

CHELTENHAM DESTROYED

An introduction to the lost buildings

By Oliver Bradbury

'The middle years of the nineteenth century saw the gradual decay of Cheltenham as a spa, and the Gothic revival and its concomitant tendencies in the realm of taste killed both the classical building tradition and all appreciation of its creations. Gloucestershire is now so proud of being the home of the romantic and *naïf* Cotswold Manor House, that it has no place in its affectations for the demure and sophisticated architecture of Cheltenham. Most Cheltonians are only too apt to see little beauty in their town and to prefer the certainly delightful houses of earlier epochs. But "there is one glory of the sun and another glory of the moon," and if one likes Chaucer, one is not thereby prevented from liking Gray. At any rate, among architects an interest in the houses of the so-called Regency period is steadily growing. It is, therefore, very much to be hoped that the citizens of Cheltenham will develop, as those of Bath have done, a sense of their responsibilities as guardians of what is, perhaps, the completest neo-grec town in the country.'

Gerald Wellesley, *Country Life*, 1926¹

1995 was the year of Timothy Mowl's *Cheltenham Betrayed* publication and with it a possible revived interest in the fortunes of England's leading Regency town *par excellence*. 'Possible' it can be argued, as a member of the Cheltenham Civic Society has described the town's attitude towards its own heritage as 'apathetic'. Mowl's book certainly made one look afresh at the insensitivity dealt to the town since 1945. Lacking documentation of the destroyed buildings (only ten missing buildings are reproduced), his book is more about the placation of the guilty parties who inflicted the damage than the former. The frustrating dearth of documentation inspired the author to begin in 1995 an inventory of the destroyed buildings.

The combined collections of the Cheltenham Reference Library, Gloucester Record Office, Civic Society (1931), National Monuments Record (1943), and Georgian Group (1944) present a helpful documentation of Cheltenham before the post-war redevelopment got underway.

Aside from the actual buildings, what has been

destroyed beyond repair is the Regency 'ambience'. It is the many modern infills amongst the rows of Regency and Victorian buildings which have done so much to dilute Cheltenham's uniqueness. John Betjeman's *First and Last Loves* (1952) effortlessly conveys the lost persuasion. The Council's ruthless imposition of a one way system road widening (as in North Place) and the insensitive road signs could not have been predicted by the late Bryan Little, another Cheltenham historian, when he wrote his first history of the town in 1952. He expressed no concern at that time about the town's future, but by 1967 Little was writing in *Cheltenham in Pictures*².

'...and for a 'primary distributor' ring road whose course has been sharply criticised; so too have some road widenings and demolitions which would be needed were such a highway cut through some attractive 'Regency' zones. For the people of Cheltenham are more conscious than they were in late Victorian times of the classical beauties of their pre-Victorian buildings.'

The municipality did not resist the wholesale redevelopment of the High Street in the name of consumerism,³ nor the ruination of Cheltenham's earliest important terrace Royal Crescent by Charles Harcourt Masters of Bath (1806), compromised by the ubiquitous bus station. Interestingly, with the bus station's tree belt currently down (on the sight of Royal Crescent's original garden), the Crescent can be seen clearly again (2000).

Fortunately the pace of demolition has slowed down since 1980. Despite this, a few buildings have slipped through the net; such as G. A. Underwood's Plough Hotel facade in 1982, and Rosehill by Papworth, Waller and Fulljames in 1991. Cheltenham has been effectively stabilised with the designation of central Cheltenham as a Conservation Area in 1973, a Municipal Conservation Department, the Listing system and the Civic Society.

It is quite difficult to calculate how many buildings have gone altogether, but a conservative estimate would be 350-400 of at least some consequence. It

is difficult to estimate because often one does not know how many buildings there were in a row or terrace. The Georgian Group correctly observed in their 1945 report: 'It [Cheltenham] does not contain many buildings which can be considered masterpieces of architecture,' but what has been lost often had great charm. The town is weaker for the collective loss of these buildings. Good examples are the Portland Tabernacle formerly on Portland Street and No. 33 Swindon Road on the site of a now defunct DIY store site.

THE 1945 GEORGIAN GROUP REPORT

In 1945 the Georgian Group⁴ issued an important report on Cheltenham. It is important for two reasons. It is probably the first expression of serious coherent concern about Cheltenham's heritage for the future, after Gerald Wellesley's prophetic warning in 1926 (introductory quote). More importantly, so much of what was advocated in the report was to be ignored or contradicted over the next thirty years or so.

Before World War Two few had reason to be concerned about the future of Regency Cheltenham with perhaps the exception of Wellesley's lonely voice in 1926; it was very much intact. The only serious demolitions since Victorian times were the Cambray Pavilion, Bath Road in 1929, Suffolk House in Suffolk Square, replaced by Eric Cole's incongruous (to their surroundings) flats in 1935, Cambray House in Cambray Place in 1937, and the Imperial Spa building on the Promenade in 1937⁵. The Colonnade went in the early thirties, the Oriel Chalybeate Spa went in the 1938, but the 'Regency' was still intact. At the beginning of the report there is a 'Note':

'In April, 1944, the Planning Committee of the Cheltenham Borough Council sought the advice of the Georgian Group in regard to the Redevelopment and Reconstruction of Cheltenham⁶.

THE PROBLEM OF PRESERVATION⁷

Such, briefly, is the architectural glory of Cheltenham. How is it to be preserved? "Preservation," as has been said,⁸ "is a delicate subject, susceptible in a marked degree of fatuity, hypocrisy, sentimentality and downright obstructionism." Towns are men and women before they are bricks and mortar,

and nobody wishes to live in a museum. Obviously, all this is true, but there are other values besides expediency and often there need be no conflict between preservation and human convenience. There are certain types of buildings which deserve preservation, among them the building which is a work of art, and the building (or group of buildings) "which possesses the routine virtues of the school of design which produced it." Cheltenham possesses few of the former, but many of the latter, and it is these whose mutilation or destruction must be strenuously resisted.

A thorough inspection of the buildings of Cheltenham has been made by technical representatives of the Georgian Group and all those possessing definite architectural interest have been listed in Appendices I and II. A number of others had an almost equal claim to inclusion, but those indicated, while no means uniform in merit, are considered especially important. Either individually or as groups, they are most worthy of preservation since it is they which give to Cheltenham its unique character.

The buildings listed in Appendix II, comprising churches and public buildings, terraces, single houses, villas, and groups of villas, deserve most careful and sympathetic consideration in relation to any replanning or rebuilding projects. As far as possible they should be retained, at least as regards their external appearance, so as to preserve the architectural and historical character of the town.⁹



Boundary Pier formerly belonging to The Casino, built 1824, demolished 1920s or 30s. *The Author*

It seems that the whole of the last paragraph was to be ignored in the years to come. 'In some areas, such as in part of Pittville, where the actual buildings are later in date and commonplace in design.'¹⁰ Little comes to mind that is 'commonplace' in Pittville. It boasts some of the finest villas and terraces in Cheltenham. It continued: 'it is more important to preserve these elements of the plan than the architecture.'¹¹ The following appears more balanced:

'In general it is most desirable, in order to maintain the character of the town, that the layout, proportions of roads and tree planting should be retained and where buildings have to be replaced, or new ones erected, the appropriate scale maintained.'¹²

How many times would scale be ignored in the future? The Eagle Star tower, Bath Road is the prime example. Bryan Little said of it in 1967: 'Worse damage seems possible from large office blocks, and the tall building being put up to house much headquarters work of the Eagle Star Insurance Company will be far too towering and unmannerly for the district of Bath Road and the College.'¹³ Four Regency houses were cleared for the Eagle Star site.

*'Use of Appropriate Materials in New Building'*¹⁴

The choice of building materials should assist in preserving the unique character of the town. Stone, plaster or stucco are more appropriate than red or multi-coloured brick ... and materials and colour should be compatible with the local architectural tradition.'

Concrete lovers and Brutalists were going to take little notice of that guideline.

'It is recommended that [such] redevelopment should be in harmony with the excellent precedents presented by the older parts of the town.'¹⁵

Again advice which was to be lambasted by Modernists.

'It appears that any necessary street improvements or increased facilities for traffic can almost always be provided without involving the destruction of any buildings ...'¹⁶

The 1945 report must have been long forgotten when Little wrote in 1967:

'The private car has now ousted some of Cheltenham's public transport, and the town is beset by the general scourge of traffic congestion. In 1965 the Gloucestershire County Council published a Town Centre Plan for the future handling of traffic in central Cheltenham. Prominent items were the closing to vehicles of the Promenade, of much of the High Street, and of some short streets north of it, and the building of an inner ring road whose wide course would cause the demolition of much property. Much controversy has ensued, and in the early summer of 1967 Cheltenham awaited the result of a public local enquiry held by the Government.'¹⁷

Nigel Temple writing for *Country Life*¹⁸ at the same time said something very similar:

'... It has been argued that Cheltenham might prosper most happily by resisting boundary growth and counting her many blessings: that any plans to accommodate our motorised society by violating the town should in any case be resisted. It could be claimed that the County Council's plan to push a multi-carriageway primary distributor road for about two miles length through the town will do not only exactly this, but also demand demolition on an unprecedented scale ... It may be that these potential large-scale demolitions will never come about.'

Returning to the Georgian report:

'Control of all Alterations and Improvements

It can not be too strongly emphasised that when a terrace or group as a whole forms a unified architectural composition, there should be no question of a partial removal or mutilation. Clumsy mutilation of architectural detail, such as cornices or pediments, should be prevented.'¹⁹

A classic example of this is the crude removal of two of the fine Ionic porticoes on Bayshill Terrace, St. George's Road - for many years the stumps of the eastern portico survived affectionately known locally as 'the dustbins'. Another example is the

removal of the plaster-work detail, and the unique design of the balconies, once on the terrace opposite Cavendish House on the Promenade. The report goes on:

'An example of this bad practise can be seen in the house at the north-west corner of Suffolk Square, (now Willoughby Hotel) where the pediment on the terminal feature of a very fine terrace has been cut through in order to lengthen a window'.²⁰

Interestingly, this example has been recently restored a good fifty years after it was singled out.

'Planning powers should be exercised to control or prevent alterations to the elevations of buildings of architectural merit and to ensure that new buildings are designed in such a way that they will not detract from, though they may contrast with, the appearance of the old'.²¹

For years Farnley Lodge (YMCA) was covered in unsightly accretions, but now its plain, yet handsome Regency facade has been revealed and restored. The Modernist office block originally built for General Accident next to the Strawberry Hill Gothic of Oriel Lodge on Oriel Road is a good example of the blatant clashing of modern and old.

'Adaptation of Regency Buildings to Modern Living

....At the same time, few of the houses possess important interior detail or fittings so that the problem of conversion is easier in that only the facades require strict conservation and the interiors can be freely remodelled where necessary'.²²

The last sentence was perhaps misguided advice. Was this the *carte blanche* for the endless post-war streamlining of Regency and Victorian interiors into bland featureless cells? The go ahead to remove fine fireplaces of rich and rare marbles, when they were so often the focal point of a room, and the stripping of cornices; often charming with fruit or flower motifs and ceiling roses.

Even the Pittville Pump Room which was superbly restored during the 1950s by the Cheltenham architect Robert Paterson, could not avoid the zeal for removing fireplaces; all the ground floor ones have gone. Wellesley described them in 1926 as: 'These are of steel, originally decorated with applied ornament in

brass, a great deal of which has, unfortunately, now disappeared.'²³ They were particularly fine; a sumptuous combination of brass and marble, almost 'Empire' in their richness. There is one token fireplace left in the building on the first floor.

It can be argued that the quality of detailing in Regency interiors declined from the 1820s into the 1830s, when compared to the finesse of the 'teens. Detailing generally gets coarser towards the Victorian period. However often the scale of the rooms made up for uninspired detailing.

Chronologically the next concern about Cheltenham's welfare came in Betjeman's 1952 *First and Last Loves*. Betjeman who had known and loved Cheltenham since the 1920s, observed of the Pittville Pump room: 'Its exterior was recently mutilated by some municipal department which destroyed the statues with which it was adorned.'²⁴ Of the town in general he lamented: 'A Cheltenham Regency Society has been founded just in time to save this lovely town from careerist civil servants and greedy speculators. If the harm that has been done in Cheltenham goes no further, in ten years time Cheltenham will be as admired as Bath.'²⁵ Unfortunately the civil servant and the speculator all but won.

In 1967 Bryan Little and Nigel Temple both expressed concern about Cheltenham's future. Nigel Temple again writing for *Country Life*:

'... Cheltenham is at a cross-roads in its development. Major decisions now in the balance could drastically affect the character and life of this Regency spa town. A less conspicuous agent for change is the continuous small-scale erosion of more or less important buildings. ... The chance to rebuild large central areas does not recur frequently. Forgetting future events, large areas of Cheltenham are being cleared now ... Cheltenham must be watchful for the continuous erosion by scattered activity against its architectural assets. Cumulatively, over years, they could be as damaging as sweeping unselective change.'²⁶

Throughout the 1960s there were reams of letters to the editor of the local paper (*The Echo*) expressing concern about the town's new direction. Finally as late as 1970 David Verey writing for Sir Nikolaus Pevsner's *Buildings of England* series for Gloucestershire expressed grave concerns, although back in 1948 he wrote in *The Architect and Building News*:

'Nowhere in spite of the amount of railings which were removed during the war, is there such a quantity and quality of ironwork. This is indeed one of Cheltenham's special features and what remains should be guarded with the utmost care.'²⁷

It is interesting that he wrote the last sentence *after* 1945. In 1970 he wrote:

'Recent developments in Cheltenham are frankly disturbing...There are bad infillings with small boxes around the south of Pittville Park and there is a terrible row of bungalows just back from All Saints Road. The new Telephone Exchange in Oriel Road however is quite polite and in scale, but it would be a pity if development here meant the destruction of Oriel Lodge. (secured 1976) A number of good houses are now in a derelict condition. Everything in the future depends on the Central Development Plan.'²⁸

DOMESTIC

The domestic section of this article attempts to briefly survey the majority of important though no longer extant private dwellings in Cheltenham. At least sixty free-standing houses or villas have been demolished, at a conservative estimate. As already mentioned, it is often difficult to determine exactly how many houses there were in certain terraces, for example the late North Place.

One can say wherever there is a modern infill within a row or terrace of Regency or Victorian houses there was probably a building contemporaneous to its neighbours. A good example is the unsightly replacement of Bayshill Lawn by Brian Tait in 1960 on Parabola Road. Historic maps like Merrett's (1834) and the detailed OS maps of the 1880s are invaluable in determining the existence of long forgotten demolished buildings.

Demolitions such as The Priory²⁹ in 1968 on the London Road and Cambray House in Cambray Place are particular for two reasons. They were both architecturally distinguished; although their architects have not been identified. Their scale was imposing by Cheltenham standards, but more importantly their undistinguished replacements have deprived the immediate locality of an authentic focal point within its architectural hierarchy. Cambray House was once the focal point terminating Cambray Place's long vista. The Priory's unsightly



Top landing of The Priory, c 1825, demolished 1968.
Reproduced with permission of the GRO (ref D3867/IV/35 DNC5-26).

replacement did little to relate to its polite Regency neighbours - ironically the replacement had gone full circle; i.e. twenty five years after it was built, it was empty, self-defeated, and derelict. In 1998 it was demolished. The exterior of the original Priory has been paraphrased to house 'just 32' flats, and an underground car park.³⁰

Other demolitions were Tudor Lodge at the Park by the Victorian architect S.W. Daukes, and perhaps J. Middleton's masterpiece Abbeyholme in the Overton Park area, both in the Gothic revival style. Abbeyholme was important for its pre-Raphaelite overtones and sumptuous, rich, ornate Victorian detailing. Neither were masterpieces on a national scale, but they were important in that they were houses designed by architects for themselves, hence valuable as manifestations of the architect's individuality, aspirations, ideas and devices assimilated into one. Here the architect enjoyed free reign, indulging in no obligations to anyone, but himself. Two houses by an architect of national importance were J. B. Papworth's Rosehill, although heavily Victorianised by Waller & Fulljames³¹ on the Evesham Road, and No.1 Lansdown Crescent, now replaced in facsimile. Attributing domestic work to Papworth in Cheltenham has always been rather woolly and needs further research. As Bryan Little put it in his 1952 book on Cheltenham: 'Worse still, there was a legend that still needed probing - the idea that nearly all Cheltenham was designed by Papworth.'³² Why Rosehill was allowed to be demolished as recently as 1991 is a mystery; surely

the later outliers could have been removed and the grounds implemented according to Papworth's



The Rock House, Vittoria Walk, 1815 & 1842, demolished 1978

masterplan housed in the RIBA, London.

A minor but unique demolition was The Rock House once enhancing Vittoria Walk.³³ It was the only building in the town covered in chocolate coloured rock, fish-scale roof tiles, and with a grotto inside. Though predominantly a neo-classical town, Cheltenham could boast a domestic grotto; indicative of the diversity and creativity of



The Portland Tabernacle, c. 1818, demolished c. 1980,
Cheltenham Art Gallery & Museum.

its early Victorian period.

The list goes on; Bayshill Lodge, where George III stayed on his seminal 1788 visit to the developing spa town, albeit not badly replaced in Victorian times. The loss of the exquisite Portland Tabernacle³⁴ on Portland Street in c. 1980, built as

a private dwelling in 1818, but converted to religious use in the late nineteenth century is unfortunate as it was one of the few Cheltenham buildings from the Soanean school, perhaps by Sir John Soane's little-known pupil George Allen Underwood. Luckily its visual counterpart the Masonic Hall survives.

PUBLIC

This section covers Cheltenham buildings which were not private dwellings or used for religious purposes. Like the domestic section Cheltenham has lost many public buildings. Public buildings usually occupy prominent positions and so are focal points for any town. In this sense their loss is more critical than private dwellings in Cheltenham. Buildings from every aspect of public life have disappeared including museums, asylums, banks, breweries, hotels, glass houses, shops, markets, vicarages, clubs, schools, spas, libraries, parks, gardens, bandstands, pagodas and grottoes. Approximately sixty public buildings have gone.

The warning signs came as early as the 1860s with the demolition of the Literary Institution on the Promenade, suggesting reappraisal, a shift of taste, which will be discussed later in this section. The following decade included the destruction and the building over Cheltenham's near sacrosanct Georgian genesis - the Old Well walk. Here the Victorians showed scant regard for Cheltenham's rebirth as a spa town. No great buildings were lost, but the Old Well walk avenue laid out as early as 1739-40 was clearly symbolic to the town. In 1900 the fine Regency Assembly Rooms by an obscure architect called Henry Kitchen were demolished to make way for the full-blooded Edwardian neo-Baroque pastiche of Lloyd's Bank on the High treet. Kitchen's Assembly Rooms had in their turn replaced a short lived building of the same purpose, possibly built by Henry Holland in 1784, and demolished in 1816. Likewise the original Montpellier Spa dating from 1808 was replaced by G.A. Underwood's 'Long-Room' in 1817.

The original Pate's Grammar school built as early as 1572 survived until 1887 to be replaced by a Victorian gothic pile (1887-9) looking more like a castle than a school. Elizabethan Pate's is the greater loss as it was such a rare example of pre-Regency Cheltenham; effectively before Cheltenham was 'on the map'.

Cheltenham has lost ten major hotels; eight of which had imposing neo-classical facades. The leading hotel was the ancient Plough. It was

demolished in 1982. The present Regent Arcade facade bears a superficial resemblance to the Plough's Regency incarnation; designed by G.A. Underwood. Its claim to fame was the biggest backyard of any hotel in England.

Still on the topic of consumerism Cheltenham like most towns and cities has lost almost all its original shop fronts (save for example an intriguing Art Nouveau facade on the Promenade next to Cavendish House). In 1970 Verey observed: 'Cavendish House has set a completely new trend in the Promenade, as have the new shopping blocks in Pittville Street and Winchcombe Street.'³⁵ Cavendish House boasted the most imposing shop front in Cheltenham. Evidence of Regency Cavendish House can still be viewed from Regent Street. A series of Regency shops called the Colonnade dating from as early as the 1790s at the bottom of the Promenade were cleared in the early 1930s. All that remains of the Colonnade is Martin's, the county jewellers, clinging onto the end of the present Art-Decoesque apology. The greatest loss in this field is Edward Jenkins eccentric Neo-Hindu Market facade built in 1822-23, on the site of the present Tesco and Bennington Street; off the Lower High street. Just how charming Regency shop fronts were can be seen from a perusal through early nineteenth century guide books on the town.

Two of the greatest public building losses were G.A. Underwood's elegant Sherborne Spa which survived in a debased form until 1937³⁶ to make way for a neo-Georgian cinema itself replaced in 1987, and the powerful, but short lived full-blown Greek-revival Literary and Philosophical Institution dating from 1835-6; by the stylistically eclectic Jearrad brothers. It was as good as any provincial rival. Other sad losses were the gem-like Mawes and Tatlow Museum next to the present Montpellier Pump Room which had only been there for twenty years when it was demolished in 1843. The fine neo-classical facade of Gardner's Original Brewery also went down with Victorian Pate's in the 1960s. The Regency Albion Brewery on the Gloucester road went too in about 1876. Finally the parks and open spaces at Jessop's gardens, Montpellier and The Park have gone or been mutilated or diminished. All three once featured dainty Chinoiserie pagodas,³⁷ which have long disappeared.

RELIGIOUS

Fortunately we have been spared the destruction of

the majority of our churches and chapels. The sheer quantity of churches in Cheltenham can be gathered by browsing through Steven Blake's 1979 *Churches and Chapels* publication. It is now almost forgotten how much of a religious centre Cheltenham became during Victorian times after the frivolous and invigorating Regency period. The most important loss, although now hardly remembered, was Papworth's St. John's on Berkeley Street in 1967. Unfortunately the Victorians had already altered the church beyond recognition into a bland gothic affair during the 1870s. Any Greek revival church (as it was originally built in 1827-29) by Papworth would by example have been a great asset to the town. Other losses have been Samuel Onley's, albeit peculiar-looking, Congregational Chapel on the present site of the Winchcombe Street Odeon in 1932. The late Italianate Royal Well Chapel was demolished in the mid 1960s to make way for a car park. St. Philip's in Leckhampton by an obscure architect called Shellard and the neo-classical Roman Catholic Chapel in St. James' Square were short lived, in time replaced by worthy, but dull Victorian churches in High Gothic style.

MUTILATION

This somewhat miscellaneous section covers houses, stables, railway stations, hotels, churches, chapels and gardens from all sections which have been severely mutilated, but not pulled down. A leading example is possibly the lopping off of two of the fine neo-classical porticoes on the previously mentioned Bayshill Terrace in St. George's road. This terrace was as grand as the Municipal Offices, and almost 'European' in scale when intact. The Methodist Chapel in St. George's Street was late Regency in style, but early Victorian in date, had its Tuscan Doric porch sawn-off in the 1950s, but to the Corporation's credit the building has been commendably restored and converted into flats. Montpellier gardens are a shadow of their former glory; a building in the far corner and the pagoda have long gone. Lansdown Station has lost its powerful early Victorian Greek revival portico by S.W. Daukes save for a solitary Doric column. The Grecian gates of Rowland Paul's 1831 Burial Chapel in the Lower High Street were lost in 1965 when the Corporation bulldozed the burial ground, converting it into a municipal garden in the process losing a bizarre mausoleum with a carved dog on top howling into perpetuity for its deceased owner.³⁸



Mr Darby's mausoleum, 1861, demolished 1965.
Cheltenham Borough Council.

CONCLUSION

Let us end with a somewhat naive but to-the-point letter written to *The Echo* in 1961 (4 Nov.) by an anonymous individual under the alias 'REGENCY-LOVER'.

'Cheltenham is a unique town and our Regency buildings are some of the finest in England. Have we a right to destroy this heritage? And is it not a short-sighted policy? Visitors come from all parts of the world to see them, and if Cheltenham is reduced to a hodge-podge of buildings in all styles of architecture all charm and originality will be lost, and Cheltenham will sink to just another town.

Surely the facade of the old houses at least could be preserved, and new buildings built in the Regency style.'

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the many people who have answered my project queries and to the following in particular: Dr. Nigel Temple, Dr. Steven Blake, Amina Chatwin, Roger Beacham, and especially Ken Pollock for his knowledge of the subject at issue.

References

- 1 16 Jan., p. 101.
- 2 David & Charles, p. 15.
- 3 As early as 1943 the late Sir Hugh Casson referred to 'the standardized facade of a chain store' apropos the High Street. 'Cheltenham A Regency Town', *Geographical Magazine*, Feb. 1943, p. 500.
- 4 A national architectural conservation body based in London.
- 5 Another case is The Casino (later Haldon House, Painswick Rd.) built in 1824 and demolished in the 1920s or 30s. Sometimes, all that remains of a former house is a mature red brick wall and a stone pier, as is the case, with The Casino. The much-eroded pier being on the junction of Painswick/Andover Road. However, the name survives with 'Casino Place' behind the original house.
- 6 London, April 1945, p. 2.
- 7 Pp. 7-8.
- 8 A name was not supplied.
- 9 Pp. 8-9.
- 10 P. 9.
- 11 P. 9.
- 12 P. 9.
- 13 *Cheltenham in Pictures*, p. 15.
- 14 Georgian Group report, p. 10.
- 15 P. 10.
- 16 P. 10.
- 17 *Cheltenham in Pictures*, p. 62.
- 18 30 November 1967, p. 1389.
- 19 P. 10.
- 20 P. 10. This example can be seen in the *Country Life* article, p. 100.
- 21 Georgian Group report, p. 11.
- 22 P. 11.
- 23 P. 99.
- 24 John Murray, p. 17.
- 25 P. 20.
- 26 Pp. 1388 & 1389.
- 27 12 March, p. 240.
- 28 *Gloucestershire: The Vale & The Forest of Dean*, Penguin, 1970, p. 125.
- 29 Arguably the single most important house to go. Refer to the author's 'A History of The Priory', *Cheltenham Local History Society*, Journal 16, 2000.
- 30 Wellington Place sale particulars, 1998, p. 1.
- 31 Refer to the author's 'Who Built Rosehill?', *Cheltenham Local History Society*, Journal 13, 1997.
- 32 *British Cities Cheltenham*, B. T. Batsford Ltd., p. vii.
- 33 Refer to the author's 'Rock House, Vittoria Walk, Cheltenham', *Follies - The International Magazine for Follies, Grottoes & Landscape Buildings*, Spring 1998.
- 34 Refer to the author's note in *Cheltenham Local History Society*, Journal 14, 1998, p. 32.
- 35 P. 125.
- 36 Built in 1817 on the site of the present Queen's Hotel and relocated lower down the Promenade in 1837.
- 37 The one at Montpellier gardens being by the Jearrad bros.
- 38 Refer to the author's 'The Follies of Cheltenham' (part II), *Cheltenham Local History Society*, Journal 15, 1999, p 23.