

THE HAMPSDEAD GARDEN SUBURB FELLOWSHIP

AND FELLOWSHIP HOUSE

THE STORY OF THEIR BIRTH AND GROWTH

EDITOR - KATHLEEN M SLACK

1993

INTRODUCTION

To appreciate fully the pioneering nature of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Fellowship and of Fellowship House one must first recall the ideals of Mrs, later Dame Henrietta Barnett, and the earliest days of the Suburb's life. Had it not been for her vision and the achievements of herself and those who first supported her, neither the Fellowship nor Fellowship House would have been born. Their story, therefore, begins in 1904. But first a warning note is sounded. As the ninety years went by since 1904, in a growing and changing community, it was inevitable that files, books and records of any one organisation would be passed from person to person and place to place with the result that the Fellowship papers do not now always appear in chronological order and some records are incomplete. When and where there are gaps in this story, therefore, they must be forgiven, as also imprecision over certain dates or the sequence of events, as these are at times difficult to disentangle.

That said, one turns again to 1904, the year in which Mrs Barnett formed a Committee consisting of herself and six eminent men to assist her with the establishment of her dream community. In 1905 that Committee formed the first, or what is now known as the old Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust Ltd, and constituted themselves as its Board of Directors, with Mrs Barnett at its head, to become responsible for the planning and management of the Suburb to be. In 1907 the Board of Trustees or Directors exercised the legal powers which they had now gained to purchase land from Eton

College for the building of the first or original part of the Suburb. They then leased plots of that land to those who hoped and intended to build houses or other premises on those plots when their building plans had been approved.

One of the first bodies to make use of the way now open to build was Hampstead Tenants Ltd, a branch formed in 1907 of CoPartnership Tenants Ltd, a national body established to enable or assist Tenants' Associations to lease land, build and manage housing or other property. In 1909 Hampstead Tenants Ltd leased land between what are now Hampstead and Willifield Way and there built a complex of flats known as The Orchard for occupation solely by old people. In 1910 they leased a plot of land in Willifield way on which they built a Club House or Community Centre. Both these ventures, The Orchard and the Club House, form an integral part of this story but first one turns to the Fellowship as such.

THE EARLY YEARS

The records preserved amongst the Fellowship Archives include single documents, files, accounts, Committee Minutes from January 8th 1916, and Annual Reports from 1951-52 onwards. These form the basis on which this story is built; strengthened in certain details from material contained in "Henrietta's Dream"***; From these sources of information one learns that the Fellowship was founded in 1910 preceded by the establishment of a Fellowship Fund in 1909, its intention being to assist Suburb tenants including those in The Orchard, who through sickness, bereavement, distress, accident, unemployment or old age were in temporary need of financial assistance. The emphasis was on 'temporary' as there was never any intention or possibility of providing for long-term need.

The idea of the Fellowship originated, it is said, in a Garden Suburb Adult School. Who started that School is unrecorded but Mrs Barnett wrote that it was "an outward and visible sign of the inward spiritual grace of the hand of man and woman who united to learn, think and worship". It was customary at that time for an Adult School, whose existence was not peculiar to the Suburb, to help those in need. It is understandable, therefore, how and why the Suburb Adult School inspired the foundation of the Fellowship Fund.

***Written by and obtainable from Kathleen M Slack.

Since the intention was to provide financial assistance for tenants in need it is clear that the basic object of the Fellowship Fund was to raise, hold and administer money for that purpose. To achieve this on as wide a base as possible a Fellowship Fund Committee was set up composed of representatives of the Suburb churches: St Jude-on-the-Hill, the Free Church and the Society of Friends - together with representatives of the existing Suburb Societies which at that time included the Ethical Society, the Women's Guild, Hendon Women's Citizens Society and the Horticultural Society. One of the Committee's first successful efforts in obtaining funds resulted from an application made to the Middlesex County Council for a grant from its Sunday Cinema Fund, payable under the existing Sunday Entertainment Act. An initial grant of £90 was made, paid thereafter annually up to 1962. Looking far ahead - to complete this first part of the story - when the National Health Service came into being in 1948 a one-time Suburb Nursing Association was terminated and its remaining funds, amounting to approximately £1000 were passed to the Fellowship Fund.

It is of some interest to note at this point various suggestions that were made by certain members of the Fellowship Fund Committee for the use of the funds as they became available as these suggestions show that the Committee were not lacking in ideas. They included the provision of a Rest Home on the Suburb for old people; the endowment of a bed in the Hendon Cottage Hospital, such a bed to be at the disposal of the Fellowship Fund Committee; the services of a retired or part-time nurse to be

resident on the Suburb, or the housing of a nurse in The Orchard. No doubt there was disappointment when these suggestions proved to be too ambitious.

At this point there is a gap in the story as the papers that might fill it are missing. This causes uncertainty as to what took place between the setting up of the Fellowship Fund in 1909 and 1916 when the first Minute Book makes its appearance. One has, therefore, to take up the tale in 1916, two years into the first world war whose disruption may indeed have been one cause for the loss of material enabling one to continue the story without a break, which begins again on January 8th 1916. On this date a meeting of what in the Minutes is named a 'Bureau Committee' was held in 'Red Gable' under the Chairmanship of Mr P W Wilson. It is stated that at that meeting a War Relief Committee set up by the Residents' Council (the forerunner of the Residents' Association) had been asked by the 'Bureau Committee' to nominate members to fill certain unspecified vacancies. A War Relief Committee is self-explanatory but the initiation and composition of a 'Bureau Committee' remains a mystery, particularly as it was minuted that the Manager and Secretary of the Bureau should receive a remuneration of 7/6d a week. Whatever the position was, however, the Fellowship Fund Committee was chosen amongst others to appoint a representative onto that strangely named body and this it did until January 18th 1916, when it was reported that it had suspended its activities in order to "co-operate with the Bureau Committee".

Whatever the constitution and purpose of the 'Bureau Committee' may have been it is clear it was dealing with individual needs as one of its Minutes states that any two members, in conjunction with the Secretary, could deal with any urgent Case up to 5/- in amount, and also that a system of visiting was being undertaken in The Orchard. The demise of the 'Bureau Committee' is never made clear but on April 17th 1916, the first meeting of a Fellowship Committee proper was held in conjunction with the Residents' Council. The Chairman of the Committee at this meeting was Mrs M Stratton: its Hon Secretary, Mr E Nichols and its Hon Treasurer, Mr Upton Taylor. It is not possible to identify with certainty the Chairmen or Honorary Officers of the Committee after that particular meeting, as the early Minutes sometimes do and sometimes do not identify who filled those posts. Not until Annual Reports were printed each year can any Officers be named without doubt. So far as it has been possible to name name's, however, of Chairmen, Honorary Officers and Home Visitors or Welfare Workers these are listed in Appendix I, with the years over which they served.

The Fellowship Committee, once firmly established, was composed of the one-time Fellowship Fund Committee, the War Relief Fund Committee, and presumably the now defunct 'Bureau Committee'. As far as can be ascertained that first Fellowship Committee had no formal constitution but the nature of its work to help those in need is clear from its Minutes; for example, payment for food for an unemployed man; payment for two weeks convalescence for a domestic servant; supply of coal in the winter for residents

in The Orchard; provision of a water bed for a person in need of this comfort. Reading these first Minutes brings back memories, at least for older people, of pre-Welfare State days - memories of the Poor Law - of Parish Relief - Boards of Guardians - Public Assistance Committees - Relieving Officers - Homes for Incurables - all of which are referred to from time to time. There are also memories of the days when those receiving help were referred to as 'cases' and old people living in The Orchard were known as 'inmates'.

During those first years the Fellowship Committee had no premises of their own; meetings being held in the Institute or other available accommodation, but its meetings went steadily on every month, year by year, its Minutes recording in detail the help given to those in need, in particular residents in The Orchard through an Orchard sub-committee set up in February 1916. At a later date 'help was given to old people in another smaller residence; the Canon Barnett Homestead off Erskine Hill. Unfortunately the Minute books for the period October 19th, 1925 to June 1934 are missing but when they appear again they include not only help provided in individual cases, but also to special events; for example in December 1921 the Committee approved a design for a medallion to appear at the top of a then current Appeal circular. This may or may not have been the design which appeared at the top of all printed Annual Reports (a design apparently intended to be indicative of the Good Samaritan) from 1925 until 1973 after which it was omitted being thought of as too reminiscent of the days of the charity of Lady Bountiful.

In May 1928 the Committee considered in what way it should be represented in a procession to take place in June of that year as part of the suburb's 'Coming of Age' Celebrations. One member of the committee offered to design and make a banner to be carried in the procession, an offer which was readily accepted and no doubt the banner was born aloft with others in the procession. Where that banner is now, if it was ever kept, is not known. In January 1934 the Fellowship Committee, together with the Residents' Council and the Nursing Association, compiled a list of nine ladies who volunteered to form a body of 'Fellowship Helpers', willing to undertake day-time visiting of homes of those who were sick or in particular those who "were left unattended in the absence of the breadwinner". This was a strange description of what could have meant the widowed, deserted, or those affected by illness of the head of the household. How long this particular domestic assistance continued is not recorded.

In October 1936 mention was made in the Minutes of a proposed Memorial to Dame Henrietta Barnett to which the Committee agreed and as all Suburb residents know, the Memorial took the form in due course of a lighted arch over a stone plinth in Central Square inscribed to the Dame's memory. Thus ends the early part of this story and one comes to the years of the second world war.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR

It is one of the tragedies in the history of the Suburb that in the second world war the Club House built in 1910 by and managed by Hampstead Tenants Ltd in Willifield Way was demolished by a land mine in September 1940. It is true, as we shall see later, that Fellowship House was built on part of the bombed site but it never took the place of the Club House, nor was it intended to do so. The Club House enjoyed vastly superior facilities and served a wider purpose than Fellowship House. It was a true community centre - a community centre for which Dame Henrietta had always wished.

It would be good if one could say that Fellowship House, even if its purpose was different, rose like Phoenix from the ashes of the Club House, but this would not be true. A hard battle had to be fought before anything was accomplished, even on a more modest scale. Five years after the demolition of the Club House, in March 1945, the Managing Director of Co-Partnership Tenants Ltd wrote to the Trust to say that Co-Partnership had considered the question of re-building the Club House but they felt the demand for the facilities it had provided would be less than before the war and as the scheme was never a financial success they did not feel disposed to employ more capital on the same basis. There was no explanation as to why it was thought the demand for the facilities would at best have been less than before the war which was almost certainly not true and the reference to the Club never having been a financial success is

not clear. The last balance sheet to be found relating to 1934 shows that the Club had a balance in hand Of some £300.

Co-Partnership at least indicated that they might be prepared to finance a Club House on a reduced scale although they felt that houses for ex-members of the forces were more important. The letter added, somewhat threateningly, that if it were decided that the original features of the Club House should be restored they would feel compelled to disclaim the lease when the full facts in regard to compensation for war damage were before them.

It is known that pleas for even partial restoration of the Club House were not successful and when compensation for war damage was finally paid in 1950 the land leased to Co-Partnership Tenants reverted to the Trust who recovered £10000 of the war damage; Co-Partnership Tenants Ltd receiving only £5000, the original cost of the building in 1910. It is not surprising that the Fellowship Committee shared the view of the Residents Council and wrote: "The destruction of the Club House by enemy action..... was a severe blow to the community." There seemed to be nothing more that could be done, however, and the post-war years ended on a sad note.

THE 1950'S

For the Fellowship Committee this decade was introduced on a festive note; namely the arrangements made in The Free Church Hall for televising the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth in 1952. A hundred old people were able to enjoy this historic occasion, followed a few days later by a coach tour for sixty old people to see the accompanying illuminations in London. This tour was also to be enjoyed by members of the Fellowship Committee until there was criticism of their participation on the grounds that Fellowship funds were not intended for the benefit of Committee members. It is not known from whom the criticism came but a motion was passed in Committee that Fellowship funds should not be used for any person solely on the ground that he or she was a member of the Committee. Presumably any members who then joined the coach tour paid for themselves.

Mention of other voluntary bodies, national and local, now begin to appear in the Minutes showing an extension of the Committee's horizon. These include the Family Welfare Association; the Women's Voluntary Services; the Greater London Association for the Blind; the Hendon & Finchley Old Peoples Welfare Committees and the London Borough of Barnet Social Services Department. There was mention in the 1952-53 Annual Report of "our three lady helpers who give personal help to aged residents through morning visits".

And now comes the first mention of Fellowship House. On January

16th 1957, apparently without any previous discussion as far as the Minutes reveal (although this could not in fact have been the case), its Chairman, Mr Edward Parry, presented to the Committee a plan relating to a possible new use of the old Club House site in Willifield Way. This first plan was thought to be too ambitious both by the Committee and the Trust to which it was submitted for consideration and the Architects, Michael Darke ARIBA and Kenneth Williams ARIBA, prepared a new plan for a smaller project. This was presented to the appropriate authorities in March 1957 and it was approved in April by the Hendon Borough Council, the Middlesex County Council Area Planning Officer and the Trust whose Board were prepared to make a grant of £2000 towards the cost of building and up to £50 a year towards maintenance of the premises.

A billiard room included in the plan never in fact materialised possibly because of the cost involved. This may be regarded as a pity as it could have attracted more male members into use of Fellowship House than in fact has been the case. One strange feature in the plan was the lack of any provision for the parking of cars despite the fact that in a letter from the Secretary of the Trust to Mr John Henderson, dated 14/7/54 it stated that one of the conditions imposed by the Middlesex County Council in giving town planning consent was that adequate car parking space must be made available. That condition was clearly disregarded and the Hendon Borough Council, although it approved the plan as presented, were "extremely perturbed" by the lack of parking facilities, particularly as there were already difficulties by

reason of the number of cars used by members of a Tennis Club now in being on part of the site behind the proposed Fellowship House.

Subsequent history has proved the strange disregard of the Middlesex County Council's condition to be highly regrettable and the "extreme perturbation" of the Hendon Borough Council to have been fully justified. Today with young children in a nearby Junior School; the Tennis Club and Fellowship House users; Willifield Way could scarcely be more dangerous, particularly with the increase in the number and speed of cars using the road, some of which did not hesitate to swerve over the pavement onto Willifield Green, if this eased their passage up the road regardless of the safety of pedestrians, young and old, until the erection of wooden posts in 1993 prevented this particular antic.

With the promise of an initial grant of £2000 from the Trust, to which it later added a promise £1 for every £1 raised by Suburb residents and others up to a maximum of £1000 and a promise of £1000 from Co-Partnership Tenants Ltd the Fellowship committee was encouraged to draft an Appeal to be signed by Edward Parry as Chairman, Lois M Barrett⁺⁺ as Hon Secretary, and Mr H C Swindall as Hon Treasurer. This appeal was to be issued on 1st July 1956 with a Flag Day to take place on 7th September to raise funds. More importantly an invitation was to be issued

⁺⁺ In the Fellowship Report for 1972 appreciation was recorded for the work of Miss Barrett after twenty years of service and also of Miss V Sheldon, Welfare Worker, after seventeen years.

to HRH Princess Margaret to cut the first sod on July 2nd 1957. Residents on the Suburb were always eager to cut first sods!

All these preparations - the approval of plans - the promise of grants - the drafting of an Appeal - the proposed invitation to HRH Princess Margaret apparently went ahead (however strange this may now seem) before notice was taken of a letter from a Suburb resident which had been published in the Hendon and Finchley Times on 12th April 1957 which criticised the use of the war damage compensation as proposed by the Trust Board, and suggesting that the Board should use the money it had received to erect another, if smaller, Club building and invest the balance to provide income for the upkeep of the premises. This letter, raking over old ashes, caused perturbation on all sides when notice was taken of it.

The Chairman of the Trust Board wrote to Mr Parry on May 19th 1957 stating that the Board did not intend to enter into any public controversy over the matter; that it had already spent money on re-instituting tennis courts on the site including the building of a pavilion; that there were other possible projects for the benefit of the Suburb to which they might feel they should contribute and, finally, that the Directors did not regard the Trust as being either legally or morally bound to utilise the money received from the war damage compensation on the site in question or indeed anywhere else. For good measure the Chairman added that he thought the Trustees were behaving generously in giving the Fellowship a virtually free site, with £2000 towards

the cost of a building plus £50 a year towards its maintenance.

The two letters, the one published in the Hendon and Finchley Times and the one from the Chairman of the Trust, caused great anxiety to the Fellowship Committee and Mr Parry wrote at length in reply, including extracts from a letter which he had received from the Managing Director of Co-Partnership Tenants Ltd. A copy of Mr Parry's letter (undated) is included here in toto:

The Secretary

Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust Limited

Dear Sir

Club House Site

My Committee have asked me, with reluctance, to write to you with reference to a letter (copy enclosed) which appeared in The Hendon & Finchley Times in their issue of 12th April 1957 on the subject of the proposed Fellowship House. As I mentioned in a recent letter to your Chairman, when sending him a draft of our appeal for funds, it was not the desire of the Fellowship to enter into discussions on the issue raised in the above-mentioned letter to the Press. Recent events, however, have shown serious misgivings in the minds of the members of my Committee lest the letter (which has already been widely discussed among local residents) will prejudice - if not entirely ruin - the appeal that we propose making.

As Co-Partnership Tenants Limited were interested in the initial development of the Club House site an opportunity was given to that Company to be associated with the appeal. A reply has been received from their Managing Director, Mr H W Piper, in the following

"Do not think that I deprecate your efforts - on the contrary they are most laudable, but I cannot see why the "Fellowship" should assume responsibility for the building when it should and could be provided by the Trust. May I suggest you approach the Trust, pointing out that while you are grateful for the £1000 perhaps they could increase the amount to £4500 and the CTL would contribute £1000. Any money you collect from

the Public and the £1000 in hand would form a Maintenance Fund.

You might like to remind the Trust that in their Articles there is a Clause which states that any surplus funds of their Company must be vested in a fund for the benefit of the inhabitants' at large. Surely the £10500 they received from the War Damage Commission is a surplus, and they are morally bound to invest it in a project for the benefit of the Suburb inhabitants.

I have no objection to your putting the foregoing to your Committee and the Trust Directors, and to meeting representatives of both parties if you wish." (Mr Parry continues) "Having taken the initiative and having been encouraged in this by your Board's reception of the project, my Committee finds itself in a very difficult position. Arrangements have been made with the Hampstead Garden Suburb Jubilee Committee for Her Royal Highness The Princess Margaret to cut the first sod on the occasion of her visit to the Suburb in July. This ceremony has been included in the Official Programme, which will be available to all residents in about ten days time; it would be most regrettable if this happy event should not take place owing to adverse criticism.

We are confident that both the Directors of the Trust and Coparts⁺⁺ regard our plans as commendable and that, in the words of our Appeal, Fellowship House will be a welcome amenity and fitting commemoration of the Jubilee. We are anxious, however, lest present and possibly future publicity, arguments, disputes and uncertainties should frustrate our plans completely.

We feel that unless and until the position qua the Trust and the alleged £10500 can be clarified it would be unwise to launch our appeal on the lines at present contemplated. In order to clarify the matter we would be pleased to be represented at a meeting as suggested by Mr Piper. Naturally we wish to proceed with our plans, but can only do so with the knowledge that we are justified in inviting residents to subscribe to a Building Fund. I need hardly stress the urgency of this and regret that this aspect of the matter should have arisen so late an hour in our planning.

Yours faithfully

⁺⁺Co-Partnership Tenants Ltd became "Coparts", ie Coparts & Coparts, Estate Agents, in the 1930s.

Presumably the Secretary or Chairman of the Trust replied to Mr Parry's letter but such reply is not now to be found amongst Fellowship papers, nor is there any record of a meeting as suggested by Mr Piper. It is clear, however, from subsequent events that the Trust Board did not change their minds over the use of the war damage compensation and the plans for the building of Fellowship House duly went ahead. Before pursuing these further, however, it is interesting to speculate what Dame Henrietta might have wished should have been done with the war damage compensation and the rebuilding, or not, of the Club House, or its replacement in part by Fellowship House. Deeply concerned though she had always been for a community centre on the Suburb she died fourteen years before the demolition of the Club House and her influence over the Trust Board, which she had once dominated, was no longer there, but it is probable she would have mourned the loss of the Club House and done her best to reinstitute it as a community centre. This, however, is conjecture and one must return to events as they actually took place. The planned Appeal on behalf of the Fellowship House Fund, under its Hon Treasurer, Mr John Youatt, was issued, the primary purpose of Fellowship being clearly stated therein as a club for older folk with rooms made available - if support for the scheme was sufficient - for meetings of Suburb Societies and residents, or for social gatherings. And so, on July 2nd 1957 HRH Princess Margaret duly cut the first sod. The ceremony was described as having taken place on a "brilliant and memorable day". A Fellowship House Building Committee was set up under the Chairmanship of Mr Stephen D Graves which met regularly up to

November 30th 1958, including the submission of an application to the Middlesex County Council for a grant towards what was called: "The task to which we are now setting our hands," namely, "The building, equipping and maintenance of a meeting place to be known as Fellowship House, for the furtherance of our social work." The financial position was set out in the application as follows:

Contract sum for building	£5370
Estimated sum for fees, stamp duty and expenditure Estimated sum for equipment	£ 400
	<u>£1000</u>
Total:	<u>£6770</u>

So far so good but further Appeals were still necessary to raise funds to furnish the premises. These were made in July and September 1958 addressed to all Suburb residents "to achieve a practical and lasting tribute to the neighbourliness that found such spontaneous expression during the Jubilee Celebrations" and "to provide a welcome meeting place, especially for older folk" and to further the Fellowship Committee's "unobtrusive day-to-day work for the sick and lonely (which) has been continuous for forty-seven of the Suburb's fifty years."

The Appeals made finally raised £5500 leaving a deficit of all but £1300. How much, if any, of this was met by a grant from the Middlesex County Council is not known as unfortunately the Annual Report for 1958-59 in which the figure would no doubt have been recorded, is one of two missing Reports. Whatever the position

was, however, the second Appeal claimed that with the building of Fellowship House "A New Chapter in the Suburb's Story Begins". In view of the hard fight which its sponsors and supporters fought to achieve their goal this hyperbole may perhaps be forgiven. Be that as it may, a third Appeal duly followed to mark "Fifty Years of Work of the Fellowship - 1910-1960". For the first time reference was made to the Welfare State with an emphasis on there being "certain duties that inhabitants of the Suburb, or any other community, could not delegate, the Fellowship endeavouring, therefore, to discharge some of those duties". What those duties were was left to the recipients of the Appeal to decide. On June 17th 1958 (prior to the second Appeal) a formal constitution of the Fellowship had been adopted. A copy of this appears as Appendix II; followed by a copy of an undated outline, signed by Mr Parry, of the agreed policy for the use of Fellowship House as Appendix III; and a Declaration of Trust for inclusion in the Lease of Fellowship House, also undated, as Appendix IV.

Before the Jubilee Celebrations, referred to above, took place a one-time Hampstead Garden Suburb Bowling Club, which had been part of the old Club House activities, decided unanimously at its winding up meeting on November 23rd 1957, to make a grant of fifty guineas to Fellowship House funds plus any balance that there might be when all its liabilities had been met. It agreed also to hand over four silver cups in the hope that they would give as much pleasure to Fellowship House members as they had to the Bowling Club members during the many years over which the

trophies had been competed. A pencilled handwritten note on this letter stated that the cups had been put into the loft at Milton Close from which they had been transferred to the loft in Fellowship House where they were found over thirty years later, black with the dirt of ages. After cleaning and restored to their original glory they were transferred for safe keeping to the Suburb Archives. Turning from the Bowling Club trophies one other interesting item of news found in the Annual Report for the year 1957-58 is headed: "The Suburb and Whitechapel". The paragraph concerned runs as follows:-

"During the Jubilee Celebrations last year the Warden of Toynbee Hall, Whitechapel, Dr A E Morgan, wrote to the Chairman of the Fellowship suggesting that after fifty years the links between the Hampstead Garden Suburb and Whitechapel might be reforged. Dr Morgan and Mr Parry met and discussed the suggestion with the result that a few ladies from the Suburb make regular visits to the aged and bedridden in Whitechapel taking with them small gifts of flowers and fruit from the Suburb. A gift fund was started for this purpose by Sir John and Lady Braithwaite and others....."

Reading this paragraph over thirty years later one cannot help a certain feeling of condescension about these visits and one is glad that a more equal relationship between Whitechapel and Suburb residents came when annual coach visits both to and from the neighbourhoods were introduced in the 1960s. And so the 1950s drew to a close with a formal opening of Fellowship House garden, marking an additional attraction to the still new building, some 140 people being invited to attend the ceremony.

THE 1960'S

The 1960s contained another reference to the one-time Bowling Club when on 4th May the Trust offered the Green and a hut thereon to the Fellowship as additional amenities to its activities on condition that the Fellowship maintained both Green and hut in a reasonable condition. This was readily agreed to and on 6th May 1961 the Trust confirmed the offer - the lease of the ground to run co-terminously with the lease of Fellowship House at a ground rent of £1 per annum; the Fellowship to maintain the site and hut in a satisfactory and tidy condition. The story of the Bowling Club and its Green finally ended on 17th May 1962 when an offer was made by the Trust to convert the Green into a croquet lawn for the use of Fellowship House members. This offer was gladly accepted and the lawn was formally opened on 8th May 1963 by Sir John and Lady Braithwaite and from that year onwards croquet became a regular feature in the summer life of Fellowship House. For the first time, in the Annual Report for 1960-61 the difference between Fellowship House and the Fellowship was spelt out in print; Fellowship House providing a Club for the over 60s living on the Suburb, paying an annual subscription, enjoying various social activities; and the Fellowship providing personal help to residents in or from their own homes by visiting, shopping, collecting pensions and so forth.

One unfortunate episode in 1961 marred the orderly life of Fellowship House, giving rise to some anxiety. This was recorded

in a letter from the Secretary dated 10th October, relating to the letting of the premises. The letter ran as follows:-

Dear X

The Committee of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Fellowship is gravely concerned with complaints it has received concerning users of Fellowship House. These complaints arise almost exclusively from occasions when the building has been let for parties, dances etc on Saturday evenings. My Committee, has, therefore, decided that in future no letting at Fellowship House shall be allowed to continue after 10.00pm on any night of the week and that, as in the past, the building shall be closed on Sunday.

The following sentence was added: "Obstruction of the garage drives of neighbouring houses must be avoided and parking restricted to one side of the road in order to allow access of traffic."

As only one house adjacent to Fellowship House has a garage drive that could be obstructed this prohibition suggests some flight of fancy on the part of the Committee and the requirement to park on one side of the road only, were it adhered to at all, is certainly not the case today. In March 1962 the Principal of the Institute Mr John de F Enderby, wrote to Mrs Morrison, the Hon Secretary of the Fellowship Committee, enquiring if the Committee would consider the possibility of the Institute using Fellowship House for an agreed sum on one or more mornings a week for one or other of the Institute's Adult Education Classes. This was agreed providing no classes were held before 10.00am and in this way Fellowship House assisted the Institute in its problems of accommodation to the present day.

Amongst other things the 1960s saw "Fifty Years Work of the

Fellowship" and the Tenth Birthday of Fellowship House Club with celebrations throughout the week of 2nd June to the 9th. These included a Birthday Tea; a Suburb Brains Trust and Quiz; a visit from Friends from Toynbee Hall; a Gala Whist Drive with Special Prizes; an Entertainment on Willifield Green by children from the Infants School (now the Junior School); an Exhibition of Club Members' Work; Croquet Games daily; and a visit from the Mayor of Barnet, councillor Usher JP; and a closing Thanksgiving Service at St Jude-on-the-Hill; including a Fellowship Hymn especially written for the occasion by Muriel Grainger. The Address was given by the Vicar of St John's Church, Bethnal Green, the Service being conducted by the vicar, the Rev Robin Dunhill MA and the Rev Peter Barraclough, Minister of the Free Church, assisted by a member of the Society of Friends. The remaining years of the decade followed in due order to their end without other events of note.

THE 1970'S

Concern for the residents of The Orchard now appears again in the Minutes with a reference to efforts being made, without success, to cause Co-Partnership Tenants Ltd the landlords, to improve lighting in, and the pathway to the flats. Failing in their efforts to these ends the Committee had to fall back on the provision of torches for those residents whose eyesight was failing who could not have been small in number. It is fortunate no accidents were recorded as having occurred in the dark or on the rough ground. Those who are familiar with the history of The Orchard as a whole know that the old flats finally fell into such a state of disrepair that eventually they had to be demolished and replaced by the more modern estate with up-to-date facilities which now forms the present Orchard. It was as a result of the rebuilding of The Orchard that the Fellowship Report for 1974 noted a marked change dating from the year 1967 when the number of elderly assisted people began to fall by reason of the now resident staff in The Orchard being able to undertake many of the tasks for the benefit of the residents hitherto carried by the Fellowship. Unfortunately the Fellowship Annual Report for the Year 1970 is one of the two Annual Reports that are missing from the otherwise complete set, but elsewhere it is noted that in 1970 the Sixtieth Anniversary of the founding of the Fellowship was marked by another United Service in the Free Church, conducted by the Minister and the Vicar of St Jude's, the Lesson being read by a member of the Society of Friends, with a club member at the organ. This sixtieth year of life included a

number of new pursuits followed by the Committee; for example with a grant of £350 made in 1971 by the Hampstead Garden Suburb Charitable Trust, a cine-projector was purchased.

Assistance was also sought from 'Outset', a newly established voluntary body sponsoring various work projects which included help for twelve elderly Suburb residents in their gardens; six others having received assistance from girls from Henrietta Barnett School, who also visited some of the housebound. Help was further obtained professionally for those whose gardens had overgrown not only beyond their own strength, but beyond that of any volunteer helper. The Charitable Trust made two further grants of £50 the first being backed by £50 from the Fellowship's own funds, to pay for work when the cost was beyond the means of the householder concerned. In 1973 contact was made both with the Social Workers in the Barnet Social Services Department and with the Health Visitors serving two group practices with patients living on the Suburb. These contacts resulted in what were described as helpful and friendly relationships for the mutual benefit of all concerned. A reference was also made to working closely with the Temple Fortune Health Centre and in particular with the Police who showed their film 'The Opportunist' at Fellowship House. Presumably this opportunity was that of a burglar or thief to be watched out for. A contact of a wholly different nature was made in 1977 with the Middlesex Area Community Service for Offenders Scheme; the scheme whereby offenders who would otherwise be given prison sentences, undertake community work which, on the Suburb, included the

clearing of overgrown gardens for disabled or elderly householders, thus extending the help given by means of grants from the Charitable Trust. It was a service referred to as of personal as well of community value that could not be overestimated. In 1974 the first of a series of talks entitled "Voluntary Organisation and the Elderly" was arranged by the Fellowship committee. This was attended by some fifty people including representatives of the Barnet social Services Department and the Finchley & Hendon Old Peoples Welfare Committees. The course was followed in 1976 with six evening seminars arranged jointly by the Fellowship and the Institute, covering different aspects of the needs and welfare of the elderly. Twenty-two people participated, each session being led by a person with practical experience in the care of the elderly.

In 1975 the Fellowship registered with a newly established Barnet Volunteer Bureau. Although large numbers of helpers were not anticipated the contact with a local voluntary body was thought to be valuable in itself. Finally in the decade the Annual report for 1978 noted that in September the Fellowship Committee had held its 600th meeting - surely a record of which to be proud and one which rose to 738 in the 1990s.

THE 1980'S

In September 1980 twenty-one years of the life of Fellowship House was marked by another United Service of Thanksgiving at St Jude-on-the-Hill, once again conducted by the vicar, the Rev Michael Porteus, assisted by the Rev Tim Edgar, with an Address by the Rev Peter Barraclough, Minister of the Free Church, the Lesson being read, as was by now customary, by a member of the Society of Friends. This week as a whole was marked by a special programme of activities and an Appeal was made to build up a Reserve Fund to meet expenditure on internal decorations and external painting of Fellowship House. The Charitable Trust again assisted generously with a grant of £750 to act as a starter for the subscription list and also made a grant of £500 in 1980 to assist payments to be made in exceptional circumstances towards the cost of tree felling or tree surgery for residents unable themselves to meet the full cost of the work. Concern for others in need as well as those on the Suburb was shown in a reference in the 1983 Fellowship Report with the reference to the raising of up to £300 at coffee mornings and Bring and Buy sales. The various charities assisted included Cancer Research; the Family Holiday Association; Save the Children Fund; Guide Dogs for the Blind and a special effort to combat Parkinsons Disease.

It was in this year - 1983 - that the Committee celebrated Edward Parry's 80th birthday but also had to accept with great regret his resignation after more than thirty years as Chairman.

"During those years", ran the 1983 Annual Report, "he has guided the Committee with wise counsel and initiative " On what was described as a lovely sunny afternoon, at the entrance to Fellowship House a Memorial Plaque, marking his death in 1985 was unveiled by Christopher Parry in 1986 in the company of over 100 people including several members of the Parry family.

The death of Mr Eric Arnott, who had tended with loving care Fellowship House garden over many years, was also recorded with sadness. An inscription in his memory now stands amongst the flowers in the garden. The last decision of note taken in the 1980s was in 1986 when Associate Membership of Fellowship House was extended both to people living on the edge of the Suburb and to friends and relatives of existing Club members. These extensions were said to be working well and they serve as another sign of the Committee's look beyond the immediate horizon of the Suburb.

THE 1990'S

By the 1990s the number of Fellowship House Club members had risen to some 300 and a typical week's programme now included Keep Fit Classes; Old Time Dancing; a Singers' Group; a Bridge Club; Music; Coffee Mornings; Croquet; Talks, illustrated and otherwise; and a Luncheon Club. In addition there were Exhibitions; Birthday Teas; Summer Outings and Holidays; and a bi-monthly Newsletter. Transport for the disabled was arranged and afternoon chiropody sessions were held each week for those in need of foot care. With this outline, but for one important item, the story of Hampstead Garden Suburb Fellowship and Fellowship House ends; the important item being matters related to money.

MONEY MATTERS

With only £90 received from the Middlesex County Council Sunday Cinema Fund dating from 1910, and such donations as there may have been (which are not known as no accounts, printed or otherwise, are to be found amongst its early papers) the Fellowship committee in its first years clearly worked on a shoe string. Its expenditure, taking one typical five year period - 1916 to 1921, never amounted in all to more than £150 a year.

It was not until July 1921 that written Treasurer's reports begin to appear at the end of the Minutes and that year there was a balance in hand of £96 odd. Five years later in July 1926 this balance had risen to £203. At the end of 1930 it was £231 but it fell at the end of 1935 to only £179. It was not until 1948 that printed accounts appeared in the Annual Reports from which it is clear that grants paid to individuals in need had largely given way to expenditure on visiting Home Helpers and on Christmas and other social occasions. The change reflects the coming of the Welfare state with its income maintenance in time of sickness, unemployment, widowhood, child care and old age under a statutory universal insurance scheme dating from 1946.

Thus largely relieved of cash payments to individuals the Fellowship began to build up a balance in hand. By 1962 its income has risen to between £500 and £600 a year.

By 1972 income had increased further to £2000, the major new items being collections through the Residents Association Wardens, investment income special efforts and payments for the

hire of the premises. Capital expenditure, for example, on the installation of central heating, appears in addition to regular items of expenditure on home helpers, heating, lighting, cleaning and so forth. At the last count in 1992 income including transfer from reserve funds stood at £15646 and there were substantial investments and cash holdings. In other words, moneywise, the Fellowship was by the 1990s in a strong financial position. A bequest of £1000 in 1993 from a distinguished onetime resident on the Suburb ended money matters on a bright note. All that now remains is to draw such conclusions as one can from the story now told from 1909 onwards.

CONCLUSION

The story of Hampstead Garden Suburb Fellowship has now covered over eighty years and that of its offspring Fellowship House over thirty years. What does one conclude from this small but valuable piece of local social history? First, one is surprised, if not astonished, to discover that need on the Suburb for help evidently came so soon, for it was never the case that the very poor whom Mrs Barnett included amongst those she was so desirous of helping, those from London's Whitechapel slums at the turn of the century, ever came. For whatever reasons occupation of the first cottages on the Suburb began with the artisan; the railway worker; the small shop-keeper; the clerk; the postman; and residents worked their way socially upwards, not downwards, to include the prosperous business man and the independent working lady.

Linking this was the fact that the first cottages were not themselves built until 1907. Why, one asks oneself again, did need apparently arise so soon? Even before the first world war the Suburb was a privileged place to live although there was then no national health service it was always a remarkably healthy place on which to be born or live, and need from sickness was far less than in other parts of the area. Unemployment was not the problem that it became in the thirties and The Orchard was not occupied until 1909 and there could not have been an obvious problem of need amongst old people before that year.

Coupled with the fact that there could not have been obvious need in the Suburb's early days, is the fact that the centres from which the members of the first Fellowship Fund Committee and the Fellowship Committee came were not built until 1909 or afterwards - St Jude-on-the-Hill, the Free Church and the Friends Meeting House, the Adult School and the Suburb Societies. It is as if the small number of well-to-do residents on the Suburb came with the very intention of finding and meeting need. Their apparent immediate awareness of the existence of need, however rare, now seems all but phenomenal. To repeat it is as if they came with the expectation of finding need or searching it purposefully out from the moment of arrival. It is noticeable too that the small number of privileged residents who formed the Fellowship were less children of their time than might have been expected. It was the time when the workhouse was still accepted as the resting place of the very poor; the large orphanage contained the fatherless child of the working class family; the infirmary cared for the indigent sick; the idea of the Welfare State was forty years away and the Charity Organisation Society, the major voluntary body in the welfare field, acted on the principle of distinction between the deserving and the undeserving poor. One could have expected the first residents of the Suburb to accept these as the norm but the founders of the Fellowship, in so far as their limited means allowed, rose beyond these even to the extent of The Town Crier⁺⁺⁺ stating fearfully in 1914: "We do not

⁺⁺⁺"The Town Crier" was a monthly Journal published by the Residents Council.

want the evil of indiscriminate charity to poison our Suburb." And Mrs Barnett, whose interest in the Fellowship appears to have been negative, was critical of charity because in her view it begot idleness which in turn begot mischief.

It is much to the credit of those early community-minded residents on the Suburb that they were not discouraged by those points of view, although inevitably they were forced to turn to State provision in the most difficult situations. It is true, as we have seen, that they used the impersonal terminology of their day, speaking of 'cases' meaning those receiving help, and 'inmates' meaning residents in The Orchard and on occasion might be thought to have been somewhat condescending, but this may be forgiven in the context of the time, and it is the case that a careful reading of the Minutes never reveals a refusal to anyone on the ground of being 'undeserving'.

Lastly one of the strengths of the Fellowship Committee and of the Fellowship House Committee is clearly the fact that their Chairmen and Honorary Officers served faithfully over many years, services which were noted with appreciation in the Minutes or Annual Reports. In more than one case only age or death accounted for the giving up of an office. One notes too how what began as an inward look for those in need on the Suburb as such gradually extended to a broader vision taking in, although inevitably to a lesser extent, those beyond its borders. And the giving of help was accompanied or strengthened by an understanding of underlying problems through lectures and

discussion.

And so one concludes finally that this story of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Fellowship and of Fellowship House is a success story that is not yet ended and may never be so as long as the Suburb retains its sense of community.

+++++