THE LAST OF THE GEORGIAN ARCHITECTS OF BATH
THE WORK AND TIMES OF JOHN PINCH

Robert Bennet

The architect John Pinch (1770-1827) has not so far received the attention he deserves. This article will attempt to provide a comprehensive analysis of the works of John Pinch set against the background of the times he lived in. It will conclude with a list of works attributed or partially attributed to Pinch in the most complete survey of his buildings so far.

The Pinch Family

The early life and training of John Pinch like that of many other Bath architects is shrouded in mystery. Proof that he was involved in the design of the buildings attributed to him comes from his neatly written signature on leases or 'skins', together with small drawings on the reverse of the document which identified the particular property to which the lease applied. We do not know what Pinch looked like but his drawings and carefully prepared notes give the impression of a capable but careful man, one who delighted in the work he did. The strong impression that emerges from a study of his career is that he was dependable and trustworthy. He was born in 1770 and died in 1827 at the age of fifty-seven.¹ There is no record of his birth in the Bath City archives but the Bath Chronicle for 14 March 1827 prints a brief obituary stating that he died in his fifty-seventh year. It is this report that alone gives some insight into his character for he is described as an affectionate husband and father, a warm-hearted and sincere friend.²

Recent work by the Bathwick Local History Society has revealed the whereabouts of the tomb of John Pinch, his wife Martha and two of his sons, John and Charles. In the burial ground of the Bathwick mortuary chapel, designed by Pinch, the tomb rests close to the southern wall of the chapel in the most favoured place. This important find helps towards a fuller knowledge of this family.

Records of the Pinch family begin with entries in the Walcot St Swithin's register for the 1790s. Eliza, daughter of John and Martha Pinch, was baptised on 23 March 1794. Another daughter Harriet and a son John were both baptised on 18 March 1798, the latter being two years of age. An earlier entry for 30 September 1795 for John, son of John and Martha Pinch, may provide an explanation for this delay. There is no later record of two Johns surviving
in the family and we must assume that the first little boy died just after his baptism. When the second boy was born in 1796, he was given the patronymic John but the family waited for two years before having him baptised. Finally, in the same parish record for 26 May 1800 there is an entry for the baptism of Laura, daughter of John and Martha Pinch.

The Poor Rate book for Chatham Row, a property owned by William Johnstone Pulteney, shows that in July 1795 the Pinch family arrived to live at number 12.\(^3\) This is the end property high above the river Avon, purchased by Pulteney with a view to a possible site for a new wharf. John Pinch lived there with his family, using the house as his business address for his work as an architect.\(^4\) The Poor Rate books show that he paid rates on that property until 1803. He may however have had to move to another location before that date, for after bankruptcy his stock of building materials was advertised for sale in 1804.\(^5\) In the throes of a severe financial crisis, it is likely that Pinch took his family to his Spring Gardens yard, possibly John Eveleigh’s old premises where they lived in whatever shelter that site provided.

Browne’s *Bath Directory* for 1809 gives Spring Gardens as Pinch’s business address. On this site there still stands a small building that has obviously been used as a storage yard at some time in its history. Called the ‘Boathouse’, it is occupied by several small businesses. A painting by Samuel Grimm dated 1789 shows this as Mill Cottages, just behind the building on the waterfront.\(^6\) The next directory to be published, Gye’s *Bath Directory* for 1819, records ‘Pinch and Son Messr’s Architects and Surveyors 27 St James Parade’. From this information, it may be assumed that the bad times in Spring Gardens were behind the family. Keene’s *Improved Bath Directory* of 1824 also showed Pinch and Son at that address. By 1826, as shown in Keene’s *Directory*, the family were living at 2 Duke Street and had their business premises there.\(^7\) This was part of the elder Wood’s Parades development, still regarded as high status housing for important people. After the death of John Pinch senior in 1827 his son John did not remain in Duke Street but moved to 21 Henrietta Street, presumably returning to Darlington estate property where the rents may have been more favourable. This address appears in the 1837 *Directory*,\(^8\) and again in 1849,\(^9\) the year of John junior’s death, when both his and his son Charles’ names are included as occupants. Interestingly, it was Charles Pinch who appeared in the list of professional men as architect, indicating that John may have been a sick man by that time and unable to work.

It is not the intention in this study to include the works of John Pinch junior apart from observing that he succeeded his father as architect and surveyor
to the Darlington estate. Some of the works attributed to the younger Pinch have been severely criticised by later generations but this is also the case with many architects. He designed in the Greek Revival style and was responsible for a number of important buildings in Bath and elsewhere. Eliza the eldest daughter was still alive in 1876 at the age of eighty-two and is referred to in the Calendar of Probate as approving the wills of her deceased sister Harriet who died that year. She is also mentioned in 1875 as performing the same service for Louisa Susannah Pinch, who may have married into the Pinch family. The 1851 census for Bath records two separate households bearing the name of Pinch, the first consisting of Charles aged forty-four, Louisa aged forty-nine and Eliza aged fifty-five. The second household could have been the family of John Junior (d.1849). It records his widow Elizabeth aged forty-one, an eldest son William aged twenty-one and seven other children aged between sixteen and two years. The Ordnance Survey Historical Map of Georgian Bath attributes the building of Rochford Place to William Pinch, and the Bath Directory for 1868 gives number 4 Rochford Place as his address. The Directory for 1854 had shown that Charles was living at that address.

Historical and Social Background

Why were there so many opportunities for the construction of fine buildings in Bath in the eighteenth century? The answer lies in the patronage of the grandees, the royalty and aristocracy, from the early years of the century.

The visit of Queen Anne in 1703 attracted a vast concourse of visitors. In succeeding years Richard Nash as Master of Entertainment was able to build on this popularity, making Bath the principal centre for fashionable life in England. Because Bath was alone in offering hot water bathing, its season became a long nine-month period from September to May. London continued to retain its popularity for the summer season. By the 1760s the excessive numbers, the crowded public rooms and the dilution of the quality by the quantity were arousing comment. By the end of the eighteenth century the days of the 'Season' were almost over. The nobility had departed to the newly fashionable resorts of Cheltenham, Brighton and even the Dorset coastal towns. The new patrons of the baths at Bath were now the visitors coming for the curative properties of the Spa. The population of the City of Bath was increasing, in part because the earlier demand for seasonal accommodation was changing to a demand for houses where people might take up permanent residence.
The century ended with a severe crisis as revolutionary France declared war on Britain in February 1793. Financial insecurity in England was such that on 21 March 1793, the Bath City Bank closed its doors to join the Bath and Somersetshire Bank in bankruptcy. As the banks broke, public and private building came to an abrupt end. Builders toppled like ninepins. One of the principal moneylenders, Richard Bowsher, never did produce the money he promised and Pulteney and the Corporation brought their fine schemes to an end. Architects also faced ruin. Thomas Baldwin’s bankruptcy and dismissal in disgrace as city architect caused him also to withdraw from the employ of Sir William Pulteney. Pinch took over from Baldwin as surveyor for the Pulteney estate in 1793, and it may have been the support received from this source that enabled him to survive bankruptcy and stay in business as an architect. The Pinch signature on deeds for 17 Pulteney Street earlier than 1793 show that he had been acting as Baldwin’s assistant while still in his early twenties.

These profound changes in Bath gave John Pinch his opportunity to be the last of the Georgian architects in the city. He may have learned his lessons from the great architects that had preceded him (the Woods, Baldwin, Palmer and Eveleigh), but what he built was quietly revolutionary, matching the spirit of the times. Initially, Pinch completed the unfinished work that reflected Baldwin’s neo-classical style. Gradually however as his confidence and opportunities increased it is possible to detect the development of designs that were within the accepted métier yet entirely of his own devising.

John Pinch’s own bankruptcy did not occur until after 1800 and does not seem to have seriously affected his activities. He continued to work for William Pulteney and his daughter Henrietta Laura Pulteney. At the latter’s death in 1808, there was a lull in building activity until the right to the succession had been legally decided. This was eventually settled upon William Henry Vane, third Earl of Darlington and first Duke of Cleveland, who had however signed the lease documents for New Sydney Place as early as 1808. In 1810, he began his own development of what was now called the Darlington estate. Fortunately for Pinch, who had to exist without his estate salary in the interim, it is recorded that Lord Darlington, on his acquisition of the Bathwick estate, stimulated renewed building activity. He also authorised the payment of John Pinch’s salary, indicating that Pinch must have survived up to that time on the occasional payments received via James Goodridge, Lord Darlington’s local agent.

It is important to point out that the final design of the Bathwick estate was drawn by Pinch as surveyor to the estate, and not by Baldwin, though his influence may be sometimes detected. But it is clear from the number of
variations to the Bathwick site plan prepared in later years by John Pinch that Baldwin’s ideas did not meet with the approval of a later generation. During the early years of the nineteenth century numerous changes were made in the further development of the Bathwick estate. The grand ranges of terraced houses were not extended and instead smaller houses and villas were built up on Bathwick hill. Where terraced housing was built, as in Raby Place and Darlington Place, it was on a more modest scale and aimed at the expanding middle class. The building of the Kennet and Avon canal (1810), which passed through the Bathwick estate, introduced a commercial element resulting in the building of wharves, warehouses and a temporary road from the Sydney Gardens to the river Avon. In 1799 the central arch of Pulteney Bridge collapsed, revealing the inadequacy of the original piling work. It was Pinch, as surveyor to the estate with an active involvement in all these affairs who repaired Pulteney Bridge, rebuilding the northern side including the shops that remain today. If we regard the starting point of John Pinch’s career as the sale of New Sydney Place buildings in 1808 then there were just nineteen creative years ending in 1827, the year of his death. For that period of Pinch’s life it is possible to plot the career of a moderately successful man, whose fame spread from Bath to bring him work in Somerset, Wiltshire and Berkshire for houses, monuments and churches.

The Development of John Pinch’s Style

The architectural historian Walter Ison has observed of the buildings completed and the new work commenced in Bath after the restoration of the peace with France in 1815, that ‘Some of the finest of these new buildings were designed by John Pinch ... The domestic buildings of the elder Pinch are the logical outcome of Baldwin’s work, to which an effect of extreme elegance has been added by generally attenuating the proportions of the fenestration, and using sharply-cut mouldings and minor detail of refined delicacy, particularly in the metalwork of fanlights, balconies and verandas’. What were those characteristics that made a crescent, a terrace or villa built by Pinch different from the buildings of other architects? It may be argued that the influence of Robert Adam upon architects such as Baldwin, Palmer and Eveleigh led them into developing a far less ornate style of architecture than the work of the Woods. This is what influenced John Pinch, and it is visible in all of his major terraces and especially his only crescent. It is only in works like the United Hospital that we see him make full use of the classical orders. Unlike some architects in the city, there was no slavish following of the designs of the Woods, but a subtle variation to the earlier designs that
commentators have recognised as a unique personal style. His work has
been described as essentially the last expression of the grand urban-
Palladian tradition, fine in detail and balance but intensely conservative in
style. An example of this, the full height corner bow pavilion used by
John Wood senior in the north-east corner of Queen Square is also used by
Pinch at both ends of his New Sydney Place. This bow feature appears in
others of his buildings such as Sion Hill Place and the semi-detached villas
of Winifred’s Dale. It is also to be found in some of the country mansions
that are attributed to John Pinch.

It is now possible to attempt to define those forces that would have exerted
so much influence upon Pinch’s work. Unlike John Wood who arrived in
Bath with a grand plan already in his mind and the ideal space to realise it,
Pinch was, at the beginning of his career, an inheritor of other men’s work.
If we detect influences of other architects such as Adam and Baldwin or
Palmer in his buildings it is because they were men of repute who were
invited to present the genesis of design for a new site. At the beginning of
his career, Pinch had to continue to design and build on those sites in the
same métier. Where his own style emerges it does so quietly, with a fine
detail and a light touch. The house building business was changing too.
Not so many high-status houses were required. Instead, it was dwellings
for the middle classes that were in demand. John Pinch, designing houses
for this new class of customer, was not called on to produce flamboyant
classical splendour for grandees but could instead indulge his own liking
for neo-classical architecture within the price that the new class of client
could afford.

Bath was built upon a gradually rising south-facing hill, that extended
from the Old Bath Bridge over the river Avon to the slopes of Lansdown,
and from Pulteney Bridge upwards through Walcot to Beacon Hill. When
John Pinch commenced his career as an architect it was the steeply sloping
sites in these upper parts of the City that were available, and part of his
characteristic style sprang from his designs for unified terraces on a sloping
site. The strategy he adopted was to use concave quadrant ramps to lift the
sill bands, the stringcourse and decorative bands and finally the cornices,
smoothly from one house to the next. The resulting buildings have an elegance
that distinguishes Pinch’s work from that of others who have also built on
these hillsides. The idea of using ramped detailing may have come from
Baldwin in a design he produced for Abingdon Buildings but his disgrace
and removal from the post of surveyor to the Pulteney interests meant that
this design was not then used. Instead, it was Pinch who took it to its ultimate
refinement as can be seen from his Cavendish Place, begun in 1808 but not
finished for another eight years (fig.1). The enlarged portion of the Vitruvian decorative band illustrates how Pinch treated the change of angle at the top of the curve. Certain of the ground-floor façades in John Pinch’s buildings follow the style already created by earlier architects, with V-jointed rustication in the case of Cavendish Place and in New Sydney Place a ground-floor storey arcaded throughout the range. In this latter example, each house has a group of three arches where in all but the end pavilions the left-hand arch is wider than the others and of segmental form to contain the doorway. New Sydney Place is John Pinch’s finest creation. This is perhaps surprising, considering this was possibly his earliest complete design for the Pulteney family and was being built at a time when the outcome of the war with France was uncertain. Work began in 1804 and the newly completed terrace was offered for sale during 1808. Unlike other ranges of buildings it was constructed in a special way with the stone brought from one quarry and the houses raised gradually together tier after tier, thereby forming one compact building in which not the least flaw or settlement or different shades of colour can be seen. A contemporary account praises the structure as a specimen of the architectural perfection that may be formed of Bath stone.

Walter Ison is full of praise for this beautiful building and comments that ‘The stone has weathered to a beautiful tawny golden colour, and the building merits the highest praise for its subtle design and the excellent craftsmanship it displays’. New Sydney Place attracted many high-status residents. In 1817 Queen Charlotte stayed in the upper pavilion, and the future William
IV at the other end of the terrace in the lower pavilion. Noble visitors in his houses helped Pinch's career by bringing his name before many potential clients among the affluent. Pinch first used the concave ramping of the horizontal detailing in New Sydney Place. The piers between the colonnaded windows and the impost from which the door and window arches spring reflect the same upward curve from house to house. The impost moulding is a lighter copy of the string course. Ison's authoritative description of this elegant range of buildings does not neglect the attic storey: 'The plain wall face is horizontally divided by an entablature-like string course at first-floor level; a moulded band carved with Pompeian scrolling at second-floor level; a moulded sill underlining the second-floor windows; and by the boldly profiled main cornice below the attic-storey, this last being finished with a secondary cornice and plain parapet.' Pinch, unlike so many other Bath architects, did not build his attic storey into the mansard roof but gave full space to his attic rooms by bringing the windows forward to form a fourth storey to the façade. This feature, which gives the impression of monumental scale, is used in many of his buildings.

John Pinch was a master of fenestration. It is tempting to speculate that his original trade was that of joiner for in his houses joinery reached a high standard. The notice of sale at his bankruptcy does describe him as Carpenter. Pinch achieved great height for his first-floor windows by taking the sills to floor level and using six panes over nine. It was later the fashion in other parts of the city for owners to lower the sill height, but in these houses by Pinch the evidence from the original balconies with their delicate ironwork shows that the windows were designed to descend to floor level. Illumination of rooms at this date was expensive and because the occupants of these houses wished to use them for parties, there was a clear advantage in allowing maximum daylight into the room. Pinch produced the designs for Cavendish Place immediately after completing those for New Sydney Place, but the sashes for the former were replaced in Victorian times, clearly shown to be of a later date by the horns to the side stiles of the upper sash. The progression in numbers of panes from ground floor to attic storey is today, twelve, eighteen, twelve and six panes. It is generally thought unlikely that Pinch designed the windows of the Piano Nobile (the principal storey of a house) to have eighteen panes, rather the more common six over nine. When the sashes were replaced in Victorian times the joiners made the upper and lower sash the same size, and when in recent years the Georgian glazing bars have been reinstated it was into these equal-sized frames. Thus each individual pane is slightly smaller than it was in Pinch's time and there are eighteen rather than the original fifteen. The three rectangular windows to each upper storey are
spaced at equal centres but graduated in width and height, and though all are without architraves that in the centre of the first-floor tier is emphasised by a frame of reeded pilaster strips, with fluted and foliated consoles supporting a return frieze and straight cornice. This style of cornice is not unique to Pinch, but where he used it the stonework with all of its detail is crisply modelled. This responds well to effects of weathering and light or shade.

The treatment of the glazing bars in the round-headed windows of New Sydney Place is a copy of those used by Baldwin in Great Pulteney Street, but the feature unique to Pinch is the delicate and complex fanlights (fig.2). It is impossible to say whether these and the glazed side panels, were made specifically to his order or were chosen from the pattern books that were available to him.

Delightful and delicate balconies enliven the façades of most of John Pinch’s work in Bath. Did Pinch design these or did he order them from the pattern books of the Coalbrookdale and the Carron Company ironworks? The complete answer will never be known but surviving drawings prove that Pinch designed the ironwork for some of his buildings, for example the gates, overthrow lamp holder and railings for the church of St Mary’s Bathwick, and the ironwork balconies to New Sydney Place (fig.3 overleaf).
Fig. 3 Detail from the skin prepared by John Pinch for New Sydney Place. (reproduced by kind permission of The Building of Bath Museum)

Whether John Pinch designed interiors and how much of what remains today can be attributed to him is a matter for debate. Undoubtedly he produced designs for the interior of St Mary’s Church, Bathwick, showing both the longitudinal section and the cross section, and including the detail of the painting on the reredos in colour. 26

Conclusion

John Pinch’s qualities as a family man and tutor are suggested by the fact that his eldest son John successfully succeeded him as surveyor to the Darlington estate. In 1827 and for two years after, John junior may have completed work started by his father; however, estate plans bearing the inscription ‘J Pinch architect’ dated 1833 were certainly by the younger Pinch. The houses that John Pinch senior designed are, however, his most enduring testimony. They were built for people to live in and to use for entertaining their friends. There was a need for space on the first storey for large groups of people to gather, in a house built at an affordable price. Pinch met this challenge with his tall well-lit first storey salons. He provided interconnecting doors to give the owner a choice of one large room or two separate rooms. Other rooms were equally well designed and comfortable to live in. Externally Pinch’s buildings give the impression of great height and elegance, of vertical emphasis achieved by careful use of the fenestration. The whole effect is completed by the strategy of bringing the attic storeys forward to share the façade of the house and in doing so, provide the entablature of the Orders represented by the whole structure.

The many visitors to the city will not have come especially to look at Pinch’s work but during their walks they will have derived much quiet pleasure from his contribution to the buildings of Bath. John Pinch gave the final shape to the Georgian architecture of Bath yet was a restrained revolutionary, reflecting in his work the rapid change in the social life of the city.
Appendix: List of Buildings

**Northampton Street**
Built between 1791 and 1805. Commenced by Thomas Baldwin, continued by John Pinch and completed by George Phillips Manners. The only independent development by William Johnstone Pulteney in the city, the lower, narrower part of the street contains several houses by John Pinch, confirmed by his signature and drawings on the deeds.

**Richmond Hill**
Built in 1795 with deeds signed by John Pinch. Terrace of eight houses with a uniform front three storeys high, having the end houses stepped forward to form pavilions. Each house is three windows wide with the exception of number one which is just two.

**Johnstone Street**
A short street, seven houses in a terrace to the left and six to the right. Built in 1805, leading southwards from Laura Place which was part of Thomas Baldwin's earlier work from 1790. Built in the time of John Pinch as surveyor to the Bathwick estate. His shared involvement with Baldwin in its design and construction can be deduced from both exterior and interior details.

**New Sydney Place**
Built during 1807 and completed for sale by March 1808. Signed leases with drawings by John Pinch exist for some of these properties. Terrace of eleven houses with a balanced composition, the large house at each end and that in the middle treated as pavilions set slightly forward of the main face of the building.

**Rockfield House, Nunney, Somerset**
Built circa 1805 by John Pinch and listed grade II*. Country house of two storeys with three bays, the central bay being in the form of a segmental bow.

**Cavendish Place**
Terrace of thirteen houses designed by John Pinch and built on the steep slopes of Lansdown between 1808 and 1816. There are many similarities between this building and that of New Sydney Place.

**Park Street**
Built in 1808, parallel with Cavendish Place having Park Place as a connecting road. The properties forming the upper two-thirds of the street were designed and built by John Pinch.

**Park Place**
Attributed to John Pinch and built in 1808.

**Daniel Street**
Built in 1810 by John Pinch and named after Daniel Pulteney. A double terraced street of thirty-six houses and a public house.
Winifred’s Dale
Built in 1810 and attributed to John Pinch, this pair of semi-detached villas may well have been the first attempt by a Bath architect to achieve two dwellings in what was designed to appear as one elegant structure.\textsuperscript{35}

Bishopstrow House, Warminster, Wiltshire
Built in 1817 for William Temple to plans by John Pinch.\textsuperscript{36} This country house closely resembles Rockford House with its central bay and plain flanking wings.

Corsley House
Built \textit{circa} 1814 for Nathaniel Barton, an attorney practising in Warminster. This small but well-proportioned country house is attributed to John Pinch.\textsuperscript{37}

Cavendish Crescent
The only crescent designed by John Pinch. Building work commenced in 1815 but was not completed for many years owing to the bankruptcy of the developer, William Broom, a speculating builder.\textsuperscript{38}

Sion Hill Place
Construction of this nine-house terrace, the last of Pinch’s designs to be built on the Lansdown slopes, began in 1818 and was completed in 1820.\textsuperscript{39} Although built over a period of time the terrace was constructed to a prearranged design.

Claremont Place
Consisting of four pairs of small semi-detached houses built in 1817 to designs attributed to John Pinch.\textsuperscript{40} Each pair of houses has a plain ashlar front and is two storeys high.

St. Mary’s Church, Bathwick
The plans were drawn up by John Pinch in 1814 and today rest in the Somerset County Record Office at Taunton. Although the foundation stone bears the date 1814, the church was not consecrated until 1820.\textsuperscript{41}

Raby Place
Building began in 1818 and was completed in 1825. The plans for the terrace of fifteen houses were drawn by John Pinch.\textsuperscript{42} The terrace, originally called Church Street, is slightly angled to follow the curve of Bathwick Hill, the apex of the angle being at the mid point.

Cleveland House \textit{(right)}
Built in 1820 on a bridge over the Kennet and Avon canal, originally as the canal offices. The deeds of this building prove it to have been designed by John Pinch.\textsuperscript{43}

Sturford Mead, Corsley, Wiltshire
Built in 1820 for Henry Austin Fussell of Frome and attributed to John Pinch.\textsuperscript{44} Occupied by the Thynne family of Longleat from 1854 to 1954.
Spa Villa, 9 Bathwick Hill

The plans for this two-storey house bear the signature John Pinch Bath. The ground plan shows that the building was to be an irregular octagon having three long faces, four short faces and a two-storey front set forward in the direction of the city.

Camden Terrace with Lower Camden Place

These two terraces built after 1820 on the steep slope of Beacon Hill and attributed to John Pinch are examples of the architectural distinction given even to small houses.45

The United Hospital

John Pinch prepared three sets of plans for this hospital which opened its doors to patients in 1826.46 Ison comments that the front is 'bold in scale and severe in expression', appropriate for a prestigious public building surrounded by the works of earlier architects.

Prior Park Buildings

Built circa 1825 and with the design attributed to John Pinch, this terrace of nineteen houses has slightly projecting centre and end pavilions, with a pediment to the central pavilion.47

Fig.4 Cleveland House, built in 1820. (photograph by R.J.Bennet)
Willow House, 6 Bathwick Hill
(fig. 5 right, photograph by R.J. Bennet)

Plans for this house were
drawn by John Pinch just prior
to his death in 1827. The
original design did not include
an attic storey and a hipped
roof was planned rather than
the end gables that exist today.

Cumberland Villa

No. 2 Bathwick Hill, built in
1824 to drawings by John Pinch,
in the collection of the Lord
Barnard at Raby Castle in
Northumberland. The style of
this villa with its hipped and
deepliy-eaved roof is similar to
that of Spa Villa built four
years earlier.

Nos 1, 3, 4 & 5 Bathwick Hill
together with 1, 2 & 3 Sion Place

The drawings for these buildings are from the Darlington estate office where
John Pinch worked, and bear his signature. Use of his initials only may
indicate that he was not the designer but had initialled his approval as
Surveyor to the estate. Reasonable certainty of his authorship is given else­
where by his full signature or the designation John Pinch and Son(s) architects.

St. Saviour’s Church, Larkhall

Although this church was not consecrated until 1832, the process of
gathering funds and designing it had begun in 1824. John Pinch junior was
responsible for overseeing the building work but there is no doubt that it
was his father who drew up the plans for this elegant building.

Darlington Place

Built in the period from 1813 to 1824 to plans by John Pinch. Of four
storeys, the ground-floor of which is rusticated with two flat-arched windows.

St. Mary’s Buildings (right)

This small cul-de-sac on the slopes of Beechen Cliff is well hidden and
therefore relatively unknown. Deeds possessed by owners of houses in the
terrace have John Pinch’s signature and his manner of using ramped
horizontal detailing has certainly been employed here on this short terrace
of nine houses.
1-6 Cambridge Place
The four detached and two semi-detached villas built in 1820 on this steep slope at the foot of Widcombe Hill were considered by Ison to have been designed by John Pinch.

Pulteney Bridge repairs
Although the original Pulteney Bridge began to collapse in September 1799 and severely so in 1800, it was not until after 1802 that John Pinch was able to complete the rebuilding of the damaged north side of the bridge.\textsuperscript{52}

Assembly Room and Stables adjoining the George Inn, Frome, Somerset
Drawn and signed by Pinch but never realised.

St Lawrence Church, Hungerford, Berkshire
Built in the Gothic style, between 1814 and 1816.

Gothic Mausoleum, Stourton, Wiltshire
Built in 1819 for Sir Richard Colt Hoare, Bart, in the churchyard of St Peter's Church, Stourton.

St Michael's Church, Twerton, Bath
Enlarged by Pinch in 1824 but rebuilt by Manners in 1839.

\textbf{Fig.6} StMary'sBuildings
\textit{(photograph by R.J. Bennet)}
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