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INTRODUCTION

This site report and description has been prepared for Dover District Council by volunteers of the Kent Gardens Trust with support and training from consultant Virginia Hinze.

The extent of the area identified represent the remains of the designed landscape and does not necessarily cover all remaining elements or the historical extent of landscape changes and takes no account of current ownership.
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

INTRODUCTION

1. The significance of the site as it exists should be assessed on two levels:

a. Its national importance relative to the importance of the Designer (who also built an international reputation as a pioneer in landscape design - although he preferred to call it topographical design) and a knowledgeable plantsman, who based his whole career on the utilisation of his knowledge and practical experience to a specific site.

b. Its local importance is confirmed by its extensive use by local people with a widening catchment area. There is a doubt of how the designed landscape will cater for future needs. There could be a conflict between the pressure for purity in restoration of the original design and developing needs. Educational and leisure uses are areas where these problems are likely to arise.

2. This outstanding and well-preserved garden by Thomas Mawson, the leading landscape designer of the early C20 was commissioned by the owner of the Wiggins Teape paper manufacturing firm in 1901 it was one of Mawson’s first independent commissions. It is the most complete surviving example in Kent and illustrates perfectly the eclectic design approach adopted. Clearly Mawson himself viewed the commission as a success, including several plates of the landscape in his ‘The Art & Craft of Garden Making’. It was designed to provide an appropriate setting for the house, exploiting the dramatic sloping site with a series of formal terraces and a canal, the whole with associated park-like grounds, a kitchen garden, subsidiary stables and lodges appropriate for a manufacturer’s new residence in the countryside.

3. The site is now in divided ownership, the lower third owned and managed as a public park known as Russell Gardens, the upper terraces owned by the residents association and the lower terraces by Dover District Council. Overall however the essential features and character of the site remain unaltered.

4. There is no record available of how the original client and his newly appointed garden designer took over the site, redesigned the building and designed the garden. (This information may be available in the archives of the Mawson Practice (see archival items). However inferences can be drawn based upon Thomas Mawson’s extensive writings. It is apparent that his approach was to consider the opportunities available from the choice of site and from that produce the design. In the case of Kearsney, the site must have appealed to Thomas Mawson's imagination.

5. To maintain its significance for the future, the site should be treated as a living and developing entity retaining the core of the design but facing the challenge of making allowance for changing needs.

6. Structures within it have been assessed and since they contribute appreciably to the character of the garden the following should be listed or recognised as safeguarded as of local significance:
   a. The main house.
   b. All brick retaining walls and steps.
   c. The brick boundary wall and house within the original kitchen garden.
   d. Extant garden structures such as pool edging.

7. The significance of Kearsney Court Gardens is not only secured by the garden itself but by the recognition given to it not only by the District Council but by English Heritage. Designation of the site as a grade II Registered Park and Garden in 2006, and the listing of three garden buildings confirms the value of the design and recognises its contribution to the history of garden design in early C20 England. Additionally, Kent County Council working in partnership with the Kent Gardens Trust included the garden in the Compendium of Kent Historic Parks and Gardens.

EVIDENTIAL VALUE

8. A considerable but so far incomplete archive survives documenting the creation of the garden and its importance in the work of Thomas Mawson. The garden was described in Builders Formal and Architectural Record (1902, 371) and Gardeners’ Chronicle (28 June 1923, 438) and photographs of the garden were included by Mawson in his book The Art and Craft of Garden Making. Additional material may
also be available from Woolerton Dodwell Associates & H. Mawson & Son in Cumbria but has not been inspected.

AESTHETIC VALUE

9. Though now in divided ownership, the gardens of Kearsney Court are little changed from the original intentions of the designer. Such a well preserved publicly available example of the work of one who became the leading exponent of the Arts and Crafts movement in garden design is unique in Kent and particularly important nationally in that there is permanent public access.

10. The garden structures are in the style of the Arts and Crafts movement but from plans, illustrations and extant remains, the planting and layout of the garden also harks back to earlier, more formal neo-classical revival of the late C19 and Edwardian period – a formality influenced by the Italian garden. It is therefore of exceptional interest in the development of garden design.

11. The design consists of a series of compartments laid out on a steeply descending site and is catered for by constructing substantial retaining walls with balustrade, steps and a water feature. At the lower level the presence of a marshy area and a slow flowing stream allowed for a formal pool with bridges and garden buildings resulting in a pleasing area of flowing water. Thomas Mawson’s buildings and extensive changes of level, still respect the site character retaining the dramatic impact of the original.

COMMUNAL VALUE

12. This definition is taken to mean that contained in the Dover Heritage Strategy (paragraph 4.8 on page 27). It is a means of assessing the way users relate to the open space by personal experiences practically and visually and the value they apply to the site as a result.

13. Implemented 100 years ago, the Gardens have been managed as a public park by Dover for over 50 years. As a result, the park has become part of the social and visual experience of local people. It would be missed if closed and even more appreciated if its facilities are improved and new needs catered for. Its popularity is wider than just the village as confirmed by the well used car park and a recent (2013) visitor survey conducted by Dover Council. So as well as being historically valuable in its own right, its value locally is to the user and in the future should be developed particularly for local schools where it is possibly an underused resource. The original owners of the land were all local business men with a local economic stake in Dover. Currently, local people have a similar link.

14. Social as well as visual links to Bushy Ruff, Kearsney Abbey and further afield are important community links for residents of Kearsney village and Temple Ewell in particular. The three open space sites are linked in that each is generally visible from the others with each having its own characteristics; the more formal Kearsney Court, the public space of Kearsney Abbey and the informal picturesque and less well used area of Bushy Ruff.

15. Although contiguous, Bushy Ruff, and particularly Kearsney Court, and Kearsney Abbey are not conveniently linked for pedestrian use. Improving pedestrian access over Alkham Road and between Bushy Ruff and Kearsney Court would improve safety, further encourage site popularity
SUMMARY OF HISTORIC INTEREST
This outstanding and well-preserved garden by Thomas Mawson, the leading landscape designer of the early C20, was commissioned by the owner of the Wiggins Teape paper manufacturing firm in 1901 and was one of Mawson’s first independent commissions. It is the most complete surviving example in Kent and illustrates perfectly the eclectic design approach adopted. Clearly Mawson himself viewed the commission as a success, including several plates of the landscape in his ‘The Art & Craft of Garden Making’. It was designed to provide an appropriate setting for the house, exploiting the dramatic sloping site with a series of formal terraces and a canal, the whole with associated park-like grounds, a kitchen garden, subsidiary stables and lodges appropriate for a manufacturer’s new residence in the countryside.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT
Unlike the other two estates covered in this study, the site history prior to construction of the house and garden is not relevant to development of the site except to note the likely attraction in its natural land form to the purchasers.

Early maps and research on the adjoining Kearsney Abbey and Bushy Ruff sites indicate that it was part of the original Kearsney Court estate. (This estate and the house were renamed Kearsney Manor when the present Kearsney Court was built). The Ordnance Survey Surveyors original drawing from 1801 shows the site as undeveloped open fields.

The development site was first defined in 1896 but serious interest in the development of the present site of Kearsney Court house and garden (Figure 1 for site boundary) began in the 1899 when the site was acquired and development started by Alfred Leney. The design was for a typically Victorian gothic house, the drawings of which still survive in a private archive. He very soon sold the site to Edward Percy Barlow who abandoned the house design, altered the style to Arts and Crafts and employed Thomas Mawson to design the gardens and local architects, Worsfold & Hayward for the house. It is not clear how much of the first house design was implemented but the new house plan resembles the first design in plan so it is possible that the existing foundations were reused at least in part. The garden was closely linked to the design of the house in timing as an original site plan exists from 1901 illustrating the layout that is recognisable today. The house and gardens were completed and the house occupied in about 1901 and a date stone of 1900 is present on a gable.

The more recent chronology from about WW1, illustrates how the site changed due to financial and public pressures. On the death of Edward Barlow in 1912, a Mr Johnstone acquired the property and it became a nursing home. In WW2 it was used as a military hospital, and in 1950 it was acquired by a Development Company which tried unsuccessfully to develop the whole site for housing. Instead, they converted the main house into seven flats. Since then, 16 free standing houses have been built and the entrance lodge is also in separate private ownership. Due to continuing pressure for development by the owner, the residents of the main house bought additional areas of the garden incorporating the bastion and middle terrace. In 1945 Dover Corporation the rest of the garden including the canal and later renamed it Russell Gardens after the Councillor who was instrumental in bringing the site into public ownership in 1947.

Further information on the C20 history of the site is available from the Dover District Heritage Strategy of June 2012.
Kearsney Court is situated two miles north-west of Dover on the B2060 Folkestone Road on the outskirts of the village of Kearsney which is adjacent to Temple Ewell. The total site covers 10 ha (25 Acres).

The site is bounded to the south by Alkham Road and to the west a fence runs along the parish boundary and separates the site from Bushy Ruff. On the north side the boundary is woodland forming the Palmtree Hill Plantation. The eastern boundary runs diagonally south east along an unmade track leading to Summerhill Lodge.

The nature of the site must have defined the design approach including the siting of the house and layout of the garden. The site rises steeply to the north from the course of the river Dour and includes a shelterbelt (Palmtree Hill Plantation Wood). To the west the land gradually drops to the level of the valley bottom containing the River Dour and the Alkham Road (B2060).

To the east, the hills are steep chalk with the railway, Temple Ewell village, and the Whitfield Hill Road leading to the A2 Canterbury Road. To the South, is the originally boggy area containing the river (now forming part of the Kearsney Court site), Kearsney Abbey, now a public park with Alkham Road dividing the two sites and the village of River to the South-West. The Kearsney Court site relates well to the old established villages and sited on a south facing slope is protected from north and east winds by hills and tree belt.

Although once open to extensive views, the site has a much more enclosed appearance as a result of the presence of mature trees within and outwith the site. This is particularly obvious in the way that trees (some from the original Mawson planting in 1900) have now cut off the house from the lower, southern part of the site which is owned by Dover District Council.

The original entrance to the whole site now serves only the house and recently built housing placed along the entrance drive. All this land is privately owned and is included in the designated designed landscape. The extensive hard landscaping of retaining walls around the main house, the kitchen garden boundary walls, gardeners cottage and lodges and lodge gates forms a valuable part of the garden design although these are in the privately owned part of the site. (See photographs Figures 11 and 15). Changes to the garden are linked to conversion of the house to flats. For example, an additional pair of unattractive but practical steel steps has been added to the upper retaining wall to provide residents with access to gardens. Since registration as a Historic Park and Garden in 2006, little change has occurred so the description remains valid.

Kearsney Court Public Gardens
2.8 Due to the designation of a public open space and now known as Russell Gardens by the district council, an additional access from the Alkham Road has been created and this is linked to the south over the road to Kearsney Abbey open space. This gives access to existing footpaths throughout the site.

2.9 There has been minimal recent change to the garden although the DCC maintenance programme has included repairing and repainting the listed garden features and temporary repairs to the canal concrete base which had started to leak.

The following description is taken from the description of Kearsney Court in the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest

GENERAL. The landscape around Kearsney Court, laid out about 1900, was one of the first independent commissions by Thomas Mawson, the leading landscape designer of the early C20. It was designed to provide an appropriate setting - almost a park in miniature with ambitious terraced gardens, wider park-like grounds, a kitchen garden and appurtenances like stables and lodges - for a manufacturer's new residence in the countryside just outside Dover. Clearly Mawson himself viewed the commission as a success, including several plates of the landscape in his The Art & Craft of Garden Making.
HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT. Kearsney Court was planned in 1899 for Alfred Leney, a brewer and drinks manufacturer. The site chosen was on rising ground above the hamlet of Kearsney, the northern half of which was occupied by Palmtree Hill Plantation and the lower open ground. However, the project was soon sold on to Edward Percy Barlow, the owner of Wiggins Teape, a paper manufacturer. The house was completed about 1900, and at about the same time - the Canal Pond summerhouses were still under construction in 1902 (Builders Formal and Architectural Record 1902, 371) - the grounds were laid out by Thomas Mawson (1861-1933), perhaps the leading, and certainly the most prolific, landscape designer of his day. This was probably one of Mawson's earliest independent commissions, and it was probably an erroneous attribution, a decade later by the Gardeners' Chronicle (28 June 1913, 438), to Messrs. Mawson Bros. of Windermere, the family firm he had recently broken away from. Several set-piece photographs of Kearsney were included in Mawson's main account of his life's work, The Art & Craft of Garden Making which appeared in five editions between 1900 and 1926. On Barlow's death in 1912 the property passed to Mr. Johnstone, a London newspaper man, and was later a nursing home and, in the Second World War, a military hospital. About 1950 the whole estate was bought by a development company; the main house was split into seven residential freeholds, and later several new houses were erected off the main drive. Part of the grounds (including the lowest third of the formal gardens) was acquired by the local authority for a park (now known as Russell Gardens), but overall the essential character of the site remains unaltered.

DESCRIPTION LOCATION, AREA, BOUNDARIES, LANDFORM, SETTING. Kearsney Court stands in above the hamlet of Kearsney in Temple Ewell, on the north-west fringe of Dover. The site, as here designated, occupies a site running uphill to the north from a valley-bottom stream, its northern half steeply so. The boundaries of the site follow the B2060 Alkham Road to the south; fence lines running through the steeply sloping woodland to the north of the house; and to the west again a fence line. From the house, close to the north edge of the site, there are views of about 2km across the valley, originally to farmland but now to secondary woodland. The setting remains fairly rural, certainly that is the sense within the grounds, although there has been some piecemeal development around and within the edge of the site. The last comprises six detached houses built off the south side of the drive to the west of South Lodge in the mid-late C20. They are excluded from the designated area.

ENTRANCES AND APPROACHES. The grounds are entered from an entrance at their eastern extremity. The is marked by two pairs of sturdy, square-sectioned 2.5m high brick and tile gate posts with concrete half-ball tops incised to resemble ashlar. The piers define the main vehicular access (the gates across which are lost) and pedestrian wicket gates to either side. The wickets have identical white-painted wooden gates, either those shown in a c.1907 photo (Mawson 1907) or close copies. Behind, a pair of identical two-storey, L-plan lodges, North Lodge and South Lodge, of about 1900 face each other across the start of the drive. These are two-storey L-plan buildings in a simple Arts and Crafts style each with a large bay window projecting, toll house-style, towards the drive. From here the drive curves upwards for 150m before levelling out and straightening for the final 80m approach to the house. The drive now stops short of the house at a row of C20 garages (not of historic interest) and a parking area. Originally it continued to a porte cochere (removed) on the north side of the house.

PRINCIPAL BUILDING Kearsney Court (not listed) is aligned east-west close to the northern boundary of its grounds, which fall steeply away to the south. The original plans, which were for a rather severe gothic house, were amended and softened by a local firm of architects, Worsfold and Hayward of Dover. It comprises an irregular, two-storey, 50m-long building. On the main south front three short gabled wings project forward at either end of the main house and at the centre; west of the west gable is the former service wing. Architectural detailing includes full-height bay windows to the central and eastern gabled wings, and a balcony supported on wooden pillars between the central and western wings. The latter has a large ground-floor bay window. At the north-east corner of the house is a three-storey turret with an elaborate conical roof with dormer windows from an observation room. Internally the house was well-appointed with good quality carpentry and fittings. Inevitably various alterations were made when the house was subdivided c.1950 but its external appearance and essential character remains little altered.

150m east of the house is its former stables, built c.1900 and converted in the C20 to The Gables, a substantial two-storey ashlar and flint house with decorative timber-framed gable.
GARDENS AND PLEASURE GROUNDS.
Mawson’s plan for the gardens and grounds was apparently executed as intended, and comprises a series of formal terraces dropping steeply away from the house to a lower pleasure ground with a large formal Canal Pond. The grounds are arranged about a central axis aligned on the balcony between the central and western gabled wings of the house.

A narrow terrace runs along the south front of the house, now mainly of grass and partly subdivided by hedges planted since the house was split up c.1950. The terrace is bounded by a balcony of arcaded brickwork, topped with half-round bricks in which are set short iron rods supporting a chain. The rods and chains do not appear on early photos of the gardens (e.g. Mawson 1907) and were presumably introduced in the C20 as a safety feature. From the centre of the terrace angles flights of stairs lead left and right down to the next terrace, with a seating alcove between them. The wall which supports the uppermost terrace stands some 3m tall, and is broken into bays by buttresses. Originally both it and the other terrace walls were planted with pear trees grafted on to quince stock (Gardeners’ Chronicle 28 June 1913, 438). At either end bastion-like sections with angle buttresses project slightly forward. As part of the subdivision of the property c.1950 additional access was provided between the uppermost terrace and the next by means of two steel fire escape-like stairs, one either side of the main flight of stairs. The second terrace is again narrow, and was fronted by white-painted wooden rails and balusters (both missing) set between brick buttress piers rising from the terrace wall. From this terrace the main flights of stairs angle back to the third terrace which is broad, grassed, fronted by a golden yew hedge and with clipped yew balls against the brick terrace wall behind. The central path leads via steps to the fourth terrace, to the rear of which is a shallow-ramped flower bed and to the front stubby brick piers with stone ball cappings linked by chains. This terrace overlooks one of the centrepieces of the garden, the Bastion, a semi-circular garden with central pool again supported to the front by a substantial 2m high brick wall. The interior of the Bastion is now lawned, although the lines of its original gravel paths and flower beds can still be clearly made out.

The view from the Bastion south is now lost, as tall secondary woodland has been allowed to grow up immediately beyond along what, since 1950, has been the boundary between the grounds of Kearsney Court and the Russell Gardens public park which now occupies the lower southern part of the pleasure grounds. The axial steps lead first to a rectangular formal pool (now dry and somewhat dilapidated) set between fenced grass tennis courts. These occupy an area intended by Mawson to be divided between tennis courts and slightly larger croquet lawns. South of the tennis courts is one of the main features of the grounds, a long, formal canal, the Canal Pond, made by Mawson along the swampy ground of a stream bed. Measuring 160m long from east to west and 15m wide and with a expanded circular central section, the Pond is closed at either end by ornamental covered bridges (or summerhouses; early C20 accounts vary in their terminology), Arts and Crafts interpretations of Palladian antecedents. That to the west carries the stream into the Pond via a ‘chute’, a shallow flight of semi-circular steps. At the centre of the south side of the Pond is a boathouse of identical character comprising a summerhouse with white-painted pillars to the front and a hipped time roof over a simple brick basement with arched boat entrance to the front. East of the Canal Pond was what in 1902 was described as a bog and rock garden ( Builders Formal and Architectural Record 1902, 371).

West of the tennis courts is a children's playground with apparatus and a brick public lavatory of the mid C20, while immediately south-west of the courts is a shelter, rebuilt in the late C20 as a pergola-like structure with brick piers.

To either side of the tennis courts and the Canal Pond are informal lawns and paths with, especially in the western half of the grounds, mature specimen trees presumably mainly introduced c.1900.

KITCHEN GARDEN.
Thomas Mawson’s design included a substantial walled kitchen garden, located on south-facing ground to the south-east of the house and aligned on it and its gardens. Measuring 90m east-west by 40m it is surrounded by tall, well-detailed, brick walls with angle buttresses with an ornamental entrance with double wooden doors under a pedimented arch in the west wall. The garden was divided into four, with an ornamental water tank at the centre. At the east end of the garden there were extensive glasshouses.
including vineyard, peach house and heated pits; the Gardeners' Chronicle in 1913 recorded that previously (suggesting that Mawson's scheme was already being simplified) 8,000 bedding plants were raised each year including 3,000 Perlargoniums. Against the inner face of the east wall is a modest gardener's cottage or bothy. Presumably when the house was subdivided the kitchen garden lost its original function and became the private garden of the former gardener's cottage, which it remains in 2006. The head gardener's house of c.1900, a single-storey part flint-walled house with a timber-framed gable and red tile roof (originally The Bungalow, now Courtland Cottage), stands 50m north-east of the cottage.

ASSSESSMENT OF THOMAS H MAWSON

Born in 1861, T. H. Mawson had the ideal upbringing to fit him for his role as Garden Designer, Landscape Architect and Civic Planner. He began by cultivating a garden at seven, learning about plants, raising them in commercial nurseries and doing survey drawings for clients. Starting from the practical rather than the academic influenced his approach to design from the small garden to the large estates and civic centre proposals. He started his own practice in 1889 and his first commission was Bryerswood gardens at Far Sawrey near Windermere. He died in 1933.

His early reading resulted in a sympathy for John Ruskin, Repton, Loudon and Edward Kemp’s approach to design and he appeared to maintain a respect for them throughout although not Capability Brown who he referred to “as turning his back on creative design to caricature nature”. The reasons were probably pragmatic in that Thomas Mawson applied his knowledge to the problem at hand rather than follow an inflexible design philosophy. His pragmatism probably also included rejecting clients' instructions and there is at least one case where he lost a major project by refusing to give in or rising to an unusual challenge. In 1898 he designed a garden representing Christ's passion although this was not completed and a Japanese garden in 1922. His practical approach was illustrated by the content and layout of his publications; early on he also produced a catalogue of garden furniture available for sale. He had Arts & Crafts sympathies, working with Baillie Scott and CFA Voysey and became a member of the Art Workers Guild in 1905. He invented the term “Landscape Architecture”, although he preferred the term Topographical Architecture. (The Art and Craft of Garden Making p15). He considered that any project should form a “unit”, so house and garden should be designed together and follow the application of three principles in his garden design; realism, romanticism and symbolism (mysticism).

Thomas Mawson’s intentions are clear with all the proposals he illustrated in his publications and expressed in the design for Kearsney Court. He used the site to formulate his proposals. The House is sited high up on a South facing slope, needing extensive modification to the hill around the house including the construction of battered retaining walls of imaginative design and fine craftsmanship, so good that they survive in sound condition over 100 years later. Lower but more extensive retaining walls step down containing herbaceous planting and curved paths. Lower down at the level of the valley bottom, a lily pond and tennis and croquet courts were sited on level ground. Finally the swampy valley bottom was drained, the stream canalised into a rectangular formal boating lake with rocky cascades and covered bridges at either end whilst the centre contained a boathouse and a circular expanse of water. The result – a design fit for purpose and beautifully incorporated into the original site.

In his book Civic Art of 1911, Thomas Mawson identified 4 design styles; Architectural, Formal, English landscape and Natural. It is fair to say that Kearsney Court expresses very well the way this designer interpreted these four approaches together on a single site.

CONCLUSION

The design of Kearsney Court dates from 1901 when The Mawson Practice was beginning to expand into civic design commissions such as the Palace of Peace Gardens in the Hague in 1908. This design is part of his predominantly garden design phase and although he continued to produce garden designs, as his practice grew, his family became more involved and the scale of work changed. Hence this design can be considered an important example of his personal approach to garden design.
It is clear from a preliminary survey that a substantial proportion of trees survive from the original design. The gardens also exhibit the identifiable remains of the original garden layout with paths, garden buildings, water features, and levels defined by retaining walls. Finally, there are extensive photographs ranging in date from the early 1900’s to the 1960’s. The majority show the various stages of planting ranging from the early flower beds (preferred by the first owner) to the grassing over of the terraces after the 1950’s. It has not been possible to obtain any information on the detailed planting proposals or constructional drawings for the garden features. Thomas Mawson’s writings provide a flavour of his approach but the availability of his office records could provide a valuable resource worth investigating.

The site of Kearsney Court House and Garden is a self-contained design which follows the philosophy of Thomas Mawson and no doubt his client. The site over 100 years later still retains its original character in spite of the changes of ownership and use that has inevitably occurred.

That the original design is still recognisable is due to the luck that it survived development pressures and to the credit of Dover District Council for their policy of care and repair. Credit must also be given to the quality of the original building work and to the robustness of Thomas Mawson’s design which has been flexible enough to cater for change whilst maintaining the original design aesthetic. We are at a key point in its securing its future. The majority of the hard landscaping, particularly the retaining walls around the house are in urgent need of restoration and repair.

The retaining walls in private ownership are showing signs of deterioration and the lack of sensitive garden management has changed the visual appearance of the garden. Due to the divided ownership some compromises are probably inevitable. Consideration should be given to the listing of further garden structures with the option of defining some as “Buildings at Risk”. The production of a Conservation Management plan could also be considered.

Structures within the garden have been assessed and since they contribute appreciably to the character of the garden the following should be listed or safeguarded as of local significance:

- the main house,
- all brick retaining walls and steps,
- the brick boundary wall and house within the original kitchen garden and
- extant garden structures such as pool edging.
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