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Executive Summary

History of the Estate

The gardens, estate and landscape of Hampton Court Palace represent a unique historical and horticultural resource of international value. The estate at Hampton Court has been cultivated since the medieval period, when it was latterly a grange, or farm, of the Hospitaller order. In the early sixteenth-century it became part of Cardinal Wolsey's new palace and subsequently part of the more lavishly embellished royal palace of Henry VIII. The layout of Henry VIII's gardens and deer park define the topography of the gardens and estates to this day, whilst in terms of their fabric the gardens retain much work from later centuries, in particular work undertaken by Charles II and by William and Mary. Indeed, Hampton Court arguably retains the finest examples of Baroque garden fabric in Europe. Over the last two hundred years the gardens and estates have ceased to be a centre of royal patronage and display and have instead been associated with the almost unique 'grace-and-favour' community established at Hampton Court. Since the reign of Queen Victoria they have been a place for public recreation. Most recently, the estate has witnessed a series of significant, and often ground-breaking, restoration projects, including William III's Privy Garden (1995), the replanting of the Long Water Avenue (2003-4), the repaving of Base Court (2008-09), Queen Mary's Exotics Garden (2007-8) and the re-presentation of Chapel Court as a Tudor privy garden (2008-09).

Revision of the Plan

This Conservation Management Plan has been produced to update the Hampton Court Palace Gardens, Estates and Landscape Conservation Management Plan (May 2004) which itself represented a full revision of the widely-copied Gardens Strategy Report produced in 1997 by the Historic Royal Palace Agency. It seeks to reassess the aims and achievements of the 2004 Plan and the 1997 Strategy, while also adapting and supplementing them to address conservation, management and operational concerns. This revised plan is the product of a collaborative process between Historic Royal Palaces and a group of independent gardens experts of national and international standing.

Philosophical Overview

Underpinning this strategy is a recognition of the need to consider the gardens, estate and landscape at Hampton Court as a unique historical patch-work, composed of distinct areas differing in age, character and significance. This plan seeks to continue a move away from management policies which have concentrated upon short-term maintenance and planting,
towards a strategy which seeks to conserve and protect the historic character of the different areas of the estate. In an effort to supplement ‘day-to-day’ management, it presents a series of policies intended to justify the establishment of larger-scale conservation projects.

Principles of the Plan

This plan represents one of a tri-partite group of conservation plans, being a companion to the Hampton Court Palace: Views Management Plan (2004) and the Hampton Court Palace: Buildings Conservation Plan (in preparation). Together these plans are intended to provide both an overarching, and a detailed, framework for the conservation and management of Hampton Court Palace. While it is intended that this plan should inform strategic and project planning, it also pays attention to the ‘day-to-day’ care and maintenance of the estate. The first half of this plan provides a summary of the history of the Hampton Court estate, an overview of previous gardens plans and strategies, and lays out a series of general principles and standards.

The Character Areas

In order to manage the development of the gardens and estates in line with the philosophy and principles set out above, the second half of this Conservation Management Plan considers the estate in the form of 16 ‘character areas’, each representing a discrete area which displays a coherent pattern of historical development and modern usage.

Review

In the short term this Conservation Management Plan will be the subject of consultation, whilst in the medium term it will be subject to quinquennial review. In addition, we hope that it will have a long-lasting influence, laying the foundation of conservation and management policy for Hampton Court Palace’s gardens, estate and landscape in the twenty-first century.

Figure 1: Crocus Time at Hampton Court, London Transport Poster, 1913. (London Transport Museum)
A. Introduction

Hampton Court Palace

A 0.1 The gardens, estate and landscape at Hampton Court (to be referred to collectively as 'the estates' in this document) are of world renown. The park covers 750 acres (304 hectares), the formal gardens 60 acres (26 hectares) and the palace buildings 6 acres (2.5 hectares), all set within a loop of the river Thames. Originally enclosed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the park (along with neighbouring Bushy Park) was stocked with deer. Documentary and archaeological evidence pertaining to the palace gardens survives from the period of Cardinal Wolsey up until the present day. The records for the reigns of Henry VIII and William III, when major new gardens were constructed, are particularly full.

A 0.2 The palace's gardens, estate and landscape form a textbook of English royal gardening styles. The estate and landscape includes the park. Their significance has been recognised in a number ways: they have Grade 1 status on English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens; the gardens and estates are a constituent part of Hampton Court Palace as a Scheduled Ancient Monument; in addition, many of the structures of the palace and gardens are Grade 1 listed buildings in their own right.

This Conservation Management Plan (CMP)

A 0.3 The gardens, estate and landscape today are owned by the sovereign on behalf of the nation. They are cared for by Historic Royal Palaces (subsequently referred to as HRP), a Charter body with charitable status, contracted by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport to manage the unoccupied palaces (which comprise, in addition to Hampton Court Palace, the Tower of London, Kensington Palace State Apartments, Kew Palace and the Banqueting House in Whitehall) on her behalf.

A 0.4 The palace and gardens are jointly visited by over 700,000 visitors a year, whilst over 200,000 visitors visit the gardens alone. This Conservation Management Plan is one of a suite of three documents setting out HRP’s plans for the future management of the site: the other two are the Hampton Court Palace: Buildings Conservation Plan (in preparation) and the Hampton Court Palace: Views Management Plan (2004). This plan provides the long-term context for the management of the gardens over the next few decades, as well as making recommendations for short-term developments. It uses the subdivision of the gardens into character areas as a tool for recognising the complexities of the site in terms of historical development and aesthetic character.
Previous Gardens and Estates Plans

A 0.5 This current strategy is the latest in a long series of strategy documents intended to define and conserve the significance of the landscape at Hampton Court Palace.

A 0.6 The first was a comprehensive historical survey undertaken by Travers Morgan Planning in 1982. This remains the most complete survey yet undertaken of the Hampton Court estate and has been of fundamental importance to the planning of all subsequent developments.

A 0.7 This was followed by two reports prepared by Land Use Consultants (LUC) during 1988-89; the first was a landscape strategy (the first such strategy to be implemented for Hampton Court) and the second concentrated on staffing levels and maintenance.

A 0.8 In 1997 a five-year Gardens Strategy Report was prepared by David Jacques in order to establish the principles of care, the desired style and content of the gardens and a framework for future restoration and improvement. Its recommendations sought to ensure a consistency (though not uniformity) of approach, so that changes that are urgent and/or important are tackled in a rational way.

A 0.9 The 1997 Gardens Strategy Report established the principle of quinquennial reviews and, thus by 2003 it was felt that it was due for revision since the operating context had changed in 1998 when the Historic Royal Palaces Agency was superseded by Historic Royal Palaces, an independent charity. This led to the 2004 Hampton Court Palace: Gardens, Estate and Landscape Conservation Management Plan which established a five year strategy for the conservation, maintenance and presentation of the Hampton Court estate. To accompany this new strategy HRP commissioned the Hampton Court Palace: Views Management Plan (Colvin and Moggeridge, 2004).

Figure 2: The Lower Orangery Garden.
B. The Operating Context

Historic Royal Palaces

B 0.1 Historic Royal Palaces (HRP) is an independent charity that looks after the Tower of London, Hampton Court Palace, the Banqueting House, Kensington Palace and Kew Palace.

B 0.2 Each of the five royal palaces in our care has survived for hundreds of years. They have witnessed peace and prosperity and splendid periods of building and expansion, but they also share stories of more turbulent times, of war and domestic strife, politics and revolution.

B 0.3 Although the palaces are owned by The Queen on behalf of the nation, we receive no funding from the Government or the Crown, so we depend on the support of our visitors, members, donors, volunteers and sponsors.

Our Cause

B 0.4 To help everyone explore the story of how monarchs and people have shaped society, in some of the greatest palaces ever built.

Our Principles

B 0.5 Guardianship. We exist for tomorrow, not just for yesterday. Our job is to give these palaces a future as valuable as the past. We know how precious they and their contents are, and we aim to conserve them to the standard they deserve: the best.

B 0.6 Discovery. We explain the bigger picture, and then encourage people to make their own discoveries: in particular, to find links with their own lives and the world today.

B 0.7 Showmanship. We do everything with panache. Palaces have always been places of spectacle, beauty, majesty and pageantry, and we are proud to continue that

Figure 3: King's Beast in the Chapel Court Garden
tradition.

B 0.8 **Independence.** We have a unique task, and our own point of view. We challenge ourselves to find new ways to do our work. We are an independent charity, not funded by the government or the Crown, and we are keen to welcome everyone who can support our cause.

### Our Strategy

B 0.9 **To give the palaces the care they deserve** – conserving them in the state we have inherited them is not enough, we aim to hand them on to the future generation in a better state. To do this we do the following

a. A buildings conservation programme.

b. A collections and interiors conservation programme.

c. A gardens and landscape conservation programme.

B 0.10 **To transform the way that visitors explore their story** - Historic Royal Palaces believes that history, beauty and art have the power to inspire and that everyone wants to understand more of the world they live in. All our projects and activities for visitors centre on promoting learning, broadening our audiences, creating a stronger presence for the palaces and their stories, producing a long term sustainable change and at the same time, making sure they have a really fun and enjoyable visit!

B 0.11 **Have a wider impact in the world** – our priority is to use our cause and the identity that goes with it across all our communication to build awareness support and influence for HRP as widely as possible.

B 0.12 **Build one organisation behind the cause** - we are a people organisation and this objective is all about making the most of them. Examples of this include leadership programmes, staff surveys, recruitment initiatives etc

B 0.13 And finally.........**Generate the money to make this all happen** - we are a charity and receive no funding from the government or from the Crown. We therefore have strategies to develop fundraising, retail, expand functions and events held at our palaces as well as encouraging more visitors to come.

### Legislative and Planning Background

B 0.14 - The legal status of the gardens is fivefold:

B 0.15 - The gardens and estates have a **Grade 1** entry on the **English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens**. The boundary of the registered area includes the palace, gardens and the whole of Home Park bordered by the river and Hampton Court Road.

B 0.16 - Hampton Court Palace is a **Scheduled Ancient Monument**. The scheduled boundary is not defined: a note on the original scheduling file reads ‘this monument is scheduled by virtue of being included in the List of Scheduled Monuments published by the Secretary of State […] the scheduled area has not been defined in the case of this monument.’
However, English Heritage's Government Historic Buildings Advisory Unit have produced their own map indicating that the scheduled area stops at the boundary of the palace and gardens, rather than including the park.

**B 0.17** - Many parts of the palace are listed in their own right, these include: Hampton Court Palace (Grade 1); the Lower Orangery (Grade 1); the Palace Garden Walls and Railings (Grade 1); the Flowerpot Gates (Grade 1); the Lion Gates (Grade 1); the Fountain Garden Gates (Grade 1); the Trophy Gates (Grade 1); the Tiltyard Tower (Grade 1); the Tijou Screens (Grade 1); the Home Park Boundary Walls (Grade 2*); the Pavilion and various other properties within the estate (Grade 2). Various statues, pedestals, bases and sundials are also listed.

**B 0.18** - Various parts of the estate and gardens fall within designated conservation areas. These include: Home Park and the formal gardens which form part of the Hampton Court Park Conservation Area; Barge Walk which forms part of a local authority conservation area; and Hampton Court Green which forms part of the Hampton Court Green Conservation Area. Home Park has also been designated a non-statutory Site of Metropolitan importance for Nature Conservation (a SMINC)

**B 0.19** - Policies for the protection of Hampton Court’s estate and its environs are included in the unitary development and local plans of the three local planning authorities (the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames, the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames and Elmbridge Borough Council). A forum for the discussion of issues which influence and arise from these policies is provided by the team of the Thames Landscape Strategy - Hampton to Kew in which HRP is a partner.

---

Figure 4: Knyff, Aerial view of Hampton Court Palace from the east, c. 1703 (The Royal Collection)
C. **History and Significance of the Parks and Gardens**

**History of the Parks and Gardens**

C 0.1 Hampton Court contains the finest surviving Baroque layout in Britain. Elegant parterres, walks with superb vistas, exquisite statuary and ironwork, and walled enclosures lie within a park bisected by canals and avenues, framed on one side by the River Thames. Together this combination provides the setting for the 6 acres (2.43 hectares) of buildings that make up Britain’s largest royal palace outside London. The principal built elements and garden areas of this landscape remain largely unaltered, though their character has changed at various times with new uses, shifting garden fashion and the growth of trees, shrubs and other plants.

C 0.2 As well as bringing about new developments within the gardens, the passage of time has had detrimental effects. As the planting scheme has changed in scale, the integrity of the Baroque layout has diminished and a number of dilemmas arise when choosing the most desirable future management of the site. Aesthetic issues as well as considerations of modern use and archaeological constraints provide limits to what can be done.

C 0.3 Hampton Court became a royal possession from the late 1520s, and in the following decade, the country’s largest Tudor gardens were developed by Henry VIII. New features such as a tiltyard, ornamental orchards, a pond yard and privy garden were also laid out and constructed, whilst a walled deer enclosure was made for the king’s sport in Home Park. Though much of the detail of these early gardens has disappeared, the fundamental division laid down by these developments survives to the present day and has subtly shaped all past developments.

C 0.4 After its initial prominence, use of the palace was less frequent by the early seventeenth century, but it is clear that successive monarchs continued to recognise its capacity to reflect the magnificence and status of the sovereign. Charles I, with his uncompleted plans for the Longford River, Charles II in creating the Long Water and its lime avenue and then William III successively demonstrated their understanding of its potential. William III came closest to realising his ideal, and the gardens he left represent the quintessential Baroque garden in Britain.

C 0.5 The survival of the gardens owes much to good fortune. Once the Baroque style had fallen from favour, Hampton Court was held up as the paradigm of the garden type that proponents of less formal landscapes wished to sweep away. Capability Brown was in charge as royal gardener at Hampton Court from 1764 until his death in 1783, though, ironically, he refused to modify the layout, recognising its historical importance and preserving it ‘out of respect for my profession’. As a consequence, the gardens and parks are remarkable for their surviving fabric from the periods of Henry VIII and William III. Indeed,
taken together with a number of important Victorian additions, the ensemble
is unrivalled in Britain and stands with its renowned companions on the
Continent: Versailles, Schönbrunn and Herrenhausen.

C 0.6 From the 1530s until its last visit in 1737 the royal court regularly stayed at
Hampton Court. Thereafter, the palace and gardens lapsed into a long period
of inertia, becoming the semi-private preserve of residents who lived rent-
free by the ‘grace-and-favour’ of the sovereign. Even at such an early date,
the palace was a curiosity, where the housekeeper and gardener operated a
remunerative sideline in showing palace and gardens to ‘suitable’ visitors.

C 0.7 With the court absent, all incentive to modernise was removed and no further
radical change took place. Successive royal gardeners saw no need to do
more than maintain the existing scheme, with the result that a slow decline
set in. The Wilderness lost its hedges as the infill planting grew to form a high
canopy, and the clipping of the topiary was allowed to lapse. In time, the
resulting growth changed the appearance of the parterres radically. In 1829,
the gardens were further diminished by the removal of all the statuary by
George IV for his new East Terrace Garden at Windsor.

C 0.8 It was this rather decrepit, yet picturesque scene that presented itself to
Edward Jesse, an itinerant surveyor for the Office of Woods and Forests, who
assumed responsibility for the highly successful improvements of the
gardens from the 1830s. This change was brought about by a Treasury
inquiry of 1838 into the management, superintendence and expenditure of
the Royal Gardens. Its findings led to the conversion of the extensive kitchen
gardens at Hampton Court to gardens ‘for the purpose of public utility’ and
their transfer to the Office of Woods and Forests. Jesse’s initiative proved to
be a prelude to the creation of purpose-made public parks a decade later,
and at least one innovation at Hampton Court proved particularly influential:
the massed bedding in the Great Fountain Garden.

C 0.9 Visitor numbers to the gardens had been rising during the early nineteenth
century but leapt dramatically after the palace was opened to the general
public in 1838 and again after the South-Western Railway was extended to
Hampton Court in 1849. With hordes of new tourists pouring through the
gates, the residents of the ‘grace-and-favour’ apartments in the palace
retreated to the Privy Garden, and new planting was designed to provide for
their privacy. In 1890, this too was opened to the public. In turn House or
Home Park was opened for the first time in 1893, a golf club being
established in the park in 1895.

C 0.10 By the late nineteenth century, the new superintendents at Hampton Court
shared the ideals of their colleagues throughout the country, adopting the
latest fashions in floriculture. From the 1870s a number of changes were put
in hand, initially with carpet bedding in the Fountain Garden, and later in the
conversion of the Wilderness to a ‘wild garden’ in the early 1900s. In addition,
a superlative mixed border was established along the wall in the Great
Fountain Garden in the 1920s, cherries and other ornamental trees were
planted extensively in the post-war period, and ornamental conifers were
established in what was to become the apprentice training ground in the
1970s (now called the Twentieth Century Garden).
The desire of successive superintendents to provide for the public has left a legacy of exceptional horticultural achievement, but also one which would now be characterised as ‘municipalisation’, even though it was carried out before local authorities assumed their modern responsibility for public parks. Seating, dustbins, gravel paths and metal edges are to be found in the Great Fountain Garden, all of which are useful but unsightly. Dust and dirt arises from the loose gravel paths which are moreover inconvenient for wheelchairs and children’s pushchairs. In the Tiltyard, a restaurant, lavatory blocks, car parking, and tennis courts have gradually encroached on the walled garden compartments. Beyond the confines of the palace, traffic levels on Hampton Court Road and Hampton Court Green have led to various traffic ‘improvement’ measures, bringing urban road furniture, fumes and noise. By the same token Vrow Walk was given a highly urban landscape treatment in the 1970s and rising traffic generally led to paths being laid outside the lines of the bollards on the west front.

Concentration upon horticultural display over the last 160 years had changed the very nature of the gardens and focussed attention on plant content, rather than the overall character of the gardens or the views. An early example was the change to the Privy Garden in the 1830s, where planting to provide privacy counteracted William III’s intention of opening a view of the river Thames. Throughout the period many thousands of ornamental trees and shrubs were planted at Hampton Court. Planting in the Wilderness, in the park, and along the Barge Walk has usually been historically inappropriate. There are over 5,000 trees in avenues in Hampton Court and Bushy Park, mostly the common lime (Tilia x vulgaris). Only a handful of original seventeenth-century trees remain to this day. Superintendents adopted the conventional dislike of the common lime, and replacement planting has mostly been with broad-leaved lime (Tilia platyphyllos), a tree of quite
different shape in its maturity. However, several varieties of lime and different spacing arrangements have been tried, leading to inconsistency. There has been sporadic planting of a variety of trees in the park. Of course Hampton Court Park is closely related to Bushy Park, the two forming halves of a whole, a connection that has been lost with the increasing prominence of the road between them.

C 0.13 Avenue trees may last for 250 years, and clipped trees even longer. However there are now few specimens planted before 1735. The hedges in the Wilderness disappeared over 100 years ago, and the hornbeam in the maze has long decayed, and was replanted with yew in the 1960s. The condition of the yews in the Great Fountain Garden is a continuing concern, unlikely to diminish in view of their antiquity.

C 0.14 Two great disasters struck the tree population in the last quarter of the twentieth century. First, Dutch elm disease struck in the 1970s, killing all the elms on the estate, including those in the Wilderness, in the bower in the Privy Garden, and those in the hedgerows. Second, the Great Storm of October 1987 destroyed approximately 500 trees, many elderly specimens. In 1986 the Great Fountain Garden section of the Long Water avenue was re-planted, and this was followed by a four-year restoration programme of planting over 1,250 lime trees on the Cross Avenue (completed in 1996). However, throughout the whole of the patte d’oie seen from the Fountain Garden, gaps remain visibly prominent. Elms were also planted along the hedgerows of the Barge Walk.

**Significance**

C 0.15 Hampton Court Palace’s significance lies in a combination of important cultural qualities, both tangible and intangible, that combine to make it an outstandingly special place. This statement of significance falls into two parts: an overall statement, that applies to Hampton Court Palace: Views and Management Plan (Colvin and Moggeridge, 2004) and the Hampton Court Palace: Buildings Conservation Plan (in preparation) as well as to this document, and a further statement more specifically tailored to the gardens.

![Figure 6: The Hampton Court Screens from Jean Tijou’s book of 1693.](V&A Picture Library)
Overall Statement of Significance for Hampton Court Palace

C 0.16 Hampton Court Palace is significant for a variety of tangible elements, including its palatial setting, still surviving intact. The close relationship between the palace buildings, gardens and park views is very clear, and its setting by the river for ease of transport and surrounding park for hunting were key attractions to the kings and queens who have lived here. The enormous extent of its surviving fabric of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is particularly important, and it stands out internationally as a unique combination of a Tudor and a Baroque palace, each nationally-significant in its own right. The palace’s design and material qualities are of the very highest, and a galaxy of designers from Marot, Wren, Talman, Hawksmoor, Cibber, Verrio, Thornhill, Gibbons and Tijou are or were represented, as well as the many less famous, but nonetheless important, sixteenth-century craftsmen. Fine and decorative art of the very highest order, including the world-famous paintings by Mantegna, can be seen here, often in its original context. The architectural evidence of changing fashion in the way that buildings are valued and conserved is also interesting, from the Stuart kings respectfully refraining from alterations to the Victorian re-romanticising of the fabric.

C 0.17 Hampton Court also has some less tangible aspects to its significance, such as its importance as the setting of key events in religious and political history, involving kings and queens, their leisure, their business (the reception of foreign ambassadors), their imprisonment (Charles I), their birth (Edward VI) and the conference that led to the writing of the King James Bible. While historians have discovered much about what happened at the palace, there is also huge potential for on-going analysis of both documents and fabric, teaching us how to learn about history as well as about history itself. Furthermore, it has a reputation as a place for romance from Henry VIII’s honeymoons to the decaying palace inhabited mainly by old ladies in the later nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. Finally, Hampton Court Palace has always been a place of entertainment, from Cardinal Wolsey’s feasts to the nineteenth- and twentieth-century tourists whose presence keeps the palace lively today.

Significance of the Gardens, Park and Estate at Hampton Court

C 0.18 The gardens of the palace are of international significance. They retain the a great concentration of Tudor garden fabric, both buried, and standing walls, and are, as such, a vital archaeological resource. Moreover, they contain the surviving Baroque layout (although with dilapidations) of the most important garden in Britain at the time, one of the most important in the whole of Europe. Partly as a result of a decline of royal interest in Hampton Court, from the mid-eighteenth century on, its gardens retain more historic fabric than any other royal palace, both in terms of built fabric and historic planting. They have a royal and political significance as the setting for important events: tilting at the court of Henry VIII was an area for politics as well as sport, for example. Many periods are represented in combination here, creating a textbook of British garden history. An extensive documentary
record exists for the gardens, consisting of documents such as the suppliers’ accounts presented for the incomplete Privy Garden at the time of William III’s death. This garden’s Anglo-Dutch style is one illustration of the strong connections between design here and on the continent, and Hampton Court in later years has inspired many imitators around the world. The gardens are internationally significant today as an exemplar of good practice, which may be copied by other historic gardens, both in Britain and overseas.

C 0.19 At a national level, the gardens at Hampton Court of the Georgian period are of interest, but are comparable to those at other great houses. There is high horticultural significance with interesting trees and plants, including several trees planted in the eighteenth century, the world’s largest (and probably the oldest) grape vine, and three national collections; Queen Mary’s Exotics, heliotropes and lantana. The many informal gardens of the ‘grace-and-favour’ period are of specialist interest, being the result of a community and way of life almost unique to Hampton Court Palace. Early visitors saw the palace as a village, with lots of little informal gardens. Later, the gardens were also significant and influential as a freely-accessible public park before the creation of the first municipal parks. In addition, the gardens have undergone significant restorations, mostly notably the nineteenth-century interpretation of the Tudor gardens and the restoration of Privy Garden in the 1990s.

C 0.20 The parks and gardens possess a self-evident historical significance, but their character and use is also important in other ways at the regional level. Today, the gardens have great significance for the tourist industry providing part of an enjoyable experience for hundreds of thousands of visitors every year. The gardens are significant as a much-visited and much-loved amenity remembered from family days out, picnics and school trips. Home Park is especially valuable as an open area and wildlife reserve in an otherwise densely populated part of Greater London. The ecology has evolved in response to a maintenance regime established over centuries; the deer in particular have only been absent for a brief period in the early twentieth century. The wet areas are particularly valuable ecologically, and careful control of the quality of groundwater should ensure that this remains the case.
D. Current Operations

Progress and Developments since 2004

D 0.1 In the period since 2004 the Gardens and Estates team has undergone a change in remit that has seen it take on responsibility for both Kensington Palace and the Tower of London on top of the work already being carried out at Hampton Court. This has resulted in a restructuring of some of the roles within the department. In addition two new positions have been created, namely a Tree and Wildlife Conservation Officer and a Park Ranger. These team members support HRP’s work in these two important areas of operation. There has also been a significant expansion of the number of regular volunteers who work with HRP, and the organisation continues to find new ways to encourage and support volunteering. HRP also take an active approach to working in partnership with external organisations to develop training programmes and to build best practice.

D 0.2 The work of the Gardens and Estates team has also been linked strategically to the buildings and collections conservation work to ensure that HRP takes a cohesive and encompassing approach to the care and display of its palaces.

D 0.3 A new policy of charging for garden visits has raised additional resources for the Gardens and Estates team. Since its introduction it has generated around £600,000. This additional money finances the Gardens Improvement Fund which gives an extra £100,000 p.a. to the Gardens and Estates team over and above its annual standard operating costs. This is particularly useful since the department still has a significant real terms annual operating deficit.

D 0.4 We have undertaken some significant and important garden projects including the Lower Orangery Restoration Project and the Chapel Court Tudor Garden recreation. Many of our projects have received favourable coverage and recognition in the wider world being covered by professional journals and other recognised media. Our gardens as a whole are also regularly praised in visitor surveys and are recognised as one of the highlights of a visit to Hampton Court.

D 0.5 Hampton Court is now hosting an increased number of functions and events and we have had to establish procedures to manage the effect on the gardens and estates. Following the restoration of the Long Water Avenue the Flower Show site in Home Park was moved. This move resulted in allowing an extra five acres for the site, but we work in close partnership with the RHS to manage and prevent any long term damage.

Partnerships

D 0.6 HRP is keen to promote and develop partnerships with external stakeholders and educational organisations. This allows best practice to be developed and
shared across the sector and enables the Hampton Court estates to realise their potential as an educational and training resource.

D 0.7 HRP is always keen to develop new partnerships. At the time of writing HRP is working in partnership with the following organisations:

- The Royal Parks
- Surrey County Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
- Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
- Thames Landscape Strategy
- KLC School of Design
- The Royal Horticultural Society
- English Heritage
- The Gardens History Society
- The Florilegium Society
- NADFAS
- Kingston University
- The Causeway Centre
- Local colleges

Gardens and Estate Research since 2004

History and Archaeology

D 0.8 The following is a list of relevant research and archaeological surveys carried out since the production of the previous Gardens, Estates and Landscapes Conservation Management Plan (2004). Copies of all of these reports are stored in the Curators’ Office (Apt. 25) at Hampton Court Palace. For a full list see Appendix B.

- Maze Excavation, (Dec 2004)
- The Tiltyard Tower, Hampton Court Palace: Historic Building Recording, Oxford Archaeology (Feb 2006)
Hampton Court Home Park: Archaeological Desktop Assessment, Oxford Archaeology (Sept 2006)

Hampton Court Palace, The Tiltyard Tower: Historic Building Recording and Investigation, Oxford Archaeology (Jul 2008)


Hampton Court Palace, East Front Drainage: Archaeological Watching Brief, Oxford Archaeology (Oct 2008)

East Front Garden, Hampton Court Palace: Historic Building Recording, Oxford Archaeology (Nov 2008)


Privy Garden Collapse, Hampton Court Palace: Archaeological Evaluation Report, Oxford Archaeology (June 2009)

Orangery Lawn Hampton Court Palace: Archaeological Investigation Report, Oxford Archaeology (Feb 2009)

The Pavilion, Hampton Court Palace: Archaeological Assessment, Oxford Archaeology (Jul 2009)

Hampton Court Palace, Privy Garden Collapse: Preliminary Summary, Oxford Archaeology (Dec 2009)

Resurfacing Works, Base Court, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey: Post Excavation Assessment, Oxford Archaeology (Dec 2009)

Hampton Court Palace, Vrow Walk: Summary of Archaeological Recording and Assessment, Oxford Archaeology (Apr 2010)

Hampton Court Pipeline at The Pavilion and Barge Walk: Written Scheme of Investigation, Oxford Archaeology (Apr 2010)

Ecology and Biodiversity

Significant research has also been produced on the horticulture, ecology and biodiversity of the estates. Copies of the following reports are available from the Gardens and Estates Team.

Home Park and Hampton Court Palace: Phase I Habitat and Scoping Survey Report, RPS (Oct 2007)

Home Park and Hampton Court Palace: Review of Existing Ecological Data, RPS (Nov 2007)

Home Park and Hampton Court Palace: Water Vole Survey Report, RPS (Jun 2008)

Potential Future Research Directions

D 0.10 The following list represents an assessment of the current gaps in our knowledge of the Hampton Court estate and proposes a series of potential research directions to address these. As is established in General Policy 2 of this Conservation Management Plan it is desirable to pursue a programme of research and investigation independent from that required by the project planning process and the following list is intended as a guide to such research. As such it does not represent proposed or commissioned projects but those that it would be desirable to undertake as a way of building a broader and more complete understanding of the history of Hampton Court Palace and its environs.

D 0.11 It is recommended that this list is subject to frequent review and that new items are added as and when appropriate.

D 0.12 - Undertake a full landscape survey and assessment of Home Park (including desk based research, archaeology, hydrology, soils analysis, ditch and bank surveys, etc.) to analyse the development and different uses of the park and to build an understanding of its changing relationship to the palace.

D 0.13 - Research Hampton Court’s Tudor parks in general to put the estate into a wider context. How did the parks relate to the palace and the honour of Hampton Court? What was the extent of the parks enclosed in the sixteenth century? How did management and use of the parks work in practice?

D 0.14 - Continue archaeological investigations of the Lower Orangery and surrounding areas both to further analysis of the fabric of the early gardens uncovered in previous excavations and to recover the important terracotta remains known to be contained in the demolition rubble of the Tudor palace deposited in the area.

D 0.15 - Undertake an historical and archaeological survey of the Tiltyard Gardens with particular focus on the historic uses and the phases of development (particularly in relation to the extant historic walls).

D 0.16 - Carry out an archaeological assessment of the Great Fountain Garden in order to identify areas of particular importance, vulnerability and sensitivity ahead of the proposed use of the garden as the Hampton Court Festival site. This should subsequently inform the locating of associated temporary structures.
E. Our Policies

E 0.1 The intention of this Conservation Management Plan is to create a policy framework that reflects and implements in a practical way HRP's overarching Cause, Principles and Strategies (B 0.4 - B 0.13). Through the guidance of the policies detailed here HRP strives to provide the highest possible level of care for the whole estate.

E 0.2 These policies promote HRP's aim that its gardens and estates should be inspirational places that enable the public to understand their history in an enjoyable and engaging way. HRP endeavour to ensure that the gardens and estates provide a suitable setting for the palaces and that they showcase the highest standards of horticultural excellence and display.

E 0.3 The policies are firmly founded on the belief that these aims are only achievable through informed decision making drawing on professional expertise and a solid basis of research; the targeted implementation of resources; and the adoption of good management practices and sustainable methods.

E 0.4 Furthermore, the policies respond to the great diversity of Hampton Court's landscapes, which range from historically significant gardens and archaeological features to important natural habitats. The policies are thus divided in such a way as to reflect that whilst some are important for the estate as a whole (F. General Policies), others are applicable only to the unique requirements of individual character areas (G. Treatment of the Character Areas).

Figure 7: A gardener rolling the grass, early nineteenth century.
F. General Policies (Estate-Wide)

F 0.1 These are a series of policies which apply to all the character areas of the gardens, and which provide an amplification of HRP’s overall strategic goals. These are not listed in order of priority. The Gardens Strategy Group would like the Trustees of HRP to sign up to these policies, which would apply to the gardens, park, and landscape as a whole.

F 0.2 Each policy is followed by a list of the standards to be reached in the application of the general policy.

F 0.3 **GENERAL POLICY 1 - Conservation**

F 0.4 Conservation must remain the overriding priority and will dictate the overall character, appearance and usage of the estate and its environs as a whole.

F 0.5 HRP will continue to value and promote the significance of both the designed and natural aspects of the landscapes in all their forms.

F 0.6 Conservation of the parks and gardens should be part of a joined-up approach to the care and presentation of the estate as a whole and any operations should be linked with work identified by our building conservation policies.

F 0.7 There should be a regular peer group review of this Conservation Management Plan to test conservation philosophy and approach.

F 0.8 When we’re assessing schemes of improvement or any secondary uses (e.g. events and functions), we should take into account any likely or potential damage to fabric of historic value or to the character of the estate. In most cases the changes we make should be reversible.

F 0.9 As much garden waste as possible should be recycled and HRP should always strive to use eco-friendly methods of maintenance where appropriate.

Figure 8: The Great Fountain Garden in the mist.
F 0.10 **GENERAL POLICY 2 - History & Research**

F 0.11 Restoration and maintenance as means of conservation should be research-led and evidence-based. Visitors should be encouraged and enabled to appreciate the gardens and estates as a historic environment.

F 0.12 Research should not always be project led (i.e. undertaken to inform a proposed scheme of conservation, re-presentation or interpretation). Opportunities for investigation of the history of the parks and gardens independently from project based research should be pursued.

F 0.13 Any scheme of improvement should be based on full archival research, relevant archaeological investigation and recording, checked and approved by the Garden Strategy Group.

F 0.14 As a general principle, research and investigation should always lead the design of new garden schemes but the research and investigation must not be led by the design. Therefore, a degree of separation between the processes of research and design should be maintained.

F 0.15 A robust process of producing, distributing and storing research reports produced in the fulfilment of General Policy 2 should be established.

F 0.16 **GENERAL POLICY 3 – Beauty and Amenity**

F 0.17 Notwithstanding the emphasis on conservation and history, the gardens must continue to be a source of delight and beauty for the visitor.

F 0.18 The estate is an important and valued amenity to visitors and local residents and all efforts must be made to prevent developments that are to the detriment of its character.

F 0.19 Proposals for improvements should achieve high aesthetic standards. All proposed improvements should be appropriate to the wider context of Hampton Court, as well as to their specific situation, fit for purpose and exhibit quality of detail and material.

F 0.20 The process of producing designs should include peer group review to test them for consistency against the character, appearance and usage determined by the approach to character areas (see Part F).

F 0.21 **GENERAL POLICY 4 - Public Access**

F 0.22 Every effort must be made to provide reasonable access for all to the gardens, both physically and intellectually, taking into account the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act.

F 0.23 Intellectual access to the gardens and lifelong-learning must complement physical access as an important goal in the management of the estate.

F 0.24 The Disability Discrimination Act requires organisations to take reasonable steps to provide access for disabled people. In considering what ‘reasonable interventions’ might be, HRP will ensure that proposals are consistent with
conservation. All physical interventions should also conform to HRP design standards when possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F 0.25</th>
<th>GENERAL POLICY 5 - Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 0.26</td>
<td>Interpretation of the parks and gardens must be considered a priority. HRP favours ground-breaking forms of interpretation including film, props, live interpretation and art works. All these will be considered for use around the estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0.27</td>
<td>Where interpretation involves physical interventions (e.g. boards and signs) these should conform to HRP design standards and should be both appropriate and unobtrusive to the visual character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0.28</td>
<td>Parks and gardens interpretation should be considered as integral to the interpretation of the palace as a whole. It should be tied into and devised in tandem with palace interpretation as set out in the Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0.29</td>
<td>A joined-up approach to interpretation should be established so that the parks and gardens are included in palace-wide interpretation strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0.30</td>
<td>The interpretation budget is monitored by the Executive Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F 0.31</th>
<th>GENERAL POLICY 6 - Baroque &amp; Georgian Gardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 0.32</td>
<td>During the coming years there will be a palace-wide emphasis on the Baroque and Georgian histories of Hampton Court, leading up the anniversary of the Hanoverian Succession of 1714. Presentation, interpretation and usage strategies in the parks and gardens should, where appropriate, reflect and emphasise this historical period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0.33</td>
<td>Consideration should be given to schemes that emphasise the Baroque and Georgian history of the palace. Schemes that relate to the Baroque and Georgian periods and show potential for joined-up approaches under this interpretation strategy will, on the whole, be given preference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F 0.34</th>
<th>GENERAL POLICY 7 - Ecology &amp; Sustainable Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 0.35</td>
<td>Special attention should always be given to biodiversity priority and to protected species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0.36</td>
<td>A Tree Planting Plan will be established to manage and enhance the importance of the estate’s tree stock in both the designed and natural landscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0.37</td>
<td>HRP should work with the responsible authorities to monitor water quality from the Longford River (principally by continued dialogue with other members of the Longford River Working Party). Whenever water quality levels fall below the approved standard (as set by the Longford River Working Party) HRP will rectify the situation in conjunction with the Royal Parks and the water authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F 0.38 The use of chemicals in the gardens must be reduced to the minimum levels possible. Recycling of garden waste should be maximised.

F 0.39 All future activity should consider the implications on biodiversity and ecological habitats. These should be enhanced whenever the opportunity exists in accordance with sustainable management principles.

F 0.40 There should be constant monitoring of colonisation by alien species and all efforts should be made to eradicate or control non-native plants and animal populations.

F 0.41 Where possible there should be a preference towards retaining standing deadwood and creating log stacks in order to create deadwood habitat and encourage biodiversity.

F 0.42 Usage of chemicals should be in accordance with HRP's guidelines, and their usage should be specified in the maintenance plan. Organic solutions should be sought where possible.

F 0.43 Experience and best practice should be shared with wildlife officers from partner organisations. In particular HRP should work with the Royal Parks to ensure the continued role of deer herds in the ecological management of Home and Bushy Parks.

F 0.44 GENERAL POLICY 8 - Historic Plants

F 0.45 The conservation and re-creation of historic gardens requires a supply of historic plants, many of which are scarce or unobtainable from commercial nurseries. Hampton Court’s nurseries will continue to provide rare plants, and the actual strains that have grown at Hampton Court in the past will be carefully maintained as a ‘gene bank’ (in the form of seeds and historic plant material) for the future. Opportunities to use historic plants commercially will also be sought, together with the investigation of partnerships to protect and increase the stock of historic species.

F 0.46 A system for recording the strains of historic garden plants at Hampton Court, together with a plan for their propagation and conservation, should be put in place. This should include information regarding species, varieties and provenance. This system should draw upon and share expertise with related projects undertaken by HRP’s partner, including the Royal Parks and the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.

F 0.47 A target (achievable within current resources) should be set for this plan to be fully in operation so that Hampton Court can operate as a ‘gene bank’ to other restoration projects.

F 0.48 GENERAL POLICY 9 – Training and Partnerships

F 0.49 Gardens staff and management must continue to develop their skills and knowledge (particularly of garden history and craft skills) through training and external advice and they should put them into practice in the day-to-day management and presentation of the gardens.
F 0.50 ‘Skills mapping’ exercises (such as that previously undertaken in partnership with English Heritage and the Royal Parks) should be continued in order to identify and address skills gaps. Resulting opportunities for joint training programs should be investigated.

F 0.51 HRP should continue to pursue opportunities to work in partnership with other key stakeholders or educational organisations in order to promote and develop best practice across the sector and to realise the estate’s potential as an educational resource.

F 0.52 A maintenance plan should be prepared for schemes where restoration takes place to a specific historical period. These plans should be subject to independent peer review and reported upon annually.

F 0.53 The skill base should continue to be reviewed annually and training targets reconsidered.

F 0.54 HRP should network with its peers in other historic gardens at home and abroad to benchmark its work.

F 0.55 Trained staff should be given responsibilities commensurate with their skills.

Figure 9: Anon, Hampton Court Old Bridge, 1864
F 0.56 **GENERAL POLICY 10 - Buildings & Structures**

F 0.57 The estates and palace were designed to be an integral whole. All future developments within the estates or the palace must consider and emphasise the links between the two. Any changes to the gardens or estates must be informed by knowledge and understanding of their relationship to the history of the palace and to an assessment of the impact on the setting of the buildings.

F 0.58 Measures should be taken immediately when any structure in the grounds, including statuary, is recognised to be deteriorating perceptibly.

F 0.59 The State of the Estate Survey, which monitors the condition of all structures in the grounds, should specify operations and their frequencies.

F 0.60 The purpose and design of all new buildings and structures introduced to the gardens and estate must be informed by knowledge and understanding of their history.

F 0.61 **GENERAL POLICY 11 - Infrastructure**

F 0.62 The estate contains paths and roadways, services such as public lavatories and refreshment stands, car parks, signs, and interpretation materials, so that visitors have an enjoyable and convenient experience in the gardens. However, such modern interventions must be guided in their design by:

- Sensitivity to the character of the estate and buildings
- An understanding of their history
- Adherence to current legislation regarding access, health, safety, etc.
- Environmental sustainability
There should be an urgent and thorough examination of path and road surfaces in respect of their use and attractiveness.

In the long term, HRP should work towards the elimination of vehicular traffic and parking on the palace site, whilst ensuring that this policy does not result in inappropriate land usage in neighbouring areas.

Visitor satisfaction surveys should continue to be carried out annually.

The historic materials for paths and roadways - generally bound gravel - have very often been replaced by loose gravel, tarmac and other modern substitutes for reasons of availability or ease of maintenance, though to the grave detriment of the gardens’ character. Whilst a full conversion to bound gravel may not be possible it will be feasible in many locations, and more acceptable substitutes are available where vehicular traffic makes a hard-wearing surface necessary.

Path surfaces should be hard or compacted, to enable easy movement of wheelchairs and buggies. However, they should always be formed from an aesthetically appropriate material.

**GENERAL POLICY 12 - Pedestrian Priority**

Pedestrian access should have priority throughout the gardens and vehicular movement kept to an absolute minimum.

Any scheme of improvement should reduce the impact of necessary vehicular traffic upon the visitor experience.

**GENERAL POLICY 13 - Events & Entertainments**

The acceptable frequency and intensity of events will depend crucially upon how they are managed, and on the reversibility of their impact. Events must be considered positively, but within tight operating guidelines that prevent permanent, irreversible damage.

Events and functions which build upon, rather than work against, the special character of the palace and estates are always to be preferred as they can help to tell the story of the palace to new audiences.

The impact of events and functions upon the gardens and estates must be effectively monitored. A survey of the area affected by events should be carried out and reviewed regularly.

Structures erected in support of events must meet the specific requirements of the site; they must be temporary, non-damaging to historic fabric and archaeological deposits, aesthetically sensitive to the character of their surroundings and remain in place for the shortest possible period of time.

All events should be planned and managed in accordance to the terms set out in the Hampton Court Palace Events Policy (internal HRP document).

No permanent, irreversible damage must occur.
F 0.78 Operating guidelines should be produced in advance of every event and form part of the contract with the operator. Guidelines should be effectively enforced to ensure that permanent damage is prevented.

F 0.79 The impact of both one-off and repeated events should be regularly monitored. The information gathered by such monitoring should inform the production of guidelines for future events.

F 0.80 The impact of all events regularly held in the same location must be subject to a quinquennial assessment of their long-term impact. The terms of reference for this assessment must be established and be robust. Amongst other things it will monitor the condition of existing vegetation, the extent of soil compaction and associated ecological matters, the effect on archaeology and the impact on visitor enjoyment.

F 0.81 Events are a secondary function of the estate, and the success and potential income or publicity from any event or other secondary function should not be prioritised over the requirements for conservation, restoration, presentation or interpretation.

F 0.82 **GENERAL POLICY 14 - Resources**

F 0.83 HRP will ensure that sufficient resources – including finance, materials, workspace, staff capacity and skills – are always available to fulfil its duty of care for the estate.

F 0.84 As part of the Annual Operating Plan process, the Head of Gardens & Estates should prepare an assessment of resourcing requirements every year, assessing the scope for possible improvement with respect to the number of staff available.

F 0.85 The autumn meeting of the Garden Strategy Group is intended to review the direction set for work, and the resources to be bid for, in the coming year.

F 0.86 No new schemes should be planned unless they can be sustained in terms of time, skills and maintenance costs.

F 0.87 **GENERAL POLICY 15 – Creating New Gardens and Natural Habitats**

F 0.88 Our policy is always, in the first instance, to conserve, maintain and enhance the palace’s existing gardens and landscapes. At times, though, HRP may want to create new gardens or natural habitats for our visitors’ enjoyment.

F 0.89 A new garden or habitat will be considered on the basis of thorough research and consultation both in terms of its design and its impact.

F 0.90 The design of any new garden must be informed by and be respectful of the historic setting and context in which it is created. The quality of the design and of the execution of a new garden must be commensurate with the status of the palace and the quality of the existing historic gardens.

F 0.91 A new garden or natural habitat can be made only if investigation demonstrates that there is no significant surviving historic garden, archaeology, habitat or landscape feature that will be damaged or destroyed.
by its creation. Additionally a new garden that is judged to have a negative visual or intellectual impact on the general setting of the palace and its environs will not be permitted.

F 0.92 A new habitat must not have a negative impact on the natural biodiversity of existing habitats.

F 0.93 A new garden must considerably enhance and deepen visitors' understanding of the palace or add greatly to their enjoyment. Proposals must be shown to demonstrably add value to the estate and should be based on a strong business case.

F 0.94 **GENERAL POLICY 16 - Regular Review**

F 0.95 This Conservation Management Plan will be subject to consultation, review, adjustment and implementation. A regular review of its goals and progress should take part each year as part of the Annual Operating Planning process, and a major review should take place on a quinquennial basis.

F 0.96 **GENERAL POLICY 17 - Further Considerations**

F 0.97 We should continue and promote the ongoing and valuable collaboration with HRP's partners including the Royal Parks, English Heritage and local planning authorities. We should better publicise and build support for the work of HRP including that undertaken with its professional partners.

F 0.98 The Hampton Court estate must be related to other important landscapes nearby, chiefly Bushy Park and the River Thames.

F 0.99 HRP should endeavour to emphasise and promote links between the gardens and estates at Hampton Court and other international and European gardens. Especially those managed by our colleagues in the Association of the Royal Residences of Europe, and related horticultural institutions.
G. Treatment of the Character Areas

The Character Areas

G 0.1 In accordance with the methodology of this Conservation Management Plan, the estate has been divided into 16 Character Areas. Individual garden elements within each area share common aspects of historical development, a physical and visual identity and a similar pattern of use. They have been refined since the production of the 1997 Gardens Strategy Report and now comprise:

G 0.2  1. Home Park and the Pavilion
G 0.3  1a. Home Park Meadows
G 0.4  2. The Stud House and Stud Nursery
G 0.5  3. Hampton Court Road
G 0.6  4. The Walled Paddocks
G 0.7  5. The Arboretum and Twentieth Century Garden
G 0.8  6. The Great Fountain Garden
G 0.9  7. The Privy Garden
G 0.10 8. The Pond Gardens (including the Vine, Banqueting House and Orangery)
G 0.11 9. The Barge Walk
G 0.12 10. The West Front
G 0.13 11. The Tiltyard
G 0.14 12. The Wilderness
G 0.15 13. The Glasshouse Nursery
G 0.16 14. Hampton Court Green
G 0.17 15. The Palace Courtyards

G 0.18 A summary description of each character area follows. Each consists of: a brief survey of the history of the area; assessments of significance and vulnerability; and a list of policies established to ensure the protection of the area. In turn, these policies and statements of significance serve to define the acceptable uses for each character area.
A Plan of Hampton Court Gardens and Estates divided into 16 Character Areas
1. Home Park and the Pavilion

History and Character

G 1.1 Home Park covers an area of approximately 750 acres (303.5 hectares). The dry, sandy area within the bend of the river Thames has been recorded since the medieval period as grazing land. By the time Henry VIII took the palace from Cardinal Wolsey in 1529 the area had been enclosed as a deer park. The king developed this by walling in a deer course in the 1530s, and little was altered thereafter for 125 years. After Charles II was restored to the throne in 1660, a canal, probably the largest anywhere at the time was dug across the park from the East Front, and was flanked by a double avenue of lime trees. This avenue, the Long Water Avenue, was felled in Autumn 2003 and replanted in Winter 2003-4.

G 1.2 After William III’s accession, George London, the Royal Gardener, added diagonal avenues radiating from the palace, and a cross avenue linking their far ends. In 1701 his partner, Henry Wise, made a terrace overlooking the Thames from the south end of the Fountain Garden to a bowling green, and extended the arrangement to link to the cross avenue via a dog-leg avenue. A ‘Lower Wilderness’ was made below the end of the canal; this was destroyed by flooding in the 1740s.

G 1.3 By 1702 four two-storied pavilions had been constructed at each corner of the bowling green, in accordance with an original idea of Hawksmoor’s, but to a design by William Talman. Amongst the various external decorative elements of these pavilions were rooftop urns designed by John Nost. All four pavilions continued as residences (principally for members of the royal family) into the early nineteenth century, the eastern most pair having been joined by a connecting wing in 1792. In 1822, however, the western pair of pavilions were demolished, due to their poor state of repair. In 1853 the north-eastern pavilion and the connecting wing were also taken down. Only the south-eastern pavilion (now called ‘The Pavilion’) survives to the present day. This was granted to Ernest Law in 1895, and remained his home until his death in 1930. There is a proposal to rebuild the north-eastern pavilion.

G 1.4 By the 1740s, royal interest in Home Park had declined, and the park became the preserve of ‘grace-and-favour’ residents. The Pavilion at the bowling green became the official residence of the Keeper, who was generally drawn from the royal line, until 1820. The Stud House (Character Area 2) was brought up-to-date with informal pleasure grounds, whilst additional paddocks were provided elsewhere (Character Area 4). The park was opened to the public in 1893, shortly after which a Golf Club was permitted. The course opened in 1895 and was designed by Willy Park, a master of his craft who also designed Sunningdale. As an early golf course, its layout is of great interest to enthusiasts. Model boat clubs followed, which were given permission to use the Rick Pond. The Great Storm of 1987 severely damaged the already declining avenues, and their replacement was begun in 1992. In
2003 a new clubhouse was constructed for the Golf Club to a design more in keeping with the historic context of Home Park.

G 1.5 Since the sixteenth century the park has been home to herds of deer. Until the early 1990s Home Park was also grazed by sheep, but these were removed in 1992 and the size of the deer herd was increased from 200 to 300 animals.

G 1.6 There has been great consistency in the management of the park over the past 500 years, this has enabled the formation of its special ecological habitats. Together, Home Park and its neighbour Bushy Park form a larger geographic whole.

Significance

G 1.7 Although there is comparatively little historic fabric in Home Park, what there is is of considerable importance. The park is part of the Grade I landscape; stretches of the boundary wall are Tudor or seventeenth century; the Long Water, with its associated features and avenues, is an internationally important example of garden design and of landscape engineering; the Pavilion is designated Grade II* listed by English Heritage and the Ice House is Grade II.

G 1.8 The bed of the Longford River, dug for Charles II, represents a potentially important archaeological deposit.

G 1.9 Home Park is an important area of green space on the edge of London and a valued local amenity. As such it is recognised as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMINC) by Natural England.

G 1.10 Landscape management of the park has changed little for many hundreds of years and therefore it represents an important historic habitat.

Figure 11: Deer, Home Park
G 1.11 - Ecological surveys have revealed Home Park to be a rich wildlife haven supporting many species of rare plants and animals. In particular there are amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals (including bats), acid grasslands, wetlands, aquatics, veteran trees and plants including mistletoe, galingale and the Autumn Squill.

G 1.12 - The deer herd comprises 300 fallow deer and has been acknowledged by the British Deer Society as one of the finest herds in the country. The deer herd also lie at the heart of Hampton Court’s history and reflects the original reason for the enclosure of the park. As such they show a 500 year continuity of land use.

G 1.13 - Home Park is a revenue generating asset and hosts the annual Flower Show as well as receiving rents from the Golf Club.

G 1.14 - The Golf Club is historically interesting because of its early design and as a further example of established continuity of function. Similarly the model yacht club also provides a small income and represents a continuing historic use of the park.

Vulnerability

G 1.15 - Important habitats and species are fragile and rely on low intensity of maintenance and use to survive.

G 1.16 - Vehicle traffic in the park detracts from the historic character and causes ecological damage. It has also led to inappropriate developments including the removal of the Stud Gates and the laying of asphalt road surfaces.

G 1.17 - The historic structures in the park are not currently being given the level of conservation they require.

G 1.18 - Damage to the historic avenues has been caused by storms and by policies of inter-planting. Although the Long Water and Cross Avenues have been successfully replanted, work is still required to restore the Kingston and Ditton Avenues.

G 1.19 - Large areas of water and historically important water features require careful management to conserve and maintain as healthy habitats.

G 1.20 - The intensity of use during events, especially the Flower Show, causes considerable ecological, horticultural and aesthetic damage to the park.

Progress and Development since 2004

G 1.21 Significant progress has been made in Home Park since 2004; most importantly we have a new understanding of importance of the area ecologically thanks to the London Wildlife Trust’s Home Park: Phase 2 NVC Habitat Survey (2010).

G 1.22 The replanting of the Long Water Lime Avenue was completed in 2004. This restoration was embellished by a new water feature, the Jubilee Fountain.
G 1.23 Water features continue to be subject to a regular routine of inspection, maintenance and repair. We are exploring new and traditional ways of controlling aquatic weeds and algae, including maintaining fish-stocks, planting Norfolk reed beds and trialling eco-friendly electronic pulsars to prevent algal growth. We are working in partnership with Sparsholt College to provide reciprocal training in water management. The Longford River has also been surveyed along its entire length allowing better future planning of inspection, maintenance and flow control policies.

G 1.24 A Home Park Infrastructure Project has been developed in conjunction with the Royal Horticultural Society (RHS) in order to address issues of access and long-term damage to road surfaces caused by the annual Flower Show. In addition policies have been developed in conjunction with the HRP Functions and Events team and other partners for the use of specific areas for events in Home Park. We continue to work closely with other partners, namely the Hampton Court Palace Golf Club, the Model Yacht Club, the RHS and our equine operators to ensure that our policies on ecological management are put into practice. New signage and interpretation panels have also been installed in the park.

G 1.25 The deer herd comprises of 300 fallow deer. We now employ the services of the British Deer Society’s vet to advise us on best practice and management. As a result we have introduced three new fallow sore bucks from an historic herd at Powderham Castle, Devon, to add a new blood-line into the herd. It is the first time new stock has been introduced in thirty years.

Character Area Policy

G 1.26 HRP’s VISION: We see Home Park retaining its special beauty and character as an important historic managed habitat and as a valued local amenity.

G 1.27 HRP’S POLICY: To reinforce the historic character of Home Park as an open deer park, for instance, by restoring the avenues and maintaining the waterways in their former state. To recognise and preserve the important ecological value of Home Park and to protect and enhance the area as a habitat for native species.

G 1.28 New temporary uses of the Park should respect its character and ecology. Mitigation measures for each event must prevent irreversible damage. The effectiveness of all such mitigation measures must be regularly reviewed and measures adapted, where necessary, to ensure the prevention of irreversible damage.

Policies

G 1.29 - C.A. POLICY 1A - Management ties should be developed between the properties in the park and HRP in order to ensure that any development or change is undertaken with due regard to the history and conservation of Home Park.
a. A policy of removing inappropriate coniferous trees from the park cottages should be continued.
b. A management plan should be developed for their gardens and included in the licence agreement for these properties.

G 1.30 - C.A. POLICY 1B - The Avenues are an important feature of the historic landscape of Home Park and should be conserved and restored.

a. The development of habitats in the replanted Long Water Avenue should be monitored and protected and methods should be implemented to prevent soil compaction in these areas.
b. Preparations should be made, in the long term, for restoration and replanting of the Kingston and Ditton Avenues.
c. One of either the Ditton and Kingston Avenues should be replanted and restored in 2020 (subject to the successful reestablishment of habitats in the Long Water Avenue).

G 1.31 - C.A. POLICY 1C - The dispersed character of other trees in Home Park (i.e. those not forming part of an avenue) should be carefully maintained and controlled.

a. The strategic views and vistas of the deer park should be preserved.
b. Regular assessments of the surviving tree stock should be undertaken.

Figure 12: Home Park Ponds
G 1.32 - C.A. POLICY 1D – Specific management procedures should be put in place to monitor and preserve the important and sensitive mosaic of ecological grassland found in Home Park.

a. In some areas grass cutting is considered necessary; especially for the Flower Show site, for car parking, for walks, and to prevent grass fires (HRP has an obligation to create firebreaks in Home Park).

b. Vegetation change will be monitored and change or improvement will be limited and resisted to retain ecological diversity and nutrient-poor grassland.

c. Planting of trees should be strictly restricted in our areas of ecologically-significant grassland.

G 1.33 - C.A. POLICY 1E – The deer herd should be recognised as essential to the character, history and ecological management of Home Park and should be managed accordingly.

a. HRP should work in partnership with the British Deer Society to ensure that best practice for deer herd management is followed.

b. HRP will liaise with the Royal Parks to ensure that common management policies are implemented to deal with major issues such as foot and mouth outbreaks.

c. The deer herd should be retained at a herd-strength numbering approximately 300 animals.

G 1.34 - C.A. POLICY 1F – HRP will work in partnership with Natural England and other statutory bodies to ensure that all shooting of deer and other species is carried out in accordance with current legislation.

G 1.35 - C.A. POLICY 1G – Continue to monitor the Longford River in partnership with the Royal Parks and other agencies and respond as necessary to adverse changes in flow or water quality.

G 1.36 - C.A. POLICY 1H – Work in partnership with the Royal Parks to ensure that river water extraction rights are retained at the current level (20,000 litres per day)

G 1.37 - C.A. POLICY 1I – Ensure that water features are maintained at the highest possible standard in terms of their aesthetic quality, their upkeep and repair and the quality of the ecology.

a. Continue to explore and implement new and traditional methods of controlling aquatic weeds, including algae.
b. Continue to monitor and repair bank erosion using traditional green engineering methods.

c. Continue to work in partnership with educational organisations to provide reciprocal training in water management.

d. Maintain and enhance the fish stocks in the Home Park water features.

G 1.38  -  C.A. POLICY 1J - A management plan should continue to be implemented by the Golf Club under HRP’s supervision and should be informed by current initiatives designed to improve the conservation and management of golf courses which incorporate historic fabric and acid grassland.

G 1.39  -  C.A. POLICY 1K – Events should only be permitted in Home Park where suitable measures to reduce their impact can be demonstrated and implemented.

   a. Clauses designed to prevent significant damage should appear in every licence issued for the use of Home Park.

   b. We will continue to work in partnership with the RHS to ensure that the Flower Show minimises its impact upon Home Park. Monitoring of the Flower Show through its licence and its annual operating plan must continue.

G 1.40  -  C.A. POLICY 1L – Developments to Home Park infrastructure should not be allowed to impinge on the character of the area.

   a. Estate roads should be narrow and be made of appropriate surfacing material.
1a. The Home Park Meadows

History and Character

G 1a.1 Although within the boundary of Home Park, the meadows or paddocks at the eastern end of the park have a very different character to the rest of the park and as such may be treated as a separate Character Area.

G 1a.2 The lower land beyond the canal has always been prone to flooding, and this has prevented building as well as ensuring the continuing fertility of the meadow. The meadows at the eastern end of the park were acquired by William III as grazing for the royal stud, and have been grazed ever since. The boundary was set in the early eighteenth century, and has remained to this day. The Ditton passage, intended to provide a direct route from the Ditton Ferry (now discontinued) to the palace was made when the park was opened to the public in the 1890s.

G 1a.3 The water courses located in the Home Park meadows form the outflow from the Longford River after it has passed through the palace’s water features and the area itself is crisscrossed with ditches which may have historically formed part of the River Thames floodplain.

Significance

G 1a.4 - The area represents a potentially significant (although currently poorly maintained) area of wetland habitat.

G 1a.5 - The network of ditches represents important evidence of historical land-use and suggests that the area may have interesting archaeology.

G 1a.6 - As part of the larger area of Home Park, the Home Park Meadows are part of an important area of green space on the edge of London. Consequently it is recognised as part of the Bushy and Home Park Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMINC).

Vulnerability

G 1a.7 - Degradation of the ditch network (partly by the action of puddling by grazing horses) has damaged the wetland character of the area. Poorly maintained ditches also reduce the biodiversity of the wetland habitat.

G 1a.8 - Encroaching scrub has reduced the biodiversity of the habitat.

G 1a.9 - Colonisation of the meadows by aggressive non-native species (including Japanese knotweed and mink) threatens native biodiversity.
Progress and Developments since 2004

G 1a.10 HRP Gardens and Estates team, in partnership with the Thames Landscape Strategy, has begun to put in place a project to restore the Home Park Meadows as wetland habitat by bringing the ditch network back into working order. An initial grant has been raised from the SITA Trust with which to fund the project and further grant funding will be found to develop the project further. This will link the area into a green corridor of wetland habitats that stretches from the Special Protection Area at Knight and Bessborough Reservoirs to the London Wetlands Centre at Barnes.

Character Area Policy

G 1a.11 **HRP's VISION:** Through careful research and restoration the Home Park Meadows will be returned to their former state as a flourishing and valuable wetland and meadow habitat.

G 1a.12 **HRP's POLICY:** To restore, on the basis of research and surveys, the Home Park Meadow reedbed and ditch network as an important wetland habitat and to manage the area accordingly in future with an eye to improving the biodiversity of the wetland habitat.

Policies

G 1a.13 - C.A. POLICY 1aA - HRP should commission hydrological and topographical surveys of the area to establish current water flow levels.

G 1a.14 - C.A. POLICY 1aB - Undertake geo-archaeological survey and historical research to develop an understanding of the historic land practices and identify sensitive areas on site. This survey is essential to inform proposals before G 1a.15, G 1a.18a, 18e and 18f. are implemented.

G 1a.15 - C.A. POLICY 1aC - Establish plans for changes in ground levels to obtain improved water movement across the site.

G 1a.16 - C.A. POLICY 1aD - Extend the Phase 1 habitat survey to detail any areas of existing habitat or species that should be protected or enhanced.

G 1a.17 - C.A. POLICY 1aE - Establish a mink monitoring and extermination programme to improve the habitat for populations of water voles

G 1a.18 - C.A. POLICY 1aF - Restore the existing reedbeds and create new reedbed areas.
a. Excavate and restore the network of ditches to ensure better water retention and movement.
b. Remove scrub to allow re-establishment of reed species.
d. Manage the existing willow trees through coppicing.
e. Create new areas of open water.
f. Transplant existing reed rhizome to new reedbed areas.

G 1a.19 - C.A. POLICY 1aG - Allow continued but controlled grazing of the area by horses.
2. The Stud House and Stud Nursery

History and Character

G 2.1 A Royal Stud existed at Hampton Court from the time of William III and is recorded throughout the reigns of Queen Anne and the first three Georges.

G 2.2 The Stud House, situated in the Home Park on the north side of the Long Canal, was the official residence of the Master of the Horse. The present house is of uncertain date, though it may occupy the site of the former stables and courtyard. It appears in drawings at the Hermitage in Russia dating from the 1770s, although a reference in *The Lady* of 1910 records it as having been built in 1782. George IV, as Prince of Wales and Prince Regent, brought the Stud to prominence, and in 1815 the Stud House was conferred on the Prince Regent's private secretary, Bloomfield, who also supervised operations there.

G 2.3 In 1815, work was undertaken on the house and paddocks (in Home Park) totalling almost £24,000 and further major alterations were made in 1817-1818 when the kitchens and offices were enlarged. The following year even more extensive work was undertaken for the proposed accommodation of the Regent's personal establishment at a cost of almost £4,500. A further surge of work recorded in 1820 cost an additional £3,000. Work on the paddocks and fences was paid for by the Office of Works, while repairs to the Stud House should have come from the Civil List. A confusion over responsibility however, led to the whole being placed under the Office of Works in June 1821.
On his accession, George IV auctioned the Stud itself, while the paddocks and stables passed to his brother, Frederick Duke of York, who held them until his death in 1827. At this point the king reclaimed them until his own death in 1830. Lady Bloomfield, who had been granted the rangership of Home Park, was persuaded to quit the premises in 1830 when it was transferred to the Master of the Horse, Lord Albemarle. In 1832, Lewis William Wyatt, the Office of Works surveyor, supervised a further re-shaping of the Stud House until he lost his post on 5 April 1832. The entire property was again put under the hammer on the death of William IV in 1837. The glasshouse connected to the Stud House was designed by John Nash. Stud House was surrendered to the Crown Estate Commissioners in 1959 and is presently leased by them to tenants. A square building north of the stables and laundry was demolished between 1947 and 1955.

The Stud Nursery is the old kitchen garden of the Stud House and is used for storage by HRP. It remained in use as a kitchen garden up to the Second World War. After the war it became a nursery supplying trees and shrubs to all the royal palaces, although latterly it was only used for Hampton Court.

Significance

- Although of limited architectural or horticultural significance the Stud House (Grade II listed) and its garden are nonetheless important because of their location and historic relationship with the estate. However, the Stud House is privately leased and is under the control of the Crown Estates.

- The Stud Nursery, which is in part leased out by HRP, provides both income and storage.

- The Stud Nursery continues to be used as a nursery and this retained historic purpose and integrity is to be valued.

- It is likely that the site contains archaeological deposits. It is bisected by the line of Henry’s culvert.

Vulnerability

- As long as the Stud House remains outside the control of HRP there is a danger that inappropriate use or additions could impinge upon the park.

- The Stud House garden is not listed by English Heritage.

- The Stud Nursery remains an underused resource for HRP.

Progress and Development since 2004

The leaseholder of the Stud House has changed and the new occupant is keen on restoring both the house and garden. The Garden and Estates team provided guidance documents and advised on the constraints that should be
followed to ensure that the garden is conserved and maintained as a Regency villa garden. Acting on HRP’s advice the occupant employed independent garden designers and has created a new garden much more in keeping with the grace and openness of the original. This work has also seen the restoration of a section of the walled kitchen garden and the removal of several unsightly garden features.

G 2.14 Much of the Stud House Nursery has been licensed to the Causeway Centre operated by the London Borough of Kingston upon Thames. The Causeway Centre provides training in horticulture and carpentry for people with learning difficulties. Some of the Stud Nursery is used as storage for HRP’s Curators and Surveyors teams. The remaining area is planted as a wildlife sanctuary which supports the ecological management plan for Home Park.

Character Area Policy

G 2.15 **HRP’s VISION:** We will seek to use this area in a way that provides continuity with its historic function. It will be both an important resource for the management of the wider estate and a place in which to foster partnership working and education.

G 2.16 **HRP’s POLICY:** To continue to seek non-damaging, low intensity use for the Stud Nursery with a preference towards it continuing to fulfil its function as a nursery. To work closely with the occupant of the Stud House, advising him/her on appropriate garden design that complements the architecture of the house and does not impinge on the character of Home Park.

Policies

G 2.17 - **C.A. POLICY 2A** - Work with the occupants of Stud House to ensure that guidelines for the management and presentation of the house and gardens are met.

G 2.18 - **C.A. POLICY 2B** - Continue to review the uses and purpose of the Stud Nursery and consider any new opportunities for the site as they arise.
   a. Continue to work with the Causeway Centre and examine further opportunities to use the Stud Nursery to its full potential.
   b. Parts of the Stud House Nursery should be maintained as an ecological planting area / wildlife sanctuary.

G 2.19 - **C.A. POLICY 2C** - Pursue opportunities to research and survey the extent of the surviving historic fabric of the Stud House and Nursery.
G 2.20 - C.A. POLICY 2D - Review the storage facilities for archaeological and architectural collections (currently used by the Curators and Surveyors teams) and consider possibilities for creating more permanent specialised storage facilities.
3. Hampton Court Road

History and Character

G 3.1 This road is an ancient right of way from Kingston Bridge to Hampton Court Green. It became walled in the 1530s when Henry VIII enclosed deer-chasing ‘courses’ on each side of the road. Various inns and houses were constructed to serve the needs of the palace and its visitors during the seventeenth century. These encroached onto highway land giving rise to the present properties outside the Lion Gate. The road was tidied up in 1701 with a 10 feet (3.1m) wide footpath. Since then little has changed except for some nineteenth-century planting along the roadside, and improvements by the highway authorities in the twentieth century to cope with a huge increase in traffic.

Figure 14: The King’s Arms Hotel and the Lion Gate from Hampton Court Road c.1900.

Significance

G 3.2 - The Hampton Court Road separating Bushy Park from the Home Park provides the link between the two parts of the historic estate; this is most evident in the area around the Lion Gate.

G 3.3 - The principal built fabric along Hampton Court Road is the long stretch of Tudor and later walls with associated gate piers. These are of some distinction and of great historical importance and include some Grade I listed features.

G 3.4 - A few of the trees and climbers along Vrow Walk are of minor horticultural interest.
G 3.5 - This is one of the major approaches to the palace for visitors arriving by road and helps to build a first impression of the estate.

G 3.6 - Although the archaeological potential of the road is probably low, it is thought that demolition rubble from the Tudor palace was used as a consolidating layer during its construction.

Vulnerability

G 3.7 - Inappropriate developments to properties bordering the road impinge on the character of the estate as a whole.

G 3.8 - High traffic levels cause pollution and limit the ecological diversity.

G 3.9 - The road design and associated street furniture give the area a cluttered municipal feel.

G 3.10 - Maintenance requirements (including grass mowing, tree management, weed killing and leaf and litter clearance) are hazardous to staff and to traffic.

Progress and Developments since 2004

G 3.11 HRP has undertaken to work in partnership with Surrey County Council, Elmbridge Borough Council, the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, the Royal Parks and the Thames Landscape Strategy to form the Hampton Court Gateways project. This is designed to improve the approach routes and wider setting of the palace. It is funded by Transport for London and uses money set aside for developing new and improved cycle routes by carrying out associated landscape improvement schemes. This has led to new cycle and pedestrian paths from Kingston Bridge to Lion Gate marked by attractive grass strips, wooden posts and granite sets. Other significant landscaping proposals have been made where Hampton Court Road meets Hampton Court Green and plans are in place for lowering and redesigning the Hampton Court roundabout to further enhance the palace’s setting.

Character Area Policy

G 3.12 **HRP's VISION:** We aim to work alongside external stakeholders to ensure that Hampton Court Road becomes an area with a character that reflects the royal history of the estates. We believe that the approaches to the palace should share something of the peaceful splendour of the rest of the estate.

G 3.13 **HRP's POLICY:** To make Hampton Court Road feel like it is part of a historic royal estate, and to make it feel significantly different from the environment of the surrounding roads. Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians are aware that they are passing through a special place.

G 3.14 The visual links from the palace to the grand approach in Bushy Park across Hampton Court Road should be enhanced and the historic links between the two parks restored.
N.B. See also the Bushy Park Management Plan.

Policies

G 3.15 - C.A. POLICY 3A - Maintain partnerships and continue the good work of the Hampton Court Gateways project to further enhance the area.

G 3.16 - C.A. POLICY 3B - Develop and implement a tree planting plan with strategies to further improve the character and appearance of the area.

G 3.17 - C.A. POLICY 3C - Simple interventions should be implemented to emphasise the regal character of the area. These might include placing additional posts and markers to distinguish the area from surrounding roads.

G 3.18 - C.A. POLICY 3D - Unify the appearances of Hampton Court Road and Hampton Court Green.
   a. Replace existing timber post and rails along Vrow Walk to match those on Hampton Court Green.
   b. Reduce the gravel areas along Vrow Walk and replace them with grass strips.
   c. Remove all the ornamental trees and climbers from the walls of Vrow Walk.

G 3.19 - C.A. POLICY 3E - Ensure that development proposals and land-use by properties bordering Hampton Court Road are monitored and appropriate action is taken against any proposals that impinge negatively on the setting of the estate.
4. The Walled Paddocks

History and Character

G 4.1 The three Walled Paddocks are all that remain of 16 originally created around 1810, for the Royal Stud, between the northern diagonal avenue, Kingston Avenue, and the Hampton Court Road. These paddocks remained in use until 1932, by which time the Royal Stud no longer had use for them and returned the land to the Royal Parks. The walls dividing these paddocks were demolished over the next three years, leaving just three remaining. These paddocks were employed in the management of the deer herd until the 1980s.

Figure 15: Washing the shire horses in the Walled Paddock

Significance

G 4.2 The Walled Paddocks continue to be used for horse grazing giving it a 200 year continuity of function.

Vulnerability

G 4.3 The lack of a clearly formulated policy for the paddocks leaves them vulnerable to being used intensively for short-term purposes, such as visitor parking.

Progress and Developments since 2004

G 4.4 All the areas of the Walled Paddocks are now used for horse grazing, although they are occasionally used as overflow car parking for the Flower Show. The old Grace and Favour allotments have been removed because of a fall in usage for that purpose and the area returned to grazing.
by Japanese knotweed, giant hogweed and ragwort is being controlled in
this area and attempts are being made to eradicate it.

Character Area Policy

G 4.5 **HRP's VISION:** We believe that the continuity of use in the Walled Paddocks
is valuable and should be retained, since these are the last survivors of many
similar former walled paddocks on the estate.

G 4.6 **HRP's POLICY:** The Walled Paddock should continue to fulfil its historic
function as grazing for horses but may occasionally be used for short-term
low impact activities such as temporary car parking.

Policies

G 4.7 - **C.A. POLICY 4A** - Maintain the Walled Paddocks as horse grazing land
and continue to use the stables to house horses.

G 4.8 - **C.A. POLICY 4B** - Short-term usage of the Paddocks should fall within the
general estate-wide policies.

G 4.9 - **C.A. POLICY 4C** - Continue to work towards complete removal of
invasive alien species from the area.

![Figure 16: Shire horse in the Walled Paddock.](image)
5. The Arboretum and Twentieth Century Garden

History and Character

G 5.1 Historic views from the northern arm of the Great Fountain Garden show that this area was historically part of the park. When the paddocks were constructed in c.1810 a tree and shrub screen was planted under the wall to conceal it, though the wider view was lost. After the Superintendent of the Hampton Court Pleasure Grounds was given responsibility for the Home Park in 1890 this small area came to be regarded not as park, but as an empty garden enclosure. Since the Tiltyard was then on lease as a nursery it was probably used for cultivation. In the 1970s it came to be used as an arboretum and subsequently as a training ground for garden apprentices, being planted up with many plants then fashionable, including ornamental conifers. It is now is an informal modern garden, designed to provide an attractive setting for a marquee erected on the permanent standing.

Significance

G 5.2 - The principal significance of the area lies in the horticultural fabric planted over the last 30 years, including several scarce and unusual plants, such as a collection of rare hollies or ilex species.

G 5.3 - The garden is enclosed by a number of early eighteenth-century walls and railings of great interest.

G 5.4 - The present aesthetic quality of the arboretum lies in the fact that it is a hidden surprise and in the context of Hampton Court this is experienced as a pleasant change.

Figure 17: The Twentieth Century Garden and Arboretum.
Vulnerability
G 5.5 - As these areas are well concealed and of only limited historic interest it is not considered a particularly sensitive area.
G 5.6 - Despite little evidence for significant historic uses the possibility of archaeological deposits should not be discounted.
G 5.7 - Historic fabric, including the early eighteenth-century railing, are fragile and in poor condition.

Progress and Developments since 2004
G 5.8 The use of this area is currently under review and HRP have entered into partnership with the KLC School of Garden Design to find new uses for the area. It is proposed that KLC use the garden as a training resource perhaps developing a series of appropriate themed gardens. We await design proposals suggesting that part of the area will also be redesigned as a sensory garden with the particular access requirements of disabled visitors taken into account. These changes would be in part funded by KLC.

Character Area Policy
G 5.9 HRP's VISION: We believe that this area deserves to be better presented for and enjoyed more by our visitors. To achieve this we will encourage new designs for the garden and promote better access.
G 5.10 HRP's POLICY: With the help of KLC, HRP has a long-term aim to create an exciting new garden which has an emphasis on access for all and may be utilised as a training resource for horticulture students. The area should have the feel of a community garden and its potential as a place for temporary events, such as contemporary sculpture exhibitions, should be promoted. However, at the same time it is desirable that the area retains the impression of being a 'secret garden'.

Policies
G 5.11 - C.A. POLICY 5A - To work in partnership with KLC School of Garden Design in order to develop a landscape master plan for the garden which includes a space set out as an accessible or sensory garden.
G 5.12 - C.A. POLICY 5B - To repair the railings and restore the historic gates to the Twentieth Century garden.
G 5.13 - C.A. POLICY 5C - To support the SMC case for introducing a new footbridge across the north canal to give a new access route into the garden, if the visitor need can be clearly demonstrated. An SMC application for a temporary bridge was made in the summer of 2011.

a. To establish specific guidance for the design of a new footbridge that satisfies HRP’s design principles and meets English Heritage requirements.

G 5.14 - C.A. POLICY 5D - Manage and enhance the collection of trees in the arboretum in accordance with HRP tree management and planting strategies.
6. The Great Fountain Garden

History and Character

G 6.1 The Long Water and double avenue of lime trees created by Charles II in 1660-61 were supplemented early in the reign of William and Mary by the addition of the Ditton and Kingston Avenues, creating a *patte d’oie*. These features were divided from the Great Fountain Garden by extensive iron railings and two ornate gates made by Jean Tijou. The enclosed area to the east front of the palace was laid out in an outer elaborate cutwork and inner *broderie* parterre designed by Daniel Marot. Thirteen fountains were incorporated into the design, giving it the name of the Great Fountain Garden, although the fountains were never put into full working order. In 1700, work resumed on the unfinished garden and topiary and flowerbeds were added to the parterre. Four bronze statues by Le Sueur were brought from Whitehall and four great marble vases, two by Edward Pierce and two by Caius Gabriel Cibber were also introduced. A design for a figure for the central fountain was made but not installed.

G 6.2 William III had the 60-foot (18.29-metre) wide Broad Walk added from the park to create a continuous walk from Flower Pot Gate to the semi-circle overlooking the river. Brick walls enclosed it on the west side, and additional railings existed on the east, extending far enough to enclose the cross avenues running north-south from the central semi-circle.

G 6.3 The parterre had a short life as in 1707 Queen Anne removed all except one of the fountains, which had never worked satisfactorily, and replaced the *broderie*, cutwork and beds by a simpler arrangement of a turfed parterre with three radial walks with borders alongside. Some of the present yews
survive from this scheme. In 1710 she moved the eastern railings further into the park, and had canals dug inside them.

G 6.4 As the yews grew out (under Capability Brown’s direction), they shaded out all other plants in the beds. From 1838, public access to the gardens had increasingly detrimental effects. Great improvements were needed and so the border under the west wall was planted with climbing roses, and yews were cleared out of the semicircle of beds by the trees in order to allow for some elaborate bedding schemes. These became famous in the second half of the nineteenth century. They were discontinued in the First World War, but later those beneath the wall by the Broad Walk (not those along the radial walk) were reinstated and became mixed borders of the utmost size and quality. Their character became herbaceous rather than mixed by the 1970s, but the bedding out schemes continued as perhaps nowhere else in the country. The present statues (mostly artificial stone by Austin & Seeley) are replacements of the 1860s, though the two large vases on the east front are the originals from 1700, reinstated in 1981.

G 6.5 To celebrate The Queen’s Golden Jubilee, two crowns, composed of 14,000 carpet bedding plants, were installed to either side of the central gates to the East Front of the palace. Background plants used included Alternthera and Iresine with details picked out in compact succulents such as Echeveria and Sempervivum and foliage plants such as Arabis.

Significance

G 6.6 - The Great Fountain Garden is one of the most important and recognisable historic gardens in Europe and serves as a focal area for the entire estate.

G 6.7 - It contains highly important built fabric much of which is Grade I listed. This includes magnificent boundary walls, ironwork by Tijou, fine statuary, the Victorian bridges over the canals, the fountain basin, and many other notable features.

G 6.8 - The potential for archaeological deposits is high and the subsurface survival of well preserved garden features of great historical significance is certain.

G 6.9 - A large number of yew trees planted in 1707, as well as three holly trees, are still in situ.

G 6.10 - There is an important continuity of maintenance practice in the Great Fountain Garden, particularly the bedding, the herbaceous border and the work on the yew trees.

G 6.11 - The area generates some revenue both as an attractive draw to visitors and as a space in which major events and functions can be held.

G 6.12 - The Great Fountain Garden relates closely with the surrounding areas of the estate such as: the palace itself, Home Park, Hampton Court Road, the Tennis Court, the Privy Garden, the Terrace Walk and views to Kingston.
Vulnerability

G 6.13 - The extremely high profile of this area means that any change or deterioration is noticed immediately by the public.

G 6.14 - Although of very great historic interest, the garden does not reflect one specific period. Interpretation is required to enable the visitor to appreciate its complexity and to respect a number of features, including the antiquity of the trees, the hard landscape features such as the Tijou ironwork and the later bedding schemes.

G 6.15 - The area is vulnerable to loss of status and to damage to its fabric caused by inappropriate use including picnicking and the playing of ball games and from the inappropriate positioning, design and management of temporary structures.

G 6.16 - The gravel surface of the paths detracts from the visitors’ enjoyment and introduces dust into the palace. It also limits access and does not meet the requirements of pushchairs, wheelchair users and other disabled visitors.

G 6.17 - Fragile archaeological deposits could be vulnerable to damage by heavy use and temporary structures in the area during events and functions.

G 6.18 - Important statuary, especially the lead-work on the Flowerpot Gate, is particularly vulnerable to vandalism or theft.

G 6.19 - The yew trees are ancient and require careful management. Some have already been lost from the layout and have not been replaced. Heavy footfall around the base of the yew trees causes soil compaction and is damaging to the trees.
G 6.20 - There is occasional vehicular access which creates wear to the path surfaces and generates dust.

G 6.21 - The area is adjacent to The Pavilion, which is privately leased. Inappropriate developments to the gardens or setting of that property may have a detrimental impact on the setting of the palace.

**Progress and Developments since 2004**

G 6.22 The high standard of maintenance established for the plants and fabric of the Great Fountain Garden has been continued. Upgrades have been made to the irrigation systems for the flowerbeds, borders and lawns. In places the lawn edges have been reinforced with discreet metal edging to define garden lines and protect from heavy use during events and from vehicular movement. Improvements have been made to the borders so that they more closely reflect the Ernest law planting scheme. There is an ongoing programme of replacing bay tree tubs and other planters with new ones of a suitable seventeenth-century design. The Warsaw lime avenue is carefully maintained but the mistletoe is no longer pruned out from these trees. The Pavilion is now under new ownership and a partnership has been developed between the owner and HRP. This has raised hopes that views and vistas along the Pavilion Terrace can be re-established. There is an ongoing programme of inspecting the Victorian bridges and maintenance and repairs have been undertaken when necessary. A reed bed has been installed in the north canal in order to reduce nitrate levels in the Longford River and a similar scheme is under consideration for the south canal. Trails have started of Nidiplast path surfaces in the area between Governor's Gate and the Privy Garden Gate.

**Character Area Policy**

G 6.23 **HRP’s VISION:** This garden is a spectacular centrepiece for the estate that brings great delight to our visitors. It needs to reflect both the historic significance of the gardens and the changing fashions in garden design.

G 6.24 **HRP’s POLICY:** This garden should retain a mix of historic periods loosely based on its appearance in Victorian times as modified during the 1920s. It has always been the largest and grandest public garden in the palace and this character should be retained and embellished, but also, additionally, interpreted to visitors. The important elements are the retention of wide, open spaces and bold planting with clear views in towards the palace and out towards the park.

**Policies**

G 6.25 - **C.A. POLICY 6A** - Continue to monitor and assess the historic fabric of the Great Fountain Garden.
a. Monitor and repair as necessary the historic walls, railings and stone plinths.

b. Monitor and assess the risk of theft and vandalism to the statuary of the Flowerpot Gate and ensure that robust and responsive prevention and care strategies are in place.

G 6.26 - C.A. POLICY 6B - Review the path materials used in the area and pursue possibilities for installation of alternative suitable surface materials.

G 6.27 - C.A. POLICY 6C - Consideration should be given, in the long term, to rebuilding the arbour in the seventeenth-century wall alcove according to its historic pattern.

G 6.28 - C.A. POLICY 6D - The Cibber and Pierce urns now positioned in the East Front vestibule should be copied, and the copies placed in their original positions at the top of the Long Water.

G 6.29 - C.A. POLICY 6E - The yews should be retained to the current standard and appearance. However, lost yews should not be replaced. Proposals should be considered for the eventual replacement of the yew trees.

G 6.30 - C.A. POLICY 6F - Remove the remaining deciduous trees on the grass keep to the south canal.

G 6.31 - C.A. POLICY 6G - Take, or continue to support, actions necessary to preserve the ecological habitats within the canals and their banks.

G 6.32 - C.A. POLICY 6H - Continue remedial action against the spread of Japanese knotweed and giant hogweed on the canal banks.

G 6.33 - C.A. POLICY 6I - There should be continued maintenance and restoration of the mixed borders.

a. The mixed borders should be restored according to the Ernest Law plans.

b. The Great Fountain Garden should retain the finest displays of Victorian and Edwardian bedding in Britain.
G 6.34 - C.A. POLICY 6J - We should prepare new guidelines for the use of the Great Fountain Garden for events.

   a. These should highlight areas where events will impact least upon the garden's historic fabric in order to prevent any damage.

   b. We have recently undertaken an archaeological survey of the garden to assess the suitability of the site for events and to inform guidelines for the locating of temporary infrastructure for events (so as to mitigate potential damage to subsurface deposits).

   c. Particular consideration should be had for planning the possible move of the Hampton Court Music Festival to this area in 2013 (on a trial basis and subject to SMC and planning permission). All necessary steps should be taken to mitigate its impact.
7. The Privy Garden

History and Character

G 7.1 In 1530 Henry VIII enclosed a triangle of land between the palace and the river with a mock-fortification wall, from which turrets jutted out into the park. Within this area a rectangle remained beneath the windows of the palace and became Henry’s Privy Garden (that is his own private garden) consisting of railed compartments. The remaining triangle to the south, occupied by a large mound, was surmounted by an onion-domed banqueting house. To the south of this towards the river lay a large brick-built water gallery used as a disembarkation point for barges. In the 1630s the Privy Garden design was altered to a grass parterre with statues introduced during the Interregnum by Oliver Cromwell.

G 7.2 Major alterations were undertaken in the time of William III. The garden needed to be widened to match the new palace frontage, and William wanted a view down to the river. The widening took place in 1690, and an elm bower was planted atop the new western terrace. The parterre was replaced by cutwork, but work stopped after a while, with the mound flattened but no prospect of the river possible. When work re-commenced in 1699 the soil in the mount area was removed and the gallery demolished. William came to inspect progress in 1701, but could still not see the river and so ordered that the lower half of the garden be taken up again, lowered still further and remade. Further additions to the garden were to include the Tijou screens, five statues, and two sundials with plinths supplied by John Nost. This work was very nearly complete when William died in 1702.

G 7.3 The garden underwent a number of minor changes over the next 120 years, of which the most visible was the growth of the topiary yews and hollies. When it was decided, in 1838, to encourage the public to visit, the Privy Garden was given to the ‘grace-and-favour’ residents as a refuge, and the small triangle between it and the Barge Walk was enclosed with it. Planting was designed to provide privacy and some colour. Gradually the flowering shrubs became trees, so that by the 1890s, when the garden was opened to the public it had the appearance of a jungle. Following an earlier scheme to re-present this garden undertaken by Ernest Law in the 1920s, in 1995 the garden was restored to the appearance it would have had upon William III’s death, after an extensive programme of archaeology and archival research. This once again opened up the views between the south front and the river.

Significance

G 7.4 Although the garden is the result of twentieth-century restoration, this should not be seen to diminish its significance.

G 7.5 There are large amounts of original historic fabric in this garden. This includes the Tijou Screens which are considered one of the finest
examples of the artist blacksmith’s work. There are also historic paths, fountains, walls and banks.

G 7.6 - The archaeological value of the garden is very high (although much has already been investigated and recorded).

G 7.7 - The garden is one of the most important gardens in England in terms of its original design and of the authenticity of the 1995 historical representation. The 1995 project set new standards for garden restoration.

G 7.8 - The horticultural value of the garden derives from the important combination of different elements.

G 7.9 - The garden has a high aesthetic quality and is much admired and enjoyed by visitors.

Figure 21: Aerial view of the Privy Garden.
Vulnerability

G 7.10 - This type of garden has a naturally inherent fragility and is vulnerable to damage.

G 7.11 - Appreciation of the garden is diminished by unfinished work on elements of the garden’s hard landscaping.

G 7.12 - The Tijou Screen is particularly vulnerable to vandalism and unfinished conservation of the screen detracts from the aesthetic quality of the garden.

G 7.13 - High levels of maintenance are required to keep paths in good condition, to prevent the timber steps from becoming slippery and to maintain the required high standards of the hard landscaping.

G 7.14 - The use of some non-historic plant varieties in the 1995 planting scheme lessens the accuracy of the re-presentation.

G 7.15 - The collapse of areas of the terraces and sinking of some of the path levels suggests a degree of instability in some parts of the hard landscaping.

Figure 22: Kynff, Hampton Court Palace and its Gardens, c.1702

Progress and Developments since 2004

G 7.16 A second replanting of the box hedges in the Privy Garden has been completed using the cultivar Blauw Heinz. This cultivar has proven to be particularly robust during trials. Some shrubs within the garden (the lavenders and the philadelphus) have been replaced having outgrown their planting positions. The issues of the roses and junipers are under review. A list of shrub replacements is being drawn up and will be put out for review. The summer planting of historic annuals and perennials has been
reintroduced and has received wide acclaim. An authentic spring display using historic varieties is maintained and the Queen Mary’s exotics collection is also used to provide a greater display in the Privy Garden. Edging materials have been added to certain parts of the design (i.e. the fleur-de-lis) in order to protect the design, the archaeology and the integrity of the layout.

Character Area Policy

G 7.17 **HRP’s VISION:** We believe that this is now an iconic area of our gardens that delights our visitors and reflects our passion for researching, restoring and telling the story of historic garden designs.

G 7.18 **HRP’s POLICY:** This garden should be maintained as a faithful representation of King William III’s Privy Garden of 1702. The accuracy and type of planting should be developed and the restoration and conservation of the historic fabric should be completed.

Policies

G 7.19 - C.A. POLICY 7A - Ensure that, as far as possible, the planting schemes and plant varieties used in the area are historically appropriate.
   a. Agree a programme of shrub replacement within the Privy Garden.
   b. Examine the availability of an historic cultivar of box hedging for use as and when the box hedging requires replacing.
   c. Monitor the holly and yew trees and as they outgrow their positions replace them with historic plants raised from cuttings.

G 7.20 - C.A. POLICY 7B - Monitor and address the condition of historic fabric in or associated with the Privy Garden.
   a. Undertake a phased programme of repairs to the Tijou Screen.
   b. Research and assess the condition of the parapet statuary on the palace’s south façade and agree a programme of conservation, restoration and/or replacement of the figures.

G 7.21 - C.A. POLICY 7C - Monitor and undertake rectification of the garden’s hard landscape.
   a. Inspect the Bower and repair as necessary.
   b. Replace the central Ketton stone steps with a more robust stone of the same colour (in hand September 2011).
   c. Monitor and address failures in the stability of terraces and paths in the Privy Garden.
8. The Pond Garden

History and Character

G 8.1 The remaining triangular portion left over from the enclosure of Henry VIII’s Privy Garden in 1530 became the Pond Yard. The ponds were no doubt to provide fresh fish for the table, but they were embellished with ornamental rails with king’s beasts set on posts. The ponds remained until William III’s time when they were converted to sunken garden areas where Queen Mary assembled the best plant collection of the day. The eastern-most was a flower garden, the middle pond was given low terracing and was used for setting out orange trees in tubs in the summer, and the western was called ‘the Auricula Quarter’, suggesting a specialist hardy flower collection. There were also three ‘glass cases’ in the garden; most probably heated greenhouses where plants from the tropics could be kept.

G 8.2 The collection declined after Mary’s death in 1694, and the glass cases were replaced by the present Lower Orangery in 1701. The area in front of the Orangery was heated by stoves, and used to house exotic plants. A fourth glass case was built for the remaining hot-house plants, but in 1768 Capability Brown planted the vine on the site which soon took over the whole building. In 1700-2 the area to the east of the new Banqueting house was cleared and a new walled aviary or ‘Volery’ Garden was created with birdcages lining its walls. By the 1880s the purpose of the Orange Tree garden had been forgotten, and it was re-named ‘The Tudor Garden’ and given over to a flower display. The flower garden (originally an orchard planted with flowers) was the final retreat for the ‘grace-and-favour’ residents after the Pond Garden area was opened to the public in 1890, and was planted with flowering shrubs. A knot garden modelled on an early seventeenth-century design was installed in 1924 on spare ground in the north-east corner under the windows of a surviving Elizabethan part of the palace. Finally, the Auricula Quarter was ‘restored’ to a hedge-work pattern in about 1950 in the mistaken belief that it reflected the pattern in existence in the early eighteenth century. Although the Pond Yard is a thus a patchwork of restorations from various dates, the basic structure of walls and paths remains from Tudor times. The sunken gardens are surrounded by seventeenth-century pollards (hedges). A final important feature of the area is the Great Wisteria, climbing the building adjacent to the Great Vinehouse.

Significance

G 8.3 - This area may be considered as one of the most important garden areas in the estate.

G 8.4 - It contains important historic fabric, including Tudor partition walls, the Banqueting House (Grade 1 listed) with its associated Volary Garden, excellent statuary, historic earthworks and other features.
Figure 23: Queen Mary's Exotics in the restored Lower Orangery Garden.

G 8.5 - There is a very high likelihood of the area containing important and sensitive archaeological deposits.

G 8.6 - The horticultural value of the area is highly significant. The Vine is the largest in the world (and is recorded in the Guinness Book of Records as such). It is probably also the world's oldest vine. The hornbeams and limes are very old and mature, as is the wisteria and one magnolia tree. The ecological value is, however, low.

G 8.7 - There is a strong significance to the continuation of historic maintenance practices used for the vine and other plants in this area.

G 8.8 - There is a reasonable degree of public sensitivity in the area since it is one of the most popular garden exhibits in the palace.

Vulnerability

G 8.9 - The historic fabric in this area is sensitive to public access and to any changes in gardening practice.

G 8.10 - Poor levels of interpretation make the significance of the area difficult to read.

G 8.11 - Some of the garden infrastructure (especially the Vine House) is coming to the end of its working life.
Progress and Developments since 2004

G 8.12 The restoration of the Lower Orangery Garden is probably our greatest garden reconstruction project during this period. It is now restored to its layout of c.1700 and plants and pots used in this area are faithful reproductions. During the course of the restoration archaeological surveys of the Lower Orangery uncovered a flight of mid to late seventeenth-century steps believed to be evidence of a lost garden design. The excavation also found significant quantities of demolition rubble from the Tudor palace including pieces of architectural terracotta that are judged to be of exceptional historic importance. The Queen Mary’s botanical collection of plants has been awarded National Collection status by the NCCPG. Many of the hedges around the area have been removed or lowered to open up better views. The new Pond Garden has been replanted and redesigned in a looser style. The Knot Garden is being restored to its original planting plan of 1924. The Banqueting House gardens, including the Volary Garden, has been cleared of most of its modern planting and a simpler layout of gravel, lawns, paths and wall fruits have been installed.

Character Area Policy

G 8.13 HRP’s VISION: This is a garden that truly represents all that is valued about our estates and it shows-off garden designs from many periods of the palace’s history. We aim to enhance it further by opening up new areas, creating new views, and linking it more closely to the Banqueting House so as to bring to life its Baroque splendour.

G 8.14 HRP’s POLICY: The Pond Gardens are one of the most popular parts of the estate and should retain the subtle mix of historic periods in a number of distinctly planted areas. A series of ‘set piece’ gardens will illustrate different periods although during the next five years emphasis should be placed on the Baroque and Georgian parts of the area (including pursuing appropriate new interventions in the Banqueting House Gardens).

Figure 24: Knyff, Aerial view c. 1703. [detail showing the Pond Garden and Banqueting House]. (The Royal Collection)
Policies

G 8.15 - C.A. POLICY 8A - Open up the Banqueting House Terrace and Gardens for greater public access and viewing.
   a. Carry out research into the historic development and uses of these areas including specific research on the aviaries in the Volary Garden and archaeological surveys of these areas.
   b. Pursue potential for reintroduction of aviaries or alternative appropriate and innovative interventions in the Volary Garden.
   c. Open up bricked windows in the Little Banqueting House terrace.

G 8.16 - C.A. POLICY 8B - Review the planting style in the New Pond Garden and consider the reintroduction of the 1950s planting scheme.

G 8.17 - C.A. POLICY 8C - Assess the effective life of the Vine House and consider the extant aluminium glasshouse with a more appropriate building in keeping with the Victorian viewing gallery.

G 8.18 - C.A. POLICY 8D - Some parts of the garden (the Lower Orangery Garden, the sunken garden) should remain inaccessible because of their fragility. They should continue to be viewed from outside.

G 8.19 - C.A. POLICY 8E - Research and resolve the issue of garden lighting in this area.

Figure 25: The Great Vine
9. The Barge Walk

History and Character

G 9.1 The Thames was the principal approach to the palace employed by the monarch until the improvement of local roads in the late-seventeenth century. The river was also a commercial waterway, with the requirement for a 'towing place', or towpath, until about the 1920s. It appears likely that it became largely disused by about 1850. As a result, any prior development from the gallery to the disembarkation point had to span the towing place. In addition, a strip of grass extended from the towpath to the hedge enclosing the meadows in varying width.

G 9.2 From the 1850s tracks for access to properties such as the Pavilion became more significant than the towpath, and planting encroached onto the grass, which would formerly have been grazed by the bargemen’s ponies. This planting has increased significantly in the twentieth century, particularly since the 1970s, when Dutch elm disease killed the ancient elms along the meadows, allowing the ornamental plants to become more prominent. There has also been regeneration along the water’s edge. Pleasure boats have been coming to Hampton Court since the nineteenth century, continuing the tradition of mooring places just east of the present bridge. Various buildings were erected in the middle of the twentieth century to serve this trade.
The Barge Walk can be split into three distinct sections: Kingston Bridge to Raven’s Ait; Raven’s Ait to the Pavilion; the Pavilion to Hampton Court Bridge.

Significance

- The area contains some important historic fabric including boundary walls and railings. There are also several ancient coppiced elms.
- The ecological value compared with the rest of the estate is relatively high. The walk, together with the adjacent park and meadows, provides a haven for wildlife (including wading birds and fish) and is an important green corridor. The Barge Walk has been assessed as having important mud flats, shingle beaches and inter-tidal vegetation. The river itself is important both as a habitat and as an integral aspect of the palace’s setting.
- Its undeveloped, rural quality is extremely valuable in the context of south-west London. It has been designated a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMINC). This is a non-statutory designation.
- The area presents a certain limited revenue-generating potential at the palace end of the walk but otherwise mooring charges are the only likely source of income.
- There are some potential archaeological deposits, including the remains of the Tudor Water Gallery and other waterlogged Thames foreshore features. The Tudor Water Gallery was partially exposed in excavation by Oxford Archaeology.
- The Barge Walk is included in the Thames Landscape Strategy and other development proposals. It is an important and valued amenity and as such is of interest to many other external stakeholders.
- The Barge Walk is part of the Sustrans National Cycle Network.

Vulnerability

- The aesthetic quality of the area threatened by competing uses.
- Poor quality infrastructure, including concrete boundary rails, detracts from the visual aesthetic.
- Inappropriate design of some boat houses, mooring points and embarkation points detracts from the approach to the palace. In particular those embarkation points used by boats bringing visitors to the palace are not in keeping with the required aesthetic of arrival points to a royal palace.
- Heavy use by both pedestrians and cyclists results in increased maintenance requirements for the path surfaces.
G 9.15 - The character of the area is under threat from inappropriate development proposals on bordering sites and on the Surrey Bank of the Thames. In particular the proposed new uses for the Jolly Boatman site threaten both the visual quality and the rural character of the Barge Walk.

G 9.16 - There is a high risk of vandalism to historic fabric, especially to the Tijou Screens, and the area is particularly susceptible to littering.

Progress and Developments since 2004

G 9.17 HRP continues to work in partnership with several external organisations, including the Thames Landscape Strategy and the Environment Agency to manage the appropriate usages of the river and river bank. A charging policy has been introduced at mooring sites in line with Environment Agency recommendations. This is generating a new income and discourages unwelcome mooring in the area. Many of the inappropriate ornamental tree species have been removed, some have been replaced with historic species and there has been further work to open up new views along the river. New infrastructure is being introduced; there are new signs and map boards designed to HRP brand guidelines and bins, benches and concrete railings are being replaced. Some boat sheds have been replaced. The area between Hampton Court Bridge and the Banqueting House has undergone major landscaping improvements providing the area with a more rural feel. Along the length of the Barge Walk the grass is maintained to a meadow regime and wild flowers are encouraged.

Character Area Policy

G 9.18 HRP’s VISION: We value the Barge Walk for its rural character, for the links it promotes between the estate and the river, and for its amenity value to joggers, walkers and cyclists. We will continue to work with external stakeholders to enhance its character and habitats and to ensure that it and, by association the palace, are not spoilt by inappropriate developments on neighbouring sites.

G 9.19 HRP’s POLICY: Public appreciation of this area as a historic barge walk, which was in use for centuries, should be encouraged by means of interpretation at either end. Its infrastructure should be continually improved.

Policies

G 9.20 General Policies

G 9.21 - C.A. POLICY 9A - Reduce motor vehicle access along the Barge Walk.
a. Install rise and fall security bollards at the Hampton Court Bridge end of the Barge Walk to provide additional security and prevent unauthorised vehicular access.

G 9.22  -  C.A. POLICY 9B - Continue to maintain the strategic views and vistas as laid down in the HCP Views Management Plan.

G 9.23  -  C.A. POLICY 9C - Continue to work in partnership with external bodies to maintain high management and usage standards for the wider area.


G 9.25  **Area Policies**

G 9.26  -  C.A. POLICY 9E - Kingston Bridge to Raven’s Ait
   a. Encourage neighbouring properties to manage their gardens to HRP standards.
   b. Encourage river tourism.
   c. Investigate the possibility of re-instating a division between the meadows and the Barge Walk in this area.

G 9.27  -  C.A. POLICY 9F - Raven’s Ait to the Pavilion
   a. This area of the Barge Walk should receive appropriate maintenance. HRP may provide this care in consultation, and possible partnership, with other associated parties.

G 9.28  -  C.A. POLICY 9G - The Pavilion to Hampton Court Bridge
   a. Boundary walls and other hard landscape features should be maintained, or modified, in a manner sympathetic with the historic environment of the palace and gardens. This work should be undertaken by the appropriate parties, in consultation with HRP.
   b. The character of the bank should reflect its former use as a Barge Walk. The maintenance and development of either bank of the river should be considered in terms of its effect upon the other and upon the views and history they share.
   c. Close partnerships should be established or maintained with companies providing boat services from and to the palace and
HRP should ensure that the design of the associated infrastructure is in keeping with the character of the palace and its environs.

d. Development proposals for the Jolly Boatman and other bordering sites should continue to be closely monitored and robust responses made towards any inappropriate proposals.

e. Links between the West Front (Character Area 10) and the Barge Walk should be developed and views from Hampton Court Station and Hampton Court Bridge opened up.
10. The West Front

History and Character

G 10.1 The road approach to the palace has not fundamentally changed since the construction of the fifteenth-century manor house on the site. At that time it extended across parkland. This was altered when Henry VIII built the wings extending out from the western façade of the palace, various service buildings in the south-west corner and the tiltyard wall, thus defining an ‘Outer Green Court’ which exists, in essence, to the present. Charles II built the guard stable along the Tiltyard wall and William III set out a causeway of rag sets, confined by bollards, from the gate to a turnaround in 1699. The gate itself was replaced by the present Trophy Gate with lead trophy figures by Grinling Gibbons in 1701. A line of elm trees extended from the service buildings along the boundary with the Barge Walk.

G 10.2 The court remained relatively unchanged until the service buildings were demolished in the 1860s. The ancient elms were felled because of Dutch Elm Disease and replanted with Norwegian maples. The courtyard thus became exposed on its river side. As the numbers of visitors increased, especially with the opening of Hampton Court Station, traffic conflict with pedestrians increased, and this led to paths being laid outside the bollards, first to the south, then to the north of the causeway. In the early twentieth century all metalled areas were given a tarmac surface.

Figure 27: Rowlandson, Hampton Court West Front in the eighteenth century. (V&A Picture Library)
Significance

G 10.3 - This large and disparate area contains a number of very important built structures, including the Barrack Block, Trophy Gate, the moat, the circle and lines of eighteenth-century bollards and nineteenth-century lamp posts.

G 10.4 - As the main entrance to the palace, this is the area of initial visitor reception and the first point at which to have a visual impact.

G 10.5 - There is a striking and memorable view of the western façade of the palace from Trophy Gate.

G 10.6 - When the palace was in royal use, there were many buildings, accretions and people in this area. Since the nineteenth century these buildings have been gradually cleared away to meet visitors’ expectations of a grand entrance.

G 10.7 - There is an additional potential for revenue generation from this area as it can be used for certain appropriate events and functions.

G 10.8 - The potential for archaeological deposits is high since the south side of the area was formerly occupied by the Tudor Houses of Office and the Toy Inn.

Vulnerability

G 10.9 - Vehicular movement around the area detracts from the historic and the grand character of the area.

G 10.10 - Vehicular movement represents a considerable risk to fragile historic fabric, especially the Trophy Gates.

G 10.11 - The lawn areas suffer frequent damage resulting from installations for events and functions.

G 10.12 - The Norway maples bordering the south side of the area are not an historically appropriate species.

G 10.13 - Development proposals for the Jolly Boatman site pose a serious threat to the visual character of the area.

Progress and Developments since 2004

G 10.14 A considerable amount of work has been undertaken to re-present the West Front. The area under grass has been extended out to the line of the stone carriageway bollards and a new pedestrian pathway has been laid from the ticket office to the front of the palace. The Barrack Block shrub border has been edged with box in order to hide the ugly plinth of brick work and the climbers have been pruned and restrained in allotted areas. The Norway Maples have been crown lifted where possible and a plan for their removal and replacement has been drawn up (however, implementation is on hold.
and is dependent on the future of the Jolly Boatman site). The Apartment 39 garden has been re-landscaped, the shrub line lowered and a new yew hedge planted on the Barge Walk side of the garden. A programme of restoration and re-gilding has been undertaken on the Trophy Gates and the stone bollards and King’s beasts have been cleaned and restored. A gate now gives pedestrian access into the Clore Learning Centre behind the Barrack Block.

Character Area Policy

G 10.15  **HRP’s VISION:** The West Front proclaims the splendour of the palace to our visitors and so we believe that it must always be presented in a way that reflects the royal magnificence of Hampton Court.

G 10.16  **HRP’s POLICY:** To maintain and develop the West Front, and to improve the surfaces of the Trophy Gate apron area, as a grand and dignified entrance to the palace that delights visitor and reflects the splendour of the architecture beyond.

Policies

G 10.17  -  **C.A. POLICY 10A** - Replant the Norway maples between the West Front and the Barge Walk. This should use historically appropriate species and
open up views of the West Front from Hampton Court Station and Hampton Court Bridge. Investigate planting disease-resistant elm.

G 10.18 - C.A. POLICY 10B - Development proposals for the Jolly Boatman and other bordering sites should continue to be closely monitored and robust responses made towards any inappropriate proposals.

G 10.19 - C.A. POLICY 10C - Investigate the evidence for the Offices and Toy Inn to better understand the enclosed character of the area.

G 10.20 - C.A. POLICY 10D - Implement traffic management policies to reduce vehicular movement on the West Front.
   a. Ultimately the Trophy Drive should be able to be used as a pedestrian walk.
   b. Pursue proposals (planning permission now granted) for moving the car park exit so that vehicles exit onto Hampton Court Road.

G 10.21 - C.A. POLICY 10E - Implement a policy of relaying the West Front lawns following the removal of installations used for extended periods during functions and events (e.g. the ice rink).

G 10.22 - C.A. POLICY 10F - Improve the surfaces and infrastructure of the roads and walkways around Trophy Gate. Any further resurfacing should be done in materials that are appropriate and enhance the character of the area.

G 10.23 - C.A. POLICY 10G – Lighting on the West Front should be designed to respect the character of the palace and enhance the splendour of the architecture.
   a. ‘Street lighting’ should be provided by the Victorian lamps; it should be in white light and should be mindful of access requirements whilst responding to the character of the area.
   b. Spot lighting of the palace during events should be designed to respond to and enhance the architectural quality of the buildings. In preference it should be in white light only (to emphasise the colour aesthetic of the brickwork) and should respect the hierarchy of the façade. The design should give consideration for highlighting particular sculptural details (e.g. the arms on the Great Gatehouse and the moat bridge beasts). Installation of spotlights should not be archaeologically damaging and should be unobtrusive visually (e.g. spotlights for the west façade of the palace should be located in the moat).
11. The Tiltyard

History and Character

G 11.1 During Cardinal Wolsey’s time this area formed part of the park, and it was walled to the north and west in about 1520. Henry VIII had it enclosed as a tiltyard in the 1530s. His eastern wall, which remains, was surmounted by carved king’s beasts, while five viewing towers lay along it. All but one of the towers had been removed by 1701. The last recorded tournament in the Tiltyard was in 1604 and it seems to have been used for grazing for most of the seventeenth century since it was referred to as a ‘pasture ground’ in 1653. Under William III it was changed into a kitchen garden and it was sub-divided by a central spine-wall and cross-walls into six compartments. The area retains this basic layout to this day. Parts of the wall are built with interesting ‘Hitch’ bricks to provide the wall with heating.

G 11.2 The tiltyard remained in horticultural use till the 1920s, though it was leased to a nursery seeds man and fruiterer from London Street, Kingston, Mr George Jackson (1851 census HO107 piece 1603 fol. 173 page 53), from about 1850. Around 1910 a strip behind the guard stables was removed and perhaps used for car parking. The Royal Parks took back the four northern compartments in 1925 and set about converting the area to public gardens. One area was given over to hard tennis courts, another to a putting green surrounded by herbaceous beds, and two were planted informally. Additional services and buildings such as the seating pavilions, a teahouse and the large lavatory block were built, and these have some considerable significance as early examples of visitor infrastructure. One compartment of the kitchen garden was subsequently given over to a rose garden, and the other was a parking area by 1958. The putting green was replaced by further herbaceous beds in 1950. The Tiltyard also contains a sundial from Garrick’s Villa, situated a mile away further up the Thames.

Figure 29: Wyngaerde, Hampton Court, 1558 [detail of the Tiltyard towers] (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford)
The Tiltyard’s six compartments are the Car Parks, The Clore Learning Centre and Bradbury Court, the Herbaceous Garden, the Hard Tennis Courts, the Tiltyard Tower Garden and the Rose Garden.

**Significance**

- The Tiltyard has been central to the functions of the palace since the early sixteenth century.
- It contains important historic fabric including the Tiltyard Tower (Grade 1 listed), Tudor boundary walls, statuary and gates.
- Excavations conducted in 2009 by Channel 4’s ‘Time Team’ provided a significant archaeological survey of the area. It is thought that the potential for archaeological deposits is high.
- The changing functions of the Tiltyard from area for leisure activities to kitchen garden and back to leisure activities reflects the history of use at Hampton Court more widely.
- Although most of the plants grown in the area are of limited horticultural importance there are some rare and interesting wall climbers and shrubs as well as an unusual birch tree.
- The area provides a focus for showcasing traditional maintenance practices and skills, particularly in relation to the wall plants.

**Vulnerabilities**

- The Tiltyard houses many different visitor facilities (including car parks, lavatories, tea-rooms) which may detract from the historic nature of the site.
- The area requires intensive maintenance through the need for pruning, work on the herbaceous beds and mowing.
- A wide range of gardening techniques are employed in the Tiltyard but they may result in maintenance problems such as those potentially arising from training plants against historic walls.
Progress and Developments Since 2004

G 11.13 The Tiltyard has been subject to significant development with the building of the Clore Learning Centre and the adjacent Bradbury Court in the southern part of the area. The rose beds have been replanted with new appropriate and disease resistant varieties of rose and box hedges have been planted around the outer rose beds. New hedges have been laid between the Rose Garden and the lower car park. Significant clearance has been undertaken in the Herbaceous Garden to eradicate an infestation of bindweed and ground elder which has allowed progress towards a representation of the area. Some resurfacing work has been undertaken around the Tiltyard cafeteria. In 2009, Channel 4’s ‘Time Team’ carried out excavations to investigate the remains of the tiltyard towers.

Character Area Policy

G 11.14 HRP’s VISION: We believe that this is an area of the garden which is full of potential and in which we will be able to develop exciting and innovative new gardens reflecting the history of the palace and opening up our estates to new audiences.

G 11.15 HRP’s POLICY: The Tiltyard must remain a preferred centre for visitor activities since the existing infrastructure of the area (the Clore Learning Centre, car park, cafeteria, lavatories etc.) dictates these functions. However, it must also be seen as an inviting area for recreational use including picnicking and children’s activities. The interpretation and use of the area should be guided by the character of its dual historic functions; on the one hand as a place for leisure activities (as evidenced by the sixteenth-century tiltyard, the tennis courts / putting green, the rose gardens and the cafeteria) and on the other hand as a working kitchen garden. The characters suggested by these two functions need not be in opposition, however, and innovative interventions should be found to emphasise both together.

Policies

G 11.16 - C.A. POLICY 11A - To pursue appropriate new uses for the Herbaceous Garden and the Hard Tennis Courts.

a. To transform the Herbaceous Garden into a new kitchen garden to emphasise the history of food production at the palace.

b. On the Former Hard Tennis Courts to create a ‘Magic Garden’ as an inspirational new garden aimed at family visitors which allows interactive learning through play and which, through innovative design, reflects both the magic of the palace and the fascination of the adjacent kitchen garden.
G 11.17  -  C.A. POLICY 11B - To continue to emphasise the Tiltyard Tower Garden as a place for catering and picnics.
   a. Manage tree cover to allow areas of sun and shade for picnickers.
   b. Introduce a small number of picnic tables to the northern area of the garden and encourage picnicking on the grass in the southern area.

G 11.18  -  C.A. POLICY 11C - Reorganise the back-of-house storage area used by catering contractors in order to tidy its appearance and presentation.

G 11.19  -  C.A. POLICY 11D - Ensure that the Car Parks are presented to the best possible standards.
   a. Work to minimise the cluttered municipal appearance of the area.
   b. Pursue plans for a new exit from the upper car park onto Vrow Walk.
   c. Undertake surfacing improvements throughout and ensure appropriate unified surfaces are laid.
   d. Continue a scheme of simple but elegant planting against the car park walls and in movable planters.
   e. Implement the agreed new way of getting cars in and out of the car park, to remove traffic from the West Front.

G 11.20  -  C.A. POLICY 11E - Continue the redesign and replanting of the Rose Garden.

G 11.21  -  C.A. POLICY 11F - Undertake a programme of resurfacing across the Tiltyard to ensure appropriate and unified hard landscaping throughout.
12. The Wilderness

History and Character

G 12.1 This area is first recorded as a Tudor ‘orchard’ or a woodland garden after Henry VIII built the tiltyard wall to the west in the 1530s. It contained the moat around the Privy Orchard to its south, and was the site of a pair of banqueting houses. A small paddock divided it from the park to the east. After plans for a new approach to the palace from the north were dropped in 1689, the area was redesigned as a wilderness with a network of paths between high hornbeam hedges. The intervening spaces were planted with elms (the last of which died of Dutch Elm Disease).

G 12.2 A troytown, or turf, maze is shown by Knyff (c.1705), though the surviving maze was probably added in 1713. In addition, at this time, the small paddock was planted as a grove. A narrow wedge of land was formed in squaring off for the western path, and Wilderness House was built for the Head Gardener. A yew tree measuring 30 feet (9.14 metres) in height was transplanted to the centre of the Wilderness around 1700, while the Lion Gate pierced the north wall in 1713 as part of an abortive attempt to revive the idea of a northern approach.

G 12.3 Over time the elms grew huge while the hedges became thinner, thus beginning the process of converting the Wilderness into a ‘wild garden’ from the 1860s. By the First World War the area was notable for its flowering trees and bulbs. Many of the paths were grassed over about this time and a ‘rocky dell’ was made, perhaps in the 1920s. A laburnum tunnel was made during the 1950s, and the paths were laid with a tarmac surface. The hedges of the maze were replaced entirely by yew in the 1960s, and measures were taken so that this famous feature could cope with the large number of visitors.

Figure 31: Drawing of the Maze from a nineteenth-century guidebook.
Significance

G 12.4 - There are some important elements of historic fabric, including the Lion Gates and historic walls.

G 12.5 - The area arguably still retains some of the character of the Tudor 'orchard' or woodland garden. It was also formerly one of the great late seventeenth-century gardens and it is possible that traces remain in the archaeological deposit.

G 12.6 - The potential for archaeological deposits is judged as high in this area.

G 12.7 - The display of spring bulbs is a valued and spectacular annual event.

G 12.8 - The Wilderness is a major arterial route for visitors.

G 12.9 - The Wilderness contains the Maze which is both an important historic garden feature as it is the oldest surviving designed hedge maze in the world (recorded in the Guinness Book of Records) and forms a significant part of the public perception of the palace.

G 12.10 - The Wilderness contains many ceremonial and commemorative trees.

Figure 32: Spring daffodils in the Wilderness garden.
Vulnerability

G 12.11 - Development proposals to buildings adjoining the Wilderness (including the King's Arms) and use of the back-of-house spaces of the Tiltyard Tower cafeteria impinge on the character of the Wilderness.

G 12.12 - Over-use of the Maze threatens its character and quality and brings attendant management problems. The Maze is one of the most sensitive garden features across the estate.

G 12.13 - Some vehicular access is allowed into the Wilderness which impacts on the character of the garden.

G 12.14 - Historic gateways are vulnerable to damage.

G 12.15 - The Wilderness has a particular problem with litter.

Progress and Developments since 2004

G 12.16 The Wilderness has been subject to a continuing and established routine of maintenance and care. All coniferous species alien to the area have been taken out. Many of the shin rails have been removed to reduce maintenance and on the grounds of health and safety. These are to be replaced with short ornate posts as path markers. Some archaeological resistivity testing has been undertaken to find evidence of earlier garden layouts. However, this has only achieved a moderate level of success. The Maze itself has visitor interpretation in the form of a soundscape installed by the art collective Greyworld, featuring sounds of intrigue and magic from the Georgian court.

Character Area Policy

G 12.17 **HRP's VISION:** We believe that this area should be sensitively developed to provide our visitors with a sense of the late seventeenth century wilderness garden whilst also promoting and enhancing the iconic display of spring bulbs for which Hampton Court has become world famous.

G 12.18 **HRP's POLICY:** The Wilderness should be retained as it is with its attractive woodland character and iconic display of spring bulbs but we do not rule out a future plan of reinstating its historic appearance and layout. The Maze must remain as a central facet of the visitor experience but it should be maintained at a level commensurate with the high standard of presentation achieved elsewhere in the estate.

Policies

G 12.19 - **C.A. POLICY 12A** - Establish a garden masterplan for the Wilderness based on detailed examination of its historic layers.
G 12.20 - C.A. POLICY 12B - Review the current appearance and layout of the Wilderness with a view to reinstating the historic garden design.
   a. Undertake an inclusive research project collating all documentary and visual evidence for the historic layout and commission further archaeological surveys of the Wilderness.
   b. Assess feasibility of mowing new pathways reflecting the historic layout as a short-term intervention.

G 12.21 - C.A. POLICY 12C - Remain alert to and fight intrusive planning applications on adjoining or nearby sites.

G 12.22 - C.A. POLICY 12D - Monitor the condition of and, as necessary, replace the laburnum arch.

G 12.23 - C.A. POLICY 12E - Keep the issue of traffic management under review and attempt to reduce its impact.

G 12.24 - C.A. POLICY 12F - Maintain the Maze at a level that meets the high standards experienced across the estate.
   a. Monitor the intensity of use of the Maze and ensure that maintenance procedures respond accordingly.
   b. Seek to upgrade the appearance and interpretation of the Maze.

G 12.25 - C.A. POLICY 12G - Review the design of garden infrastructure (especially the Governor’s Gate kiosk) and consider replacing inappropriate structures with more sensitive designs.
13. The Glasshouse Nursery

History and Character

G 13.1 The site of what appears to be the earliest cultivated area associated with Hampton Court Palace lies beneath the Glasshouse Nursery. This area was walled and moated, perhaps by Cardinal Wolsey, and subsequently became Henry VIII's Privy Orchard. It remained in use for a century before being converted into an early example of a kitchen garden. Little change is then recorded until William III's time, when the area was converted to a 'melon ground' for the cultivation of melons, cucumbers and other similar vegetables under glass on 21 beds of rotting manure.

G 13.2 During the early nineteenth century the area became more of a general kitchen garden, and numerous horticultural glasshouses were placed here. It has also been used since Victorian times for the production of vast numbers of bedding plants. Potting sheds and offices were built along the northern wall, and in time this area became the centre of horticultural operations at Hampton Court. The Manager's office was built at the north-east corner in the late nineteenth century.

G 13.3 Today the nursery grows over 100,000 spring and summer bedding plants, as well as propagating and wintering Queen Mary's seventeenth-century exotics collection.

Figure 33: Nineteenth-century view of the Hampton Court Nursery.
Significance

G 13.4 - The principal importance of this area is that it maintains a tradition of propagation that has taken place at the palace since the time of William and Mary. This is the last cultivated kitchen garden remaining adjacent to a royal palace.

G 13.5 - The area serves as the hub of horticultural activities at Hampton Court. It is a central focus of garden management and maintenance and thus the work here underpins most other gardens operations.

G 13.6 - The Nursery is home to three National Collections; Queen Mary’s exotics, lantana and heliotropes.

G 13.7 - The area contains some historic fabric including several interesting historic walls.

G 13.8 - The area is in part shared by the Landmark Trust and the Royal Tennis Courts; both organisations have an influence on development in this area.

Vulnerability

G 13.9 - The Nursery is an area of intensive use with little room for expansion.

G 13.10 - Limited space restricts some areas of activity.

G 13.11 - The glasshouses only have a finite effective life and constant monitoring of their condition is required.
Progress and Developments since 2004

G 13.12 Surplus bedding plants are now sold to visitors to Hampton Court from a plant barrow in the gardens. In addition HRP has entered a commercial partnership to propagate vine eye cuttings for sale. Some propagation has been undertaken of plants of provenance, namely vines, hollies, yew trees, specimen trees and other historic shrubs and herbs. However, restricted space has limited this area of activity. A programme of maintenance and repair has been carried out on the glasshouses. This has led to an assessment of their potential longevity being drawn up with an eye to the future replacement of the glasshouses. The nursery has been opened to the public as part of the garden tour programmes.

Character Area Policy

G 13.13 HRP’s VISION: We are passionate about the continuity of cultivation on this site and we believe that the Glasshouse Nursery is one of Hampton Court’s hidden treasures. We aim to continue to promote the tradition of plant cultivation in the palace grounds and to enhance the nursery's potential as an educational resource for visitors and students.

G 13.14 HRP’s POLICY: The cultivation tradition in this area of nearly 500 years should be continued through its use as a nursery. The area should be used much more to promote the skills of historic gardening by allowing better public access and interpretation.

Policies

G 13.15 - C.A. POLICY 13A - The layout and patterns of use of the area should be regularly reviewed to ensure that the most efficient use of the space is achieved.

G 13.16 - C.A. POLICY 13B - Monitor the condition of the glasshouse units and establish a plan of repair or renewal.

G 13.17 - C.A. POLICY 13C - The location of the Tapestry Wash Room should be reviewed with a preference towards it being moved to an alternative location to allow additions space for nursery activities.

G 13.18 - C.A. POLICY 13D - Proposals for allowing greater access to palace visitors should be pursued so as to increase public awareness of the importance of the area and its collections.

a. Nursery tours should be offered regularly and be clearly promoted.

b. Consideration should be given to creating a permanent exhibition of the National Collections at Hampton Court in one of the glasshouses.
14. Hampton Court Green

History and Character

G 14.1 The Green is ancient common grazing land, but the Lord of the Manor also had the right to extract minerals. Much of the gravel for William III’s garden paths thus came from the Green, and one large pit remains in the grounds of Hampton Court House, a property that was parcellled off from the Green in the 1750s. Several of the workshops of the craftsmen employed at Hampton Court, including that of Jean Tijou, are known to have been located on the Green. In George I’s time a line of trees planted outside the Tiltyard wall became frequented by the German *frau* at Court, and became known as Vrow Walk. Slightly further onto the green the road appears to occupy the same course as in William III’s time. Further land was detached from the green in the mid-nineteenth century for some cavalry barracks, now demolished and occupied by parking. A line of horse chestnuts was planted alongside the road in the nineteenth century, while the area between the tiltyard wall and the road was ‘landscaped’ in the 1970s. To the south of the Green stands the important Tudor Royal Mews of the c.1530s.

Figure 35: Lens, A South View of the Camp of Hampton Court Green, 1731. (Yale Centre for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection)

Significance

G 14.2 - The Green is of limited horticultural or ecological significance but its importance is derived from its high aesthetic value.

G 14.3 - The Green is bounded by some mature early twentieth-century horse chestnut trees.

G 14.4 - Adjacent to the Green are buildings of significant architectural and historic interest, including the Royal Mews and Hampton Court House.
Although no archaeological surveys have been conducted, the potential for archaeological deposits is judged to be high.

The Green is regularly used for fairs and other activities and is therefore an important revenue generating asset.

The Green is a part of the Hampton Court Green Conservation Area.

Vulnerability

The Green provides an attractive green border to the palace but has lost its integral relationship with the Hampton Court estate.

Some of the horse chestnut trees on the Green have been found to be suffering from horse chestnut leaf miner and bleeding canker virus.

The Green is intensively used having one fair and other similar major events each year and providing overflow car parking during the annual Flower Show and Festival.

The ownership of Campbell Road (on the northern boundary of the Green) is not clear. This has led to incremental encroachment by local residents to the detriment of the character of the Green.

Progress and Developments since 2004

Working in partnership with local authorities and other agencies there have been improvements made to the Green's infrastructure. Paths have been upgraded and extended to provide a suitable shared surface for pedestrians and cyclists as part of the expansion of the Sustrans National Cycle Network. The wooden post and rail fence has been replaced in partnership with the Hampton Court Gateways project and additional bins and benches have been installed around the Green. New planting has been undertaken with some horse chestnuts planted along the northern boundary and a screen of indigenous trees and shrubs screening the coach park to the east.

Character Area Policy

We highly value Hampton Court Green as it continues the tradition of links between the palace and the local community. We will continue to manage it as an important local amenity and to enhance the wider setting of the palace.

The Green should retain the feel of a village green, reminding of its former function as common grazing land. Temporary uses that have historical precedent will be considered. Visitors should be made aware through new interpretation of the associations between the Green and the surrounding historic buildings in order to promote greater understanding and appreciation of this area.
Policies

G 14.15 - C.A. POLICY 14A - The present maintenance regime for the Green works well and should be maintained. This maintenance policy should be informed by partnerships with local residents.

a. The grass should continue to be kept at meadow- rather than lawn-length, and the planting screening the car park should be maintained.

G 14.16 - C.A. POLICY 14B - In partnership with the Green's local residents, introduce a variety of suitable uses as the opportunity arises.

a. Positive consideration should be given to fairs, open-air theatre or other activities which respect the Green's historic character and its local residents, and which take place outside of its peak times of use as a car park.

G 14.17 - C.A. POLICY 14C - Monitor the condition of the diseased horse chestnuts and establish a plan for major felling and a suitable tree species (e.g. Indian Horse Chestnut) for replanting should the need arise.

G 14.18 - C.A. POLICY 14D - Maintain working relationship with Hampton Court House and, in partnership, agree a strategy for replanting the boundary shrub border.

G 14.19 - C.A. POLICY 14E - Maintain partnership with the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames on the Hampton Court Gateways project to ensure that improvements to the Green continue to take place.

G 14.20 - C.A. POLICY 14F - Research and establish the ownership of Campbell Road and establish a clear management plan for this area to ensure that incremental encroachment by residents is controlled and any developments are in line with the recommendations of HRP’s Conservation Management Plans.
15. The Palace Courtyards

History and Character

G 15.1 Before Cardinal Wolsey began to build his palace in c.1514, an earlier house had stood on the site. This house, developed on land owned by the Knights Hospitallers, was built between c.1495 and c.1500 by Lord Giles Daubeney and its principal courtyard occupied the same position as Clock Court. Clock Court was, therefore, the original core around which the palace grew and, as such, can be considered as the earliest part of the extant complex.

G 15.2 Recent archaeological surveys in Base Court have shown, however, that additional ranges stood to the west of the early house, perhaps separated from it by a moat ditch. Excavations uncovered the remains of a medieval barn probably first built in the late-thirteenth or early-fourteenth century but subsequently remodelled and still in use at the turn of the sixteenth century. To the north of the barn there was a cobbled surface and evidence of ponds.

G 15.3 Wolsey’s first change to the house when he took over the lease in 1514 was to extend it to the west, creating Base Court. This formed a new outer courtyard and made Clock Court the inner court of the complex. Building work lasted from c.1514 to c.1522. Whilst the courtyard was being built the barn structure (now heavily remodelled and shortened) was used as a mason’s lodge. When complete this great cobbled courtyard surrounded by lodging ranges was one of the largest domestic courtyards of its day. It was designed as an area for receiving and lodging high-ranking guests and, until the construction by Henry VIII of the Water Gate in 1536, it was the principal entrance to the palace. In the southern half of Base Court excavations found evidence of a water feature originally dating from Wolsey’s tenure. It was probably mirrored by another on the north side of the courtyard and was remodelled in the later sixteenth century. Although Base Court functioned as a grand entrance to the palace, archaeological evidence shows that small buildings were, at times during the sixteenth-century, constructed inside Base Court to serve as workshops for the craftsmen building the palace.

G 15.4 As the palace expanded during subsequent phases of development it spread east and new ranges created by Henry VIII enclosed several new courtyards including Fountain Court and Chapel Court during the 1530s. Little is known, however, about the character of these spaces during this period although it is worth noting that during the 1540s Fountain Court was called Green Cloister Court, suggesting that it had a grass surface.

G 15.5 Little altered at Hampton Court during the first half of the seventeenth century but after the accession of William and Mary in 1689 Christopher Wren was employed to remodel the palace. His work saw the demolition of the ranges surrounding Fountain Court and a new Baroque palace built in their place. This altered the architectural character of the courtyard but not its size or form since Wren’s palace stood on the same footings as Henry’s had. Wren also chose to encircle Fountain Court with a cloistered walkway mirroring the
layout of the Tudor courtyard. The ranges surrounding Fountain Court have always been occupied by the royal apartments and thus it was overlooked by some of the finest rooms. It may, therefore, be considered as the highest status of the palace's courtyards and right at the heart of the building.

G 15.6 Wren’s interventions at Hampton Court also changed the characters of both Base Court and Clock Court. In the 1690s he built the colonnade in Clock Court to provide a grand entrance to the King's apartments. In 1699-1700 Wren repaved Base Court and Clock Court to allow the King's coach to be driven up to the colonnade. To achieve this he added a central carriageway across the middle of Base Court with slightly rougher paving on either side.

G 15.7 Little changed until the nineteenth century when, in 1891-2, all the paving in Base Court, with exception of the central carriageway and the perimeter paths, was replaced with grass plots. These remained until 2008-09 when Base Court was excavated and repaved to a scheme reflecting Wren’s design.

G 15.8 At the same time HRP undertook a project to re-present Chapel Court as a Tudor privy garden. This courtyard had been used throughout the nineteenth century as a Grace and Favour garden but was, for much of the later twentieth century, neglected and not fulfilling the potential of the space.

G 15.9 In addition to Base Court, Clock Court, Fountain Court and Chapel Court, the following policies should, as appropriate, also apply to all other small courtyard spaces within the footprint of the palace as well as to Tennis Court Lane.

Figure 36: Base Court following repaving.
Significance

G 15.10 - The courtyards of Hampton Court Palace characterise the building and are fundamental to its design, function and history.

G 15.11 - These spaces form important focal points for the visitor experience of Hampton Court.

G 15.12 - The courtyards provide spaces in which to deliver innovative interpretation for daytime visitors and evening guests.

G 15.13 - The larger courtyards provide space which may, on occasions, be used for functions or filming and thus represent a revenue generating asset.

Vulnerability

G 15.14 - Any development or change has the potential to impact particularly heavily on the character of the palace.

G 15.15 - These areas have a high visitor footfall and any interventions may be subject to intense wear and tear.

G 15.16 - Frequent use for functions and filming, particularly where temporary structures are used, can, if poorly managed, spoil the appearance and character of the space for our visitors.
Progress and Developments since 2004

G 15.17 Two of the palace courtyards have undergone significant and important restorations during the period which has resulted in changes to the maintenance regimes and improvements to the character of the spaces. The repaving of Base Court in 2008-09 has restored the appearance and feel of the Tudor palace and also afforded the opportunity for extensive archaeological surveys which have completely changed the accepted history of the site. In 2008-09 Base Court also contains new signage and has become the hub from which all visitor routes now start. A Tudor wine fountain has been built to the design shown in the Field of Cloth of Gold painting to provide a focal point for Base Court. This is a movable structure and on occasions may be located in Clock Court instead. Chapel Court was also re-presented. The old Grace and Favour garden was removed and replaced with a Tudor Garden. The design of the new garden was based on in depth research into the gardens of the period and was based on evidence of gardens at both Hampton Court and Whitehall Palace. It now provides a rich display of King’s beasts on poles, green and white chevron posts and rails and decorated flowerbeds of historic roses and period flowers, surrounded by a mixed flower meadow.

Character Area Policy

G 15.18 HRP’s VISION: We believe that the courtyards of the palace are at the heart of the estate. They will be maintained as areas in which visitors and guests can enjoy the magnificence of the buildings and can read the stories inherent in the architecture. We will present the courtyards to a standard that reflects and enhances the sense of splendour and beauty whilst not detracting from the buildings themselves.

G 15.19 HRP’s POLICY: The courtyards should be recognised as fundamental to the character and function of the palace. They must be maintained to a high standard that reflects the royal heritage of Hampton Court. Inappropriate interventions should be avoided since changes to these spaces have a large impact on the appearance of the palace. However, innovative uses for the spaces and interventions within them should be sought where they allow visitors to enjoy the spaces and appreciate the significance of the courtyards and the buildings.

Policies

G 15.20 - C.A. POLICY 16A - A continued regular routine of maintenance, cleaning and weeding should be followed in all of the courtyards to a standard reflective of the royal character of the buildings.
C.A. POLICY 16B – The grass in Fountain Court should be cut maintained to a high amenity regime and the pond cleaned and maintained to a high standard.

C.A. POLICY 16C – Maintain the Chapel Court Tudor Garden as a faithful recreation of a sixteenth-century garden.

a. Ensure that the planting continues to only use appropriate historic species suitable for the sixteenth century.

b. Maintain the statuary and garden infrastructure to a high standard that reflects the splendour of the Tudor royal court.

c. Complete installation of ornate ship frame to provide topiary for the garden.

C.A. POLICY 16D – Exercise care over the design and placement of temporary planting in pots and containers around the courtyards as inappropriate planting may have an adverse effect on the visual character of the palace.

C.A. POLICY 16E – publish the results of the Oxford Archaeology Unit Base Court excavation of 2008.

Figure 38: Painting the rails for the Tudor Garden, Chapel Court.
H. Major Projects

H 0.1 The following projects are those currently under consideration by HRP. They are presented here to give an indication of future planning and so that they may be assessed by the Gardens Strategy Group for the purposes of creating a prioritisation plan.

Home Park Meadows Habitat Restoration Project

H 0.2 Character Area 1a: 2011 onwards

H 0.3 £110,000+

H 0.4 This project seeks to restore the valuable habitats of the meadows located on the eastern boundary of Home Park adjacent to the River Thames. HRP is working in partnership with the Thames Landscape Strategy Project (TLS) and has secured an initial project fund from the SITA Trust. Further grant funding will be sought for future phases.

H 0.5 The Meadows are primarily used as grazing meadows for horses. The area was formerly an important wetland habitat but poor management practices have diminished its biodiversity. This project will bring the network of ditches that are found in this area back into working function enabling the restoration of the existing reedbed and the creation of new wetland features. These will provide valuable habitats for a number of priority species, including water voles and bittern.

H 0.6 The project will link into a green corridor of wetland habitats that stretches from the Special Protection Area at Knight and Bessborough Reservoirs to the London Wetlands Centre at Barnes.

H 0.7 The SITA Trust funding will employ a Thames Landscape Strategy Project Officer for 2.5 days per week, and cover 100% of the capital costs for work carried out by volunteers and 50% of the labour costs for work carried out by volunteers. SITA will fund 100% of the survey work which will allow the project to be developed and 50% of the capital costs of excavation and construction work in the first two years.

H 0.8 In the first phase of the project SITA funding will be used to carry out the following:

H 0.9 - Hydrological and topographical surveys to establish current water flow levels.

H 0.10 - Geo-archaeological survey and historical research to develop an understanding of historic land practices and identify sensitive areas on site.
H 0.11 - Extended Phase 1 habitat survey to detail any areas of existing habitat of species that should be protected and enhanced.

H 0.12 - Establishment of mink monitoring and extermination programme to better protect populations of water vole.

H 0.13 - Services of a Landscape Architect to plan out proposed ground levels to obtain improved water movement so as to restore the existing reedbed and create new reedbed areas. An archaeological investigation is required for the reedbed before implementing the alterations.

H 0.14 - Restoration of the existing reedbed including; excavation of ditches that feed into this area, scrub removal, willow coppicing, creation of open water areas.

H 0.15 - Creation of new reedbed areas including; first year removal of Japanese knotweed, scrub removal, excavation of main ditch, transplants of existing reed rhizome.

Figure 39: Home Park Meadows showing the dried-up former wetland.

Little Banqueting House Terrace and the Banqueting House Gardens

H 0.16 **Character Area 8: 2011/12**

H 0.17 **£5,000 (Soft landscaping only) + other costs**

H 0.18 As part of the strategic focus on the Baroque and Georgian history of the palace it is proposed that the Little Banqueting House Terrace and the
Banqueting House Gardens are given a new prominence by opening up views into them and allowing better visitor access.

H 0.19 The project should be based on detailed research into the use and development of these areas, including archival and archaeological surveys, and a re-presentation of these gardens should preference a display representative of the early eighteenth-century design.

H 0.20 In the first phase of this project it is intended that the blocked windows looking onto the Little Banqueting House Terrace should be reopened. This will open up views into the Banqueting House Gardens and re-establish the historic connection between the Pond Gardens and the Banqueting House.

H 0.21 It is also proposed that the project considers options for reinstating the Volary (or aviary) Garden. This was an integral part of the original conception for the Banqueting House and its gardens, since the architect William Talman and the gardener Henry Wise based their designs on Louis Le Vau’s menagerie in the gardens of Versailles. The bird cages they installed were of oak, with wire mesh and boarded roofs. They surrounded three sides of the garden and had an apsidal end around a circular fountain. These lasted from c.1700 to 1746, when they were dismantled. There has been a long tradition of keeping exotic birds at the royal palaces and it is hoped that a recreation of these aviaries can both help to tell the story of the eighteenth-century gardens and reinstate this tradition. In the first instance proposals will be considered either for creating aviaries accurately reproducing the historic structures and housing a collection of exotic birds or to create an innovative display that reflects this history without using live animals.

Figure 40: The Little Banqueting House Volary Garden.
Creation of Upper Car Park exit on Vrow Walk with associated landscaping

H 0.22 Character Area 11: 2011/12
H 0.23 £10,000 (Soft landscaping only) + other costs

H 0.24 This project is part of a wider strategic plan to alter the layout, display and use of the Tiltyard area (C.A.11). Vehicle exits from the Upper and Lower Car Parks currently direct cars across the West Front of the palace which is detrimental to its character and conservation. It is proposed, therefore, that a new exit will be created from the Upper Car Park on Vrow Walk. This will both reduce the level of vehicle movement on the West Front and will make leaving the palace easier for visitors since they will be able to access the Hampton Court roundabout directly.

H 0.25 This project will involve significant structural and landscaping work. Some initial research has already been undertaken but more will be required to ensure that there is the minimum possible disruption to historic fabric. A landscaping plan must also be developed so that any new interventions are of a high standard reflecting the royal heritage of the site and new infrastructure should be installed in accordance with HRP guidelines and with all necessary watching briefs.

Redesign of Twentieth Century Garden in partnership with KLC with the installation of a new bridge across the north canal

H 0.26 Character Area 5: 2012/13
H 0.27 £250,000

H 0.28 This project intends to realise the potential of the Twentieth Century Garden by improving access and redesigning it. HRP are working in partnership with KLC School of Garden Design to develop proposals for a new layout. KLC will use the garden as a training resource and it is intended that the area should be divided into a number of themed spaces. Proposals to date include a vegetable and herb garden to supply historic species to the Tudor kitchens and a garden for plants used in natural dyes which will actively support the work of the Textiles Conservation Studio. A vital role for this garden could be as a gene bank for historic varieties of trees and shrubs, e.g. the now very rare silver hollies in the Fountain Garden. This would be a service not just to Hampton Court but to garden restoration nationally. In addition we would also like to create a sensory garden, which is easily accessible to disabled people. The area should have the feel of a community garden and may also be used as a place for hosting temporary events, such as displays of contemporary sculpture. The garden improvements in this area will be part funded by KLC.
To enable the successful use of the garden new access routes will be required. It is proposed, subject to Scheduled Monument Consent, to install a new bridge over the north canal which will allow easy movement between the Great Fountain Garden and the Twentieth Century Garden. HRP will work together with English Heritage and local planning authorities to create a bridge to an acceptable design. The new bridge must satisfy HRP’s design principles but it has yet to be decided whether there should be a preference towards a modern design or an historic design.

The ‘Magic Garden’

This project aims to create an interactive garden aimed at the family market as part of a wider strategic plan to update the Tiltyard area. The ‘Magic Garden’ will be located in the NW corner of the Tiltyard on the former tennis court site (subject to archaeological survey).

An early idea for this ‘Magic Garden’ area was a relief maze, so that the real maze could be restored accurately, in hornbeam and without tarmac and iron railing. Whether or not a relief maze is made, a vital function of the new gardens will be to take pressure off the wilderness maze. The philosophy behind the ‘Magic Garden’ will be that of ‘learning through play’. However, this will be a garden first, not a playground, and should be attractive to all generations. To that end it should be naturalistic so that it changes and develops with the seasons and it should be low-tech in terms of physical infrastructure. It must be both significant and authentic, unique to Hampton Court and underpinning HRP’s values. The garden should reflect the magic of Hampton Court and draw on its history, myths and legends to encourage learning and playfulness in our younger visitors. It should also reference the specific historic uses of the Tiltyard gardens as first a Tudor tiltyard and later a kitchen garden.

It is envisaged that the ‘Magic Garden’ will be within a pay perimeter (either the whole palace ticket or an enhanced garden ticket). This will generate revenue to meet costs and contribute to HRP’s charitable income. Other gardens around the country (e.g. Alnwick Garden) have demonstrated the capacity to fire people's imaginations, sustain repeat visits, attract investment support, and work from both business and learning points of view.

HRP have appointed a Project Board and the Project Sponsor is Tracy Borman

The Kitchen Garden
Character Area 11: 2012/13

£275,000

As part of the strategic plan to redisplay the Tiltyard gardens it is proposed that the former Herbaceous Garden should be turned into a kitchen garden. From the early-eighteenth century until the beginning of the twentieth century a large part of the Tiltyard was put over to horticultural use and it is intended to re-establish this in part of the area so as to emphasise the connection between the gardens and food production.

It is intended that the new Kitchen Garden will be adjacent to the proposed ‘Magic Garden’ and it will be appropriate, therefore, to create a conceptual link between the two spaces.
Annexe A: The Gardens Strategy Group

Members
The 2011 Gardens Strategy Group consisted of:

John Barnes Conservation Director, HRP (chair)
Rod Giddins/Paul Gray Palaces Director, HRP
Terry Gough MVO Head of Gardens & Estates, HRP (Contributing author and author of interim review of the strategy)
Susanne Groom Curator: Collections, HRP (Contributing author)
Dr Lee Prosser Curator: Historic Buildings, HRP
Dr Lucy Worsley Chief Curator of the Historic Royal Palaces (Co-ordinating author)
Brian Dix Archaeologist
Marylla Hunt Landscape Architect
Dr David Jacques Historic Landscape and Gardens Consultant (Contributing author)
David Lambert Historic Landscape and Gardens Consultant
Dr Todd Longstaffe-Gowan Gardens Adviser
Dr Jan Woudstra Historic Landscape and Gardens Consultant

Much work on the 2011 revision of the plan was carried out by Dr Alden Gregory for Historic Royal Palaces, for which we thank him.

Terms of Reference for the Gardens Strategy Group:

- To provide specialist advice to Historic Royal Palaces on projects and proposals for the long-term conservation and development of the gardens and estates at each one of its palaces site.
- To provide specialist advice on the management and maintenance of the gardens and estates, and on plans drawn up to guide this process.
- To provide additional research, drawings and reports when commissioned to do so.
- To assist Historic Royal Palaces with public relations, helping to communicate its cause and charitable purpose to the world.
- The Group will meet twice a year, in May and October.
- The May meeting will be a report about what’s happening, work in progress, issues arising. There will be a less formal agenda, and the group will be able to ask questions and discuss projects freely.

- The October meeting will be more formal and strategic and will review the year ahead. The group will be able to comment on a forward plan, and if necessary their advice and support will enable Terry and Lucy to bid more effectively for money in the Annual Operating Plan round which begins at that point. John Barnes and Rod Giddins from HRP’s executive board guarantee to attend this meeting.

- Two weeks before each meeting, the Group will be circulated with the forward plan for the next six months. They will then get due notice of projects coming up, and the chance to think about their implications before the meeting.
Annexe B: Select Bibliography

The following is a short bibliography intended to supplement the history of the gardens and estates presented above. For a comprehensive bibliography covering published and unpublished material relating to the gardens, estate and landscape of Hampton Court Palace, see the Hampton Court Palace: Bibliography (an internal HRP document).

Reports (Copies kept in Curators’ Office, Hampton Court)

- Royal Parks Historical Survey Hampton Court and Bushy Park, Travers Morgan Planning (1982)
- Geophysical Survey of the Privy Garden, Hampton Court Palace, Northamptonshire Archaeology Unit (Dec 1991)
- Archaeological Evaluation of the Privy Garden, Hampton Court Palace, Northamptonshire Archaeology Unit (1992)
- Hampton Court Gardens: Archive relating to the changes 1699-1713 at the PRO, David Jacques (1994)
- Geophysical Site Investigation Ground Probing Radar Survey at Hampton Court Palace, London (Tiltyard Site), Geo-Services International (UK) Ltd. (Jan 1995)
- The Bowling Green Pavilions of Hampton Court, G.R. Dillamore (Feb 1995)
- The ‘Private Gardens’ at Hampton Court, David Jacques (April 2004)
- Radar Survey of Lower Orangery, Hampton Court Palace, Sandberg Consulting Engineers (Aug 1995)
- A History of the West Front and Associated Barge Walk, David Jacques (Dec 1998)
- Display of Exotic Plants at Hampton Court, Jan Woudstra (Sept 2000)
- Lower Car-park and Tennis Court Lane, Hampton Court Palace […]: Archaeological Evaluation Report, Oxford Archaeological Unit (Nov 2000)

- The Installation of Lights along Banqueting Hall Path, Hampton Court Palace: Archaeological Watching Brief Report, Oxford Archaeological Unit (Mar 2001)


- Hampton Court Palace, Tijou Screen Security Railings: Written Scheme of Investigation, Oxford Archaeology (Mar 2002)

- Hampton Court Palace, Orangery Gardens Stage II: Archaeological Investigation, Oxford Archaeology (Aug 2002)


- Maze Excavation, (Dec 2004)


- The Tiltyard Tower, Hampton Court Palace: Historic Building Recording, Oxford Archaeology (Feb 2006)

- Hampton Court Home Park: Archaeological Desktop Assessment, Oxford Archaeology (Sept 2006)

- Hampton Court Palace, The Tiltyard Tower: Historic Building Recording and Investigation, Oxford Archaeology (Jul 2008)


- East Front Garden, Hampton Court Palace: Historic Building Recording, Oxford Archaeology (Nov 2008)


- Privy Garden Collapse, Hampton Court Palace: Archaeological Evaluation Report, Oxford Archaeology (June 2009)
- Orangery Lawn Hampton Court Palace: Archaeological Investigation Report, Oxford Archaeology (Feb 2009)
- The Pavilion, Hampton Court Palace: Archaeological Assessment, Oxford Archaeology (Jul 2009)
- Hampton Court Palace, Privy Garden Collapse: Preliminary Summary, Oxford Archaeology (Dec 2009)
- Resurfacing Works, Base Court, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey: Post Excavation Assessment, Oxford Archaeology (Dec 2009)
- Hampton Court Palace, Vrow Walk: Summary of Archaeological Recording and Assessment, Oxford Archaeology (Apr 2010)
- Hampton Court Pipeline at The Pavilion and Barge Walk: Written Scheme of Investigation, Oxford Archaeology (Apr 2010)

**Ecology and Biodiversity Reports (Copies kept by the Gardens and Estates Team)**

- Home Park and Hampton Court Palace: Phase I Habitat and Scoping Survey Report, RPS (Oct 2007)
- Home Park and Hampton Court Palace: Review of Existing Ecological Data, RPS (Nov 2007)
- Home Park and Hampton Court Palace: Water Vole Survey Report, RPS (Jun 2008)

**Published Sources**

- Desmond, R., 1877. Bibliography of British and Irish Gardens. Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies.


- Keane, W., 1850. The Beauties of Middlesex; Being a Particular Description of the Principle Seat of the Nobility and Gentry in the County of Middlesex.


- Knyff, L. & Kip, J., 1714. Britannia Illustrata: or Views of Several of the Queen’s Palaces and also the Principle Seats of the Nobility and Gentry of Great Britain. 1.
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