

DUXBURY IN DECLINE: THE FORTUNES OF A LANDED ESTATE, 1756-1932

William Walker

The history of the Duxbury estate, near Chorley, has a small contribution to make to what David Cannadine, in 1977, called the 'genteel and less well known' debate about the decline of the landed estate in the nineteenth century, contrasting the mildness of the controversy with the better known agitation about the gentry in Tudor and Stuart times.¹

At the kernel of the estate stood Duxbury Hall, of which there now remains only the stable block, home farm, cruck barn, and parkland. The house itself fell prey to bad drainpipe design and post-war austerity. It was the hub of the Lancashire estates of the Standish family of Duxbury from 1315 until the late nineteenth century, and the home of their lawyers, the Mayhews, from 1898 until its sale to Chorley Corporation in 1932. In 1878 the estate totalled 6,054 acres with a revenue of £9,121.² Duxbury land spread to Heath Charnock, Heapey, Whittle-le-Woods, Anglezarke, and Peasfurlong near Warrington. In addition there were lands of 1,900 acres in county Durham, yielding £4,316 in 1868.³ Thus for most of the nineteenth century the owners fell comfortably into the ranks of the greater gentry and could almost be counted amongst the élite of 400 families identified by Professor Mingay.⁴ From 1676 the owners of the estate were baronets, Sir Frank Standish who died in 1812 being the last to hold the title.

Duxbury followed the general decline in the fortunes of the landed estate. In 1963 Professor F. M. L. Thompson

charted this process in *English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century*.⁵ However, the debate has continued, sporadic and always gentlemanly, about how this supposedly inevitable decline occurred and why it happened. A model of the story could be developed as follows. From 1760 to 1815, when there was great demand for food from a rising population, increased efficiency, and disrupted imports during the French Wars, rent rolls doubled and landlords were comfortable, enjoying icing on an already rich cake. From 1815 to 1850 they met difficulties. Professor Spring selected housebuilding, gambling, and the weight of family settlements as the main factors; Professor Thompson pointed also to election expenses and profligate elder sons.⁶ However, both took an optimistic line, Thompson arguing that great debts could be borne providing that annual interest payments did not exceed annual income, and Spring drawing attention to the opportunities for agrarian improvements, investment in railway companies, exploitation of mining royalties, and sale of building plots.⁷ In the third stage of the model, from 1850 to 1880, it can be argued with T. W. Fletcher that owners in agrarian Lancashire made great strides, being able to extract a 20 per cent increase in rent rolls from improved land.⁸ Then from 1880 to 1910 we see the landowner assailed by the depression in prices (and therefore rents), increasing labour costs, tenant rights, and death duties; although at one time it was asserted, notably by Fletcher, that things were not so bad in the North as elsewhere. However, Dr Cannadine and Dr Rogers, if not Professor Thompson, dated the significant break-up of estates from this time.⁹ After 1910 land prices held up, but this may have simply provided an opportunity for more landowners to sell and get out. Finally, at the close of the First World War, there was a short period in which many landed estates were broken up and many landed families in effect disappeared. The non-return of heirs from the battlefield, the fear of taxation, and the fall in numbers of domestic servants made the running of large estates and their houses impossible for many families. Thus we might outline a model of the debate on the timing and causation behind the decline of the landed estate and its owner. How does a study of the Duxbury estate cast light upon the arguments?

Sir Frank Standish was born in 1745 and by the age of eleven had lost his father, two brothers, and two sisters.¹⁰ A further sister died when he was fifteen. Thus he was the sole surviving child, and settled payments on the estate amounted only to his mother's jointure. In 1768 he was able to bar the entail on the estates and redeem the mortgage on the outlying manor of Peasfurlong.¹¹ His fortunes followed the easy path which the model anticipates between 1756 and his death in 1812: rents did double.¹² He was able to pad out the estate with purchases in Heapey manor in 1786.¹³ A position of ease was achieved on an estate with indifferent land quality where farms averaged only 30 acres and where there were old-fashioned leases (for example the tenant of Croston's Farm in 1756 had to do service at the water mill, provide glass, and keep a dog) and little sign of initiative.¹⁴ The agent John Rainford, who spent most of his time in the Black Bull, reported in 1788 that the housekeeper at the Hall, Molly, was keeping open house, the gardener had done no work in four months, and husbandmen were leaving.¹⁵ There is just the odd hint of enterprise — a mill croft was leased in White Coppice in 1776, Kem Mill in Whittle-le-Woods in 1811, and Causey House in 1813, all for spinning, carding, or bleaching.¹⁶ In addition a new shaft was driven at the Anglezarke lead mines which employed sixteen workmen and extracted 73 tons, but by 1790 Sir Frank closed down the operation, claiming that he had been cheated.¹⁷ This was the only non-agricultural operation in which the estate management was directly involved; typically Sir Frank was not amongst the petitioners for the Lancaster Canal in 1796.¹⁸

What were Sir Frank's real concerns? He probably underwent a relaxed education at Brasenose College, Oxford; he was listed as dining at Preston Guild celebrations in 1762; and he had a brief flirtation with political life when elected M.P. for Preston in 1768, only to be unseated on protest.¹⁹ Although High Sheriff of Lancashire in 1782, he spent much of his time in London, having a town house in Lower Grosvenor Square.²⁰ His great passion may well have been horse racing. Duxbury became a stud and Sir Frank owned a dozen horses, two sired by the earl of Derby's Sir Peter Teazle.²¹ The puzzle of Sir Frank's life is his failure to

marry. In the absence of children, his heir was Frank Hall of Egglestone, county Durham, born 1799, the grandson of Sir Frank's aunt.²² He took the additional surname of Standish. Sir Frank himself died in London in 1812, mourned by all who knew him as a real gentleman of the Turf.²³

There is a portrait by Mauzzaise of the new owner of Duxbury in Astley Hall, Chorley. The subject looks about twenty, cherubic and round-faced, decked in an academic gown with red trim and a rather fine pair of boots, all set against a background of Seville.²⁴ The man was a dedicated epicurean if not a hedonist, devoted to the arts and travel. He took long tours to the Baltic and the Mediterranean before settling at his house in Seville. This had obvious repercussions for Duxbury. He was seldom there, for as he noted in the introduction to his *Notices of the Northern Capitals*, 'Of rural retirement, delicious as it is, I speedily had enough'. Neither did the weather suit: he wrote of the 'plunge into dreary vapours'. Even in London the likely alleviation for boredom would be to open a book for taking bets on the Derby.²⁵ However, he rebuilt the E-shaped house as a Georgian mansion with handsome reception rooms, a cantilevered marble staircase, and fine murals depicting the Seasons. He extended the parkland, forcing the road which is now the A6 away to the east, and built lodges. Summer houses, an open-air bath, and nurseries completed the picture.²⁶ Frank Hall Standish also invested in paintings from the Italian, Flemish, French, and Spanish schools. Coins, books, and sculpture, especially by Villareale, took his fancy. In 1832 he vainly attempted to limit his personal expenses to £100 per month but had spent £700 in five months on wine alone.²⁷ The next year he wrote a will bequeathing books, prints, pictures, and drawings to Louis Philippe of France, 'with a further £2,000 for the purchase of more pictures, in token of my great esteem for a generous and polite nation'. In 1841 the beneficiary's representative, Baron Taylor, accepted a valuation of the paintings at £11,431, the drawings at £396 and the books at £5,509. Taylor was considerate or encumbered enough to leave fifty pictures at Duxbury, but he took away two hundred and twenty.²⁸

The estate was run by the steward, Richard Woodward of

Bolton, and solicitors Gorst and Birchall of Preston. They achieved stable rents, after some difficulties in 1818–19; there was indeed an increase in revenue, but from non-agricultural sources.²⁹ There were three small collieries leased by 1835; quarries; the Standish Street ground rents in Chorley; and the rent from three public houses. These yielded little but there is an interesting lease of Kem Mill in Whittle for £450 per half year, which mentions recent improvements, including a steam engine.³⁰ The attempt to exploit the lease of lead mines to John Thompson of Wigan between 1822 and 1837 failed. The expert William Wager summoned from Derbyshire counselled no further initiatives. He complained bitterly of knee trouble and the weather, perceiving no vital need to descend the shafts.³¹

In all revenue increased by about £2,000 per year, which would just about meet overseas expenses alone, but not in addition to the refurbishment of the Hall and interest payments. Expensive loans were replaced by mortgaging the estates to the steward and solicitor for £40,000.³² Before Frank Hall Standish died in Cadiz of the gout in January 1841 he added another £20,000 loan on top.³³ The annual income of the estate could more than cover interest; the difficulties which arose were due to unusual personal expenditure and were not insoluble. By comparison the Clifton estate at Lytham owed some £190,000 in 1848, on an income of £27,500.³⁴

Frank Hall Standish did not marry. He dallied with a certain Catherine Lagorce of Bordeaux, tragically carried off in an epidemic in 1833, afterwards vowing never to be involved again with women, married or unmarried. A small pension was left to her family which the solicitors steadfastly avoided paying.³⁵ Frank was perfectly happy to leave his estate to a gentleman who would look after it, and assumed that this might be his half-brother, Sir Henry Hume Campbell.³⁶ The latter did indeed carry his brother's body from Cadiz but then had his hopes dashed. The legal heir turned out to be William Carr of Cocken Hall, county Durham, who prudently changed his name to William Standish Standish in May 1840.³⁷ He brought an extra 1,000 Durham acres with him, yielding £2,000 a year at first and rising to £5,000 by 1878. Duxbury, too, seemed successful,

offering up £6,410 in 1843 and £9,121 in 1878.³⁸ However, a massive mortgage for £130,000 was taken out in 1853 with the Law Life Assurance Company of Fleet Street, specialists in the field.³⁹ This would cost £4,500 per annum to service. It is tempting to conclude that William Standish Standish and his son, also William, who succeeded him in 1856, were aiming at significant landlord-led improvement on the estate. T. W. Fletcher has claimed that in south Lancashire 'improvements were to be seen on every hand' in the 1840s.⁴⁰ Dr Rogers says of the Duxbury loan that the mortgage 'was taken out for drainage and other improvement work as well as clearing existing debts'.⁴¹ Indeed at the time the government made £2 million available for drainage loans to high farmers, companies like the Lands Improvement Company were busy, and the Clifton estate requested £25,000.⁴²

However, the 1853 survey of the estate indicated that of the tenants only Mr Rawes, who was also local agent, had interested himself in new tile drains.⁴³ If one walks the Duxbury estate on a dry day the cropmarks from these drains on Farnworth House farm are clear, and the rest of the estate is mild bog. On wet days it is impassable bog in places. Research at Anglezarke has revealed the old stone rubble drains still in place.⁴⁴ Any increase in agricultural rents seems to have come from a handful of larger farms,⁴⁵ and the major improvement was from non-agricultural sources, for example Cocken and Ludworth collieries in Durham.⁴⁶ Duxbury Hall itself was rented to a local cotton manufacturer, Richard Smethurst, for £574 per year.⁴⁷ £13,694 accrued from the windfall of compensation for the Anglezarke reservoir.⁴⁸

Rather than fund agricultural improvement, the new mortgage would firstly pay off old debts of around £80,000. How would the Carr Standishes have spent their income? The father had houses in Nice, Bath, Tours, and Grafton Street in London. During his time Duxbury Hall had thirteen servants, with six outside, whereas the cotton manufacturer managed with nine.⁴⁹ A tragic fire on 2 March 1859 burnt down half the Hall,⁵⁰ and the architect E. M. Barry provided a copy of the original at a cost of £20,000, but Phoenix Insurance had covered it for only £10,000.⁵¹

There were many repairs at Cocken, costing £656 in 1874 alone.⁵² Five extra farms were purchased to consolidate the Heath Charnock holding in 1859.⁵³ William had to be a deputy lieutenant, and was High Sheriff of Lancashire in 1845, both costly duties.⁵⁴

Above all there was the expense of providing for a son and three daughters. The son, William Standish Carr Standish, went to Eton and Sandhurst. A cornetcy in the prestigious 8th Hussars was purchased in 1853 (going rate £840; pay 6s. 8d. per day; expenses £500 per year).⁵⁵ He served during the Indian Mutiny, acquired sunstroke, gave up his commission to the most deserving man from the ranks, returned by the Cape for his health, amused himself with the Lancashire Yeomanry D Troop, became increasingly ill, was nursed in a Bond Street hotel, and died on 23 February 1878 at Southport.⁵⁶ Three daughters meant three dowries, and they all married above themselves. Emma married Sir J. G. T. Sinclair of Thurso with 78,000 moorland acres. Susan married Captain C. W. Paulet of the 8th Hussars, grandson of the Marquess of Winchester. Mary married Edmund Berkeley Lucy at St George's Hanover Square. The groom was a younger son of the Lucys of Charlecote.⁵⁷ The vast mortgage had been taken out just as William's commission was purchased and Emma's marriage took place. It did not meet all the demands either; there is a cryptic note in red on a set of accounts from 1896: '£10,000 in dower payments for the three ladies'.⁵⁸ I therefore doubt that there had been much money for agricultural improvement forty years previously. William Standish Standish, the father, died in 1856, William his son in 1878. The latter left personal effects of £12,000.⁵⁹ His Lancashire estates bled interest of £4,500 a year from an income of £9,000, the Durham estates £3,450 from £5,000.⁶⁰ This was undoubtedly a difficult position, but not an impossible one, not least because members of the family had been provided for financially.

We now enter the age of the New Realism. In 1875, Susan's spouse, William's brother officer Captain Paulet of Wellesbourne, began to act as attorney for his poorly friend's estate.⁶¹ An administrative structure under him soon became apparent. Mr N. G. Dawson of Croston was chief agent. Joseph Hogg of Duxbury was local agent. The

accounts for Lancashire and Durham were unified by 1904 at the latest. Messrs Fair and Rea of Preston kept overall accounts and reported to London.⁶² Tough decisions had to be made. The years after 1878 were ones of agricultural depression. T. W. Fletcher argued in 1961 that a move to livestock and dairying in the North softened the impact, but in 1986 Dr Rogers asked of Lancashire, 'Why was so much land sold off over the three decades following the onset of the depression?'.⁶³ Sales were the order of the day as far as Captain Paulet was concerned. Cocken Hall went to the earl of Durham in 1878.⁶⁴ In Lancashire, the public houses, cottages, and Heapey bleachworks were soon sold.⁶⁵ Even the Duxbury library was auctioned in 1880 along with William Standish's Indian lances.⁶⁶ The best farmland in Heapey and Heath Charnock was sold to local solicitors and butchers, bringing between £28 and £43 per acre.⁶⁷ The Hall was rented in 1891 and sold in 1898, along with the park and Anglezarke moor, to the Mayhew family for £42,250.⁶⁸

The sales amounted to half of the 6,054 acres held in 1878; there were 3,092 acres left in 1902. The remaining land was well run. Sixteen per cent of the income from rents was invested in long overdue improvements to farms and farmhouses: shippsons, manure tanks, stables, piggeries, barn repairs, and sanitation.⁶⁹ The rents per acre in 1909 were roughly equivalent to those of 1878.⁷⁰ A home farm was developed before 1898, the park was rented as pasture, and the sale of timber was considered.⁷¹ The biggest venture was the letting of a much larger Duxbury Park colliery to the south of the Hall from 1875.⁷² Eventually its workings undermined the Hall's foundations with dire effect. In 1906 the 3,000 acres yielded £4,092. By then the old Law Life Assurance Company mortgage was negligible. The accounts balanced perfectly in the 1904 report and there was still £589 available for the three daughters of William Standish or their heirs. One of the latter, George Felix Standish Sinclair, was able to secure a loan on the strength of the estate; he visited it once with much fuss about train times, the weather, and the relative merits of a newfangled motor car or an old-fashioned carriage.⁷³ The sale of the remaining estate was delayed until 1920. There is

no evidence available to explain the delay or the final decision to sell in this specific case.⁷⁴

The final chapter in the story of Duxbury is heavy with feudal overtones. The Hall was sold to Walter Mayhew in February 1898. He was a solicitor handling mining leases for the estate, and a former mayor of Wigan, who bought Duxbury as a present for his ailing wife Annie.⁷⁵ Unfortunately she died in September 1898.⁷⁶ Walter's son Percy, a globetrotting photographer, was designated lord of the manor and in 1907, at the age of 43, married a society beauty, Evelyn Constance King, in St Margaret's Westminster. On their return from a three-month tour of Europe, their carriage was drawn to the Hall by the tenantry and servants, passing beneath garlanded archways bright with the famed white blooms.⁷⁷ Walter died in 1918 and Percy in 1920, but Percy's widow stayed on, a revered or feared figure in black, until her departure in 1932, when she sold out to Chorley Corporation, taking only the chauffeur and the drawing room mantlepiece with her.⁷⁸

During its final years the truncated Duxbury estate was surprisingly resilient. The Mayhew family certainly maintained style and position. They improved the water supply using a hydraulic ram, installed quite the best laundry rooms in the area, tended a famous garden, and kept twenty-three servants and hands.⁷⁹ Christmas parties saw the great carpet rolled by seven men in preparation for balls that lasted two days. Women from the locality were lined up to receive red flannel, and the children were given 6d. There were shooting parties and Primrose League events. The family attended Sunday service at St Laurence's church in Chorley, where they occupied the Standish pew.⁸⁰ A small piece of land at the corner of the park was provided for an Anglican mission church in 1909.⁸¹ The role was costly. The fancy internal drainpipe system caused deadly damage. Duxbury Park colliery caused subsidence.⁸² Percy ran up medical bills, yet another Duxbury male in poor health.⁸³ There were death duties to pay and dower to Annie's sisters, some £20,000 each.⁸⁴ The Mayhews became penny pinchers: the lodges were let at 4s. per week but the slightest cracked pane had to be paid for; a local smallholding, Woodcock's, yielded £22 from 11 acres in 1898 but £40 by

1932.⁸⁵ There were some financial coups. In 1903 Anglezarke Moor was sold to Liverpool Corporation for £23,478 to secure the catchment area for its reservoirs.⁸⁶ Percy Mayhew was able to leave £68,041 in his will and all death duties were paid by 1926, as his widow indignantly informed the Borough's solicitor in 1932.⁸⁷ The Hall and park (300 acres) were sold for £18,000. Mrs Mayhew had toyed with selling the timber but eventually decided to depart, to a destination since untraced. However, she could have soldiered on: she was solvent and the Mayhews got back roughly what they had invested in the estate.⁸⁸

In some ways Duxbury appears as an unusual example of a landed estate of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.⁸⁹ The family at the big house was less obsessed by producing heirs than one might expect. They gave very little to charity, far short of the 5 per cent thought typical by Professor Mingay.⁹⁰ They played no political role; this was not one of Mark Girouard's 'power houses'.⁹¹ Their management of the estate varied from total lack of interest to manic involvement. The most efficient period was after 1875, when an attorney ran Duxbury, rather than the 'high farming' middle years of the century.

When did Duxbury's decline become critical, and what were the major causes? The estate met its first real difficulties in the first half of the nineteenth century; both then and later in the century, this was obviously due to the personal extravagance of the owner. Opportunities for agricultural improvement were not seized between 1840 and 1878. After 1878 the break-up of the estate was consequent upon the lack of a male heir, for the financial problems were manageable on a slimmed-down efficiently run estate. The final death knell for the estate was 1920, and for the last family at the Hall it was 1932.

In 1977 Dr Cannadine called for a multitude of local studies to illuminate the history of the landed estate. The history of Duxbury supports a model which allows for the survival of such estates, not without difficulty, until well into the twentieth century. However, no model can explain every local variation.

NOTES

- 1 D. Cannadine, 'Aristocratic Indebtedness in the Nineteenth Century: The Case Re-opened', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, XXX (1977), p. 624.
- 2 Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/11; 11/12.
- 3 Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/11; 11/69.
- 4 G. E. Mingay, *English Landed Society in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1963), pp. 19, 26.
- 5 F. M. L. Thompson, *English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1963).
- 6 F. M. L. Thompson, 'The End of a Great Estate', *Ec.H.R.*, 2nd series, VIII (1955-6), pp. 36-52; D. Spring, 'English Landownership in the Nineteenth Century: A Critical Note', *Ec.H.R.*, 2nd series, IX (1956-7), pp. 472-84; D. Spring, *The English Landed Estate in the Nineteenth Century: its Administration* (Baltimore, 1963).
- 7 The debate has been resumed by Cannadine, *Ec.H.R.*, 2nd series, XXX (1977), pp. 624-50.
- 8 T. W. Fletcher, 'The Agrarian Revolution in Arable Lancashire' *T.L.C.A.S.*, LXXII (1962), pp. 93-122.
- 9 Cannadine, *Ec.H.R.*, 2nd series, XXX (1977), p. 646; G. Rogers, 'Social and Economic Change in Lancashire Landed Estates during the Nineteenth Century' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Lancaster Univ. 1981), p. 209; Thompson, *English Landed Society*, pp. 321-2.
- 10 Lancs.R.O., DX 1027.
- 11 Lancs.R.O., DX 1030.
- 12 Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/1; 11/2.
- 13 Manchester Central Library, Archives Department [henceforth M.C.L.A.D.], L216.
- 14 Lancs.R.O., DP 397/12/6.
- 15 Lancs.R.O., DX 950.
- 16 M.C.L.A.D., L573, L215, L1/27/2/3.
- 17 Lancs.R.O., DX 950.
- 18 C. Hadfield, *Canals of North-West England*, I (Newton Abbot, 1970), p. 185.
- 19 G. E. C[okayne], *Complete Baronetage* (5 vols, Exeter, 1900-9), IV, p. 81; W. A. Abram, *Memorials of the Preston Guilds* (Preston, 1882), p. 96; W. Dobson, *History of the Parliamentary Representation of Preston* (Preston, 1856), pp. 8-19.
- 20 *Manchester Mercury*, 2 June 1812.
- 21 *Blackburn Mail*, 29 July 1812; R. Longrigg, *The History of Horse Racing* (London, 1972), p. 98.
- 22 Lancs.R.O., DX 1032.
- 23 *Manchester Mercury*, 2 June 1812.
- 24 In 1986 the picture was not on public display. It is a copy of an original by the Sevillian José Gutierrez de la Vega y Carriazo. The copy was presented to the family on the instructions of Louis Philippe. Xanthe Brooke is thanked for this information.
- 25 Frank Hall Standish, *The Shores of the Mediterranean* (2 vols, London,

1837); *Notices of the Northern Capitals of Europe* (2 vols, London, 1838); *Seville and its Vicinity* (London, 1840).

26 Lancs.R.O., DX 934; *V.C.H.Lancs.*, VI, pp. 208–13.

27 Lancs.R.O., DX 1090.

28 Lancs.R.O., DX 1127, 1128, 1194, 1195.

29 M.C.L.A.D., L1/27/2/11; Lancs.R.O., DX 988.

30 M.C.L.A.D., L1/27/2/13.

31 Lancs.R.O., DX 930–82.

32 Lancs.R.O., DX 1103.

33 *Blackburn Standard*, 20 Jan. 1841.

34 Rogers, thesis, p. 36.

35 Lancs.R.O., DX 1108–26.

36 Lancs.R.O., DX 1127.

37 *The Durham Directory and Almanack* (G. Walker, Durham, 1857), p. 38.

38 Lancs.R.O., DX 1041, 1201.

39 Chorley Town Hall [henceforth C.T.H.], Duxbury Deeds, Conveyance 14 Feb. 1898; Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/77.

40 Fletcher, *T.L.C.A.S.*, LXXII, p. 116.

41 Rogers, thesis, p. 193.

42 Ibid., p. 191.

43 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/2; 11/77; M.C.L.A.D., L1/27/2/11.

44 G. Sellers, 'A History of Farming in Anglezarke' (TS., 1982, in Chorley Reference Library) p. 14.

45 Lancs.R.O., DX 1200–1.

46 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/13.

47 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/77.

48 M.C.L.A.D., L1/27/3/7.

49 Chorley Reference Library, 1851 Census, Enumeration District 3.

50 *Blackburn Standard*, 9 Mar. 1859.

51 *Chorley Guardian*, 26 Sept. 1891.

52 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/13.

53 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/50; 11/72.

54 J. and J. B. Burke, *A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Landed Gentry of Great Britain and Ireland for 1846* (London, 1846), II, p. 1279.

55 C. R. B. Barrett, *The 7th, Queen's Own, Hussars* (2 vols, London, 1914), II, p. 407.

56 *Chorley Standard*, 2 Mar. 1878.

57 Chorley Reference Library, photograph (miscellaneous file, no. G3) of Standish family tree compiled by T. C. Porteous.

58 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/79.

59 Lancs.R.O., National Probate Index (WLA 1.30) will proved at Lancaster, 30 Apr. 1878.

60 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/11/13.

61 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Lease, 7 July 1875.

62 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/81.

63 Rogers, thesis, p. 209.

64 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/13.

65 Lancs.R.O., DDRf 11/79.

66 Chorley Reference Library, Bannister cuttings, vol. 2, 1 May 1886; *The Palatine Note-book*, I (Manchester, 1881), pp. 147–8.

67 Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/74.

68 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Conveyance, 14 Feb. 1898.

69 Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/16/89.

70 Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/12; 11/18.

71 Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/11; 11/72.

72 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Lease, 7 July 1875.

73 Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/13; 11/82–3.

74 *Chorley Guardian*, 27 July 1920.

75 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Conveyance, 6 May 1932.

76 *Chorley Guardian*, 9 Sept. 1898.

77 Ibid., 2 Feb. 1907.

78 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Conveyance, 6 May 1932.

79 D. Rayner to Chorley Hygienic Laundry (unpublished letter, 29 Nov. 1967); undated photograph; and article: all in possession of G. Birtill of Chorley, interviewed 26 Nov. 1986.

80 Interviews with Mrs B. Hargreaves, 20 Jan. 1986; Mr J. Taylor, 26 Feb. 1986.

81 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Lease, 4 May 1909.

82 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Lease, 14 June 1921.

83 *Chorley Guardian*, 18 Sept. 1920.

84 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Abstract, 1932.

85 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Conveyance, 14 Feb. 1898; Lease 13 Feb. 1932.

86 Liv.R.O., 352 MIN/WTR/1/41.

87 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Observations and Requests on Title.

88 C.T.H., Duxbury deeds, Agreement, 22 Feb. 1932.

89 Although the evidence for Duxbury is limited, there is scope for further enquiry, for example concerning the tenantry. Son did not always follow father. Sixty-eight farms were traced throughout the period 1756–1932, of which twenty-seven were handed on for more than one generation. Sitting tenants did not generally acquire the land on the break-up of the estate. There were few vacant farms throughout; rents may have been slightly low: Lancs.R.O., DX 988, 1199–1201; DDRF 11/13–16; 11/18; *Chorley Standard*, 26 Sept. 1891; Lancs.R.O., DDRF 11/79; *Post Office Bolton Directory* (Tillotson & Son, Bolton, 1889).

90 G. E. Mingay, *The Gentry: The Rise and Fall of a Ruling Class* (London, 1976), p. 140.

91 M. Girouard, *Life in The English Country House: A Social and Architectural History* (Harmondsworth, 1978), p. 2.