Allotment of land in lieu thereof'.[7] In the 1750s an attempt was made to exploit widespread local cultivation of hemp and flax for linen, by erecting a leaching house with weaving sheds at Appleby Carr.[8]

At the beginning of the 19th century Appleby had the elements essential for the classic closed parish. Pollbooks record six voters in 1807, all with qualifying freeholds elsewhere; in 1832, of the nine voters only Charles Winn of Appleby House qualified by reason of local freehold, the rest being rentiers. Voting patterns indicate stark unanimity, with all voting for Pelham in 1807, all for Pelham and Sheffield in 1832, except Charles Winn, who voted for Sheffield only.

At the other end of the social scale, the history of religious dissent in Appleby suggests social control of the labouring people. Wesleyanism failed to take hold, despite its strength in the surrounding parishes, especially Winterton, attempts to establish it ceasing because of 'quiet pressure'.[9] Primitive Methodism appeared about 1819; there was no purpose-built chapel until 1906, although in 1832 the house of Jeptha Arnold was licensed for worship by Protestent Dissenters.[10] Cottage meetings continued throughout the rest of the century, and a number of Primitive Methodist local preachers are recorded in the village in the census enumerators' returns. However, during the 1880 election – the only one he had to fight; he was returned unopposed as second member in 1868 and first member in 1874 – the local Liberal press noted that according to his own claims, Rowland Winn was

> as liberal in his views as needs be, and particularly tolerant in religious matters. This is the more remarkable when we remember that in his own parish of Appleby the church is the only place of worship there. We will not for a moment suppose that there can be any difficulty in obtaining a site for a dissenting chapel in any place that has so liberal a landlord as the Conservative candidate for North Lincolnshire. Perhaps there are no dissenters in Appleby.[11]

The open and closed villages of the last century can readily be identified still by plan and architecture. Open villages sprawl, not necessarily haphazardly, but uncouthly, with unassuming small houses fronting directly onto roadways; available space was kept to the rear, partly to allow for working yards, partly because there was no call for gardens where social pretensions were not high and land for building at a premium. The terrace form appears often, sometimes with long rows, put up all at once, sometimes with interruptions to wall-line or building materials, indicative of piecemeal, exploitative infilling. In plan, open villages reveal closely packed mosaics of housing and workshops, suggesting private planning but on a reduced scale, to take advantage of the smallest scraps of land by contrived infiltration. Former open villages can often be indentified today by their mutedly urban nature, seen locally in intermediate settlements such as Winterton, Kirton Lindsey and Scotter. Former closed villages conversely retain a 'traditional' appearance, of neat cottages with generous hedged gardens, and convenient (even where initially somewhat basic) individual facilities placed decently to the rear. When planners of garden cities put their ideas into practice, it was to the rebuilt closed villages that they looked for examples, and the image of 'traditional' country life which they inspired remains in the collective vulgar consciousness of the advertising industry.

In Lincolnshire the landlord class occasionally manifested signs of benign self-interest by the erection of visually pleasing and perhaps morally improving cottages, often replacing older structures in nucleated settlements, occasionally extending to the replacement of whole streets in village centres. Model cottages provided in small numbers to serve outlying farmsteads in isolated situations do not concern us here, since they were built out of necessity, not idealism. Complete clearance of an entire village to enable wholesale remaking and provision of new social amenities (or new means of social control) was unknown in Lindsey, although reading rooms were often provided by landlords, and Messingham briefly enjoyed a public bath-house about the turn of the century. Only at Holton le Moor does rebuilding appear to have been promoted by sweeping idealism, the surviving structures suggesting that the Dixons remade the larger part of the settlement on a virtually Fabianesque plan. Throughout north-west Lindsey variation in date, form and scale of cottage rebuilding can be found; these reflect variety in social motivation, economic considerations, and fashion in what was a long-term and complex alteration in village life.

The earliest example in north-west Lindsey is to be found on the Sheffield estates at Burton and Normanby. The work of Sir Robert Sheffield, the 4th baronet, and his agent Robert Barker, performed over the period 1790 to 1820, it consisted largely of improving cottages already there, without resort to architectural pretentiousness. It was simply a matter of good estate management, a practical rebuilding which could not do other than promote the material and moral well-being of the labourers, whom