

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 18/2977/FUL

**Address:** Marble Hill HouseMarble Hill ParkRichmond RoadTwickenhamTW1 2NL

**Proposal:** 1. Marble Hill House: External decoration and repair work (if a window is substantially rotten, partial or full replacement of joinery) and replacement rooflight. 2. Stable Block: External alterations, installation of mechanical plant, timber plant enclosure to the rear and front landscaping (creating an outdoor seating area) to facilitate the refurbishment of the existing café.3. Service Yard: new pedestrian access and associated refuse storage facilities.4. Landscaping: new soft and hard landscaping including restoration of gardens, upgrade of sports pitches and facilities, replacement of seating and new play areas.5. Sports Centre: External ramp for improved access.

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mr Chris Sumner

**Address:** 3 Sandstone 5 Kent Road Kew Richmond TW9 3JJ

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Support the proposal

**Comment:** I am writing to urge your Council to grant planning permission for the proposals. You have recently received a long report prepared by the self-appointed and, I should say, unrepresentative group Love Marble Hill. Their report impresses by its length and contains one interesting finding, which is that the draughtsman of the contested plan in the Norfolk Record Office was James Dorret, "cartographer/valet" to the Duke of Argyll. However, none of what the report contains addresses the main issue - which is that Marble Hill House and Park are listed grades I and II\* heritage assets that are deteriorating and in need of considered and informed attention. The report does not significantly undermine English Heritage's interpretation of the history of the development of the site, which remains essentially as set out in Mavis Batey's "Alexander Pope. The Poet and the Landscape" (pp. 74-85) "Villas of the Ancient - Marble Hill". Much is made in the LMH report of the lack of contemporary confirmation of details and assertions, but as Dr Jacques points out, lack of evidence is not evidence that something was not so. An example of LMH's sometimes questionable interpretation of detail is that they make much of the figures shown crossing the riverside lawn in the engraving after Augustin Heckell. However, in Heckell's original drawing dated 1748 in the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, the figures are not shown.

It is regrettable that the funding for a responsible and carefully researched proposal by English Heritage should be jeopardised and important decisions made in an atmosphere of claim, counter-claim and recrimination.

The house and park are of national importance as well as providing familiar and much-loved amenities for local people, but both are deteriorating and urgently require the considered attention that EH now proposes to give them.