

# **Marble Hill Revived Statement of Community Involvement**

**September 2018**

## 1. Introduction

In March 2017, following pre-application consultation with the local community, English Heritage launched its first planning application for the Marble Hill Revived Project.

English Heritage's plans for Marble Hill House and Park originally comprised:

- Restoring Henrietta Howard's Georgian garden
- Re-interpreting the House, extending its opening hours and installing a lift for access
- Extending the café, shop and play area at the Stable Block
- Enhancing the sports pitches at Marble Hill Park and re-configuring the changing areas
- Managing current woodland, creating and enhancing biodiversity at Marble Hill.

Following further extensive public consultation, in February 2018, English Heritage withdrew the planning application in order to undertake a second wave of public consultation to address the issues raised by the public. The scheme for the current planning and listed building consent application comprises:

- Restoring Henrietta Howard's Georgian garden  
Re-interpreting the House, extending its opening hours and installing a lift for access
- Improvements to the café within the Stable Block
- Enhancing the sports pitches at Marble Hill Park and re-configuring the changing areas
- Managing current woodland, creating and enhancing biodiversity at Marble Hill.

Following the withdrawal of the application, English Heritage wrote to stakeholders in February 2018 to say:

*"There has been strong support for many of the proposals from many people and organisations, and we are grateful for the letters and messages we have received from the local community, local groups and stakeholders.*

*There has, however, also been strong opposition to some elements of the proposals, notably the café extension, the restoration of the original landscape, and the new children's play area. So, we've decided to take a step back. We have withdrawn the current Planning Application and will be starting on a new community consultation programme to try to find a practical consensus on the areas of concern.*

*We have not taken this step lightly but believe that securing the broad support of the community before taking the project further is in the best interests of Marble Hill House and Park. We will therefore be increasing the membership of the Community Steering Group to include additional residents' groups and other groups so that their concerns can be fully represented.*

*We will also set up a number of Consultation Workshops to discuss those aspects of the proposals that have attracted particular concerns. And we'll run a series of Open Days at the Park where we can answer people's questions. Also, we will be communicating more regularly with residents, local groups and stakeholders so that they can see and read about the proposals more easily and make comments direct.*

*We have consulted the Heritage Lottery Fund who will be funding a large part of the proposed improvements and they are supportive of our strategy to secure stronger support from the local community. We hope that, together, we can go forward positively to secure agreement on how best to revive Marble Hill House and Park.*

*For further information, please visit the Marble Hill Revived webpage at [www.english-heritage.org.uk/marblehillrevived](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/marblehillrevived). And you can read our community newsletter at <https://goo.gl/nLWV9R>. “*

Please note that consultation with statutory consultees and the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames is covered in English Heritage's planning application statement.

## **2. Policy Context**

### **The Localism Act**

Consultation is an essential requirement for major development projects and is encouraged by both national and local Government. Indeed, the Government has put community consultation at the heart of The Localism Act (2011):

*“Alongside neighbourhood planning proposals, a new requirement for compulsory community engagement at the pre-application stage is one way through which this can be achieved, particularly for larger applications which are likely to fall outside the neighbourhood planning process. By giving local people a stronger say in the planning process and making developers aware of issues of importance to the community that will need to be resolved through the design process, we expect that issues will be raised (and resolved) sooner, and planning permission granted more swiftly and in more cases.”*

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) (NPPF) was a key part of Government's reforms to make the planning system less complex and more accessible. The framework acts as statutory guidance for local planning authorities and decision-takers, both in drawing up plans and making decisions about planning applications. The NPPF encourages early and proactive community engagement. Paragraph 66 of the previous version of the NPPF states that:

*“Applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Proposals that can demonstrate this in developing the design of the new development should be looked on more favourably.”*

The consultation programme was also carried out in accordance with the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2018), which encourages early and proactive community engagement. Paragraph 128 of this document states that:

*“Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.”*

### **London Borough of Richmond**

The Council’s Statement of Community Involvement, adopted on 9th June 2006, says:

*“The Council encourages pre-application discussions and community involvement from the outset. Seeking community views on the acceptability of proposals, especially before an application is finalised, strengthens people’s ability to exert influence and provides an opportunity for problems to be ironed out, thus reducing the potential for later confrontation.*

*Council officers generally leave developers to pursue their own methods of consultation at this stage, using their own resources, so that officers can remain at ‘arm’s length’ from discussions, meetings, exhibitions and information distribution. Officers will, however, ask for feedback on how pre-application consultation has been conducted and what the outcome has been.*

*All applicants are encouraged to explain their proposals informally to neighbours and to anyone else who might be affected, either before or at the time of making their application.”*

### **3. Consultation programme**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Material made available to the public</b>
November-December 2016	Pre-application consultation	Project web page at <a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/marblehillrevived">www.english-heritage.org.uk/marblehillrevived</a>
Stakeholder day 18 Nov 2016 (15 groups) Drop-in 19 Nov 2016 (246 people) Dog Walker’s consultation 25/26 Nov 2016 (34 people) Community group outreach visits throughout	Public information on initial proposals. The level of detail was left flexible to enable English Heritage to remain responsive to public suggestions and feedback.  The purpose of this stage was to inform and consult with stakeholders and the public	Public exhibition  Flier delivered to households in TW1 and TW2

<b>Time</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Material made available to the public</b>
November and early December 2016.		
January 2016 Sports groups 24 Jan 2017 (17 people) Public meeting 25 Jan 2017 (34 people)	Meetings held for sports groups and general public to provide a new level of detail to proposals and incorporate many of the suggestions made in late 2016	Flier for posting and dissemination Visualisations of commercial hub, landscape and house  Newspaper advertisement
February 2017  March 2017	Site walks /final amendments from public feedback  Submission of Planning Application	Visualisations of commercial hub, landscape and house
June 2017	Meetings with representatives from the Orleans Park Residents Association.	
July 2017	Public meeting to discuss planning application	Visualisations and maps of commercial hub, landscape and house
July 2017	Meeting with ward councillors	Visualisations and maps of commercial hub, landscape and house
September 2017	Meeting between Senior EH Staff, Ward Councillors and representatives of Orleans Park Residents Association (now Love Marble Hill)	The above and additional information about landscape management at Marble Hill Park.
February 2018	Planning application withdrawn  Second wave of public consultation launched	

Time	Consultation	Material made available to the public
March – July 2018	<p>Community Steering Group enlarged from 14 to 21 groups to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional local residents' groups</li> <li>• local schools</li> <li>• local businesses</li> <li>• Love Marble Hill</li> </ul> <p>Community Steering group meetings held monthly to report on and monitor consultation</p>	<p>Minutes published on project web page</p> <p>Results shared in 3 newsletters, each distributed to 59,000 – 136,000 households in a 2-3-mile radius around Marble Hill.</p> <p>Content included: Talks Presentations Q&amp;A Plans Maps Reports on each Consultation workshop (see below)</p>
March 2018	<p>First Newsletter sent to 136,000 households in a 3-mile radius around Marble Hill House and Park. Briefed residents on the proposals and areas for comment. This invited comments on the Marble Hill Revived e-mail address. <a href="https://goo.gl/nLWV9R">https://goo.gl/nLWV9R</a></p>	<p>Maps and plans Explanations/ visual Invitations to Open Day Invitations to send responses to English Heritage</p>
May 2018	<p>Second Newsletter sent to 59,000 households in a 2-mile radius around Marble Hill House and Park. This updated residents on the progress of the consultation and invited comments on the Marble Hill Revived e-mail address.</p>	<p>Meeting reports Explanations/ visuals Invitations to Open Day Invitations to send responses to English Heritage</p>
July 2018	<p>Third Newsletter sent to 59,000 households in a 2-mile radius around Marble Hill House and Park. This updated residents on the progress of the</p>	<p>Meeting reports Explanations/ visuals Invitations to Open Day Invitations to send responses to English Heritage</p>

Time	Consultation	Material made available to the public
	consultation and invited comments on the Marble Hill Revived e-mail address.	
April 2018 Play Consultation Workshop	Workshop on the Children's play area at Marble Hill Park  Audiences ranged from families, residents, Love Marble Hill, local heritage organisations and local sports and leisure groups.	Minutes published on project web page  Results shared in newsletters, each distributed to 59,000 households in a 2-mile radius around Marble Hill.  Content included Talks Presentations Q&A Plans Maps
April 2018 Meeting with Love Marble Hill (LMH)	Meeting to discuss LMH's proposals for the park, including the café, impact on traffic in the area and their proposals for an eco-centre at Marble Hill.	Results shared with subsequent Community Steering Group.
April 2018 Meeting with residents of Montpelier Row	Meeting with residents of Montpelier Row and Orleans Road, as well as representative of Love Marble Hill and local ward councillors.	Results shared with subsequent Community Steering Group.
May 2018 Landscape Consultation Workshop	Workshop on the Marble Hill landscape proposals  Audiences included local heritage and ecology groups, Love Marble Hill, sports groups, dog walkers and residents.	Minutes published on project web page  Results shared in newsletters, each distributed to 59,000 households in a 2-mile radius around Marble Hill.  Content included: Talks Presentations Q&A Plans

<b>Time</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Material made available to the public</b>
		Maps
June 2018 Café consultation workshop	Workshop on the café extension proposals  Audiences included 5 representatives from Montpelier Row, Love Marble Hill, local dog walkers and residents.	Minutes published on project web page  Results shared in newsletters, each distributed to 59,000 households in a 2-mile radius around Marble Hill.  Content included Talks Presentations Q&A Plans
May and June 2018 Open Days	Free tours of house and garden Information point to find out about, and respond to, the project proposals Demonstrations around the park: Brilliant Play, Richmond Environment Trust, Lotus and Laurel Yoga	Tours Demonstrations Q&A Plans Maps
June 2018	Garden History Symposium: 18 <sup>th</sup> century garden specialists gathered to review the current historical understanding, archaeological findings and new evidence from Love Marble Hill	Presentations from Garden Historians, Historic England archaeologists and local residents?

#### 4. Who did we want to involve?

<b>Type of stakeholder</b>	<b>How groups were targeted</b>	<b>Approximate numbers involved</b>
Local residents	Visits, open days, targeted meetings for Montpelier Row and Orleans Road	285

Type of stakeholder	How groups were targeted	Approximate numbers involved
	<p>One newsletter distributed door-to-door to 136 households. Two newsletters distributed door-to-door to up to 59,000 households</p> <p>A web page was created to provide extensive information about the project, including downloads</p> <p><a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/marble-hill-house/marble-hill-revived/">http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/marble-hill-house/marble-hill-revived/</a></p> <p>A Twitter page was created to disseminate information about the project <a href="https://twitter.com/mhrevived">https://twitter.com/mhrevived</a></p>	
Love Marble Hill (formerly Orleans Park Residents Association)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tours with EH specialists (Head of Landscape and Gardens, Senior Historian, Landscape Historian),</li> <li>• Extensive email correspondence</li> <li>• Garden History symposium organised to review LMH's new historical evidence</li> <li>• Meeting with Marble Hill Site Staff to pilot eco events at Marble Hill Park</li> <li>• 2 site visits to other ecology centres with EH's Audience Development Manager</li> </ul>	10
Families	<p>Playgroups, Marble Hill Play Centre</p> <p>Representation at consultation workshops</p>	100
Sports enthusiasts	<p>Liaison with a wide range of sports clubs and associations</p> <p>Representation on Steering Group for major sports group users of Marble Hill</p>	30
Dog walkers	<p>Dog walker informal sessions x 2</p> <p>Dog walkers invited to:</p>	60

Type of stakeholder	How groups were targeted	Approximate numbers involved
	Play Landscape consultation workshops	10
Adults	<p>November 2016 Open morning, January and July 2017 public meetings Summer 2018 Open days:</p> <p><b>Sunday 13<sup>th</sup> May 2018:</b> Members of the public were invited to come along to the Marble Hill open day to meet the team, ask questions about our workshops so far, hear about the community steering group, share their views, sign up to the newsletter and MHR updates.</p> <p>We welcomed 126 people on free tours throughout the day. The tours included the history of Marble Hill House, a Behind the scenes tour of the house delivered by the curator and Marble Hill</p> <p><b>Saturday 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2018:</b> Second Marble Hill open day. We welcomed 149 people on free tours throughout the day. The tours included the history of Marble Hill House, Marble Hill Garden tour and tours of the trees within Marble Hill Park. The Kitchen Garden was also open for tours between 11am – 2pm.</p> <p><b>Garden.tours:</b> The Kitchen Garden was also open for tours between 11am – 2pm, families enjoyed yoga on the lawn as well as children’s activities and 9 pin bowling.</p>	600
Teachers and pupils in schools	<p>Assemblies and staff meeting visits</p> <p>Representation on steering committee for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deputy head of St Mary’s School</li> <li>• Two students from Orleans Park School</li> </ul>	250
BAME audiences	Visits to BAME groups in Twickenham, Whitton and Hounslow	50
Disabled people	Access groups in Twickenham and Whitton	30

Type of stakeholder	How groups were targeted	Approximate numbers involved
Women	Through women's business networking group Inspired Women	60

## 5. How did we inform, consult and feedback?

The following consultation has taken place to listen to local concerns about the planning proposals, deepen understanding of the needs of current users and understand more fully what will attract new ones:

- Meetings and discussions between English Heritage and adjoining property owners
- Information provided to the local press, for example

[http://www.richmondandtewickentimes.co.uk/news/16055755.Marble\\_Hill\\_planning\\_app\\_withdrawn\\_and\\_community\\_consultation\\_launched/](http://www.richmondandtewickentimes.co.uk/news/16055755.Marble_Hill_planning_app_withdrawn_and_community_consultation_launched/)

- A web page was launched with details of the proposals and a feedback form
- <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/marble-hill-house/marble-hill-revived/>

- A Twitter page was created to disseminate information about the project  
<https://twitter.com/mhrevived>
- A series of Open Days featured free tours on the house, the history of the landscape and the ecology of the woodlands. Additional tours were run monthly between April and August 2018.
- In November 2016, two stakeholder briefing sessions were held, including a briefing and tour of the house and landscape (13 local organisations invited)
- In Spring and Summer 2018, four Steering Groups featuring wider representation  
[http://www.richmondandtewickentimes.co.uk/news/16126979.Marble\\_Hill\\_hosts\\_first\\_steering\\_group\\_on\\_6\\_million\\_restoration\\_plans/](http://www.richmondandtewickentimes.co.uk/news/16126979.Marble_Hill_hosts_first_steering_group_on_6_million_restoration_plans/)
- In Spring and Summer 2018, three consultation workshops inviting participation from those interested in commenting on play area, landscape and café

- Three regular consultation update newsletters published, distributed to local area, sent electronically to those who request it and displayed in the park
- Meetings with local groups with a special interest: eg Love Marble Hill, Montpelier Row residents
- Outreach visits to community groups
- Two drop-in information sessions at a local café to inform dog walkers (34 people)
- Two public consultation meetings, one to cater for sports and leisure groups, and one for the general public (Sports group: 15 people; general public: 31 people)
- A short online survey of families at the Marble Hill Play Centre regarding whether Marble Hill should feature dog free areas. (32 responses)
- An online survey to find out what local residents' perceptions of their park were.

	Inform	Consult	Feed back
Stakeholder briefing day	x	x	
Meetings and discussions with local residents	x	x	
Broadened Membership Steering Group	x	x	x
Three consultation workshops	x	x	
Newsletter	x	x	x
Open Days	x	x	
Dog walkers consultation	x	x	
Community group visits	x	x	
Online feedback form		x	
E mail correspondence		x	
Surveys (families and general public)			x
Sports group meeting	x	x	x
Public meeting			x
Discussions with adjoining property owners	x	x	x

## 6. How English Heritage consulted on the Marble Hill Revived project

### 6.1 Methods for informing and consulting

#### October 2016 – March 2017

- Informal meetings and discussions were used to create constructive and responsive relations with residents in adjoining properties to Marble Hill.
- During our November briefing sessions and public drop-in, a pop-up exhibition about the proposals was accompanied with tours of the house and gardens for members of the public and stakeholders.
- A dog walkers' consultation was held at the Orleans Park café just outside Marble Hill so respondents could bring their dogs. The Audience Development Manager gave a brief overview of what the project means for visitors with dogs, and maps of the site were provided to aid discussion.
- The Audience Development Manager visited community groups, informing them about the proposals through presentations and hands-on experiences.
- A web page has been available throughout the consultation period with information about the proposals as they developed: [www.english-heritage.org.uk/marblehillrevived](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/marblehillrevived). It includes an online feedback form.
- As English Heritage developed more detailed proposals based on public feedback, two meetings were held to inform the sports groups and the general public. These featured an enhanced exhibition and the opportunity

to hear from the English Heritage leads in Landscape, Interpretation, Engagement and Properties.

- Finally, to gain clarity and inform our planning, English Heritage carried out two very short surveys of local groups: one to ask families what their views were on dog-free areas (34 respondents) and one to ask local residents their views on Marble Hill as a local amenity (40 respondents).

### **April 2017 – January 2018**

Responding to the planning application launched in March 2017,

- A series of meetings were held between senior EH staff and local lobbying residents. Attendees included residents from Montpelier Row and the Orleans Park Residents Association.
- A public meeting was held at Orleans Park School. 130 residents attended to watch a presentation by senior EH staff and respond in an extended Q and A session.

### **January – August 2018**

Following withdrawal of the first Marble Hill Revived planning application

- An online feedback form has been provided for input from the public, and a dedicated e mail address provided for members of the public to comment, respond and ask questions.
- Four meetings of the Community Steering Group were held to keep a watching brief on the consultation process. These had a general brief and looked at all aspects of public input into the process. Members were also briefed on results as they became available.
- Three consultation workshops were held to look in detail at the Play Area, the Landscape and the Café. These provided detailed guidance and specialist help but also looked at compromises which would meet the needs of local residents and the general public.
- Meetings were held with Love Marble Hill, Montpelier Row and the Marble Hill Play Centre to listen to recommendations for change. These were held by senior EH staff and were aimed at providing information and question and answer opportunities in a bid to reach workable compromises.
- At Open Days, the Project Manager has been available to listen to input from the public and written feedback methods were available. Members of the public could learn from curators and property stewards about the background to the park's history and ecology, and were able to question, comment and feed back.
- The Garden History Symposium was organised specifically to address concerns from some local residents regarding whether the garden at the centre of the Marble Hill Revived project existed, the evidence relating to it and whether the plan circa 1750 was a proposal or a plan depicting the landscape at the time. The leading experts in 18<sup>th</sup> century garden history were made available to local residents' group, Love Marble Hill, and they, in turn, were invited to present their views.

## **6.2. Feeding back to those consulted**

Feedback has been happening in a number of ways. It is part of an on-going dialogue with our local public through Marble Hill's Audience Development Manager (ADM).

Anyone who accepted the invitation to respond by e mail has had feedback from the ADM and in some cases been invited for a walk-round of the house and grounds for discussion.

The primary purpose of our January 2017 meetings was to feed back on the input English Heritage received during the development phase of the Marble Hill Revived project. By providing English Heritage's experts at this stage, feedback was received quickly, implemented where appropriate and possible, and opportunities taken to engage respondents in further discussion during the early stages on the project.

Visits to community groups are continuing, and feedback will form an integral part of presentations to these groups.

### **Feedback February – August 2018**

The following methods of feedback have been available during the most recent consultation process:

- Online feedback form
- Dedicated email address staffed by site staff
- Ongoing opportunities for site walks/ information/ access to plans with the Audience Development Manager
- Steering Group: suggestions included in minutes
- Consultation Workshop: minutes shaped new planning application
- History Symposium

## 7. Responding to feedback

Feedback from the public has been extensive and detailed. Full records of the most recent consultation responses and actions taken are available as an appendix to this document. However, the main issues relating to Local Authority planning issues were as follows:

Issue	Response from English Heritage
<p><b>Marble Hill's impact on the local community</b></p> <p><b>Traffic</b></p>	<p>A transport assessment was carried out for EH by Vectos, and submitted as part of the original planning application. LB Richmond asked for supplementary information which was produced but this was not uploaded on the Council's planning portal because the planning application was subsequently withdrawn. Residents' feedback suggested that the Transport assessment should also factor in the transport implications of future developments in the vicinity of Marble Hill Park which have received planning permission, as well as the potential impact on our proposals on neighbouring roads.</p> <p>An updated version of the Vectos Transport Assessment will be submitted which will comply with all NPPF requirements relating to transportation. Much of the local resident feedback relating to transport suggested that EH should provide far more information than is required by NPPF. EH notes that Twickenham has an existing transport problem which it is not EH's responsibility to resolve, and which EH cannot attempt to resolve in isolation. However, EH is responding to this feedback by producing a second Transport document which outlines how EH can work in partnership with a range of local stakeholders to both improve the current transport situation on the one hand, and further mitigate any impacts of the Marble Hill Revived proposals on the other – in order to potentially improve the transport situation locally – in doing so by going over and above our requirements under NPPF.</p>

Issue	Response from English Heritage
<p><b>Opening the house 5 days a week</b></p> <p>A very strong welcome and support for this proposal from the vast majority of respondents.</p>	
<p><b>Rediscovering the Georgian garden</b></p> <p>Many local residents love the naturalistic, unspoilt nature of the park as it is. They are concerned that EH will create a 'theme park' feel and develop the site in an unsympathetic way.</p> <p>The removal of trees to improve the 'mosaic of habitats' has been an emotive issue. Many feel woodland quadrants and garden area of the park will appear different and too formal. They also fear this will have an impact on wildlife in the park.</p> <p>Love Marble Hill has challenged the historic provenance of the circa 1750 map, and believe the garden was never implemented despite the existence of many of its features existent in today's park.</p>	<p>The proposals retain and enhance the natural character of the park alongside habitat and landscape diversification. The garden will relate the house to the park and enhance its historic setting and wildlife habitats, allowing visitors to enjoy a more appropriate setting to the house and the river and unique public park with many layers of history.</p> <p>The proposals will diversify the habitats in the park, benefiting many types of wildlife. The mix of formal and more natural areas will create new and exciting spaces for park visitors to explore.</p> <p>The existence of the garden as shown in the c.1750 plan has been confirmed by in-depth archival research, including 18th-century letters, accounts, drawings, plans and contemporary descriptions of the landscape. as well as through a comprehensive landscape survey and archaeological investigations.</p>
<p><b>Play facilities at Marble Hill Park</b></p> <p>EH's initial plans to put play apparatus into the existing dog-free play space were unwelcome with local users.</p> <p>They asked for the area to remain clear so it can be used by families for the very young.</p> <p>They suggested a nearby play area with low-level features, and a woodland play trail along the eastern perimeter of the park.</p>	<p>English Heritage will leave the current area as it is and add an additional area to include low-level play equipment for young children. There will also be a play trail around the perimeter of the park.</p>

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response from English Heritage</b>
<p><b>Creating a restaurant, café and nearby play area</b></p> <p>Local residents were concerned an extension would impact negatively on Montpelier Row residents, causing noise, intrusion and too many traffic movements.</p> <p>They have asked for a café which only uses the existing footprint of the Stale Block.</p>	<p>English Heritage's previous and revised proposals were for an enhanced café not a restaurant.</p> <p>The resultant café layout is largely contained within the footprint of the existing building. This is achieved by extending the seating into the space that is currently the female WCs. Some ventilation equipment will be located outside the kitchen door in a roofed enclosure.</p> <p>This space can be used more flexibly during the low season, for example by sports pitch users.</p>
<p><b>Enhancing sports pitches/changing facilities</b></p> <p>This is welcomed by sports groups, though plans to seed pitches mean there would be fewer pitches for the three years of the project. Sports groups are keen to see more ambitious plans, including social accommodation, e.g., a pavilion.</p>	<p>The impact on sports teams during the improvements has been considered during the planning and discussed with sports users. There is currently no scope for stand-alone social accommodation in the proposals.</p>
<p><b>Events</b></p> <p>A moderate events programme has been welcomed, comprising medium scale and small-scale events. Requests to bring back the music concerts, to stage open air theatre and cinema were regularly made during consultation.</p>	<p>Marble Hill Revived Activity Plan incorporates medium scale and small-scale events with audiences of between 200-300 maximum.</p>
<p><b>Screening</b></p> <p>Some requests by local residents to ensure any new screening does not interrupt their traditional view of the House and Park.</p>	<p>Taken into consideration by the Landscape Architect in planning.</p>

## Appendix 1 Minutes of Steering Group and consultation meetings



## Marble Hill Steering Group (Expanded)

20 March 2018

6.30pm – 8.30pm

Great Room, Marble Hill House

### Invitees:

- Maria Walker, CEO Twickenham Film Studios
- Janine Fotiadis-Negrepontis, Love Marble Hill
- Celia Holman, Twickenham Society
- Dave Cree, Kew Park Rangers
- Sue Green, Inspired Women
- Claire Chapman, Brilliant Play Solutions
- Rachel Worely, Reality Dog Training
- Maureen Coyle, MH Property Manager
- Rosaleen and Luke , Orleans Park School
- Ed Harris, Twickenham Museum and local history society
- Kate Pitt, EH, MH Audience Development Manager
- Andy Philp, Thamesians Rugby Club
- John Anderson, Marble Hill Society
- Michael Murray Fennell, EH
- Berny Simcox, Environment Trust

	Content	Actions	Leading
1	Welcome and Introductions		Alex Sydney
2	<p>Update</p> <p>2.1 AS explained that English Heritage has taken a step back in relation to the Marble Hill Revived project and has withdrawn current planning application. EH is now carrying out a new consultation programme. Have not taken that step lightly – but EH is aware this is a local park for the local community and it needs to have broad buy-in from the community.</p> <p>2.2 The Steering Group membership has broadened from 14 groups to 22.</p>		

	Content	Actions	Leading
	<p>2.3 Original groups were primarily existing users of the park.</p> <p>2.4 EH has tried to broaden the membership out to take in a greater number of viewpoints.</p> <p>2.5 It is not possible to invite everyone but we want to make sure people in the room can represent the full range of local viewpoints on the project.</p> <p>2.6 There will be Consultation workshops covering 3 main areas: play facility, in April; the landscape between house and Thames/ woodland quarters in May; the café, in June.</p> <p>2.7 EH will also run a series of open days so people can find out more generally about the project</p> <p>2. 8 EH will be communicating more regularly through newsletters – copies are available for anyone who hasn't had one</p> <p>2.9 There are individual groups who have asked to have a meeting with us and we are in the process of arranging those.</p> <p>2.10 EH hopes to find a way through some of the more contentious issues, maximise positive suggestions and come away with proposals to build into a new planning application.</p> <p>2.11 Q: Montpelier Row – are they represented on the Steering Group – one Montpelier Row resident wrote to the Chief Executive of English Heritage requesting a place. A: EH has invited them to feed in through other meetings.</p> <p>2.12 Q: Will Steering Group members hear what other individual groups have to say ?</p>	<p>2.12 EH will summarise the discussion which takes place in those meetings and share with steering group.</p>	
1.	Key elements of the proposals that each group represented likes and does not like about the Marble		

	Content	Actions	Leading
	Hill Revived project in its current form.		
2.	<p><b>Twickenham Museum and local history society</b></p> <p>The Museum and Society look upon Marble Hill as a scheduled ancient monument and public park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work needs to be done to the house – from a jewel in the crown of this side of the river it needs to be sorted out and tidied up and everyone will have a place in it.</li> <li>• The café needs to be more in keeping with a landscape of this quality. Having a bigger café will generate the money EH needs. It does not have it at the moment, and has not been spent on this area. If that is the only way EH can look after Marble Hill, so be it.</li> <li>• No negatives – TM looked at the proposals and said it is very happy with all of the elements.</li> </ul>		Ed Harris – Twickenham Museum and local history society
3.	<p><b>Thamesians Rugby Club</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly the club is excited about changing facilities which are in line for a much needed revamp and not particularly modern.</li> <li>• Concern – over the temporary removal of some of the pitches whilst the pitch improvement works take place – 4 rugby teams share 2 pitches. Even for a couple of seasons 1 available pitch would be very difficult.</li> <li>• Thamesians like most of the investment project which seems essential to viability of MH – including fabric of the house, public access and opening. Club loves the idea of bringing to life the history of the place and use of 18C map.</li> <li>• They like the biodiversity of park. The club is of the opinion that it is unfortunate they can't have a sports pavilion, but think this might be chalked up for the future.</li> </ul>	KP to share detail on this with AP.	Andrew Philp from Thamesians Rugby club
4.	<p><b>Marble Hill Society</b></p> <p>The MHS believe the investment project is essential to</p>		John Anderson, Marble Hill Society

	Content	Actions	Leading
	<p>the future viability of Marble Hill. In particular they are in favour of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-awaited, major conservation work to the fabric of the House and improved access and public opening</li> <li>• Focus on presenting the House &amp; Park as it would have been used by HH and her friends &amp; family (and the much needed Visitor Centre &amp; shop) - bringing to life this fantastic local history to be enjoyed by people of all ages</li> <li>• The plans to recreate (as much as is possible) HH's lost Pleasure Garden using the 1752 map</li> <li>• The range of improvements to the sports facilities and the bio-diversity of the park.</li> <li>• Like Least - nothing really, though had funding permitted, it would have been great if a place could have been found for a new Sports Pavilion/social space for the many sports teams who use the park. A longer term ambition perhaps.</li> </ul>		
5.	<p><b>Environment Trust</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resident since 1980. Knows the park very well.</li> <li>• ET is a nature and conservation charity and interested in the landscape.</li> <li>• They are delighted the house opening hours will increase. Everything good as far as ET is concerned.</li> <li>• ET has had a tour of every tree due for cutting back we felt that all was justified apart from willows. After speaking to EH regarding these the willows are being retained.</li> <li>• Their concern is activity with badgers and ET will be working closely with EH to make sure they are protected.</li> <li>• Café essential to continue the legacy of MH. Can see benefits of new café. No views on</li> </ul>		Bemy Simcox from Environment Trust

	Content	Actions	Leading
	playground.		
6.	<p><b>Reality Dogs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reality Dogs views expansion of café as positive because it would provide place for people to eat without dogs present. It would be nice if the café could open earlier on a Sunday. RD members exercise their dogs in the park beforehand.</li> <li>Q: Drainage – does this mean pitches get too boggy? AS confirmed this is currently the case. RD is happy to use the park whenever possible, and would be delighted with drainage.</li> <li>Restoration of the garden is paramount to bring it back – suggest a sensory garden for dogs to take dogs away from main lawn. RW suggested that EH could create a sensory garden for dogs around the perimeter. Because most people without dogs don't walk the perimeter. Un-dog-friendliness of new garden could be a drawback. AS confirmed fencing has been removed from the proposals, but a future consultation is planned.</li> </ul>		Rachel Worley from Reality Dogs
7.	<p><b>Twickenham Film Studios</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lived here since 1983 – brought children and dog walker. Would like to see a park for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, more innovative.</li> <li>Believe you should restore the house but like simplicity of the grounds.</li> <li>Likes the idea of a better café in the coach house but noted that there are lots of eateries in the area, so unless you do something different there is a significant risk of not achieving the required footfall.</li> <li>From a commercial point of view, MW felt that concerts are revenue generators. so she doesn't understand why EH is not bringing these back because in her view, Marble Hill is an ideal location.</li> <li>MW suggested – a woodland house instead of a marquee, constructed of wood and could be</li> </ul>		Maria Walker, Twickenham Film Studios.

	Content	Actions	Leading
	<p>learning centre, and wedding venue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MW expressed a concern about returning to the concept of the past. To recreate the gardens seems a little artificial to her. For example, the The maze at Hampton Court has been there from day one, but this is not so at Marble Hill. Recreating lacks honesty. However, MW does like the idea of a sensory garden.</li> </ul>		
8.	<p><b>Love Marble Hill</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would be a great thing to have the house refurbished – it feels under used. Suggests EH should be more ambitious with its plans for the house - maybe boutique weddings or even tea dances.</li> <li>One of Love Marble Hill's worries is that there will be a significant increase in park costs which could turn out to be financially unsustainable. Janine F-N said in relation to park costs under the new scheme the park would go from costing £359,000 per year to over £1,000,000 once MH Revived was up and running. AS said running costs are currently around £200,000 per year. JF-N's primary concern is that it needs to be made clear to people that £6m won't secure future of the park.</li> <li>Concerned about the fencing between house and river. Feels that EH are really pushing this idea. This has been parkland since 1902 and it would be a shame to do that. Parks are tending to go natural low maintenance.</li> <li>Whilst Love Marble Hill can see the benefits of improving the café, they feel that EH's current proposals are un-neighbourly and would impact local heritage assets including the grade 2 listed wall and Montpelier Row.</li> <li>The project will have a negative impact – stripping out 70% woodland – we'll lose song thrushes, move badger sets. JF-N suggests that the project should be forward thinking and produce a blueprint for the future—looking after our habitat but going beyond that by making Marble Hill a centre for Ecology. At present, JF-N feels that it is a real missed opportunity</li> <li>Concern raised regarding increased traffic to Marble Hill</li> <li></li> </ul>		<p>Janine Fotiadis-Negrepontis, Love Marble Hill</p>

	Content	Actions	Leading
	<p>Questioned visitor figures being used by EH. EH currently says just under 700,000 people visit the park yearly and Janine-FN queried this figure and asked if House Festival figures were being used.</p> <p>When Alex Sydney referred to the garden plan of around 1752 he referred to it as an 'accurate survey' Janine F-N disagreed with the terminology 'accurate survey' as she said there is no evidence to support this claim. AS then said he would be providing more evidence that the gardens according to the 1752ish garden plan was laid out, Janine F-N said she would welcome this.</p>		
9.	<p><b>The Twickenham Society</b></p> <p>The Twickenham Society has a remit to represent history and nature and amenity of local area. CH stated that the Twickenham Society echo the comments of the Ed Harris and Marble Hill Society: we feel reassured by ETRT contribution. TS is broadly in favour of the plans proposed. Have had detailed proposals on interpretation presented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Café – There are some very sympathetic details which will make it feel less imposing- CH felt that amendments could be made to make it more neighbourly.</li> <li>• TS is broadly in favour of the landscape proposals and commented that this didn't seem like an overly formalised restoration – Current MHR plans represent loosely landscaped areas.</li> </ul>		Celia Holman, Twickenham Society
10.	<p><b>Kew Park Rangers</b></p> <p>Commented that Marble Hill Park is a wonderful facility here and KPR appreciate it.</p> <p>KPR has a clubhouse at North Sheen rec. Playing here on Saturday we have two men's teams and one BETS team. Currently pitches are adequate, missed a few games.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is being proposed would be good - the improvements would present the opportunity to use to use the grounds more than KPR have done in the past. Pitches need improvement.</li> <li>• There is also the social aspect after the game – games finish and everyone leaves. Supports</li> </ul>		Dave Cree Kew Park Rangers

	Content	Actions	Leading
	<p>improvements to the café because if there was a decent sized and good quality café that would be a great benefit to KPR players.</p>		
11.	<p><b>Inspired Women</b></p> <p>Marble Hill was a core part of SG's childhood and an important base for her in adulthood. As a local businesswoman, SG is excited to see the activity going on to make MH a vibrant part of community. Inspired Women supports women to empower support and nurture each other – now expanding to help disadvantaged women. This idea for expansion was inspired by story of Henrietta Howard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likes the children's play area proposals – sees it as an important part of what's going on. Beneficial to families, projects and children with additional needs.</li> <li>• There is a lot of space but the house is at the heart of this and money going to restoration of the house is important.</li> <li>• Cafe will generate a huge amount of revenue – it can be designed to welcome many audiences. - If EH gets it right, SG is certain there are many people around who will use it regularly. Parents want something on site because they want to be able to use the café while they do lots of things in the park. We need to move on with the times.</li> </ul>		Susan Green, Inspired Women
12.	<p><b>Brilliant Play</b></p> <p>Brilliant Play uses the landscape – CC was initially worried the project meant locals would lose the landscape but this has turned out to be not the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility to use the landscape is very important and trees might not allow events like concerts. It is a really exciting project because CC understands that the park has to pay for itself and feels that the proposals will facilitate this.</li> <li>• The café has to happen. Love the opportunity for the community to get together. Sharing skills</li> </ul>		Claire Chapmen Brilliant Play

	Content	Actions	Leading
	<p>and interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Play area: Has concerns about the design but will save her comments for the consultation workshop.</li> </ul>		
13.	<p><b>Orleans Park School</b></p> <p>Both have always lived in the area and have fond memories of the park.</p> <p>Rosaleen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• House clearly needs more investment. Turner's house regenerated – amazing. I'd like a bit more community engagement in the house like Orleans House Gallery. Commented that although she was probably a core target audience, this meeting was actually the first time she had ever been inside the house.</li> <li>• Regeneration of the grotto and of the café is a great idea. Rosaleen often goes inside the café but can't get what she wants in it. It needs to have more of a community feel.</li> <li>• We just need to revamp the house and park.</li> </ul> <p>Luke</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed with Rosaleen comments and added that the proposals for improving sports provision were an important positive – there is lots of potential for regenerating the facilities round here. A girl's changing room would be great and is long overdue.</li> </ul>		Rosaleen and Luke, Orleans Park School
14.	<p><b>15. AS read SWLEN contribution</b></p> <p>South West London Environment Network welcomes the focus on reviving the fortunes of Marble Hill House and Park. Marble Hill is an important and wonderful historic House and a resource for people and nature with scope for conserving and enhancing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The original proposal mentioned drainage of</li> </ul>		

	Content	Actions	Leading
	<p>sport pitches and the creation of a wetland habitat. We strongly support the creation of new types of habitat and additional funding could be accessed to achieve this in addition to education provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for the biodiversity within the woodland quarters, specifically song thrush and badgers. We feel any project to revive Marble Hill that proposes works to these quadrants could risk protection of these species.</li> <li>• We cannot support works that causes detriment or the destruction of habitat of any important and protected species</li> </ul>		
16.	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <p>16.1 AS noted that he was pleasantly surprised at the range of comments and the range of crossover and general support</p> <p>16.2 Three distinct areas have emerged for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential Commercial opportunities currently not included in the proposals</li> <li>• Risk around financial costs</li> <li>• Traffic</li> </ul> <p>All other issues are picked up by our three workshops.</p> <p>16.4 <b>Date of next steering group meeting:</b> Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> April at 6.30pm at Marble Hill House</p> <p>16.5 <b>Workshops:</b> AS explained that EH is inviting people who have expressed an interest in the subject negative or positive. If people want to be invited they should email their interest to the Marble Hill Revived e-mail <a href="mailto:marblehillrevived@english-heritage.org.uk">marblehillrevived@english-heritage.org.uk</a></p> <p>The workshop will be managed by an independent facilitator. If it is not possible to accommodate everyone who wishes to attend, we will invite people to feed questions and comments to use so there will be a dialogue for those who are not able to attend.</p> <p>We hope this demonstrates that there is a process in</p>	<p>EH will write notes up and make sure they are made available to members.</p> <p>EH will include these issues on a future agenda and give consideration to a further workshop on commercial opportunities</p> <p>Workshops and steering group meetings will be sent to members. Next steering group meeting we will report on workshops to steering group.</p>	

	Content	Actions	Leading
	train for genuine dialogue		



Meeting Title	Marble Hill Steering Group
Date	Tuesday 24 April
Location	Marble Hill House
Present	Colin Cooper (SWLEN) Luke Dudley (Orleans Park School) John Anderson (Marble Hill Society), Sue Hamilton Miller (Twickenham Society) Rhys Williams (St Mary's School) David Bird (Marble Hill Cricket Club) Maria Walker (Twickenham Film Studios) Janine Fotiadis-Negrepontes (Love Marble Hill) Claire Chapman (Brilliant Play) Katy Lamb (Marble Hill Play Centre) Berny Simcox (Environment Trust)

Item	Topics	Actions
1. Minutes of the 20 <sup>th</sup> March Steering Group and Actions	2:12: included in the agenda for today's meeting  3: KP to share detail of project with Thamesians: a meeting is being scheduled to do this.	No outstanding actions
2. Play Area consultation workshop	<p><b>Presentation on Play Workshop</b>  <b>KP, Audience Development Manager</b></p> <p>Present overview of findings from play workshop. Jill Jones instigated the fenced play area originally. It was set up as a baby area and general consensus from the workshop was to keep it as 0-5. Possibility of including low level mazes include planting            Think about wider play area- borough play map            Movement of fence area- people felt it wasn't necessary to move the fence, extend it instead.            Suggestion of small scale events e.g. petting zoo.            Story telling came up repeatedly from several tables            Equipment for hire- boxes of soft play toys, deck chairs etc.            Water fountain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CC: There used to be a water fountain there years ago which also had a lower space for dogs as well</li> <li>- SW: Will send info through by end of week re grants for water fountains</li> <li>- CC advised 2 grants available for water fountains.</li> </ul> <p>Small strand of people suggested there should be somewhere located near the café area for 0-9, additional climbing area.            Lots of people suggested to go elsewhere on the park for play. Natural areas in the park- concern for ecology was highlighted by a few people.</p>	

Den building- include space for kids with variety of special needs.  
Encourage tree climbing

Ecology events – Love Marble Hill suggested variety of events based around ecology.

Work more closely with MH Play centre on family events.

KP covered slide on ideas that got mixed reviews.

Dogs- subject came up during play workshop. People had some strongly minded views on dogs. Some people did not want any more fenced areas and wanted to allow dogs open access were others highlighted concern for children and young in to park as dogs will come up and jump on them. EH are looking to update bylaws in line with surrounding Richmond parks.

- JFN questioned number of people who were concerned saying it was only one person. KP explained variety of people who raised concern from different workshop groups
- CC highlighted this concern was also raised in the park with the children and it is an ongoing concern for families.

**Group Discussion:**

MW: likes the natural affect play suggestion. Bee hives etc. Activities for kids to learn from.

DB: No need for another play area enough in the area

KL: clarifies age group for MH play centre 0-5 and 5-15 for One o Clock club.

Berny: Is there really a need for equipment. Sad that we have to provide equipment when there is an entire open park with green space.

CCo: raised concern for One o Clock club taking business away from it.

KL: Understands the need to keep people by the café but is there something else we could provide instead like low level activites in the park e.g. croquet. Provided a safe contained area by the café will help people relax in the area- have a toy corner.

Rhys: He was at play workshop but felt his table really only focused on 0-5 not older kids. Feels we have the opportunity at MH to provide open space for older kids to ball play ball on the open green etc. this is not offered by any other play facility in the area and should be highlighted. Parents relax by café kids play ball.

CCh: No point in duplicating what we already have. There is not the material left in the park to build dens. Tree climbing – important to have balance. Use trees that fall naturally. Not many trees in the park that are suitable for climbing.

Alex: We have annual tree survey that assesses trees. Difficult to actively encourage tree climbing and ensure it's not to the detriment of tree ecology.

SHM: Natural play ground in Teddington for children with disabilities- good for ideas

- Idea stone sun dial and petanque

CC: Natural play should be encouraged

JA: There is a difficulty that lots of parents don't allow tree climbing

KL: Could we have den building by the café or a more complicated

	<p>floor maze for the older kids.  AS: HLF approved purposes. Play facility in vicinity of café. Investigate scope for flexibility. A core audience for any café is parents with young kids  CC: What is being considered for older children?  LD: Teenagers like open space. The park is a safe area to hang out, kick a ball around, safe area not isolated. There is someone you can call on if you need assistance.  DB: was there always play area in park plan?  AS: yes reason it is being discussed is it caused so much contention  Maria: Could you move the café to the sports area? Move the café to play area (one o clock club) instead of moving play area to café.  SHM: Diamond Jubilee gardens – great example of merging the two  Maria: All play areas should be inclusive and wheelchair accessible. We want to have a park for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.</p>	
<p>3. Brief update on other recent/forthcoming meetings</p>	<p><b>Meeting planned on 25 April with residents of Montpelier Row.</b>  Their primary concern is the café.</p> <p><b>Garden symposium 20 June</b> – this will involve a number of garden experts and Love Marble Hill will be making their contribution. This will allow us to look at new information and challenges in an informed way. EH is confident in the historical basis for the garden but always open to new developments.</p> <p>JFN: is June 20 soon enough? AS: It takes time to organise symposiums and get the specialists all in one room. We believe this is the best way to address the historical accuracy.</p> <p>SHM: Our priority should be that we save the house. Whatever other compromises need to be made it is vital to restore the house and make it viable.</p> <p>AS: we need to unite the house and garden in the way it was always intended, and that is one of our agreed purposes. To get the HLF grant our research must be robust and this symposium will help us with that.</p> <p><b>Meeting with Love Marble Hill</b>  Very constructive meeting.  There were clear differences of opinion. They brought a counter-proposal for the cafe which we will be discussing at the café workshop.  Eco centre: we are following up on initial suggestions to use an area in the sports block for a series of pop-up events  Included discussion about putting in cycle ports</p> <p><b>Meeting with Marble Hill Play Centre</b>  Positive meeting with many areas for partnership/ crossover  Pressing need for MHPC to find sustainable way to make their</p>	

	business model work	
4. Other Commercial opportunities	<p><b><u>Commercial Opportunities</u></b></p> <p><b>Concerts</b>  AS: in the past these have caused considerable damage to park. EH is only prepared to run concert when promoter takes risk. Usually this means it requires at least 3 shows to make them commercially viable. Content NB- everyone has a view on what should be held and they require planning permission at MH.  Concerts can attract around 8000 people, while pop up cinemas average around 200.  MW: Kew and Hampton run very successful shows. It should be possible here too.  RW: We could have the same profile here as at Hampton. It takes time to grow but get it right. There are good transport links and it is unique that there are so many local residents/ local community to support.</p> <p><b>Weddings</b>  AS : Business model in the planning application at present stacks up. There are a number of quite stringent restrictions in the house – for example no stilettos and no red wine. If we had a marquee at the side of the house it would be a suitable venue for high ends wedding and financially would ‘stack up’. It would only stay up for the wedding and then be taken down. We would have to apply for planning permission for this.  MW: Wooden structure to house weddings would help to reduce noise levels. You could use the building all year round for conferences – it could also be used as an eco centre.</p>	
5. AOB	<p>Landscape consultation will be 12 May  Café consultation will be 2 June  EH is sending out the second newsletter in a week’s time  We previously publicized a Steering Group meeting in May but this will not now take place. The next Steering Group will be on 12 June, when we will pick up on both the consultation workshops.</p>	



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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
--	---	---



Meeting Title	Steering Group
Date	Monday 20 August 2018
Location	Marble Hill House
Present	Jill Jones, Sheila Hale, Katy Lamb, Julia Neden-Watts, Alex Sydney, Celia Holman, Janine Fotiadis-Negreponte, Denise Carr, David Bird, John Anderson, Maureen Coyle, Simon Webb
Apologies	Rachel Worley Reality Dog Training, Maria Walker Twickenham Studios, Alan Carter Crossbats, Berny Simcox Environment Trust, Claire Chapman Brilliant Play

Item	Topics	Actions
<p>1. Minutes of the last meeting</p>	<p>The minutes were approved with the following changes: Suggestion from CH regarding someone from a judicial background. Minutes recorded that CH did not think Michael Symes was independent. CH stated that this was an inaccurate representation of what she said– CH felt he might not be appropriate in the view of some other people in the Steering Group.</p> <p>EH believes for anyone independently reviewing evidence needs to have sufficient knowledge of the subject matter and therefore should be a landscape historian with knowledge of 18<sup>th</sup> century landscape garden history...</p> <p>CH asked for it to be noted that in her opinion the July Marble Hill Community Update newsletter was misleading in stating that the conclusion of the symposium was that the gardens did begin to be laid out from the 1720s onwards. as She noted that the symposium did not come to a formal conclusion.</p> <p>AS responded to say that the participants of the symposium have all confirmed that the Love Marble Hill presentation did not change their views that the gardens were laid out from the 1720s onwards.</p> <p>JF-N asked for clarification about fencing around landscape areas. She requested that it be put onto the record that fencing will not happen. AS confirmed that whilst fencing was now to be included around the Woodland Quarters in the English Heritage’s revised proposals, EH no longer had any plans in the short term or long term to fence off the wider area between the House and the River.</p> <p>CH noted that three people questioned the viability of the business case of the Marble Hill Revived Project at the last meeting but that this was not reflected in the minutes. AS agreed that this was correct and agreed that the minutes should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>1.1 CH does not represent Twickenham Riverside Trust. CH to send some wording to AS.</p> <p>1.2 CH to send some revised wording for this section of the minutes to AS</p> <p>1.3 AS confirmed Pleasure Gardens will not be fenced as outlined in early plans.</p> <p>1.4 AS to add and minute three people questioning the business case of MHR.</p>

<p>2. Brief update of other and forthcoming meetings</p>	<p>2.1 AS noted that a number of meetings have taken place in relation to the café. EH has been developing an alternative café proposal which stays within the foot-print of the Stables as much as possible, based on a design by Martin Habell. EH is working with architects to develop those plans and have had meetings with MH to talk through design issues which have arisen. AS confirmed that EH will continue to work with MH in this way until the end of the design process.</p> <p>2.2 On 3rd August, Kate Mavor(CEO of EH) and senior members gave a briefing to Cllr Gareth Roberts and 4 other councilors including Julia Neden-Watts. Everyone had found it a useful process – a number of points had been made during the meeting which had been taken on board by EH including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A marquee adjacent to the house was unlikely to be well received in a planning application. As a result, EH has decided to remove that from the planning application and the area will now be planted as an orchard.</li> </ul> <p>JFN: Does this mean the café will host weddings? AS Confirmed that it did not and that no wedding receptions would now be taking place onsite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport – Cycle Racks will be incorporated into the proposal to provide lockable space for up to 40 bikes, at 2 locations within the park.</li> <li>• A path will be incorporated along the inside of the park on the edge of the west field, for the length of Orleans Road so pedestrians can walk along the path and not the road.</li> <li>• Redesign sports changing facilities so the toilets in the block will be made publicly accessible. This will facilitate a net increase in the number of publicly available toilets in the park by 5 despite the proposals resulting drop in toilets at the stable block itself.</li> </ul> <p>2.3 Events roundup : KP outlined the events which had taken place during the summer of 2018 including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Free family fun day organised by Inspired Women</li> <li>-Sell-out Ecology Event – Insect Hotels</li> <li>-Dog show</li> <li>-Family Heritage Morning – tours of Marble Hill for the very young, with crafts at Marble Hill Play Centre</li> <li>-events with the Environment Trust including event for 90 schoolchildren</li> <li>-Music at the park – concerts which attracted families and lots of locals of all ages.</li> <li>-Outreach at the National Play Day event at Orleans House</li> </ul>	
<p>3. Transport report summary</p>	<p>SW, i-Transport LLP consultant, introduced. Presentation given (appended to minutes). SW explained that the presentation was 'work in progress' and subject to</p>	<p>3.1 PowerPoint to be sent to members after the meeting.</p>

checking/change as Vectos had not yet completed their work.

Additional information and comments during presentation:

PTAL public transport accessibility level – goes from 1 – poor to 6- very good. This site is 4 - good.

Orleans Road – problems – used by both cars and pedestrians. This causes an H&S issue The insertion of a path in the park should help with this.

Broadly car use is about 10-15%

Walking and running – 75 - 82%

Question from member of group as to whether children are counted? Children are counted in the car occupancy count but SW was not able to confirm if they were interviewed in the visitor interviews.

A question was asked about why EH thinks it can attract c.50, 000 visitors to Marble Hill House when Chiswick House only receives around 15,000 a year.

AS responded to say that Chiswick House charges for entry, and as the gardens are free to enjoy, paying the entry fee of £7 is a big disincentive. Here, because entry to Marble Hill House will be free, if people have spare time they'll visit, which means a much higher level of visitation. 26 per cent of people who come to the house will come by car; it is forecast as a 'worst case' which is double the existing observed car borne modal split.

Queries from steering group included:

- i. Can we be sure the house will attract additional visitors and boost park numbers?
- ii. If HHs story were better presented many would come and learn more. It would be part of the heritage hub in this area.
- iii. Questions regarding the data sourced for decision making – should pay and display machine info be used, etc.
- iv. On busy days local parking is at or over full capacity

AS added to presentation:

EH does not have a policy of attracting coaches to the house. Drop off points are not a viable option.

The only reasons for coach visits are generally 1 – school visits, 2 – travel trade. EH has made the decision that Marble Hill will not be a travel trade site, so the only potential uses would be school groups. Orleans House (OH) will be EH's education provider. They have an existing policy which encourages public transport. Hardly any school groups visit MHH. It is envisaged that existing groups would, following the project come to OH for full day and visit Marble, rather than just visit OH for a half day. There will be an increase in school visits but they will be encouraged to use public transport.

River – discussing use of river to visit Marble Hill House.

Points raised by Steering group members:

3.2 AS to investigate second path near main gate for families.

- i. EH should encourage teams to use public transport
- ii. EH should use all streams of data available and the previous transport report does not use every source of data.

Additional measures over and above project

- Request additional signage to stop vehicles going down residential roads: Orleans Road and Montpelier Row
- Trying to link existing walking and cycling routes to Marble Hill
- Improved sustainable travel advice on EH website
- Additional offsite car parking on weekends – discuss with other local providers. OP school indicated they would be prepared to allow us to use additional space if we wanted to. This is backup. We already have an alternative plan lined up.
- Entry where cars come in, children and pedestrians come in at same place. EH will be investigating creation of a separate post code for the car park to make sure vehicles arrive at the car park.
- EH is reviewing car park pricing.  
All this will have a beneficial impact on the travel characteristics to the site car usage which has not been factored into the Vectos report.

The following suggestions were made by members of the steering group:

- Where cars enter the site, children come in at same place. A separate path at this point would be great.
- Local Councilors – can leverage funding for improving disabled access in the area
- JFN: Coaches for Orleans Gallery park in front of local resident’s house which is potentially dangerous to children alighting. AS noted that this was useful to know as EH can talk to them about this.
- CH asked to circulate her own transport projections based on assumptions contained in the previous version of the transport report. AS suggested that this was not done as it would be misleading – he suggested that instead CH waits until the final report is ready when she will have all material to make accurate assumptions.

EH committed to circulating the final transport report to the Steering Group in advance of the planning permission being submitted.

Final Transport Report circulated with these minutes.

3.3 MC to discuss with OH surrounding coaches and alighting at OH for Marble tours.

4. AOB	Meeting in 2 weeks' time. 4 September. At this EH will outline 2018 planning application summary.	
5 Dates of Future Meetings	Tuesday 4 September 6.30pm	

# MARBLE HILL REVIVED

# TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

Simon Webb BSc (Hons) CEng MICE FCIHT

- Managing Partner
- i-Transport LLP



## CONTENTS

- ▶ Introduction
- ▶ Existing Situation
- ▶ Existing Visitor Numbers
- ▶ Forecast Visitor Numbers
- ▶ Net Increase in Visitor Numbers
- ▶ Other Transport Issues
- ▶ Parking Issues
- ▶ Potential Complementary Transport Measures
- ▶ Conclusions/Discussion



## INTRODUCTION

- ▶ [i-Transport](#) LLP
- ▶ [Vectos](#) work not yet concluded
- ▶ Sharing initial conclusions
- ▶ EH will issue final report

## EXISTING SITUATION

- ▶ 6 pedestrian/cycle accesses
- ▶ Principal vehicular access onto Richmond Road
- ▶ Secondary delivery/service access to the west onto Richmond Road
- ▶ 76 space car park on site – Pay and Display
- ▶ Bus services along Richmond Road
- ▶ Rail Station – [St Margarets](#)
- ▶ Richmond Underground/Overground station
- ▶ PTAL 4 – Good
- ▶ 5 year review of personal injury accident statistics – 10 slight, 3 serious

## EXISTING VISITOR NUMBERS

- ▶ Counts undertaken in June 2015
- ▶ Interview surveys undertaken in July 2017
- ▶ Currently 692,000 visitors pa to the Park
- ▶ Currently 2,900 visitors pa to the House
- ▶ Approximately 695,000 visitors pa

## FORECAST VISITOR NUMBERS

Marble Hill Park and House Visitor Numbers – High Season

Year	Total Visitors	Total High Season Visitors	Total Low Season Visitors	House Visitors	Daily House Visitors	Daily Park Only Visitors- High Season <sup>2</sup>
2017/2018	695,000	463,333	231,667	2,940	47 <sup>1</sup>	2,516
2021/2022	806,200	537,467	268,733	67,183	442	2,570
2027/2028	811,294	540,863	270,431	54,086	356	2,660

1- Based on 2016 opening dates (25/03/16– 30/10/16, weekends only): 63 days  
 2- Based on 183 days High Season

## FORECAST NET INCREASE IN HIGH SEASON VISITOR NUMBERS

### Marble Hill Park and House Visitor Numbers

Scenario	Park Only Visitors	House Visitors	Total Visitors
Existing (2017/2018)	2,516	47	2,563
2021/2022	2,570	442	3,012
[Increase]	[+54]	[+395]	[+449]
2027/2028	2,660	356	3,016
[Increase]	[+144]	[+309]	[+453]

- In high season:
  - +145 visitors per day to the Park;
  - +310 visitors per day to the House.

## FORECAST NET INCREASE IN HIGH SEASON VISITOR AND VEHICLE NUMBERS

### High Season Daily Total Vehicle Generation

Year	Marble Hill Park		Marble Hill House		Total	
	Arrivals via Car	Total Vehicles	Arrivals via Car	Total Vehicles	Arrivals via Car	Total Vehicles
2017/2018	375	250	12	8	387	258
2021/2022	383	255	115	77	498	332
2027/2028	396	264	93	62	489	326

- Apply modes of travel and vehicle occupancies
- Worst case assumption that 26% of visitors to the House (not 10-15% observed) travel by car
- Weekend high season forecast of +74 vehicles per day

### Net Increase in High Season Daily Vehicles

Scenario	Park Only Visitors	House Visitors	Total Visitors
Existing (2017/2018)	250	8	258
2021/2022	255	77	332
[Increase]	[+5]	[+69]	[+74]
2027/2028	264	62	326
[Increase]	[+14]	[+54]	[+68]

## PARKING

- ▶ 7-day survey of car park occupancy (July 2017)
- ▶ Maximum observed on-site occupancy = 47 spaces/76 spaces = 62%
- ▶ Weekend survey of on-street parking July 2017. High levels of occupancy, particularly on certain streets such as Orleans Road and Montpelier Row
- ▶ 30 public spaces free for use at busiest period (3pm on Saturday) i.e. more free spaces at all other times
- ▶ Ongoing analysis using increased visitor numbers and duration of stay
- ▶ Demand can be accommodated on-site

## OTHER TRANSPORT ISSUES

- ▶ Café deliveries
- ▶ Coaches
  - Procedures in place
  - Use discouraged
  - Will not use Orleans Road
- ▶ Sport Pitches
  - No increase in intensity of use
  - Able to be used at other times

## POSSIBLE COMPLEMENTARY TRANSPORT MEASURES

- ▶ Improved signage/way finding
- ▶ Links to walk/cycle routes
- ▶ Improved travel advice on website
- ▶ Additional offsite car parking on weekends
- ▶ Specific postcode for car park
- ▶ Travel Plan
- ▶ Consider revising car park charges
- ▶ Not allowed for in analyses

## CONCLUSIONS

- ▶ The site has a 'good' level of public transport accessibility (PTAL 4)
- ▶ The car parking is to remain as existing with a total of 76 parking spaces, including 3 disabled parking bays, continuing to operate a 'Pay & Display' system
- ▶ Minor increase of 74 vehicles per day at high season when compared with the existing baseline
- ▶ Complementary transport measures will be developed
- ▶ The proposed development will not result in a material impact on the surrounding highway network
- ▶ Preliminary conclusion that parking can be accommodated on-site



Meeting Title	Play Consultation Meeting
Date	Saturday 14 April
Location	Great Room - Marble Hill House

Item	
1. Site visit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendees visited play area opposite the café.</li> <li>JLG, landscape architect for the Marble Hill Revived project, had marked the proposed boundary change of the play area with flags.</li> </ol>
2. Comments made at Play Area	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This area was fenced in the 1970s to create a dog-free, safe play area for small children and their carers.</li> <li>It is important to retain a designated space for the very young ones</li> <li>There is a need for a few more benches, especially for pregnant mums.</li> </ol>
3. Comments made during introductions in the Great Room	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If play equipment is to be introduced anywhere, it should be outside the play area.</li> <li>Park boundaries are neglected; these should be thinned out to allow the introduction of play incidents around the park.</li> <li>Possible temporary events in the play area - a petting zoo and storytelling.</li> <li>Parents want unstructured play provision</li> <li>Parents want children to be able to climb trees.</li> <li>Age-range for play area to be 0-5 years.</li> </ol>
4. Presentation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JLG introduced types and themes of play during presentation</li> <li>Brilliant Play showed pictures from Gunnersbury Park. These included low level mazes with planting used to create pathways and texture. No safety surface used. Seating natural and wooden. Storytelling space provided.</li> </ol>
5. Comments made after presentation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was suggested that a Borough Walk might be a good idea to see how Marble Hill Park links up with other play sites. There used to be a Borough wide play map and play strategy. It would be good to see Marble Hill in the context of the wider offer.</li> <li>Could mums have a play area clear of apparatus? Could climbing or more adventurous opportunities be scattered elsewhere in the park?  This could include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- natural play</li> <li>- Eco play</li> <li>- A storytelling space could be used to tell the heritage stories of the site as well as other uses.</li> <li>- Children should have the chance to have unstructured play and tree climbing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Why is EH moving the play area? Group then discussed proximity to the café.</li> </ol>

	<p>EH responded that they would like create more direct lines of sight between the café and the play area.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. If introduced play equipment in the play area should be low level (height) to maintain views and connection to the rest of the park.</li> <li>5. Happy for play area to be extended but must keep the east boundary unchanged. Moving the east boundary west, will create an unusable area of grass that will be destroyed when used as a cut-through.</li> <li>6. If the play area were extended, low-level play equipment, mazes or texture planks could be introduced to the extension. The original section to be kept as is.</li> <li>7. Entrance to café and play enclosure should not be directly opposite each other as this would cause congestion.</li> <li>8. There should only be one entrance into the play enclosure for security reasons.</li> <li>9. It was suggested that EH could introduce a second play enclosure, with play equipment much closer to the café (i.e. to the left of the existing picnic benches, where the double gates are. This would be in front or to the side of the proposed new build café's accessible courtyard)</li> <li>10. If the area in front of the house (the pleasure garden) were fenced off, parents would be happy to lose the play area altogether or to have larger play equipment installed there.</li> <li>11. Parents would be happier with more equitable use of the park for the different user groups.</li> </ol> <p>Historic Provenance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12. The Love Marble Hill group stated that their research concluded that Nine-Pin alley has no historic provenance.</li> <li>13. This is not a view shared by EH because archaeological investigations have confirmed its existence.</li> </ol> <p><b>Post meeting note – On the 17th of April the Love Marble Hill group were invited to present their research findings at the Garden History Symposium in June. EH welcomes any research that improves our understanding of the park.</b></p> <p><b>Post meeting note – Historic England archaeologists worked to uncover the hidden landscape gardens dating from the 18th century at Marble Hill, as shown by a plan of about 1752. Read more about their findings: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/research/support-and-collaboration/research-and-english-heritage-trust/marble-hill-excavations/">https://historicengland.org.uk/research/support-and-collaboration/research-and-english-heritage-trust/marble-hill-excavations/</a></b></p> <p>Non-play comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. Cafe – the café should sell ice-cream</li> <li>15. The Love Marble Hill group stated that EH propose to reintroduce a Ha Ha to Marble Hill Park. EH responded that this was not the case; re-introducing a Ha Ha has never been part of any proposals for the Marble Hill Revived project.</li> </ol>
6. Plenary : Conclusions from each table	
Table 4	1. Would be comfortable with introduction of low-level structures or low-levels features to the play area.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Keep the play enclosure simple.</li> <li>3. Maintain existing sight lines.</li> <li>4. Possibly make benches moveable</li> <li>5. Have a play trail running along the perimeter of Marble Hill Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o This would include den building next to the ETRT kitchen garden, logs, trees, swings and a storytelling area</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. Allow small scale events to be held in the play area</li> </ol>
Table 5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nature and eco play preferred</li> <li>2. Encourage adventure play- locomotive and social play- tactile and sensory experiences</li> <li>3. Prefer play area to remain unchanged (i.e. do not introduce play equipment)</li> <li>4. Could introduce play equipment/incidents along the perimeter of the play area for children with autism etc.</li> <li>5. Extend play area instead of repositioning the eastern fence line.</li> <li>6. There should only be one entrance into the play enclosure.</li> <li>7. Like the idea of creating a storytelling area</li> <li>8. Would like an art area on the Terrace</li> <li>9. Would like space for den building</li> <li>10. Would like an ecology area</li> <li>11. A box of outdoor games could be kept in the café- foam balls etc. for use in the play area</li> <li>12. Don't want any play incidents/equipment in sweet walk because of disturbance to Montpellier Row.</li> <li>13. With natural materials a creative play area could be made in the wider Park</li> <li>14. Join up with other play facilities in the area. Have a Borough Walk for play facilities in the area</li> <li>15. Allotments in the garden</li> </ol> <p>Non-Play comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16. There should be more/better interpretation throughout the landscape.</li> <li>17. A picnic area between the rugby field and the Pleasure Ground was suggested.</li> </ol>
Table 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Eco and natural play preferred.</li> <li>2. Eco and natural play should be incidental within the wider park and can tie in with history of the park.</li> <li>3. There shouldn't be any big play structures – children should 'come across it.' There should be carving along the trail.</li> <li>4. Keep the play area where it is (i.e. do not change boundary).</li> <li>5. Leave play enclosure unchanged if possible.</li> <li>6. If play area is extended, could have low level wooden structures, tactile play elements added to perimeter or extension.</li> <li>7. Have an additional play area in front of the café so parents and carers can watch older children play – perhaps with a climbing tree. To incorporate lots of ideas around logs, as the children already love and play with fallen logs in the park. Log trails and dens</li> <li>8. Support the idea of trails through the park</li> <li>9. Like the idea of dens</li> </ol> <p>Non-play comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Would like a potable water fountain introduced (drinking and hand-washing facilities) near the play area (Some suggested one outside the MH Play Centre as well.)</li> </ol>
Table 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Natural play in the form of fallen logs – things that would be naturally occurring – is preferred.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. No fixed equipment in play enclosure</li> <li>3. Monitor demand before bringing in additional benches.</li> <li>4. The play area should stay where it is- if it gets busier maybe a slightly larger area</li> <li>5. It would be good to have blankets for hire and a box of outdoor games (foam balls, skittles) that can be brought into play area.</li> <li>6. Tree climbing should be available.</li> <li>7. There was concern that a trail along the park perimeter could affect biodiversity. EH to consider losing sport pitch/es to remove conflict.</li> <li>8. Introduce ecology center near Marble Hill Play Centre</li> <li>9. KG – meeting AS to discuss how MHPC and EH can work together</li> <li>10. Upgrade MHPC to improve offer to 2-5 age group</li> <li>11. There is no provision for older children who actually need a place to go for safe congregation.</li> </ol> <p>Non-play comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12. Add traditional fence/ropes around cricket pitch.</li> <li>13. Would like wildlife species signposts around the park.</li> <li>14. Will EH be bringing their park rules in line with the Borough to limit commercial dog walkers to 4 dogs at a time?</li> <li>15. Dog mess around the park is problematic. How will EH encourage/enforce responsible dog-owner responsibility?</li> </ol>
Table 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Eco and natural play preferred.</li> <li>2. Leave play area as it is.</li> <li>3. If play area were extended, can introduce low level play opportunities like the grass mazes and textured play.</li> <li>4. Would like to see introduction of bug hotel in Woodland Quarters and just off the paths separating the Woodland Quarters.</li> <li>5. Like idea of hollow logs.</li> <li>6. At Kew gardens there is a wood walk, a texture walk, a story circle and themed benches.</li> <li>7. We would like a dog free area on the Pleasure Ground.</li> </ol> <p>Non-play comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Information boards focusing on biodiversity would be good.</li> <li>9. Unhappy about dog mess; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Would like EH to create a larger fenced off areas for families</li> <li>b. Provide more dog bins</li> <li>c. Charge dog walkers</li> </ol> </li> <li>10. Dog mess; if overgrown areas were thinned out and managed better, this might induce better behavior from dog-walkers who are currently not picking up dog mess.</li> <li>11. More managed approach to dog mess.</li> </ol>
7. Discussion about dogs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dog mess problematic to many park user groups (e.g. parents of small children, sports and exercise users)</li> <li>2. It was stated that 90% of dog owners are responsible. That it would be unfair to punish the majority because of the irresponsible 10% who were identified as commercial dog-walkers.</li> <li>3. In response, another attendee advised that she had witnessed a dog-walker and parent (non-commercial dog-walker) with their child leaving dog mess in the park and didn't therefore believe that the dog-mess issue could only be attributed to commercial dog-walkers.</li> <li>4. Another attendee gave examples of puppies bounding onto babies during an exercise session. Whilst the puppy is being friendly, this is distressing for</li> </ol>

	<p>mother and potentially dangerous for baby.</p> <p>5. There was a difference of opinion about whether dogs are a nuisance to non-dog groups such children/babies, elderly, sports and exercise users.</p> <p>6. EH urged to reduce the number of dogs that commercial dog-walkers can bring into park at any one time, in line with the London Borough of Richmond.</p>
8. Thanks and close 1.10pm	Meeting closed.



Meeting Title	Marble Hill Revived - Landscape Consultation Workshop
Date	Saturday 12 May 2018
Location	Marble Hill House

Item	Topics	Actions
1. Background	<p>Marble Hill is the last complete survivor of the elegant villas and gardens which bordered the Thames between Richmond and Hampton Court in the 18th century. The villa is Grade I listed and Marble Hill Park is designated Grade II* in Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens,</p> <p>Marble Hill is historically significant and architecturally important. It was saved for the nation by an act of Parliament in 1902, which followed a public campaign to preserve the view from Richmond Hill from suburban expansion.</p> <p>Since the 1980s it has seen little investment leading to the park losing its original character.</p> <p><u>The Marble Hill Revived Project:</u></p> <p>The Marble Hill Revived Project seeks to deliver a sustainable future for Marble Hill, by restoring the house and its landscape, providing training and volunteering opportunities, and small scale community events. A £4m grant has been awarded by the HLF to this £6m project.</p> <p>Last year, after consulting with local residents and the Local Planning Authority, English Heritage (EH) submitted a planning application for a series of £6m improvements to the house and across the park. Lots of people responded positively to our plans but it was clear that there were also concerns about some elements of our proposals, notably the café extension, the restoration of the historic garden, and the new children's play area.</p> <p>The landscape consultation focused on the biodiversity and a further event, the historic garden symposium has been scheduled for June to discuss and evaluate the evidence for of the 18<sup>th</sup> century garden. The notes below are a record of the landscape consultation that took place on the 12<sup>th</sup> of May at Marble Hill.</p>	
2. Preamble to park visit	<p>a) Independent chair welcomed attendees and gave brief outline of agenda.</p> <p>b) Independent ecologist, landscape architects and EH staff were introduced to attendees.</p> <p>It was noted that:</p> <p>c) The woodland quarters (the four woodland areas, adjacent to the house, to which public access is prohibited) have not been actively managed since the times of the Greater London Council (also known as the GLC).</p> <p>d) The only woodland management that has taken place has been removing fallen trees following gales and on the grounds of Health &amp; Safety (e.g. the removal of a hazardous limbs or trees).</p>	

	<p>e) The result of this lack of tree management has resulted in a lack of good quality replacement tree stock. The present woodland is of poor quality characterised by too few good quality tree specimens, self-seeded trees, tall thin trees and a lack of natural light reaching the woodland floor. These conditions in turn dictate the biodiversity and therefore the variety and population of wildlife species on the estate.</p> <p>f) The Marble Hill Revived project presents an opportunity to improve biodiversity at Marble Hill</p>	
<p>3. Park Tour</p>	<p>a) Attendees were taken on a tour of the Woodland Quarters and Pleasure Gardens by JLG (Landscape Architect) and EH's Head of Gardens and Landscapes.</p> <p>The following were noted during the tour:</p> <p>b) A significant proportion of the ground in the woodland quarters is covered in ivy. Whilst ivy has its benefits the monoculture condition limits biodiversity.</p> <p>c) The spring season is considered as the high spot of the English year based on the rich variety of flora and colour as flowers come into bloom accompanied by varied birdsong. This is not the case at Marble Hill. One reason being here is not enough natural light coming through the trees and reaching the woodland floor to allow a variety of flora to thrive.</p> <p>d) Achieving biodiversity is entirely possible with appropriate interventions that could be delivered with the help of local residents.</p> <p>e) There were lots of elms lost in the great gale.</p> <p>f) EH proposals aimed to introduce a more balanced age-range of trees, which is better for the long-term tree succession, biodiversity and woodland management.</p> <p>g) Parakeets have occupied the nesting sites of the woodland songbirds. There are ways to redress this with reinforced nest box so that other birds in addition to parakeets have somewhere to nest. Local schools, children and birders can be involved in keeping records. This will mean that in May, walking through the woodland quarters, you would hear a much richer mix of birdsong</p> <p>h) Conditions around the perimeter of Marble Hill Park are very important. These conditions link into the broader landscape and the dark corridor along the River Thames. Plans to improve the rugby pitches are modest, improving the quality of the surface – improving drainage and porosity and reseeded to improve the playing condition and pitch resilience to wear.</p> <p><b>Q&amp;A</b></p> <p>1) Q: Which trees would need to be removed?</p> <p>A: Some trees are being considered for removal - for example a poor quality tree growing in the canopy of the other trees could be removed. There is benefit to the remaining trees in having more space.</p> <p>A leaning tree was discussed and there was a discussion on the pros and cons of removing trees to enable succession panting.</p> <p>2) Q: What type of trees will be replanted?</p> <p>A: Due to climate change and the introduction of new tree diseases, EH need to ensure species selection is mindful of biosecurity and climate change adaptation. Examples of species for replanting are: <i>Quercus rober</i> (English Oak), <i>Ulmus 'Lutece'</i> (Dutch Elm Disease resistant Elm), <i>Betula pendula</i> (Weeping birch),</p>	

	<p><i>Corylus avellina</i> (Hazel), <i>Malus sp</i> (apple), <i>Pinis sylvestris</i> (Scotts Pine), <i>Populus nigra and alba</i> (The Black and the White Poplar), <i>Prunus avium</i> (Wild Cherry), <i>Quercus ilex</i> (Holm Oak), <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> (Common Acacia), <i>Sorbus aucuparia</i> (Rowan), <i>Taxus Baccata</i> (Yew), <i>Tillia cordata</i> (Small leaved lime)</p> <p>3) Q: Why are the trees planted in a straight line (formal)?</p> <p>A: Planting often looks regimented on a plan but will generally look softer in reality.</p> <p>4) Q: Proposals to date show the tree avenue planting and the squaring off of a piece of lawn for the house. Would they be round at the outside of the current trees</p> <p>A: Apart from 6 poor quality specimens, existing avenue trees would not be removed. The new avenue and grove planting would be in addition and occupy space which is currently short-mown.</p> <p>5) Q: Could you clarify whether badgers are present on the site?</p> <p>A: The 2015 ecological report did not confirm evidence of badgers in the park but there was in the vicinity of the park. EH received a report from our ecologist of evidence of badger activity in September 2017, this was also noted in an archaeological report published in October 2017.</p> <p>The whole site is important to badgers for their night time foraging, the woodland quarters have outlier setts in partial use, there are at present no breeding setts in the woodland quarters, no doubt due to the presence of dogs. We will work around the badgers' changing use of the site and adapt proposals as necessary in order to protect the badgers and fulfill all statutory requirements.</p> <p>6) Q: Will your programme of work impact any badgers?</p> <p>A: Not at all. There is more than enough scope here to accommodate landscape improvements and badgers protection.</p>	
<p>4. Introductions and attendee comments.</p> <p>(Marble Hill, Great Room)</p>	<p>Attendees ranged from local residents, landscape organisations, wildlife organisations, play provider, students from the local school, previous and newly elected councilors and garden volunteer from Chiswick House &amp; Gardens.</p> <p>During the introductions, there was support for landscape improvements, tree management and biodiversity enhancement:</p> <p>Local resident: "We feel the park has been badly neglected for well over 15 years. Everybody here is in favour of restoring it."</p> <p>Volunteer from Chiswick: "To anyone concerned about the pruning of the woodland I would encourage you to visit Chiswick Gardens which went through a similar transformation. You can't identify that wood has ever been taken out. There are bluebells and pink campion – it has developed very well."</p> <p>Local resident: "This is about community. We appreciate English Heritage raising funds to improve Marble Hill. This is about skin in the game – EH's mission to restore the garden vs. locals users of the park. Locals should have more skin in the game – for example providing funding for running costs"</p> <p>Concerns were raised about:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Basing the landscape improvements on an historic plan</i></li> </ul> <p>Local resident “There are two separate issues here. One is the maintenance and improvement of the grounds. And in this way we are all behind what you are doing. The other is the restoration of an 18<sup>th</sup> century landscape. The two are not compatible”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Not understanding the plans</i></li> </ul> <p>Local resident “This is a gorgeous park – an informal landscape. The 1752 plan shows formal lines of trees in an 18th century way. Are we going to see very formal lines of trees or a bluebell type landscape? This is confusing and I think this is why locals do not understand English Heritage’s plans”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The perceived formality of the planting scheme</i></li> </ul> <p>Local resident “The planting looks very dense and will narrow the view to the river.”</p> <p>JLG confirmed that there will be a wide view to the Thames. The new trees will be 6 meters apart.</p> <p>EH rounded off the introductions by reiterating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EH welcomes research that improves understanding of the park and for this reason will be hosting a garden history symposium in June where all matters of historic provenance will be discussed. EH is committed to authenticity as an organisation and we will not proceed unless we are satisfied that the historical basis for our project is authentic.</li> <li>- EH advised that care had been taken to provide a balance that enhances the positive elements a historic park and a municipal landscape. EH does not believe the park management and landscape restoration are mutually exclusive.</li> </ul>	
<p>5. Outline of current Landscape Scheme by Landscape architect.</p>	<p>Presentation covered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Context of Marble Hill Park – located within the Arcadian Thames, within the protected view. The park is part of a wider network for wildlife.</li> <li>2. Management &amp; Maintenance – a variety of methods can be adopted and carried out in different intensities across the park.</li> <li>3. Baseline data gathered – Preliminary Ecological Assessment highlighted the various habitats existing on site and species known to be found in the local area. Further surveys of birds, bats and badgers detailed specific species found on site.</li> <li>4. Pleasure Grounds Proposals – outline of tree works proposed, new tree planting and introduction of understory layers, creation of the ninepin alley and path network within the woodland quarters</li> <li>5. Planting Palette – outline of tree species proposed and shrub and herbaceous species in the understory</li> <li>6. Habitat Enhancements – reference images showed the type of habitats that could be created through enhancements to the woodland quarters</li> </ol>	

	and ways in which community engagement could help attract wildlife				
6. Outcome of Group exercise	At the end of the group sessions it was noted that attendees would like to see the following species returning/thriving at Marble Hill Park:				
	#	Species to attract, retain or increase	Habitat required	Food Sources Required	Landscape Measures Required
	1	Badgers	Lawn/grassy area Meadow area Woodland area	Slow worms Earthworms Frogs Rodent Birds Eggs Lizards Insects Bulbs Seeds Berries	Maintain a diverse area of woodland and open grass areas.  Minimise disturbance from dogs and people.
	2	Bats	Bat box Eaves Flower border Hedge Herb garden Lawn/grassy area Meadow area Patio Pond Woodland Area Flight paths	Small insects such as:  Moths Gnats	Tree planting and thinning.  Conserve trees where there are roosts.  Introduce bat boxes to increase habitat.  Create and maintain foraging flight lines.  Increase insect habitat in scrub and meadow areas:  Plant wildflowers for food source for insects.  Plant nectar-producing

				<p>flora such as lilac for food source.</p> <p>Planting woodland edges next to paths will bring about greater insect population.</p> <p>Put up bat boxes.</p>
3	Butterflies	Sunny Wind protected	<p>Nectar</p> <p>Near water source</p> <p>Diverse range of plants for caterpillars. E.g.</p> <p>Queen Anne's Lace Violets Marigolds Milkweed Stinging nettles.</p>	<p>Variety of plants that bloom at different times all summer.</p> <p>Long grasses.</p> <p>Flowering trees, shrubs and, herb layer.</p> <p>Increasing diversity of meadows.</p>
4	Hedgehogs	<p>Flower border</p> <p>Hedge</p> <p>Lawn/grassy area</p> <p>Meadow area</p> <p>Shrub</p> <p>Woodland area</p>	<p>Slugs</p> <p>Snails</p> <p>Beetles</p> <p>Earthworms</p> <p>Birds' Eggs</p> <p>Nestlings</p> <p>Carrion</p>	<p>Note: Presence of badger population will deter an active hedgehog population as they are a food source for badgers.</p> <p>Provide shrub cover and hedge lines.</p> <p>Provide variety of landscape for variety of</p>

				food sources.
5	Kestrels	Farmland Grassland Heathland Urban and suburban	Small Mammals Birds Worms Insects	Maintain a diverse habit of woodland shrub areas and open grass
6	Lesser Spotted Woodpecker	Woodland Urban and suburban Wetland	Insects	Maintain standing deadwood where viable.  Put up nest boxes.
7	Little Owl	Woodland Farmland Grassland Urban and suburban	Small Mammals .e.g. wood mouse.  Birds Beetles Snails Slugs Worms	Introduce wildflowers for birds.  Encourage pollinators for wildlife (e.g. moths, butterflies, birds, bees)  Deadwood for beetles.  Areas with moist soil for worms, snails, slugs.  Create areas of grass with tree cover i.e. create good feeding ground.  Put up nesting boxes
8	Song Thrush	Woodland Farmland Grassland Urban and suburban	Worms Snails Fruit	Improve scrub and shrub areas to improve food source.  Improve shelter for nesting.

				<p>Large trees for perching on.</p> <p>Create areas of grass with tree cover i.e. Good feeding ground.</p>
<b>9</b>	Stag Beetle	<p>Decaying wood (on moist soil).</p> <p>Protected from predators e.g. magpies or cats</p>	Deadwood	Provide areas of deadwood in shady damp areas in a variety of sites in the park.
<b>10</b>	Swallow	<p>Farmland</p> <p>Grassland</p> <p>Upland</p> <p>Wetland</p> <p>Urban and suburban</p>	Variety of small invertebrates which are caught on the wing	<p>Improve plant diversity of woodland edges and meadows.</p> <p>Improve flight paths.</p>
<b>11</b>	Tawny Owls	<p>Woodland</p> <p>Farmland</p> <p>Urban and suburban</p>	<p>Small Mammals</p> <p>Rodents</p> <p>Small Birds</p> <p>Frogs</p> <p>Fish</p> <p>Insects</p> <p>Worms</p>	<p>Introduce wildflower areas to increase insect food sources for birds.</p> <p>Encourage pollinators for wildlife (e.g. moths, butterflies, birds, bees)</p> <p>Deadwood for beetles.</p> <p>Areas with moist soil for worms, snails, slugs.</p> <p>Create areas</p>

				of grass with tree cover i.e. Good feeding ground. Create areas of grass with tree cover i.e. Good feeding ground. Introduce nesting boxes.
<b>12</b>	Sparrows	Woodland Farmland Urban and suburban	Seeds Insects	Provide roosts in hedges and shrubberies.  Meadows will provide more insects.  Cutting meadows in the autumn will provide seeds heads.  Within woodland shrubberies, use species that are nectar plants.  Provide plans that fruit such as Hawthorne, and blackberries, for winter food. Put up nesting boxes.
<b>#</b>	<b>Species to be controlled</b>			
<b>13</b>	Parakeet	Woodland Urban and suburban	Fruit Berries Nuts	Put up nesting boxes with metal

			Seeds	openings to protect other species from parakeets.
	<b>#</b>	<b>Non-wildlife</b>	<b>Suggestions</b>	
	<b>14</b>	Homo sapiens	<p>Educational opportunities</p> <p>Notice Boards/Signs – so that public are educated about the species/ eco balance at Marble Hill.</p> <p>Use younger generations to protect the natural landscapes.</p>	
7. Discussion after Group exercise.	<p>1. TW asked if trees would be clipped and formal.</p> <p>A: The trees between the woodland quarters and the Thames will be standard trees and as they grow lower branches will be removed to maintain East/West views across the park. There will be cutting of low branches to protect views. The only clipped and formal planting will be the enclosure for the oval ‘Arcade’ (Hornbeam palisade) which will be clipped and managed as a hornbeam hedge., other hedges will also be clipped annually to maintain their form</p> <p>2. JJ asked why cowslips are not growing in woodlands near Cambridge Park.</p> <p>A: In some cases they may need to be planted. The land may have had grazing or been cultivated- this is part of its landscape history and we may be able to enrich by reintroducing.</p> <p>JW Marble Hill has had 70 years of municipal management that will have prevented reseeding of wildflowers.</p> <p>3. Has English Heritage got detailed figures about the use of the park by dog walkers etc.?</p> <p>A: English Heritage has been collecting demographic data of park users.</p> <p>4. TG: Why are 11 very formal fruit trees in formal rows in one of the woodland quarters?</p> <p>A: 2D plans exaggerate the formality. An Orchard is typically set out in a formal way with grids of trees, but the experience walking through it does not appear that way, softened by a meadow understory with wildflowers.</p> <p>5. What is the proposed cost of maintain the garden?</p> <p>A: It is difficult to extrapolate the figures instantly but we spend around £100,000 on garden maintenance contractors at present every year. We don’t have a payroll for maintaining the gardens but the cost of the staff would be</p>			

	<p>around £60 – 70,000 per year. We have made a significant commitment to the Heritage Lottery Fund to create this garden and would be in breach of the grant if we did not deliver the additional maintenance that the gardens will require. Much of this will be delivered by an in-house gardener and an apprentice and volunteers.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> In 2016/17, EH spent £205,000 on maintenance of Marble Hill. The vast majority of this was spent on maintaining the landscape. Our Management and Maintenance Plan and Business Plan both commit an additional £71,000 to the maintenance of the landscape. These documents were submitted to HLF and would form part of any Grant Award contract with HLF should planning permission be granted for the project.</p> <p>6. Q: Large gap next to house what is this?</p> <p>A: A space left for marquee. This would enable EH to generate income. The marquee was not included in the March 2017 planning application.</p> <p>EH will commit to limiting wedding / marquee events to 12 times a year as a planning condition.</p> <p>7. Statement: JJ: more than 300 trees to go – even if you plant 400 the pollution levels are illegal here. To lose so many trees so fast would affect pollution.</p> <p>A: Scientific studies have shown that the young tree planting will use up more co2 and pollution than that declining overgrown trees as they will be healthy and vigorous and putting on more extension growth.</p> <p>8. Perception: “Planting in the lawn area looks too dense”</p> <p>A: Planting in question will be 6m apart. (This was more spaced out than had been previously understood by attendee).</p>	
<p>8. Other comments made</p>	<p><b>Landscape Management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Paths: path along west side of park currently un-surfaced. Could this be made to be more hard-wearing/permanent to avoid compaction? Ideally natural/gravel surface not tarmac.</li> <li>b) Litter is not good for biodiversity.</li> <li>c) Litter is extreme after a hot day and foxes redistribute it – could we have fox proof bins?</li> <li>d) More volunteers/staff in park would help keep areas free of litter.</li> <li>e) Use bins with lift handles to prevent being pulled out by wildlife.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dog Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f) Opportunities to use hedges, deadwood, deadwood hedging to control movement/dogs.</li> <li>g) Richmond using licensing system to control dog use – similar programme could be introduced at Marble Hill.</li> <li>h) More bins needed on popular dog walks.</li> <li>i) Need more people (rangers/staff/volunteers) to encourage use of dog bins.</li> <li>j) Stop dogs accessing all areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Wildlife Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k) Bats underappreciated.</li> <li>l) Focus on a few species (proxies) – as ‘champions’ and monitor their</li> </ul>	

	<p>success in the park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>m) Birds – use MHP as a pilot for a parakeet study, not to exclude but to control through natural methods, and re-encourage smaller songbirds with the use of parakeet-proof nest boxes.</li> <li>n) Wild flowers and pollinators are most important to encourage more species.</li> </ul> <p><b>Landscape proposals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o) The pitch in the south east corner is always waterlogged and never useable – turn it into a wildflower meadow.</li> <li>p) Reuse football pitch near the river to plant more woodland.</li> <li>q) Include wetland in the park and use as an educational area</li> <li>r) Create bee hives.</li> <li>s) More planting around edges of the park could create maintenance issues.</li> <li>t) Bulb planting for schools.</li> <li>u) TW The history of Marble Hill is really important – I don't know of another place that has a formal garden used as a park in the same way. But the history of the 18<sup>th</sup> century garden is narrow: in the 18<sup>th</sup> century this was a farming area, in 20<sup>th</sup> century there was the attempt to turn it into a housing development and the park was taken into Local Authority care. It was used as a Metropolitan Open Space, taken up by the government and handed to English Heritage. We should be celebrating what the park is today rather than trying to roll the clock back.</li> </ul> <p><b>Fencing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v) Use natural fencing to encourage further wildlife</li> <li>w) No fencing between the house and the river Natural fencing around woodland</li> <li>x) Low hedges/ dead hedging used as natural borders/fencing</li> </ul> <p><b>Income generation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>z) Don't erect marquee; add more managed woodland to the marquee space.</li> </ul>	
9. Points of difference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>Biodiversity and conservation objectives are incompatible:</i> It is EH's view that heritage conservation and wildlife conservation and enhancement are complimentary.</li> <li>b) <i>The landscape works should be based on modern history not 18th century history: Much of what park users enjoy today was established in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, for example, where animals once grazed or crops grown, sport is now played.</i> We believe that the rejuvenation of the park should draw on many aspects of the park's history, its present and potential use and ecological potential. Marble Hill is of national significance as a rare survival of an early 18<sup>th</sup> century landscape and for a local campaign that saved the park from being built over by Act of Parliament in 1902. The late 20<sup>th</sup> century decline needs to be reversed to ensure that the park can be enjoyed as it is today, by future generations. There has been subtle replanting on the East side of the park over the last 30 years to soften the harsh municipal edges of the park, reintroducing long grass areas for wildlife that are enjoyed by visitors. Today much of what we are proposing is an extension of this, enabling visitors to enjoy nature space, sport and</li> </ul>	

	<p>history in the same place. The rejuvenation of the woodland quarters will increase visitor access (and introduce new flight lines for bats and swallows) whilst also creating more diverse wildlife habitats. We have a severely declining tree stock in the woodland quarters. Tree thinning is desperately needed to give selected existing young trees the space and light to grow, as well as providing space for new planting to thrive. More light will enable the establishment of a more robust shrub layer, important as both a food source and for shelter and nesting. More light will enable the establishment of an herb layer (for example ferns, primroses and bluebells). New tree planting will create new shady areas, a benefit to park users who can benefit from the cool shade in London's increasingly hot summers. All this is aimed at balancing an extraordinary cultural and natural heritage with the needs of park users.</p>	
<p>10. Next steps</p>	<p>Minutes to be on the Marble Hill Revived site once approved.</p> <p>EH to analyse the biodiversity comments.</p> <p>EH to analyse any new information from Historic Symposium.</p> <p>EH to reshape landscape proposals where possible.</p>	



Meeting Title	Cafe Consultation Workshop
Date	Saturday 2 June 2018
Location	Marble Hill House

Item	Topics	Actions
Walk round with AS	<b>Visit to Café area behind Stable Block</b> AS summarized old plan MH – This is a group of old historical buildings in a historic relationship Front elevation – AS noted that of the 5 scenarios to be presented to the group today one includes glazing the Stable Block Arch. Tables would sit around the front and side elevations of the building and not in the Courtyard so as to keep the building between the outdoor seating and local residents in order to minimize sound pollution.	
Introductions Steve McAdam		
Three presentations about the scheme	AS <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Set context as to why café &amp; shop important for the Marble Hill Revived project as a whole. Specifically:</li><li>• Importance of sustainable future for the park and the need to offer improved facilities which will meet the needs of both local residents and the wider community</li><li>• Provided financial summary which is included in the attached presentation</li><li>• Improvement to bottom line of about £100,000.</li><li>• Why all this for £100,000 a year? Marble Hill needs investment. With the £4m Parks for People Grant, EH has the opportunity to deliver that investment. EH can't afford to deliver it another way.</li><li>• AR: numbers for the café – there's a lot of cost running the café, and if EH does not get right level of sales these figures will not work. AS responded by saying that EH are well aware that it will not be possible to deliver these numbers if we do not get the offer right. He noted that EH had gone into great detail with its financial planning including running a number of sensitivity analyses (including for a significant drop in the levels of visitation to the park) and these showed that although the café contribution would decrease, it would still</li></ul>	

represent an improvement of the bottom line.

JA Head Properties Curator at EH

- We want to talk in terms of broad general contexts today.
- Broad architectural brief to convert / refurbish stable block area to create a vibrant café and retail space
- Original design while complementing Stable Block would be a contrast
- External appearance subsidiary to existing building and should be sympathetic to surrounding listed buildings and listed park landscape.
- EH uses a combination of professional judgement with subjectivity
- It is important to understand the way in which the Stable Block area is significant
- Then look at the changes you are proposing to make and put together a list of the impacts that will take and give them magnitude. These include

*Evidential value – tell you how the building was used*

*Historical value*

*Aesthetic value*

*Communal value – why local people love a building*

*Architectural value*

Conservation Management Plan for Marble Hill's plan of the Stable Block – shows external walls of Stable Block have high significance and date from 19<sup>th</sup> century. This is important and there are also sensitivities surrounding proximity to Grade I listed building and grade II\* historic landscape.

Assessing impacts – EH uses ICOMOS standards. (*Glossary made available for group*)

Members of the public at today's meeting will use these standards to assess a number of options.

DT – Head of Catering for English Heritage

- Recap of objectives for the cafe
- This is a community café. We are well aware that if local resident's don't use it, then EH haven't got a successful business
- We will feature a welcoming refreshing bespoke café for MH. We don't have one model that fits all. We will ensure we have food that local park users want.
- The café needs to be a hub for apprenticeship training which is a key reason for HLF choosing to fund the Marble Hill Revived scheme
- This necessitates a kitchen big enough to provide a training hub for EH use, and Richmond College to come and use to train as well.

- The café will provide financial sustainability to MH

### Explanation of plans

#### Option A (Existing plan – as previously submitted in Planning Application)

- Kitchen plan – 60 covers inside. 80 outside.
- Baking zone,
- Hot meal zone
- Space to deliver training.
- Kiosk for park users

#### Option B

- No extension
- 24 covers.
- External seating 100 covers.
- No seating in courtyard
- No secondary kiosk – this would be done with a mobile unit or ticket booth
- This option is simply not financially viable

#### Option C

54 internal covers

Kitchen which could support 2 apprentices.

Apprenticeship and training is a key element of the funding.

PB – Anyone who uses the park knows for 6 months of the year there is nobody in the café. Those are the numbers EH is dealing with in the winter.

Locals are thinking about a small café for the community.

This is a training facility which necessitates an architectural change. We have always said we don't know why this has to be so big – sounds different from what we have been told.

AS – Going forward, even if we do not proceed with Option A, we will need a kitchen somewhere in between the size of where we were before and what was proposed previously because we need to have an element of apprenticeship training within the café to satisfy HLF and BIG Lottery.

#### Option D (the Love Marble Hill proposal designed by Martin Habel)

MH outlined his scheme:

I approached the problem to find a reconciled scheme to meet the needs of EH and campaigners. There are ways you can handle impacts on the wall. I have said there are other problems – e.g. odour from kitchen, noise and the fact that existing walls act as sound mirrors. We had same arguments

for Richmond Riverside. It will destroy ambience of the private garden. Food spills off the table and local wildlife will come to eat – it is not good for natural life. Turned problem on its head and said why not reverse this and have within the space of the coach house itself. I interviewed quite a few park café managers. They said winters are horrendous, business drops right off. EH need money – Summer events are a peak. If you have a building more flexible in its use it can generate more income over the year. Have made provision so that the cricket club/football matches can use the cafe, you can do small hires , small business seminars. If you have a space that can subdivide you can generate money throughout the year. I recognise question of apprenticeships which take space. If you look at the bigger plan, use of space for ecology, education, children’s trails, you could have an establishment structure for EH which offered apprenticeship not simply in catering but on a wider context (management etc)

You put out of use a valuable hard surface for staff parking. Why lose it? We know from traffic studies that was a real bone of contention. Leave the rear along, exclude the public, you have moved sound/odour source away. I felt there were lost opportunities with the proposal because EH has a story to tell, much bigger story how Thames was tamed, wildlife has survived, how use of riverbanks over the centuries has changed. A story to tell based in shop and reading area which becomes a heart of Twickenham. Twickenham has been poor relation but has a mix of urban history, nature and art. I have included shop to get footfall – can have a drink at café or have a meeting room. Below you can create a split level and confine within the arms of the rear existing coach house. This could be the hub for an ecology story. You could also use costumed role play. This is at the heart and could make the whole thing sing. We all know there was a long list and hope it is all history.

AS it has been really useful way to move forward. Final option builds on MH plan.

MH park could be a flagship in the way it accomplishes other schemes

PD: I feel whole thing is flawed I don't think it is as effective as having a café over by the car park at the 1 O'Clock club. I think café should be there not here and this should be offices.

DT: EH has looked very carefully at the location of the café. Whilst there may be some demand in the vicinity of the One O'Clock club, there are a number of reasons for the café needing to stay in the Stables/Coach House:

- There is an established café offer in the Stables already – why move it?
- EH anticipates that around 40% of its café turnover will

come from people visiting Marble Hill specifically for the house and formal gardens. The café therefore needs to be close to the house in order to capitalise on this business.

- The level of business which could be driven from the area around the One-O’Clock club alone is very small in comparison.

### Option E

- This is basically Option D with a couple of tweaks incorporated in order to minimise the impact on the historically significant elements of the building fabric. Can still have two apprentices.
- Retail moves into the Stable Block.
- No kiosk so a mobile unit or in ticket hut.
- Not at design stage yet.
- Glazed walls and doors.

### Summary:

	Plan A	Plan B	Plan C	Plan D	Plan E	Plan D & E Retail Only
	Full year					
<b>Design Options</b>						
Visitor Numbers	845,120	845,120	845,120	845,120	845,120	845,120
Conversion	17.6%	13.0%	15.5%	16.0%	16.0%	2.0%
Transactions	148,910	109,866	130,994	135,219	135,219	16,902
Average Transaction Value (inc. VAT)	£4.00	£3.35	£3.75	£3.75	£3.75	£5.40
Gross Profit %	70.0%	65.0%	67.0%	68.0%	68.0%	52.0%
Internal Covers	60	24	54	60	60	0
External Covers	80	100	100	100	100	0
<b>Income</b>						
Sales	506,928	313,235	418,066	431,550	431,550	77,677
Gross Profit	354,850	203,603	280,104	293,454	293,454	40,392
Total Income	354,850	203,603	280,104	293,454	293,454	40,392
Cost of Sales	152,078	109,632	137,962	138,096	138,096	37,285
COS %	30%	35%	33%	32%	32%	48%
<b>Direct Expenses</b>						
Wages	188,786	112,200	126,500	135,000	135,000	22,500
Other Staff Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vehicle costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operating costs	13,792	7,470	9,970	11,578	11,578	1,500
Total Direct Expenses	202,578	119,670	136,470	146,578	146,578	24,000
Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Net Contribution	152,272	83,933	143,634	146,876	146,876	16,392
Direct Wage Ratio	37.2%	35.8%	30.3%	31.3%	31.3%	29.0%
Net Contribution %	30.0%	26.8%	34.4%	34.0%	34.0%	21.1%
SPH	£ 0.60	£ 0.37	£ 0.49	£ 0.51	£ 0.51	£ 0.09

Drop between plan A and plans D and E – we can close down some areas and this reflects this.

Plan C B and E we have a bottom line contribution from the café of c. £145,000 which is not too far from the contribution which would have been provided under the original plan.

AR: Noted that Option D would be cheaper to build than

	<p>Option A</p> <p>DT all of options would be cheaper than Option A.</p> <p>JJ – Will EH be managing the café or will it be an external company running it? – DT we will be running this as an in house concern.</p> <p>AR: Asked for clarification that this contribution did not include any catering for events like weddings and is based on closing by 6pm and opening 10am with possible kiosk opening for dog walkers.</p> <p>DT: EH – the figures exclude any income from Weddings or similar events. To clarify, EH will not be using the café in this way as we want to minimise the impact on residents (which is why we are prepared to commit to daytime opening hours) Furthermore, a flexible space would not appeal to potential wedding clients anyway.</p>	
--	--	--

SM	<p>Scoring</p> <p>Introducing criteria</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="416 304 1046 909"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Topic Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Heritage Impact</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Food offer &amp; Training</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Financial Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Build Cost</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Look &amp; Feel (Exterior)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Layouts (Interior)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>Impact on Neighbours</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>Impact on Park Users / Visitors</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>Other</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>Other</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Are there any other topics – group to inform if missing</p> <p><b>Additional criteria:</b></p> <p>Trees</p> <p>Traffic and parking</p> <p>Flexible use (for community) – it was agreed that this could be incorporated into the Interior layout category and scored accordingly.</p> <p>15 minutes –</p> <p>Groups requested to evaluate weighting for initial categories</p>		Topic Area	1	Heritage Impact	2	Food offer & Training	3	Financial Performance	4	Build Cost	5	Look & Feel (Exterior)	6	Layouts (Interior)	7	Impact on Neighbours	8	Impact on Park Users / Visitors	9	Other	10	Other	
	Topic Area																							
1	Heritage Impact																							
2	Food offer & Training																							
3	Financial Performance																							
4	Build Cost																							
5	Look & Feel (Exterior)																							
6	Layouts (Interior)																							
7	Impact on Neighbours																							
8	Impact on Park Users / Visitors																							
9	Other																							
10	Other																							
Feedback	<p>Weightings as follows, one for each table group. It was agreed that we would take an average as our actual weighting. This is highlighted in bold:</p> <p>Financial performance 3 4 4 4 <b>(3.75)</b></p> <p>Build costs 4 3 3 4 <b>(3.5)</b></p> <p>Look and feel 4 4 4 4 <b>(4)</b></p> <p>Layout 3 3 2 3 <b>(2.75)</b></p> <p>Impact on neighbours 4 3 4 4 <b>(3.75)</b></p> <p>Impact on park users 3 3 4 4 <b>(3.5)</b></p> <p>Trees 2 2 4 2 <b>(2.5)</b></p> <p>Traffic and parking 2 4 4 4 <b>(3.5)</b></p>																							

Scores

Comments: Change as little as you possibly can.

JC we were a little worried about the toilets – there are plenty of ways to address that but it needs to be considered.

AS agreed - that is the biggest negative impact on park users in this scheme.

Final scheme settled on by the group – scheme E

	Scheme		Heritage Impact	Food offer & Training	Financial Performance	Build Cost	Look & Feel (Exterior)	Layouts (Interior)	Impact on Neighbours	Impact on Park Users / Visitors	Trees	Traffic/Parking		Total score
A	Original Scheme	Score: 1 - 5	2	10	8	5	3	5	2	7	2	3		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	8	27.5	30	12.5	12	13.75	7.5	24.5	5	10.5		151.25
B	Fit within stable's southern block - no extension	Score: 1 - 5	12	6	4	13	13	6	15	6	14	12		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	48	16.5	15	32.5	52	16.5	56.25	21	35	42		334.75
C	Fit within stable's southern block - small extension	Score: 1 - 5	7	9	9	11	5	8	6	7	11	10		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	28	24.75	33.75	27.5	20	22	22.5	24.5	27.5	35		265.5
D	Fit within full stable block with glazed extension and use of archway	Score: 1 - 5	9	9	11	9	12	9	11	12	12	10		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	36	24.75	41.25	22.5	48	24.75	41.25	42	30	35		345.5
E	Fit within full stable block with glazed extension but archway left as it stands	Score: 1 - 5	10	9	11	9	12	10	11	11	12	10		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	40	24.75	41.25	22.5	48	27.5	41.25	38.5	30	35		348.75

Next Steps

AS: Although this workshop has resulted in a resounding low score for original scheme, AS noted that EH has not (as yet) taken scheme off the table. EH has committed to looking at different options which we have now done, and to getting local people's input into the process (which was the purpose of this exercise). EH will now take the feedback from this very useful and constructive workshop and discuss our next steps internally. We will communicate the outcome to people later in the summer.

This will happen before EH puts in a planning application.

SH ask that EH bears in mind the venue should have style, chic beauty. The restaurant at the Chelsea Physic Gardens was mentioned. Restaurants with those elements are the restaurants that are successful. What it looks like and what people want are important.

AS the reason DT is passionate about the catering in the Marble Hill Revived project is because it enables us to take our catering to the next level.

AR If you did adopt D/E there is a £400,000 capital saving. What would that be spent on?

AS The delay to this project has meant that any savings are likely to be offset by increases in costs due to inflation. .

PB – don't go into a closed compartment and come out with something awful. What has happened in this room has been really positive. It would be a bad move and if that could not be conveyed to the people above. There would be much positive support even if HLF won't give you help, we would lobby. We could turn our campaigning around to support you and lobby HLF. It is the people's voice that says this thing and there is always a solution to be got.

	<p>AS – Thankyou - we will be making that point with HLF in our discussions with them.</p> <p>AS closed the meeting by thanking everyone for their time and constructive approach. He reassured all attendees that EH really is listening and taking local opinions on board, and views this workshop as an important part of that process.</p>	