



ENGLISH  
HERITAGE

# MINUTES

Meeting Title	Marble Hill Steering Group
Date	10 July 2018
Location	Marble Hill House
Present	Claire Chapman (Marble Hill Play Centre and Brilliant Play) , Colin Cooper (SWLEN), Alex Sydney (Head of Investment and Involvement, English Heritage), John Watkins (Head of Landscape and Gardens, English Heritage) David Bird (Marble Hill Cricket Club), Maria Walker(Twickenham Film Studios), Roger Crouch (Ward Councilor), Celia Holman, (Twickenham Society); Janine Fotiadis Negrepontis (Love Marble Hill); Maureen Coyle (Property Manager, Marble Hill House) Rachel Worely (Reality Dog Training) Alice Philpott (Resident, Cambridge Gardens)
Apologies	Berny Simcox, Environment Trust Alan Carter, Crossbats Cricket Club

Item	Topics	Actions
1. Minutes of the last meeting	Minutes and actions	No actions
2. Events	Brief update on recent and forthcoming meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Open Day – very successful event with 149 people taking part in historical landscape, tree and house tours. Positive feedback indicating the many respondents on the day were in favour of most aspects of the Marble Hill Revived project proposals.</li></ul>	2.1KP to contact next door East Twickenham Twickenham

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Music in the Park – two events have taken place each attracting around 80 people to picnic and listen. Taking place at the front of the house. Final 2 music in the park events on July 28 and 29.</li> <li>ii. Family Fun Day – at least 500 people came along to the Family Fun Day run by Inspired Women, the professional networking group involved with the Marble Hill Revived preparations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Coming up:</p> <p>Family Heritage Morning – Saturday 14 July  First eco event – Insect Hotels – Sunday 15 July</p> <p>CH: Essential to reach families not from the immediate area who would benefit from the event. Suggest contacting Next Door East Twickenham and Twickenham Riverside to publicise events.</p>	Riverside
3. Landscape symposium update	<p><b>Landscape symposium update</b></p> <p>John Watkins presented a summary of the symposium. The main points were:</p> <p>Chaired by Michael Symes.</p> <p>First speaker Dr Marion Harney from Bath University, specialist on Pope.  Dr David Jacques who has researched Marble Hill  Love Marble Hill shared important research which means that this can be attributed to James Dorritt, the Duke of Argyll’s surveyor. Thus survey can therefore be redated as c.1749 not c.1752.  Magnus Alexander shared work of the Historic England archaeologists. They found correlation between c.1749 plan and the Pope plan. Slopes, an arbour, earthworks and gaps for walks all correlate.  Tom Cromwell (HE archaeologist) explained how the excavations located the nine pin alley.</p>	

When looking for a grotto, archaeologists found the edge of large hollow. Both alley and grotto were found at exact locations of 1749 plan.  
EP from EH explained the evidence for the development of the garden using archival research.  
Jan Woudstra discussed thoughts on the c1749 plan which could be used to understand how it was planted.

Conclusions from the talks:

- Pope was involved in the design of the Marble Hill Garden
- Archaeological evidence confirms existence of all main features of the garden
- The structure of the garden was laid out in the 1720s.

JFM asserted that Now the date is accepted as 1749 it cannot be an accurate survey because at this time the land was not owned by Henrietta.

Accounts plans and contemporary descriptions confirm Henrietta Howard lived at Marble from the 1720s onwards.

JFN questioned the timeline:

JFN questioned the timeline:

1. EP asserts garden receipts, attributing them to the garden, when they were for the sweet walk
2. Dr Jacques is using accounts and receipts by Roger Morris 1724/5. This is where he finds the basis of his garden theory. In 1742 £90 6 men 8 days work, up until that there's one ice house. The John Rocques map of 1746 depicts all local gardens accurately and there is nothing at Marble Hill. John Rocque's later map of 1754 and includes the gardens. The archaeology can be attributed to a later garden – not 1720s.

Post Meeting Note:

1. There are three undated gardening contracts during Henrietta Howard's ownership. They include references to the Pleasure Ground (garden) and the Sweet walk.

2. There is lots of evidence for the gardens before 1742 please see <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/marble-hill-house/history-and-stories/henrietta-howards-garden/> and [http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/content/properties/marble-hill-house/3146388/3146395/Research to uncover Henrietta's garden at Marble Hill.pdf](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/content/properties/marble-hill-house/3146388/3146395/Research_to_uncover_Henrietta's_garden_at_Marble_Hill.pdf)

The Rocque plan (1746) shows an avenue of trees and no detail relating to the garden, including large features we know were in place by this date such as the grotto and the Green House.

There are many reasons why the Rocque plan (1746) might not show the detail of the garden at Marble Hill. It may be that Howard did not allow the surveyors access to her land or it may be because she was not one of the subscribers, unlike many other landowners. It is notable that Marble Hill is not labelled and the owner is not recorded unlike many of the gardens shown in more detail e.g. Whitton is labelled and recorded as belonging to the Duke of Argyll.

CH: facts are being quoted selectively, misdated, or mis-defined. An example is the Sweet Walk, where a receipt for plants is attributed to the 1724 Pleasure garden. But a closer look shows it to be the Sweet Walk.

Post meeting note: See explanation above.

AS: Academics have come to a balanced conclusion at the Symposium independently of English Heritage.

At the Symposium, Michael Symes indicated no decisions were to be made on the day. JFN – Duke of Argyll needs to be more prominent in the Marble Hill garden narrative, and this addressed with the Heritage Lottery Fund.

MW - there has been no deliberate attempt to misinterpret on EH's part. What has to happen and EH must do is acknowledge the research that has been done.

AS - If there are elements of the garden that were there, then there is a basis for restoration. We are proposing not to restore every element but to reinstate some elements of it. A long

	<p>as those elements are there, none of the people involved in this debate are too far apart.</p> <p>RC – symposiums will never produce definitive judgments from historians.</p> <p>DB Suggestion to appoint someone who is not necessarily a historian- an independent arbiter- to ‘adjudicate’.</p> <p>AS We have tried to do is bring out experts on the subject. They are interested in the truth and have no reason to maintain the status quo if evidence proves the previously accepted interpretation of history to be wrong. They are not arbiters. But they are all serious well respected academics.</p> <p>AS –that is not how history operates. Another historian could well come up with an alternative in a few years.</p> <p>On being pressed by members of the steering group, JW agreed to EH could ask Michael Symes to summarise both cases and draw his conclusion.</p> <p>Post meeting note: An e-mail from Celia Hollman dated 12<sup>th</sup> July stated that Love Marble Hill were no longer happy with this approach because they did not consider Michael Symes to be independent (as he once wrote the following sentence in a 1986 paper on the Plantings at Whitton: <i>“There is no evidence that Argyll advised the Countess on the actual layout, but it is thought that Pope and Bridgeman gave assistance.”</i>) EH responded to say that if LMH would not accept that Michael Symes was independent, they would no longer ask Michael Symes to carry out his assessment of the evidence.</p>	<p>4.1 JW to ask Michael Symes to summarise points of difference.</p> <p>4.2 AS to share papers after meeting with LMH and Twickenham Society.</p>
<p>3. Landscape workshop update</p>	<p><b>Landscape consultation – summary by John Watkins</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodland quarters – have not been managed since GLC for tree safety alone.</li> <li>• One of results of lack of tree management is there is a lack of good quality tree stock.</li> </ul>	

- There are lots of self seeded trees. There is a lack of natural light, lots of squirrel damage, and the biodiversity is not what it could be.
- Improving biodiversity is therefore an important aim.
- EH had a range of attendees, local residents, landscape orgs, local students, previously and newly elected councilors.
- Concerns raised about formality of tree planting

Restoration of the garden

- Care will be taken to provide a balance between the current municipal nature of the park and the historic landscape
- Any landscape restoration needs to be achieved together with changes which will improve the bio-diversity of Marble Hill.
- JW explained that the landscape architect presentation talked about both the conservation area, wider habitats in the park, and how this can be broken down into smaller character areas.
- Variety methods of maintenance – lots of different methods
- Ecological assessments have identified wildlife on site – birds, bats, badgers and specific species.

The group looked at various species we might want to attract to the site  
Key species as well as song thrush/house sparrow.

**Other issues raised:**

- Litter
- Dog management
- How income will be generated
- More bat and bird boxes
- Opportunity to work more as a community project
- Maintaining deadwood for insects
- Importance of attaining fencing round woodland quarters – access by dogs not good for wildlife.
- Paths – questions whether the extent – and too many. Consider how wildlife move

	<p>between these habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about how work would be programmed- bulldozers or over a much longer period.</li> <li>• London Wildlife Trust focused on specific species and how we can get habitats to foster those.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Restoration versus ecology – that gave EH food for thought about how we could change our designs to have ecological benefit without changing integrity of the garden.</p> <p>Workshop members were not given the choice to completely redesign the landscape – this was because funding has been obtained on the strength of the original application and so complete re-design is not an option.</p> <p>CC – Marble Hill contains very important song thrush breeding territories. Will these be protected in the new plans? If these and badgers are sufficiently protected it would allow CC to support the application.</p> <p>JW: EH will be improving situation, cover and density of cover for song thrushes so they can breed safely. This will involve getting food for them, insects and worms. That’s why the other aspect would be to make a ground floor which encourages more insects. We definitely want to increase the thickets at the front.</p> <p>Badgers – how will EH safeguard these?</p> <p>Ecologist doing EH bat survey first reported the presence of badgers in September 2017. We have been commissioning reports to assess badger activity on site since then. EH will put in place all recommendations to ensure badgers are accommodated at Marble Hill.</p> <p>CC: Example of good practice -Kew badger facility</p>	
4. AOB	<p>Three Steering group members questioned the business case for the Marble Hill Revived Project and Marble Hill.</p> <p>RW: Dog management and dog control – more needs to be done at Marble Hill Park.</p>	

	<p>AS This is an important core part of HLF process events – EH is trying to do some of those things this Summer.</p> <p>RW – a ranger with specialist dog skills would be a good idea.</p> <p><b>Newsletter</b> Latest edition of newsletter handed to Steering Group members.</p>	<p>4.1 MC to investigate possibility of involving volunteers with promoting responsible dog walking in the park</p>
--	---	---