wars* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2007).

[13] On the open-air movement, see David Matless, *Landscape and Englishness* (London: Reaktion, 1998), Chapter 2, and Ken Worpole, *Here Comes the Sun: Architecture and Public Space in Twentieth-Century European Culture* (London: Reaktion, 2000). The style of much interwar suburban pub architecture and to some extent pub gardens can be classified as a form of conservative or suburban modernity, as discussed by Deborah Sugg Ryan in connection with the suburban home and by Alison Light in relation to middle-class domestic culture more widely: Deborah S. Ryan, *Ideal Homes, 1918-39: Domestic Design and Suburban Modernism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp. 58-60; Deborah S. Ryan, '"Living in a Half-Baked Pageant": The Tudorbethan Semi and Suburban Modernity in Britain, 1918-39', *Home Cultures*, 8/3, 2011, pp. 217-244; Alison Light, *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservatism Between the Wars* (London: Routledge, 1991).

[14] Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et Punir: La Naissance de la Prison* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), translated from the French by Alan Sheridan as *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (London: Allen Lane, 1977).

[15] For a review of this literature, and a discussion of discipline and its limits in relation to a range of institutional settings including those with gardens, see Jane Hamlett, with Lesley Hoskins and Rebecca Preston, 'Introduction',

and other essays in Jane Hamlett, Lesley Hoskins and Rebecca Preston (eds), *Residential Institutions in Britain, 1725-1970: Inmates & Environments* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2013), pp. 1-15. See also, Felix Driver, *Power and Pauperism: The Workhouse System, 1834-1884* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 3; Chris Philo, '"Enough to Drive one Mad": the Organization of Space in 19th-Century Lunatic Asylums' in Jennifer Wolch and Michael Dear (eds), *The Power of Geography: How Territory Shapes Social Life* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 258-90; and Leslie Topp and James E. Moran, 'Introduction', in Leslie Topp, James E. Moran and Jonathan Andrews (eds), *Madness, Architecture and the Built Environment: Psychiatric Spaces in Historical Context* (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 41-61, p. 54.

[16] On the public house and surveillance see, Fiona Fisher, 'Privacy and Supervision in the Modernised Public House, 1872-1902, in Penny Sparke et al (eds), *Designing the Modern Interior from the Victorians to Today* (Oxford: Berg, 2009), pp. 41-52; James Kneale, 'A problem of supervision: Moral geographies of the nineteenth-century British public house', *Journal of Historical Geography* 25/3, 1999, pp. 333-49. On the new type of customer as 'an effective "policeman"', see David W. Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives: Reinventing the Public House in England, 1896-1960* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006), p. 110.

[17] 'Social Value of the Public House', *Brewers' Journal*, 16 October 1946, p. 1094.

[18] John Greenaway, *Drink and British Politics Since 1830: A Study in Policy-Making* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), p. 114.

[19] In England, according to Gutzke, the breweries who were most active in reform put most of their budgets for improvements into building new pubs rather than alterations, see *Pubs and Progressives*, p. 207.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Thomas Burke, *English Inns* (London: Collins, 1943, 1947 edn), p. 44.

[22] Emily Cole, *The Urban and Suburban Public House in Inter-War England*, three vols, Vol. 1 (London: Historic England, 2015), pp. 80-82; Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*, p. 175.

[23] Cole, *The Urban and Suburban Public House*, Vols 1-3; Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*; Paul Jennings, *The Local, A History of the English Pub* (Stroud: Tempus Publishing, 2007).

[24] Stella Moss, '"A grave question": The Children Act and public house regulation, c.1908-1939', *Crimes and Misdemeanours* 3/2, 2009, p. 111.

[25] E.g. Lesley Hoskins and Rebecca Preston, 'Behind the scenes: participants and processes in the development of London's interwar suburban shopping parades', *Architecture and Culture*, 6/1, 2018, pp. 99-121.

[26] Helena Chance, *'The Factory in a Garden': A History of Corporate Landscapes from the Industrial to the Digital Age* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2017), Introduction, pp. 1-12.

[27] Although the distinctions could sometimes be blurred, we are concerned here with the 'ordinary public house and its provision of a garden' rather than with roadhouses, which typically had much larger grounds; see Horace Shipp, 'In Praise of Beer Gardens', *Landscape and Garden*, Autumn 1938, p. 144. For the roadhouse, see David. W. Gutzke

and Michael John Law, *The Roadhouse comes to Britain: Drinking, Driving and Dancing, 1925-1955* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017).

[28] See James Nicholls, *The Politics of Alcohol: A History of the Drink Question in England* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2009).

[29] Ibid., p. 134.

[30] Thorne, 'Movement for Public House Reform', p. 233.

[31] See, Alistair Mutch 'Shaping the Public House, 1850-1950: Business Strategies, State Regulation and Social History', *Cultural and Social History*, 1/2, 2004, pp. 180-181.

[32] Both organisations sought to encourage temperance by promoting the supply of food, non-alcoholic drinks and respectable recreation at public houses. Others, notably Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell, preferred to keep such amenities as bowling greens and other sporting facilities separate from the public house, favouring the creation of counter-attractions in the form of new sites of rational recreation; see Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell, *British 'Gothenburg' Experiments and Public-House Trusts* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1903), p. 69.

[33] 'The Public House Trust', *The Shields Daily News* (31 August 1904), p. 2.

[34] Elizabeth McKellar, 'Peripheral visions: alternative aspects and rural presences in mid-eighteenth-century London', *Art History*, 22/4, 1999, pp. 495-513.

[35] Jonathan Conlin, 'Vauxhall Revisited: The Afterlife of a London Pleasure Garden', 1770-1859', *Journal of British Studies*, 45, October 2006, pp. 718-43; Conlin argues that Vauxhall's appeal lay in the practice of seeing and being seen, which was the opposite of panopticism, ibid., p. 719.

[36] E.g., in London, Battersea Park and Kennington Park, see J.J. Sexby, *The Municipal Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces of London* (London: Elliot Stock, 1898), Chapters 7 and 1.

[37] Hazel Conway, *People's Parks: The Design and Development of Victorian Parks in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Moral and sanitary reform was not the sole motive for park provision. Many parks were financed using a combination of the income from associated middle-class housing and from the rates, and in turn the parks inflated the land values of these developments. See Jeremy Burchardt, *Paradise Lost: Rural idyll and Social Change in England Since 1800* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2002), pp. 55-6; Stephen Daniels, 'Landscaping for a Manufacturer: Humphry Repton's commission for Benjamin Gott at Armley in 1809-10', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 7/4, 1981, pp. 379-96, p. 395; and Alison C. Kay, 'Villas, values and the Crystal Palace Company, c.1852-1911', *The London Journal*, 33/1, 2008, pp. 21-39, p. 30.

[38] H.L. Malchow, 'Public gardens and social action in late Victorian London', *Victorian Studies*, 29/1, Autumn, 1985, pp. 97-124.

[39] Carole O'Reilly, 'A blot on the landscape? Civic memory and municipal public parks in early twentieth-century Manchester', *Landscape History*, 38/2, 2007, pp. 63-75.

[40] Paul Elliott, Charles Watkins and Stephen Daniels, '"Combining science with recreation and pleasure": cultural geographies of nineteenth-century aboretums', *Garden History*, 35, 2007, pp. 6-27, p. 6.

[41] Peter Thorsheim, 'The corpse in the garden: burial, health, and the environment in nineteenth-century London', *Environmental History* 16, January 2011, pp. 38-68, p. 48.

[42] See *The Guild Gardener* for its work in 'training' the former 'slum tenants' on the new estates and the statement made by the Guild's Chairman and Editor, Lady Seton, that 'It is a proved fact that no estate on which the gardens are kept up turns into a slum', in 'The National Gardens Guild', *The Liverpool Quarterly*, January 1936, p. 27.

[43] Edwin A. Pratt, *The Policy of Licensing Justices* (London: P.S. King, 1909), p. 65.

[44] E.g. the Fellowship Inn, Bellingham and the Downham Tavern, Downham. The Robin Hood at Becontree had a winter garden.

[45] In the Edwardian period, the rise of public-house tea gardens coincided with the tea garden's association with lawn sports in membership clubs, private upper middle-class gardens, and some public parks. Hotels and guesthouses also often had tea gardens at this time, and public-house tea gardens or lawns were initially aimed at this 'better class' of customer. On tea gardens and 'better class' customers see Reginald Cripps, *Notes on Public House Reform: A paper read at Denison House* (London: People's Refreshment House Association Ltd, 1910), p. 9.

[46] Pratt, *Policy of Licensing Justices*, p. 61 and p. 64.

[47] Ibid., pp. 57 and 60.

[48] Moss, 'Grave Question', p. 102.

[49] Ibid., pp. 102-105.

[50] On the State Management Scheme see Robert Duncan, *Pubs and Patriots: The Drink Crisis in Britain During World War One* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013).

[51] Henry Carter, *The Control of the Drink Trade: A Contribution to National efficiency, 1915-1917* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1918), p. 212.

[52] Arthur Greenwood, *Public Ownership of the Liquor Trade* (London: Leonard Parsons, 1920), pp. 180, 182.

[53] Carter, *Control of the Drink Trade*, pp. 263, 266.

[54] Under its chief architect, Raymond Unwin, the report recommended minimum standards of building and facilities and, crucially, pressed for state support for working-class housing, regulated by Unwin's town planning schemes; see Mark Swenarton, *Home Fit for Heroes: The Politics and Architecture of Early State Housing in Britain* (London: Heinemann, 1981).

[55] Ross McKibbin, *Classes and Cultures: England 1918-1951* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 188.

[56] John Burnett, *A Social History of Housing, 1815-1985* (London and New York: Methuen, 1986), p. 250; Scott, *Making of the Modern British Home*, p. 7.

[57] W. Reginald Hall, 'The best solvent: the public house as a powerful factor in social reform'. *The Cologne Post*, 2 September 1920, p. 2.

[58] Hermann Levy, *Drink: An Economic and Social Study* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951), pp. 113-116. Levy's research was carried out in the 1940s; the *New Survey* had observed in the 1930s that improved housing and access

to the radio were making the pub less attractive: Hubert Llewellyn Smith (ed.), *New Survey of Life and Labour in London*, 9 Vols., 1930-35, Vol. IX (London: P.S. King, 1935), p. 149.

[59] See, for example, *The Royal Commission on Licensing (England and Wales) Report, 1929-31* (London: HMSO, 1932).

[60] Carole O'Reilly, '"We have gone recreation mad": The consumption of leisure and popular entertainment in municipal public parks in early twentieth-century Britain', *International Journal of Regional and Local History*, 8/2, 2013, pp. 112–128, on p. 119.

[61] E.B. Musman, 'The Design and Construction of Public Houses', *Architects' Journal*, 24 November 1938, p. 835.

[62] Bertram Wilson, 'The Licensing Acts and Public House Construction', *Journal of the Institute of Brewing* (July 1935), p. 275.

[63] Shipp, 'In Praise of Beer Gardens', pp. 143-5.

[64] E.g. Rosamund Jevons and John Madge, *Housing Estates: A Study of Bristol Corporation Policy and Practice Between the Wars* (Bristol: University of Bristol, 1946), pp. 82-3.

[65] Llewellyn Smith (ed.), *New Survey of Life and Labour*, p. 262.

[66] 'The Ideal Pub: And Some of the Realities', *The Observer* (1 December 1929), p. 20.

[67] Scott, *Making of the Modern British Home*, p. 56.

[68] Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*, p. 170.

[69] Basil Oliver, 'English Inns', *RIBA Journal*, 14 May 1932, p. 562.

[70] 'Social Value of the Public House', *Brewers' Journal*, 16 October 1946, p. 1095.

[71] James H. Johnson, 'The Suburban Expansion of Housing in London, 1918-1939', in J.T. Coppock and Hugh C. Prince (eds), *Greater London* (London: Faber & Faber, 1964), pp. 142-66, p. 142.

[72] Jerry White, *London in the Twentieth Century* (Harmondsworth: Viking, 2001), p. 29.

[73] Jevons and Madge, *Housing Estates*, p. 16.

[74] Johnson, 'Suburban Expansion of Housing in London', p. 160.

[75] Carl Chinn, *Homes for People: 100 Years of Council Housing in Birmingham* (Birmingham: Birmingham Books, 1991), p. 49.

[76] Peter Malpass and Jennie Walmsley, *100 Hundred Years of Council Housing Bristol* (Bristol: University of the West of England, 2005), p. 5.

[77] 'Removal of Licenses', *Birmingham Gazette*, 5 March 1924, p. 9.

[78] See Fiona Fisher and Rebecca Preston, *The Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Public House in Bristol* (Historic England, 2015), pp. 266-267, available online: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/nineteenth-andtwentieth-century-pubs-bristol/ (accessed 16 July 2018).

[79] Yorke, *Planning and Equipment*, p. 24.

[80] Andrzej Olechnowicz, *Working-Class Housing in England Between the Wars: The Becontree Estate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 79.

[81] Basil Oliver, 'English Inns', *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, 14 May 1932, p. 566.

[81] Ibid., p. 565.

[82] On Birmingham see, Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives,* p. 83; on Bristol see, Fisher and Preston, *Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Public House in Bristol*, pp. 187-89.

[83] Basil Oliver, *The Renaissance of the English Public House* (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), p. 82.

[84] 'The Improvement of Public Houses', *A Monthly Bulletin*, 3/10, 1933, p. 146.

[85] Sydney Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years* (London: Faber and Faber, 1958), pp. 177-8.

[86] Elizabeth Glen and Gilbert McAllister, *The Inn and the Garden City* (London: Batsford, 1948), pp. 20, 12; the book included three of the refreshment houses built for LCC cottage estates.

[87] Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives,* p. 86.

[88] 'Holiday Bowling Tournament Draw', *Birmingham Gazette*, 25 July 1936, p. 13.

[89] 'Birmingham's Prize Gardens', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 3 August 1929, p. 5.

[90] Cole, *Urban and Suburban Public House*, Vol. 1, p. 82.

[91] *One Hundred and Fifty Years of Brewing, 1788-1938* (Bristol: Bristol Brewery Georges and Company Limited, 1938, p. 6 (hereafter *One Hundred and Fifty Years of Brewing*).

[92] See London County Council, *London Housing* (London: LCC, 1937), p. 227; Watling's refreshment house was never built due to tenants' objections, for which see note 106.

[93] Oliver, *Renaissance of the English Public House*, p. 95.

[94] Yorke, *Planning and Equipment*, p. 112.

[95] Mass Observation, *An Enquiry Into People's Homes* (London: John Murray, 1943), p. 210.

[96] Antonia Rubenstein (ed.), *Just like the Country: Memories of London Families Who Settled the New Cottage Estates, 1919-1939* (London: Age Exchange, 1991), p. 86.

[97] E.g. *RIBA Journal*, 14 May 1932, p. 555.

[98] Terence Young, *Becontree and Dagenham: A Report Made for The Pilgrim Trust* (London: Becontree Social Survey, 1934), p. 81.

[99] Oliver, *Renaissance of the English Public House*, pp. 84, 95-6.

[100] Skittles was a popular game in the West Country and many of Bristol's interwar pubs included indoor skittle alleys as part of the building, so that the gardens had to be designed to accommodate them; see Fisher and Preston, *Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Public House in Bristol*, Part II: 1914-1939.

[101] Georges' advertisement, *Western Daily Press*, 16 December 1935, p. 5; 'Palatial New Inn for Knowle West', *Western Daily Press*, 17 December 1935, p. 5.

[102] Young, *Becontree and* Dagenham, p. 190.

[103] Oliver, 'English Inns', p. 555.

[104] Olechnowicz, *Working-Class Housing*, p. 81.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Valentine Williams, 'New Homes for Old: What the tenant thinks', *The Listener*, 21 July 1938, p. 142; Ruth Durant, *Watling: A Survey of Social Life on a New Housing Estate* (London: P.S. King, 1938), p. 89.

[107] Oliver, 'English Inns', p. 566.

[108] On the mixed social character of the parish in 1938, see Application for further aid towards building an additional new church, 22 September 1938, Lambeth Palace Library, ICBS 12483.

[109] Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, pp. 177-8.

[110] *The House of Whitbread*, 9 January 1929, pp. 234-6, p. 236; our thanks to Joanna Smith for this reference.

[111] The magazine was edited by the landscape architect, journalist and founding member of the London Gardens Guild, Richard Sudell, and reflects a shift in his and others' thinking from a paternalistic to a more civic engagement with landscape improvement and green-space reform.

[112] Shipp, 'In Praise of Beer Gardens', p. 144.

[113] Ibid.

[114] Ibid., p. 145.

[115] Yorke calculated that shelters, terraces, car parks and gardens, including any bowling greens, should amount to no more than 10.5% of the total cost of the public house; extensive paving on different levels would have increased this. See Yorke, *Planning and Equipment*, p. 44.

[116] 'New Public House at Chippenham', *Western Daily Press*, 5 March 1937, p. 4; *One Hundred Years of Brewing*, p. 50.

[117] Ernest E. Williams, *The New Public House* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1924), pp. 157-8.

[118] Ibid., p. 158.

[119] Moss, 'Grave Question', p. 105.

[120] Ibid., p. 114.

[121] Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*, pp. 165-166.

[122] Ernest E. Williams, *The New Public House* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1924), p. 159.

[123] Oliver, *Renaissance of the English Public House*, p. 84.

[124] Ibid., p. 34.

[125] Basil Oliver, 'The Modern Public House V', *A Monthly Bulletin*, 4/2, February 1934, p. 30.

[126] *One Hundred and Fifty Years of Brewing*, p. 22.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Horse-drawn or motorised charabancs were large vehicles used for group outings and pleasure trips.

[129] See Cole, *Urban and Suburban Public House*, Vol. 2, p. 199.

[130] Moss, 'Grave Question', p. 111.

[131] 'Another Modern House of Refreshment', *Western Daily Press*, 6 February 1935, p. 5.

[132] The exception was the Venture Inn, where there was an understanding that, as the sole pub for a large outlying local authority estate, custom was less mixed.

[133] 'Inns Ancient and Modern', *Western Daily Press*, 15 November 1934, p. 5.

[134] Hilda Jennings, *Societies in the Making: A Study of Development and Redevelopment within a County Borough* (London: Routledge, 1962), p. 116.

[135] Letter to the *Bristol Evening Post*, 5 January 1976, Bristol Central Library Press Clippings file.

[136] Burke, *English Inns*, p. 44.

[137] 'Lure of Modern Public Houses', *Birmingham Gazette*, 7 March 1930, p. 4.

[138] Basil Oliver, 'The Modern Public House II', *A Monthly Bulletin,* November 1933, p. 170.