

**Report to the General Board of Health on a further inquiry into the sewerage, drainage, and supply of water, and the sanitary condition of the inhabitants of the township of Elland-cum-Greetland, in the county of York / by William Ranger, Superintending Inspector.**

**Contributors**

Ranger, William, 1800-1863.  
Great Britain. General Board of Health.

**Publication/Creation**

London : Printed by George E. Eyre and William Spottiswoode ... for Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1852.

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/ue3259t6>

**License and attribution**

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

REPORT  
TO THE  
GENERAL BOARD OF HEALTH  
ON A  
FURTHER INQUIRY

INTO THE SEWERAGE, DRAINAGE, AND SUPPLY OF  
WATER, AND THE SANITARY CONDITION  
OF THE INHABITANTS  
OF THE TOWNSHIP OF  
ELLAND-CUM-GREETLAND,  
IN THE COUNTY OF YORK.

By WILLIAM RANGER, Esq.,

SUPERINTENDING INSPECTOR.



LONDON:  
PRINTED BY GEORGE E. EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,  
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.  
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1852.

## REPORT

TO THE

## GENERAL BOARD OF HEALTH

OF A

## NOTIFICATION.

THE General Board of Health hereby give notice, in terms of section 9th of the Public Health Act, that on or before the 17th day of June next, being a period of not less than one month from the date of the publication and deposit hereof, written statements may be forwarded to the Board with respect to any matter contained in or omitted from the accompanying Report on a Further Inquiry into the Sewerage, Drainage, and Supply of Water, and the Sanitary Condition of the Inhabitants of the Township of Elland-cum-Greetland, in the County of York; or with respect to any amendment to be proposed therein.

By order of the Board,

HENRY AUSTIN, *Secretary.*

*Whitehall, 6th May 1852.*



LONDON:

PRINTED BY GEORGE H. EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOOD,  
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY,  
AND HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1852.



PUBLIC HEALTH ACT (11 & 12 Vict. c. 63.)

*Report to the General Board of Health on a Further Inquiry into the Sewerage, Drainage, and Supply of Water, and the Sanitary Condition of the Inhabitants of the Township of Elland-cum-Greetland, in the County of York.* By WILLIAM RANGER, Esq., Superintending Inspector.

2A Pall Mall, April 19th 1852.

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

I HAVE the honour to lay before you the following Report, founded on the result of a second inquiry, which I held at Elland in March last, in accordance with the 9th section of the Public Health Act, to that effect; printed notices of my intention having been previously circulated in the manner prescribed by the Act.

The inquiry was commenced at the Saville Arms inn, on Wednesday the 17th of March 1852, where I found the following gentlemen assembled:—Messrs. C. & A. Pitchforth, J. W. & G. B. Baker, Hirst, Waddington, Slater (Surgeon), D. Dutton, W. Watson, T. & H. Hawkyard, Joshua Dodgson, J. Burley, Abraham Hanson, Samuel Holstead, and William Brook, the three latter forming a deputation from a town's meeting.

Before entering upon the more immediate object of the present Report, I may be permitted to remind your Honourable Board, that when I presented my Preliminary Report on the sanitary condition of Elland, I then stated that I considered the Public Health Act should be applied "not to the township of Elland-cum-Greetland, but to that portion of it indicated upon the plan prefixed to the Report;" I also recommended that the qualification for a member of the Local Board of Health should consist in "his being rated to the relief of the poor upon an annual value of not less than 15*l*."

To the first of these two recommendations no objections were made, nor had any written communications on the subject been previously made to your Honourable Board.



On the contrary, I am glad to state that the boundary I proposed met with the unanimous approval of the rate-payers.

With regard, however, to the recommendation of a 15*l.* qualification, considerable difference of opinion prevailed; the advocates for a high scale supporting the amount I had named, whilst those who desired a lower qualification wished to have one of not more than 5*l.*

A petition from the advocates of both of the above-named qualifications had been transmitted to your Honourable Board some time before the second inquiry was held.

The following are copies of these two documents:—

PETITION IN FAVOUR OF THE 15*l.* QUALIFICATION.

*Memorial of the Principal Inhabitants, Owners of Property and Ratepayers within the District of Elland, in the County of York, applicable to the Public Health Act.*

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT in pursuance of a petition of the inhabitants of the township of Elland-cum-Greetland, in the county of York, to the General Board of Health, for an inquiry and examination of the said township with a view to the application of the Public Health Act, the said Board have, by their Superintending Inspector, William Ranger, Esq., caused the requisite inspection to be made, and who has thereupon issued his recommendations.

That the said Superintending Inspector recommends “that every person, at the time of his election as a member of the Local Board, and so long as he shall continue in office by virtue of such election, be resident as by the 16th section of the Public Health Act (1848) is required, and be rated to the relief of the poor of some township, parish, or place, of which some part is within the said district, upon an annual value of not less than 15*l.*”

Now, therefore, we the undersigned inhabitants, owners of property, and ratepayers, within the said district, and rated to the relief of the poor of and within that district, in the respective sums set opposite to our respective names, do hereby humbly memorialize the General Board of Health to adopt the recommendations of the said Superintending Inspector, especially as to the qualification of members of the Local Board, and not to make any alteration therein by adopting a lower rate of qualification than the amount so recommended as aforesaid.

(Signed by 24 ratepayers, the gross amount of rateable property they represent being 1,627*l.* 9*s.*)



PETITION IN FAVOUR OF A 5*l.* QUALIFICATION.

*To the Hon. the Commissioners of the General Board of Health.*

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

*The memorial of the inhabitants of Elland, in the parish of  
Halifax and county of York,*

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT the petition for an inquiry respecting the adoption of the Public Health Act having been numerously signed, evinces the desire generally entertained for the adoption of its salutary provisions within this district; and the able, and faithful Report of Mr. Ranger merits the warmest thanks of every one interested in the matter.

Your memorialists, however, beg respectfully to state that the recommendation of Mr. Ranger, as to the qualification of members for the Local Board, if eventually adopted, will operate against the public interest generally, and endanger the carrying out of the measure according to the intentions of the legislature.

Your memorialists find, on examining the poor rate, a 15*l.* qualification is held mainly by mill proprietors, manufacturers, and occupiers of land, whilst it excludes nearly all shopkeepers, and most of the respectable inhabitants of the town.

Your memorialists would therefore respectfully, but earnestly, recommend, that the qualification for members of the Local Board be 5*l.* rated to the poor, seeing that in this locality the value of household property is much below what is obtained in market towns, and that a high qualification will create a class interest, which in many respects will be at variance with that of the public in general, and prevent the effectual carrying out of the Public Health Act within this district.

(Signed by 335 ratepayers.)

The last-named memorial was accompanied by a letter from the Overseers of the Poor, Messrs. J. Burley and Henry Hawkyard.

Letter of Messrs. Burley and Hawkyard :—

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

THE overseers of the poor of Elland beg respectfully to state, that the enclosed petition and memorial (that last quoted) has emanated entirely from the working class of Elland. The labouring class fear that the high sum of 15*l.* rated in the poor assessment necessary as a qualification for a Commissioner of the Local Board of Health, will throw the power of sanitary improvements into the hands of a class of ratepayers who are many of them resident on the outskirts of the town, and, consequently, not interested in the sanitary improvements. Since Mr. Ranger's Report has made its appearance, very many of the humble class who were hostile to, or at least very careless for, sanitary measures are now, from Mr. Ranger's views, quite sanguine for improvement. We ourselves would respectfully submit to your



Honourable Board that we consider a rating of 15*l.* much too high; and if this sum be not materially reduced, Commissioners cannot be appointed to carry out the intended sanitary measures. Government will have all to perform, and that with a rigorous and unsparing hand. Reduce the qualification, and you may obtain from the inhabitants of Elland a body of Commissioners able, willing, and determined to co-operate with your Honourable Board in carrying out to the fullest extent the sanitary reforms so much wanted in Elland. In conclusion, accept our thanks for the Reports of Mr. Ranger forwarded to the overseers; and to Mr. Ranger our thanks, our sincere thanks, for the faithful and accurate statements presented in his Report.

We remain, &c.

J. BURLEY,

HENRY HAWKYARD,

Elland, 5th Dec. 1851.

*Overseers of the Poor.*

The following letter on the same subject was transmitted to your Honourable Board by Mr. Thomas Hawkyard:—

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

As constable of Elland, in the parish of Halifax and county of York, I hereby take the liberty to add my official testimony to the arguments used in the memorial enclosed, which I have the honour to present to your Honourable Board, that a 5*l.* rating, such as prayed for in the memorial, would only be equivalent to 24*l.* in the neighbouring towns of Halifax and Huddersfield; and to express my hearty concurrence in the prayer of the said memorial, for what I cannot but regard as required both by sound policy and justice.

I have, &c.,

THOMAS HAWKYARD,

Elland, 5th Dec. 1851.

*Constable.*

#### STATEMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE 15*l.* QUALIFICATION.

The only evidence I received during the inquiry in favour of the 15*l.* qualification was from Mr. Waddington and Mr. Pitchforth. The former of these two gentlemen merely expressed in general terms his approval of the original recommendation: the latter said,—

“That he would certainly have preferred it also; but as there seemed to be a general wish to have a lower amount, he was ready to accept a 10*l.* qualification.”

#### STATEMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO THE 15*l.* QUALIFICATION.

Mr. *Thomas Hawkyard* said,—

“That he had been appointed by a public meeting, held two days previously, to attend at the inquiry on behalf of the persons



who were present on the occasion. But before entering on the question of the qualification, he begged to express his approval of the boundary recommended in the Preliminary Report. With regard to the qualification, however, he was of opinion that it should be fixed at 7*l.* 10*s.* This amount would, he believed, be satisfactory to the ratepayers generally, and it would certainly be so, in the highest degree, to him personally. To show the necessity for adopting the lower sum, he had instituted a comparison between certain properties at Halifax and others of a similar kind at Elland, which would prove how much higher the former were in rateable value than the latter.

Occupier.	Area in square yards.	No. of stories.	Rooms on a floor.	£	s.	d.
Mr. Lumley, ironmonger, Halifax	70	3	2	63	10	0
Mr. J. Thornton, ironmonger, } Elland - - - - - }	69	0	2	5	17	0
Mr. M'Vine, Northgate, Halifax	72	3	1	32	15	0
Mr. Swale, Westgate, Elland -	60	2	1	6	5	0
Mr. Fleming, Southgate, Halifax	59	2	2	23	0	0
Mr. Turner, druggist, Elland -	60	2	1	5	17	0
Mr. Lord, Northgate, Halifax -	35	2	1	20	0	0
Mr. Swift, Southgate, Elland -	32	2	2	3	7	0
Mr. Drake, watchmaker, Halifax	50	2	2	13	7	0
Mr. A. Slater, Southgate, Elland	40	2	1	1	15	0

Mr. *J. Burley*, overseer of the poor, stated :—

“ That every one to whom he had spoken on the subject expressed their approval of the boundary recommended in the Preliminary Report. As to the qualification, however, he thought it ought to consist in the possession of real or personal property to the amount of 500*l.*, or else in the being rated to the poor at 7*l.* 10*s.* annually.”

On analyzing the rate book he had found that the number of occupiers within the boundary was as follows :—

40 males,	}	rated at 15 <i>l.</i> and upwards.
9 females,		
6 males,		rated from 12 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i> to 15 <i>l.</i>
14 males,	}	” ” 10 <i>l.</i> ” 12 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i>
3 females,		
10 males,	}	” ” 7 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i> ” 10 <i>l.</i>
2 females,		
25 males,	}	” ” 5 <i>l.</i> ” 7 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i>
7 females,		

He ought to state, that of the 40 males rated at 15*l.* and upwards, 24 were non-resident. Under the other heads,



the occupiers were all living within the boundary. By his mode of calculation, therefore, it would be seen, that:—

If a 15 <i>l.</i> qualification and up-		}	16 persons would be eligible		
wards were adopted,					
„ 10 <i>l.</i>	„ „		36	„	„
„ 7 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i>	„ „		46	„	„
„ 5 <i>l.</i>	„ „		71	„	„

Mr. *Abraham Hanson*, one of the deputation from the public meeting, said,—

“That he had been a bitter opponent to the application of the Public Health Act; but that in common with many other of the ratepayers, he had studied the Preliminary Report, which had induced him entirely to change his views on the subject. He was now anxious that the town should be placed under the operation of the Act; and in furtherance thereof he begged to read the resolution adopted by the public meeting which had appointed him one of the deputation: ‘That this meeting approves of a 5*l.* qualification, and likewise of the boundary set forth in the plan prefixed to the Preliminary Report to the General Board of Health.’ If the 15*l.* qualification were adopted, they would only have 16 residents rated at that sum from amongst whom to choose their future Local Board; he also believed, that many of these were opposed to the Public Health Act, and had no wish to carry out its provisions.”

Mr. *W. Brooks* said,—

“That he was of opinion a better working Local Board would be secured if the qualification were lowered. The number of persons rated at 15*l.* was very limited, and some of them had already been summoned for neglecting to make improvements in their property.”

Mr. *W. Watson* and Mr. *David Dutton* both “expressed their wish that the possession of property of the annual rateable value of 7*l.* 10*s.* should be taken as the qualification.”

Mr. *G. B. Barker*

“begged to express his approval of the boundary recommended in the Report, and his belief that the practical application of the Public Health Act would lead to the reduction of the present amount of sickness, and at the same time confer many other benefits upon the inhabitants.

“According to his analyses of the rate book, forty persons would be eligible at 15*l.*; forty-five at 12*l.* 10*s.*; and fifty-five at 10*l.*

“In his opinion, the best Local Board would be secured, and the provisions of the Public Health Act most efficiently carried out, if a 10*l.* qualification were adopted.”



*Mr. J. W. Baker* also said,—

“That he was satisfied with the boundary named in the Report, and that he believed the latter gave a very correct and faithful representation of the state of the town. He thought a 10*l.* qualification the most likely to secure an intelligent Board, and that that should be the amount fixed on; the number of the members remaining as originally proposed.”

*Mr. Slater* also supported a qualification of 10*l.* annual rateable value, or of the possession of 500*l.* real or personal property.

*Mr. Joshua Dodgson* said,—

“He was of opinion that it would be the most advisable course to adopt the lowest qualification, viz., the being rated at a valuation of 5*l.* He did not say this because the change would affect him personally, but because he thought it the most likely to conduce to the future welfare of the town.”

*Mr. J. Halstead*

“expressed the same opinion. He believed, moreover, that by adopting the 5*l.* qualification a more active and disinterested Local Board could be secured than if either a 10*l.* or 15*l.* qualification were agreed upon.”

It will be seen from the above evidence that a very considerable majority of the witnesses advocated an alteration in the recommendation I had given in my Preliminary Report; and that there was a very strong feeling in favour of a qualification of not more than 7*l.* 10*s.*

The Board will also observe that the ratepayers are anxious to apply the Public Health Act, and to take immediate steps for improving the sanitary condition of the township. Such being the prevailing sentiment, I am of opinion that it is highly desirable the qualification should be fixed at such an amount that the ratepayers may have a considerable number of their fellow townsmen from whom to select their future Local Board; the effect of this will be, in my judgment, to secure the Public Health Act a more general support, whilst I have every reason to believe that the zeal or efficiency of the Local Board will not be in any way diminished by the proposed alteration. I beg therefore to suggest to your Honourable Board that the boundary proposed in my first Report be the District for the purposes of the Public Health Act, and that the qualification for the members of the Elland Local Board of Health be as follows:—“That every person, at the time of his election as a member of the Local Board, and so long as he shall continue in office by virtue of such election, be resident, as by the



16th section of the said Public Health Act (1848) is required, and be rated to the relief of the poor of some township, parish, or place, of which some part is within the said district, upon an annual value of not less than 7*l.* 10*s.*

I have the honour to remain,

My Lords and Gentlemen,

Your most obedient humble servant,

W. RANGER,

*Superintending Inspector.*

*The General Board of Health,  
Whitehall.*