

DERBY'S QUEST FOR CITY STATUS, 1927–1977

By JOHN BECKETT

(School of History, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD)

On 7 June 1977, the Silver Jubilee of Her Majesty The Queen, it was officially announced that among the civic honours associated with this occasion Derby was to be promoted to the status of a city. Six weeks later The Queen visited the new city as part of her Jubilee tour, and presented the Letters Patent personally to the mayor, Jeffrey Tillett. It had taken fifty years to achieve this promotion, because Derby first formally applied when it became a diocesan see in 1927; indeed, many people in the town, among them the town clerk, assumed it was automatically entitled to city status on this occasion. Nor is this surprising because in the nineteenth century an English town which became the seat of an Anglican bishopric needed simply to nod in the direction of the Home Office to be issued with Letters Patent creating it a city. The link was broken following the elevation of Wakefield in 1888, but many people did (and, indeed, still do) think that city status and a cathedral go together. Derby's claims were turned down in 1927, but the idea took root and was difficult to shift. On and off for the next fifty years Derby sought city status, and finally succeeded in 1977. Thirty years later it is possible to tell the story of Derby's long and, eventually, successful quest for city status. Using Home Office papers subsequently deposited in The National Archives and made available under the Freedom of Information Act, together with papers in the city council's own archives, it is possible to ask what it all meant?

The quest for city status began with the creation in 1927 of the new Diocese of Derby. From 1884 until 1927 the archdeaconries of Chesterfield and Derby were part of the Anglican diocese of Southwell, with the cathedral at Southwell Minster. It was an unsatisfactory arrangement, which came to an end only when the two archdeaconries were separated off into a new diocese with All Saints, Derby, as the cathedral.¹ In the wake of this split, and with the new bishop safely installed, G. Trevelyan Lee, the town clerk of Derby, wrote on 7 May 1928 to J.H. Thomas MP and the Duke of Devonshire to ask if they could propose Derby for city status:

You are of course aware that it has just become the seat of a new Diocese and in addition to this it has always been the County Town. There is no other town in the country which is not already a city in which all these circumstances apply...².

The town clerk's assumptions were fair and reasonable in the circumstances, but the case was not watertight. After all, the Diocese of Derby had been carved out of the Diocese of Southwell, but although Southwell had been created the see town in 1884 it was not a city.³ Elsewhere Chelmsford and Bury St Edmunds were see towns, but not cities. Nor were all county towns cities. These reasons apart, the town clerk could also point to promotions for neighbouring towns including Leicester in 1919 (before it acquired a cathedral), Stoke in 1925 and, further afield, both Portsmouth and Salford

in 1926. And it was not as if Derby had never previously been interested in city status, because an informal application had been made as long ago as 1908.

In these circumstances the town clerk must have been thoroughly disappointed with the responses he received. Thomas, the MP, approached Sir John Anderson, Under Secretary of State at the Home Office, who responded:

I am afraid I cannot give you any encouragement as to the prospects of Derby being made a city. Some years ago, in 1908, the question was put unofficially to the Home Office but the answer was unfavourable, and the circumstances have not altered materially in the meantime. The truth is that in size Derby comes nowhere near the standard which has roughly been laid down. Very unusual circumstances would therefore have to be shown to justify us in regarding Derby as an exceptional case, and in fact no such circumstances appear to exist. It is quite true that it has just become the seat of a new Diocese, but for many years past that has not been accepted as giving a town any claim to be made a city, and several applications based on that ground had been refused.⁴

Anderson's reply was both helpful — in making clear that the diocesan link had been officially abandoned — and unhelpful, in being rather vague about Derby coming 'nowhere near the standard which has been laid down'. How was the town clerk to know precisely where it stood in relation to the 'standard', when Anderson did not tell him what it was? Such obfuscation was, however, common practice in city status matters.

Anderson left the door sufficiently ajar for local opinion to decide that his decision was not final. If MPs decided to press a case, whatever it might be, they were entitled to be received by the Home Office in order to state their business. Accordingly, on 15 July 1928 a deputation from Derby went to the Home Office to put the claim for Derby's promotion to city status. The deputation was headed by two local MPs, J.H. Thomas and Sir Richard Luce, and included the Duke of Devonshire, the mayor of Derby, and the town clerk.

Since 1907, at the suggestion of King Edward VII, the Home Office had operated an informal guideline that no town could be considered for city status unless its population reached or exceeded 300,000. Given the rapid growth of towns in Victorian England, this had seemed at the time a reasonable yardstick, but in the early decades of the twentieth century population increase was much slower. No towns were reaching the limit, and the Home Office was forced or persuaded to allow promotion to several towns which were not far below the guide figure. The Home Secretary admitted to the Derby delegation that the operational figure was, in reality, 250,000. Stoke had been raised to a city in 1925 with a population of 294,000, and in 1926 both Portsmouth and Salford had been promoted despite having populations hardly in excess of 250,000.

Derby was not in the same league. Its population was estimated by the Home Office at 134,700. As Sir William Joynson-Hicks, the Home Secretary, explained to the delegation, to honour Derby 'would bring in a large number of rival claimants and would make the honour far too cheap . . . there are eight towns with a population larger than Derby and eight others with populations between 120,000 and 140,000 which would certainly press their claims.' The delegation left the Home Office knowing that the cause was hopeless, and on 27 July the Home Secretary wrote formally to Sir Richard Luce rejecting the application.⁵

Despite this rebuff, the Derby contingent remained unhappy that its case was so easily rejected, and when later in the year Plymouth was awarded city status, Derby was offended. The Mayor of Derby wrote to J.H. Thomas, who forwarded his letter to Joynson-Hicks, arguing that 'Derby has even a stronger case for advancement'. The Home Office was having none of it, and the Home Secretary rejected the claim with a promise to tell Thomas why it was impossible next time they met.⁶

Whether or not he did, and whether or not Thomas was convinced, the matter was raised once again in 1929. On 19 August the mayor of Derby sent another informal application to the Home Office, which was politely rejected ten days later primarily on the grounds of Derby's size, but also because: 'the fact that Derby is now the seat of a bishopric is no ground for its claim to be made a City. This was definitely laid down in 1905.'⁷

Undaunted, Derby made further representations to the Home Office in 1931. On 12 June a delegation headed by the Duke of Devonshire, and including the mayor and town clerk, went to the Home Office. Once again the Home Secretary pointed out that Derby was simply too small, with a maximum population of 176,000 even taking into account the surrounding areas. The delegation had a new angle on the question, suggesting that as the Prince of Wales was paying an official visit to the town on 30 June, this would be an ideal opportunity for an announcement. Nor was this just opportunism, since both Leicester in 1919 and Stoke in 1925, had received city status in conjunction with a royal visit.

The Home Office accepted the application, but after the Derby delegation had returned to the Midlands the civil servants' research showed that there was insufficient new material for the case to be reopened. A grant to Derby would lead to too many other claims (from larger towns such as Bolton, Southampton, Swansea, Sunderland, Birkenhead, Oldham, Brighton) and others of much the same size which would want to be upgraded (Middlesbrough, Wolverhampton, Blackburn — another cathedral town — Gateshead, South Shields, Stockport, Southend and Preston). The civil servants also objected to the difficulties likely to arise by encouraging the theory that a county town had a preferential claim to be a city. The case was unacceptable to the Home Office and, on 17 June the Home Secretary wrote to the Duke of Devonshire saying too many principles would have to be broken for Derby to be promoted.⁸

Subsequently Derby's claims were simply not worth entertaining, although city status was regularly alluded to by mayors' in the course of their inaugural speech. The population reached 142,403 in the 1931 census, but had declined to just 132,325 in 1961. Despite these damning statistics Derby entertained hopes of promotion in 1954 in conjunction with celebrations of the 800th Anniversary of its first charter. In preparation, G. Emlyn Jones, the town clerk sought advice from Alan Swift, his opposite number in Cambridge. The University town had been promoted to city in 1951, and Swift was an obvious person to ask for advice. Swift warned him about the excessive secrecy involved: 'This business of trying to get City status is one of the most ticklish that one has to handle. The Crown does not like any preliminary publicity and if it is humanly possible any sort of publicity in minutes and agenda and in the press should be avoided at all costs.'⁹ Derby went ahead and submitted a draft petition in 1955, but was turned down.¹⁰

City status seemed as far away as ever, but circumstances changed in 1966 when the Minister of Housing and Local Government accepted recommendations from the

Royal Commission on Local Government which impacted on Derby. From 1 April 1968 the borough of Derby was expanded to take in Chaddesden, Alvaston and Boulton, Sinfyn Moor, Littleover, parts of Elvaston and Swarkestone, Mickleover, Findern, Radbourne, Twyford and Stenson, Darley Abbey, Allestree, Quarndon, Duffield and Mackworth. Its acreage increased from just over 8,000 acres to nearly 19,000 acres and, above all, its population rose from an estimated 128,000 to 217,000. Research in the Ministry of Housing and Local Government showed that once reorganisation was complete, Sunderland would have a population of 221,000 from 1 April 1967, Derby 217,000 as of 1 April 1968, and the new county borough of Teesside 386,000 as of the same date. In fact, in the 1971 census Derby had a population of 219,510, just ahead of Sunderland with 215,590.

Initially no one seems to have noticed the potential significance of this reorganisation of boundaries for Derby's claim to city status, but local pride was roused when the 1972 Local Government Act effectively reduced Derby to the status of a District Council.¹¹ The town clerk wrote to the Department of the Environment in July 1972 enquiring about the possibility of city status 'after local government reorganisation'. He added

I have not noticed anything in the papers we have received from the Departments or in the report of the parliamentary debates specifically mentioning this. I assume that it will still be possible to apply even after local government reorganisation if a town thinks it has a sufficient case, and that whatever may happen to the application, it will not be turned down merely on the grounds that the area is now a district council and not (say) a county borough. I would be most grateful if you would say if this is the correct view.

Fisher was being pressed by some of his local councillors, including Gerald Toft Andrews, a Conservative councillor 1968-72, who had the idea that the proposed reduction in Derby's status after local government reorganisation might be compensated by the award of city status. The diplomatic view from the Department of the Environment (the successor to the Ministry of Housing and Local Government) was straightforward: 'This is of course a matter turning on the royal prerogative and we cannot define the circumstances in which city status will, or will not, be granted.'¹²

Andrews left the council in 1972, but he remained interested in the possibility of Derby being promoted to city. In January 1974 he wrote to the Department of the Environment asking how Derby might be made a city. What, he wanted to know, was the procedure, could ordinary people, or even individuals apply on behalf of the town? What, in other words, were the basic requirements?¹³ His letter was passed to the Home Office, which provided him with a fair idea of what he was up against.

The style "City" is a Royal Prerogative title which is granted by the Crown on the personal advice of the Home Secretary of the day. In modern times city status is an honour very rarely bestowed and is therefore highly valued as a privilege by those places already entitled to it. There is no formal procedure by which an application may be considered before approval or rejection. It has happened that city status has been granted following consideration of a petition submitted by a local authority, but it has also been granted following completely informal enquiries, not necessarily by the local authority itself. The title has also been bestowed to mark some special occasion: for example, Lancaster was raised to the status of a City to mark the Jubilee of King George V. You will gather from all this that no rules govern the submission of applications for

city status. Equally, there are no basic requirements or criteria (in the sense of a check-list) against which any application is judged; although it is fair to say that the title has only been granted in modern times to towns of major importance in respect of population and size and with a distinctive character and identity of their own.¹⁴

Andrews seems to have made no immediate move beyond sounding out local councillors to see if there was any enthusiasm for drawing up an application. He came to the conclusion that there was none, largely due to the political climate on the council, but he was unwilling to let the moment pass.

Andrews pressed ahead in 1975 with a private application. He drew up a petition and, on 14 March, submitted copies to the Home Office and to Buckingham Palace (which passed it on to the Home Office).¹⁵ For a month he heard nothing, and then the Home Office wrote to him on 28 May to suggest that rather than risk a formal refusal of the petition, he would be advised to encourage Derby District Council to take up the case. Andrews wrote to the Borough Secretary, Ernest Preston, whose reply was not encouraging: 'with regard to the question of city status, all that I can say is that this is not a matter presently under consideration by the Council'. When he enquired again five months later, Andrews received the same rebuff.¹⁶ Andrews later reflected on why he had proceeded in this way:

Judging by one or two statements by the Derby Borough Council majority party in relation to the office of Mayor and [the] wearing of medallions by the former mayors of the County Borough of Derby was to be prohibited on civic occasions, it appeared unlikely that an official and formal application for city status would gain the support of the Derby Borough Council at that point in time. . . . In addition, the private application was intended to be a holding action, in advance of other towns, who might be contemplating such applications. Furthermore, the political climate of the Derby Borough Council seemed to indicate that a decision on city status would not be made until after a new Council had been elected in May, 1976. From a long term aspect, to wait until then for Derby Borough Council to both obtain the general support and forward a formal request, might have been too late for Home Office acceptance, especially if another notable town had already presented a strong case, or for that matter if the Government had made tentative plans for the Jubilee celebrations, during 1976. As a former member of Derby County Borough Council, 1968–1972, and now as a member of the political wilderness gave me the opportunity to pursue an interim application, which a member of the Council is unable to undertake if he/she honours the political party code of loyalty.¹⁷

Andrews, in other words, was simply trying to keep the pot simmering in Derby until better political times came along, and he was influential enough, despite being in the political wilderness, to persuade Ernest Preston to approach the Home Office early in 1976 with a further enquiry:

It has been informally suggested by leading members of the Council that consideration should be given to an application for city status for Derby in Silver Jubilee year. An application for city status was made by Derby in the mid-1950s but was refused. I shall be grateful if you will kindly let me know what is the procedure for making an application for city status.¹⁸

Colin Thursby responded from the Home Office, stressing in the usual language that civic honours of this kind were given only sparingly, but that

As regards procedure, it is not necessary to submit a formal petition; and I think that the best course would be for you to write to us, setting out any particular matters of which you would like the Home Secretary to be aware in considering your request. You will appreciate of course that the outcome will not be known until much nearer the date of the Jubilee celebrations.¹⁹

Preston responded by saying simply that '...at the moment, there is only some vague talk about an application for city status. I shall write to you again if this comes to anything, and I am instructed to make an application.'²⁰

Despite this throw-away line, Preston was undoubtedly taking into consideration the changing political climate. At the local government elections on 6 May 1976, three days after he wrote to the Home Office, the Tories were returned to power on Derby Borough Council, with Gerald Andrews among their successful candidates. At the first meeting of the General Purposes Committee on 26 May the new leader of the council, Councillor Ronald Longdon, raised the issue of an application for city status, to be made in conjunction with the Queen's forthcoming Silver Jubilee in 1977. The Committee — which included Andrews — agreed in principle that an application should be made:

Councillor Longdon raised the question of an application for City status in connection with the Silver Jubilee. The Borough Secretary reported that civic honours of this kind were granted as a mark of distinction by personal command of The Queen, acting on the advice of the Home Secretary. RESOLVED that the Council be recommended to agree in principle that an application be made. . . .²¹

Information was rapidly collected in support of Derby's claim. This included population estimates, and a great deal of material on the town's history and present industrial structure, as well as its services. The key point was simple: Derby was the eighth largest non-metropolitan district in England and Wales, and the only one with a population of 200,000+ not already a city.²²

The full Council ratified the application on 9 June 1976, and it was forwarded to the Home Office on 15 July with the general support of trade and commerce, and only the Trades Union Council actively dissenting.²³ In a covering note Preston referred Thursby to his letter of 30 April 'and our subsequent telephone conversation', and added that he had

now been instructed by the Council to request the Home Secretary to consider an application for City Status for the Borough of Derby. The Council take the view that Derby, with its long history, its civic record and its past and present contribution to the country's economy, is worthy of the title of City. The application has the full support of both political parties on the Council and, it is believed, of the majority of the inhabitants of the Borough. Derbyshire County Council, the Derby and Derbyshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Derby and District Chamber of Trade have all expressed support for the application.

He enclosed all the background information.²⁴

The decision to apply for a Silver Jubilee honour was an interesting one. No formal announcement was ever made that a city would be created on this occasion, although the matter had been under discussion between the Home Office and Buckingham Palace for some months prior to the submission of Derby's application. Early in 1976

when plans were being drawn up to celebrate the Queen's Silver Jubilee in 1977, the Home Office approached Buckingham Palace with the suggestion that one of the ways of marking the occasion would be through a grant of city status. When the Queen indicated her assent to this particular proposal, the Home Office began sounding out potential candidates and assessing their qualifications.²⁵ Whether someone tipped the wink to Gerald Andrews and his fellow councillors is not clear. Possibly the Home Office sounded out Derby simply because it was known to be interested and because of its size, but fortuitously or not the petition arrived in the Home Office just as candidates were being assessed for the Silver Jubilee grant of city status. In total nine candidates were identified: Blackburn, Brighton, Croydon, Derby, Dudley, Newport, Sandwell, Sunderland and Wolverhampton.

Through the autumn of 1976 the Home Office, in conjunction with the Department of the Environment, was considering the relative merits of the candidates. It concluded that only three satisfied enough of the criteria to be given serious consideration: Derby, Sunderland and Wolverhampton. The assessment of Derby was as follows:

Derby like Sunderland, can present quite a strong case on historical grounds . . . last petitioned for city status in 1955, but was turned down primarily on the ground that its population was considerably below 200,000. . . . With a population of 218,000 it is now the largest non-metropolitan district which is not already a city. Its nearest rival in this sense is Luton with a population of only 164,000. The grant of city status to Derby should, therefore, cause little legitimate dissatisfaction amongst the other non-metropolitan aspirants. But Derby's merits are not wholly negative and a reasonable, if not overwhelming, case can be made for honouring it on the grounds of its antiquity and size — which reflects its industrial importance — and as (since 1927) the seat of a Bishopric. In themselves none of these points would be conclusive. Taken together, they amount to a case which appears to be stronger than that of any of the other aspirants.²⁶

This was hardly a ringing endorsement, but it was enough. Sunderland, which had headed the queue since the 1960s, lost its place simply because local government reorganisation in 1974 incorporated it within the metropolitan county of Tyne and Wear. As a result, in 1977 it was held to have made the case 'too soon' for consideration.²⁷

The Queen accepted the case for Derby, as she was bound to do since she always accepts the advice of her ministers on such issues. It was agreed that the announcement should be made on Jubilee day, 7 June, with a presentation of the Letters Patent in Derby during her Jubilee tour visit on 28 July. The Crown Office was asked to prepare the warrant for the Letters Patent, and it commissioned Miss Joan Pilsbury to prepare them.²⁸

Next there was the delicate matter of telling Derby without the news leaking. Since the town's MPs, Philip Whitehead and Walter Johnson, had both written in support of the claim, it was considered reasonable that they should be tipped off in advance. They were told by letter on 4 May. When Sir Philip Moore visited Derby in April to finalise plans for the royal visit, he told the lord lieutenant and Ernest Preston in order 'to enable them to plan accordingly'. In particular, although they were sworn to secrecy, they needed to find a place in the Queen's schedule for the presentation of the Letters Patent. Preston had also to be requested to pay the requisite fees: £120 to the Home Office and £100 to the Crown Office.

All this was going on in secret; indeed, Gerald Andrews himself seems to have despaired of success.³⁰ Then on 31 May 1977 the Home Office wrote formally to Ernest Preston to inform him that the petition had been granted and that Derby would be raised to city status in conjunction with the Jubilee. On 7 June 1977, the day of the Jubilee, came the formal announcement of Derby's success: Derby was to have city status 'to mark Her Majesty's Silver Jubilee', and it was also announced that the Queen would herself present the letters patent when she visited the new city on 28 July as part of her Jubilee tour.³¹ Derby had leap-frogged past Sunderland to be raised to city status, and the north-eastern town had to wait a further fifteen years to be elevated.³²

The Queen duly visited Derby on 28 July 1977, when she presented the letters patent to the Mayor, Alderman Jeffery Tillet. The Queen, her secretary subsequently informed him, 'is sure that Derby's proud traditions will be even better upheld under their new status than they were before'.³³

There was still one further uncertainty to be resolved. It was assumed in Derby that the grant of city status would also mean that the mayor became Lord Mayor. Alderman Tillet 'expressed bewilderment at the fact that he and subsequent mayors of Derby will not automatically receive the title of Lord Mayor'. In part his bewilderment stemmed from the fact that 'Mayors of Derby have been entitled to wear the traditional Lord Mayor's robes of black and gold for many years, and this caused confusion at functions attended by other mayors and lord mayors in full regalia'.³⁴ Gerald Andrews told Home Secretary Merlyn Rees that there was 'a little bewilderment and confusion that the chief citizen has not been conferred with the title of Lord Mayor'. In fact, with the exception of Cardiff in 1905, the two titles have never been bestowed simultaneously, and many English cities do not have lord mayors: indeed, Ernest Preston had been specifically told that the grant did not include a lord mayoralty.³⁵ As the Home Office subsequently told Andrews, 'the title of Lord Mayor is an additional privilege granted, if at all, only after City status has been held for some considerable time. It is by no means an automatic concomitant of City status'.³⁶ The quest continues: Derby applied for lord mayor status when the government conducted a competition among aspirant cities in conjunction with the Queen's Golden Jubilee in 2002, but Exeter was the successful candidate.

Was it all worth it? Local historian Maxwell Craven, writing a decade after the award of city status, commented that 'this one act more than compensated for the blow sustained in the loss of powers to the County Council in 1994 and has in many ways contributed to the optimism with which the city has progressed since'.³⁷ It was an apt summary because city status has largely been sought in recent times in the context of urban promotion. As towns have had to boost their competitiveness in the national, international, and even global economy, marks of civic status have become increasingly important. When Derby applied for a grant of city status in 1977 the procedure was informal and involved little more than the Home Office suggesting to a few likely towns that they submit some evidence in support of their case. Towns were selected for the short list largely on the basis of their size (200,000 population or more) or because they had previously shown interest in city status. Someone in the Home Office carried out a desktop assessment of their claims, and a decision was arrived at with little more than an exchange of letters between the Home Secretary and the Secretary of State for the Environment. By 1992, when Sunderland was at last promoted in conjunction with

The Queen's fortieth anniversary, the Home Office had moved from informal consultation to a competition, and competitions were also held for both the millennium and Golden Jubilee grants. Furthermore, against the government's declared intentions, three towns were promoted in 2000 and five in 2002. No fewer than forty-two towns applied for city status in 2002. Derby was fortunate: the boundary change of 1968 had given it a boost which Gerald Andrews, in particular, recognised as an opportunity for it to claim the promotion it had expected to achieve automatically in 1927. Had it not succeeded in 1977, the subsequent competition would have been far more intense.

NOTES

- ¹ John Beckett, 'Derbyshire and the Establishment of the Diocese of Southwell in 1884', in P. Riden and D. Edwards, ed., *Essays in Derbyshire History* (2006), 247–65. I am grateful to Wendy Bateman for some help with the local research for this paper, and to the late John Heath for his comments on an earlier draft. The overall context of city status grants is discussed in John Beckett, *City Status in the British Isles, 1830–2002* (Aldershot, 2005)
- ² The National Archives (TNA) HO 45/14110, G. Trevelyan Lee to Rt Hon J.H. Thomas MP and Duke of Devonshire, 7 May 1928.
- ³ John Beckett, 'City Status in the Nineteenth Century: Southwell and Nottingham, 1884–97', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society*, 103 (1999), 149–58.
- ⁴ TNA HO 45/14110, Sir John Anderson to J.H. Thomas, 11 May 1928.
- ⁵ TNA HO 45/14110, Home Office notes, 18 July 1928; Home Secretary to Sir Richard Luce, 27 July 1928.
- ⁶ TNA HO 45/14110, Mayor of Derby to J.H. Thomas, 22 October 1928; Home Secretary to Thomas, 23 October 1928.
- ⁷ TNA HO 45/14110, Mayor of Derby to the Home Secretary, 19 August 1929; Home Secretary to the Mayor, 29 August 1929.
- ⁸ TNA HO 45/14110, Home Secretary to the Duke of Devonshire, 17 June 1931.
- ⁹ Cambridgeshire RO, R101/47, Alan Swift to G.H. Emlyn Jones, town clerk of Derby, 26 November 1954.
- ¹⁰ TNA HO 286/67; HLG 43/1195
- ¹¹ Much of the following account is based on two sources. The first is Gerald Toft Andrews's account of the quest for city status, drawn up following the presentation of letters patent in 1977, and now held in Derby Council House. I am grateful to Philip O'Brien for making the material available to me. The second is Home Office file HO 286/126, initially closed for 30 years from the time of Derby's elevation but opened early (1 January 2005) following the passing of the Freedom of Information Act.
- ¹² TNA HLG 120/1714, H.S. Fisher to Department of the Environment, 18 July 1972; M.K. Eden to Fisher, July 1972. (This file was also opened early under the Freedom of Information Act.)
- ¹³ TNA HLG 120/1714, G.T. Andrews to Department of the Environment, 3 January 1974.
- ¹⁴ Andrews MSS, A.P. Wilson to G.T. Andrews, 4 February 1974.
- ¹⁵ Andrews MSS, P.R.A. Fulton to Andrews, 24 March 1975; Sir Philip Moore to Andrews, 24 March 1975.
- ¹⁶ Andrews MSS, A.J. Butler to Andrews, 28 May 1975; Andrews to Derby Borough Council, 5 June 1976; Ernest Preston to Andrews, 13 June, 20 November 1975.
- ¹⁷ Andrews MSS.
- ¹⁸ TNA HO 286/126, Ernest Preston, Borough Secretary, to Under Secretary of State, Home Office, 27 April 1976.

- ¹⁹ TNA HO 286/126, Colin Thursby to Preston, 30 April 1976 (copy).
- ²⁰ TNA HO 286/126, Preston to Thursby, 3 May 1976.
- ²¹ TNA HO 286/126 Copy Resolution of the General Purposes Committee, 26 May 1976.
- ²² TNA HO 286/126 includes a copy of the petition.
- ²³ TNA HO 286/126, Ernest Preston to Colin Thursby, 15 July 1976.
- ²⁴ TNA HO 286/126, Thursby's acknowledgement of the letter, 19 July 1976.
- ²⁵ TNA HO 286/126, R.F.D. Shuffrey to Sir Philip Moore, 3 Aug. 1976, 4 Jan. 1977.
- ²⁶ TNA HO 286/126, 'Annex'. The annex contains a digest of the merits of each of the candidates except for Sandwell, which applied late.
- ²⁷ TNA HO 286/126, Merlyn Rees, to Peter Shore, 8 December 1976, Shore's endorsement of the proposal, 8 December 1976, and The Queen's acceptance, 29 January 1977.
- ²⁸ TNA HO 286/126, Shuffrey to Miss D.M.P. Malley, 3 March 1977.
- ²⁹ TNA HO 286/126, Shuffrey to Moore, 2 May 1977. Sir Ian Walker-Okeover, the lord lieutenant, had been so keen to see Derby promoted that months before the final decision was taken he was anxious to plan for the handing over of the Letters Patent by The Queen. As Sir Philip Moore, from Buckingham Palace, told Ralph Shuffrey of the Home Office on 3 August 1976, the lord lieutenant 'has proposed that as the first item of The Queen's Silver Jubilee visit to the county, Her Majesty should present a Charter conferring city status on the Borough of Derby. The Lord-Lieutenant has made it clear that he has no knowledge as to whether this proposal will be approved. I should be most grateful if you could let me know the latest position. If there is no Charter to present, we shall have to think of some other item for the beginning of the programme in Derbyshire.' TNA HO 286/126: Shuffrey replied to Moore on 4 August to say that Derby was one of the candidates but that no decision had been taken.
- ³⁰ I take this to be the implication behind Andrews's comments in a letter to Home Secretary Merlyn Rees, written on 24 June 1977 in which he referred to the 'unexpected honour', and the 'surprise announcement' on 7 June: Andrews MSS.
- ³¹ Andrews MSS, Home Office to Borough Secretary, 31 May 1977; *Derby Evening Telegraph*, 8 June 1977; *The Times*, 29 July 1977.
- ³² TNA HO 286/67
- ³³ Andrews MSS, Queen's Secretary to Mayor of Derby, 29 July 1977. It is remarkable how many activities The Queen packed into that single day. From Derby she visited Chesterfield, Mansfield Library, Trent Bridge Cricket Ground for a few minutes at the England v Australia Test Match, Nottingham's Queen's Medical Centre — which she officially opened — and finally Nottingham Council House for dinner, and Nottinghamshire County Hall for a reception.
- ³⁴ *Derby Evening Telegraph*, 8 June 1977.
- ³⁵ TNA HO 286/126, Shuffrey to Preston, 31 May 1977.
- ³⁶ Andrews MSS, Andrews to Merlyn Rees, 24 June 1977, and C. Thursby to Andrews, 10 August 1977.
- ³⁷ Maxwell Craven, *Derby: an Illustrated History* (Derby, 1988), 238.