

**A Prospect beyond History:** The Contextual  
Analysis of the Designed Landscapes in the North Riding, Yorkshire  
during the Long- Eighteenth Century **Volume I**

Leslie E. Johansen  
PhD  
University of York  
Archaeology  
2009

## ABSTRACT

L.E. Johansen, *A Prospect Beyond History: A Contextual Analysis of the Designed Landscapes in the North Riding, Yorkshire during the Long- Eighteenth Century*. Submission of thesis for PhD. Bibliographic Details: 2 Volumes; pages; 186 illustrations, 96 in colour; five figures; 7 tables.

This thesis is in response to Tom Williamson's study of the parks and gardens in Norfolk. Through an inclusive and multi-contextual approach Williamson dispelled notions of a teleological evolution of designed landscapes over the eighteenth century. In response this thesis analyzed 126 designed landscape parks and gardens within the North Riding through a multi-contextual approach.

The analysis of these parks and gardens through a socio-economic context was carried out revealing that the great landowners and land magnates established precedence for the continued maintenance of formal elements within the designed landscapes through out the long-eighteenth century; a trend which was emulated by the members of the greater gentry and lesser gentry.

By reviewing the landowners and their designed landscapes through a socio-political context, highlighted alternative narratives through which we can study eighteenth century designed landscapes. Reviewing the national and regional contexts of these landowners through their marital, political and various social contexts, including membership to London Gentlemen's Clubs such as Whites and Brooks's, revealed that the gentlemen of the North Riding were not disconnected from the national context. Analyzing the traditional or progressive stance of the landowners through analysis of their political and religious affinities determined. Whilst some of the landowners were traditional, this traditionalism was not reflected within their designed landscapes. Additionally the maintenance or retention of formal elements within the design transcended political and religious affinities, as landowners regardless of traditional or liberal affinity were taking part in this regional trend.

Lastly and conclusively, the designed landscapes in conjunction with these various narratives were analyzed within both a geographical and topographical contexts. Although this analysis highlighted some regional trends occurring within the riding, it revealed that social constructs and connectivity often over-rode regionality based upon individual geographical and topographical situation. Additionally this process elucidated lines of communication occurring across the riding, represented in a regional chronology of design. Through the exploration of alternative narratives, namely the Gentlemen's Clubs, established a venue in which this communication occurred.

# CONTENTS

## Volume 1

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Figures	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Abbreviations	viii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	1
Yorkshire	3
1.2 Literature Review	7
1.3 Methodology	10
Desk Based Assessment	10
Selection of Landscapes	11
Creating Time-Depth	12
Socio Economic Context and Establishing Ownership	12
Social, Political and Economic Context	13
Distribution of Designed Landscapes	13
2 Socio-Economic Context	15
2.1 Introduction	15
Regional Analysis of the Landscape Parks and Gardens within the North Riding	15
The Designed Landscape Parks and Gardens of the North Riding Within Their Social Context	17
2.2 Land Magnates and Great Land owners	29
Introduction:	29
The Designed Landscape Parks and Gardens	33
Conclusion	58
2.3 The Estates of the Greater Gentry	60
Introduction	60
Analysis of the Designed Landscapes with Time Depth	64
Analysis of Estates with Nineteenth Century Maps	75
Conclusion	85



2.4 The Estates of the Lesser Gentry	86
Introduction	86
Analysis of the Designed Landscapes with Time Depth	90
Estates with Nineteenth Century Maps and Plans	95
Conclusion	103
2.5 Analysis and Discussion	104
Introduction	104
Analysis and Discussion	105
Conclusion	112
3 Social Context	116
3.1 Introduction	116
3.2 Discussion	118
Introduction	118
Landscapes of the Peerage and Local Gentry	118
Landscapes of Landowners with Local versus National Contexts	128
3.3 Conclusion	139
4 Geographical Context	142
4.1 Introduction	142
4.2 Topography of the North Riding	143
Natural England's Character Areas of the North Riding	144
4.3 Distribution Through the North Riding	146
Estates with Time-Depth	151
Conclusion	166
4.4 Regional Dialects	169
Lowland Regions	170
Upland Regions	193
Transitional Lands	205
4.5 Conclusion	209
5 Conclusion	219
Bibliography	229
Maps Consulted	239



## Volume 2

Table of Contents	ii
List of Plates	iii
List of Tables	xiii
Plates	1
Tables	103
Gazetteer	117

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Levels of Landownership	23
Figure 2	Breakdown of the North Riding Estates of the levels of landownership	27
Figure 3	Distribution of titles landowners within the North Riding	28
Figure 4	Great Landowners and Land Magnates within the North Riding	31
Figure 5	Status of landownership based on lands owned throughout the Kingdom	32

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are numerous people including family, friends and colleagues who have been helpful in so many different ways, from distant support from across the pond, to cups of tea and a high tolerance to the late-night-erratic-tapping of computer keys. There are so many people without whom, I am not sure I would have made it to this very point. To all of you I give my most heartfelt appreciation.

First I would like to thank and send my appreciation to the archivists and staff at the North Yorkshire County Records Office, who were so kind with all of my requests to view the estates maps and plans. I would also like to send my appreciation to Paul Stamper and Andy Wimble with English Heritage, for all of their assistance with the 'brown files'. I would also like to thank Peter Goodchild, Eric Matthews and Helen Lazenby (who has recently left us) all whose knowledge on the Yorkshire families has been invaluable. I would also like to thank Lord and Lady Bolton, Mr and Mrs Clutterbank, Mr and Mrs George Winn-Darley, Sir George and Lady Wombwell, and Sir William Worsley whose kindness and willingness to let me explore have been wonderful. I would also like to thank all of the landowners of the North Riding, past and present, without whom this research would not have been.

There have been a vast number of people who have been there for support intellectually, emotionally and their sense of wit has been a calming factor, not only throughout the past four years, but most definitely during these past few months: Steve Ashby, Ed Blinkhorn, Katharine Boardman, Ben Elliott, Eva Fairnell, Rebecca Lane, Richard and Sally Marriott, Aleks McClain, Claire McKay, Colin McNicol, Anhelio Mariani, Nicky Milner, Cath Neal, John Pemburton, Paul Ruxton, Hayley Saul, Paul Stamper, Rachael Stamper, Tim Tatlioglu, Pam and Gavin Ward, Emma Waterton and Katie Webb. I thank all of you for your support and friendship. This extends to everyone back home across the pond who have been supportive, encouraging and amazing all the way through this adventure: Kim Asch, Carol Aus, Chris Brandner, Kelly Burt, Augusta Downey, Chris Johnson and Jana Rumberger. I would also like to acknowledge all of the Johansen and Emmons clan who have strength and ability to follow my dreams. To Charles for all of his support and kindness through this time and to Christine and Graeme McKay and Sally and Richard Marriott I am ever grateful for 'taking me in a one of your own', your love and support have been un-measurable.

It is with happy heart that I give recognition and respect to Ben Gourley and Anthony Masinton; who's ever present support and patients were most appreciated. Whilst un-boundless thanks goes to the both of you for the numerous times you helped me throughout my research. However, this thanks does not extend to GIS (as you both will understand).

There is a group of people who have been there for me as academic guides through out Aleks, I could not have done this without your 'sisterly' guidance. Steve and Emma your suggestions and guidance has kept me focused (for the most part) and sane. I would really like to thank everyone who has given me support and assistance these past few weeks. I could not have done it with out



you: Aleks, Emma, Eva, Rachael, Steve and most importantly Hayley, who not only assisted with the technical workings of this project, but as my house mate, has had to witness the degradation of my ability to interact with the planet during my final write-up.

At this point I must thank those who are always near: Mom, Dad, Joseph and Jim, Grandpa and Grandma, Nini and Rome, Francis, Rufus, Jane, Tom and Faye, Anita, Rosa, Sarah Wise, Zac and Graeme; all of whom are truly dear and truly missed.

Finally, and absolutely most importantly, I must thank my supervisor, Dr Jonathan Finch, whose support, wisdom and understanding has proven to be the most valuable asset to my successfully completing this research. To you I give my greatest and utmost gratitude. Without your gentle and sometimes not so gentle prodding, I do not know what I would have done. Thank you.

## ABBREVIATIONS

GD	-English Heritage Garden Registry File
NYCRO	-North Yorkshire County Records Office
OS	-Ordnance Survey
VCH	-Victoria County Histories

## INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

'Yorkshire... one may call and justify this to be the best shire of England...I would term it the Garden of England, save becaufe it is fo far from the Mansion Houfe, I mean the City of London'

-- *Thos Fuller (1662)*

Traditionally literature exploring eighteenth-century designed landscape parks and gardens focuses on key landscapes, known designers and contemporary writings, the source of the first critique being *The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening*, by Horace Walpole (1780). From this point forward each historian quotes, sources, builds upon and/or debates the last, creating a similar consciousness of thought regarding the evolution of landscape park and garden design over the eighteenth century. In light of this an accepted 'teleological' evolution of design has arisen in order to explain the shift in design trends over the eighteenth century away from the more formal, classical elements prevalent at the start of the century towards a more natural aesthetic, which started to appear in the 1760s (Macaulay 1953; Hadfield 1960; Hussey 1967; Willis 1977; Thacker 1979; Everett 1994; Girouard 1980; Jacques 1983; Taylor 1983; Hunt 1986; Williamson & Bellamy 1987; Cosgrove & Daniels 1988; Bending 1992; Taigel & Williamson 1993; Darby Joy 2000; Williamson 1995, 2002).

As designed landscapes have been redeveloped, the addition of parks and gardens on the English Heritage register (held in English Heritage offices in Swindon) has been a vital step in recording the physical evidence within the existing landscape. The regional efforts of the National Trust and English Heritage, however, once again, focus on grand estates,



creations of key designers and/or designs deemed unique or monumental within the evolution of parks and gardens over the eighteenth century. Rescue archaeology and individual research projects have recorded existing landscape features both above ground and beneath the surface. Archaeologist Brian Dix, and historians like John Phibbs and conservationist, Peter Goodchild have written and presented methodologies for studying landscapes which include thorough desktop assessment and field survey in attempt to place the landscapes within its broader context. However, their research still approaches individual landscapes, giving contextual 'snap-shots' of design throughout the century (Lambert 1995, Dix 1985, Phibbs 1983).

Recent research by Timothy Mowl has shifted focus from the individual landowner or designer at a particular site to the dynamic relationship between the two and the influence of this relationship upon the final design. By taking into account the economic, political, social and artistic stances of both, the communication and relationship between the two, he reveals their motivation and intent, bringing us closer to understanding why certain aesthetic choices were made (2000). In addition, his regional studies of the landscape parks and gardens within Gloucestershire (2002), Dorset (2003), Wiltshire (2004), Cornwall (2005) and Worcestershire (2006) he starts to question the 'broad-brush garden histories that treat England as one horticultural unit' (2002, 11). His regional studies reveal regional patterns which do not follow the accepted teleological evolution of design once proposed by historians.

An inclusive methodology was pioneered by landscape archaeologist Tom Williamson in his regional research of eighteenth-century designed landscape parks and gardens of Norfolk. By adopting this inclusive approach, Williamson was able to fully comprehend the evolution of designed landscapes of Norfolk over the eighteenth century, dispelling notions that the evolution was indeed teleological. He elucidated variances in style, patterns of distribution and evolution of design based upon the influence of economics, personal taste and the social and political identity of the landowner. He observed the adaptation and manipulation of the natural landscape and the built environment within the overall representation of the design (Williamson 1998). In his recent article 'Designed

Landscapes: The Regional Dimension'; he took the study of the landscape parks and gardens of Norfolk to a deeper level by studying the influences of the natural topography on the designs. Williamsons analyzed the designed landscapes of Norfolk within a topographical, geographical and geophysical context. He stressed that by looking regionally, would elucidate ways in which different styles of design were adapted to local circumstances telling us about principal aesthetic and social concerns of the designers and landowners. In this regard we need to think locally as well as nationally (Williamson 2004). Through his research, Williamson was able to place the accepted teleological evolution of the designed landscape over the eighteenth century in a precarious place.

Williamson argued that the national chronology of the designed landscape should be examined in greater detail through further regional studies. In order to test theories, such as the extent of delayed implementation of designs or the retention of formal elements, it was felt best to look to areas of the country well beyond the home counties. With this in mind, the focus of this research will be on the development and subsequent redesign of the landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding of Yorkshire.

### *Yorkshire*

Located in the north-east of England, Yorkshire has traditionally been considered to be distant and remote from the political and social epicenter of London (Bossy 1976, Fuller 1662). Because of this distance and remoteness, historians have considered that trends would reach this region far later than counties closer to London (Girouard 1980, Hoskins 1988, Williamson and Lytleton 1907). Traditionally, when historians wished to research the inspiration for design trends, landscapes located in the south and closer to London have been the focus of research. This thesis will seek to test this theory by examining the landscape parks and gardens located in this 'remote' region of Yorkshire to see if indeed, the development of designed landscapes was later than the accepted chronology would expect. The natural topography is quite diverse from, the broad lowland regions of the Vales to the varied topography of the North York Moors and the Yorkshire Dales. By



carrying out an analysis of the designed landscapes within this varied topographical and geographical context, can reveal how this natural setting would have influenced the designs on a more regional and local scale. This analysis can then be placed alongside regional studies carried out by Williamson. By studying the landscapes within this multi-contextual approach will help to clarify and expand the accepted narrative of in hopes to add depth and understanding to the narrative of eighteenth century designed landscapes.

On the basis of date of design, one cannot deny that the creation of iconic landscape parks and gardens such as Castle Howard (1700-1730) and Duncombe Park (1713) were early to contemporary within the national chronology of design. Both of these landscapes contained early designs of Vanbrugh, Hawkesmoor, Bridgeman and Switzer. Both were considered sources of inspiration for other parks and gardens throughout England (Hussey 1967, GD 2061, Soumarez-Smith 1990, GD2063, Mowl 2000). Duncombe Park is considered to be one of the first landscapes in which Bridgeman extended the visual experience of the landscape unobstructed into the distant view with the inclusion of what was thought to be the first use of the ha-ha within England (Walpole 1785, Hussey 1967). Being contemporary designs with iconic landscapes such as Chatsworth (1709), Twickenham (1719) and Lyme Park (1720) and important preceding landscapes like Blenheim (1720s), Chiswick (1729) Stowe (1730) and Rousham (1737), indicates that not all of the landscapes within the remote regions of England were mere followers of trends.

During earlier research of the designed landscape parks and gardens within the region, it was noted that landowners were shifting towards naturalistic designs over the eighteenth century. However, unlike national trends, these landowners did not completely replace their earlier formal designs in favour of naturalistic designs throughout the eighteenth century. This regional trend occurred within both the larger designed landscapes as well as within smaller parks and gardens.

It is within this remote region with known instances of retained formality, that this research will be carried out. By analyzing the designed landscapes of the North Riding within a multi-contextual approach, the following research will first analyze the



landscapes through the economic, political and social contexts of the landowners, in hopes to prove or dispel notions in regard to the conservative stance of Yorkshire gentlemen and/or their remoteness and disconnection from the society and trends of London. Additionally by analyzing the implementation and subsequent development of their designed landscape parks and gardens within these contexts it is hoped to place the designs of the North Riding in their proper place within the national chronology of landscape design. Lastly, by studying the landowners and their landscapes within their regional, geographical and topographical contexts, it is hoped to elucidate, if not London, then who or what is influencing the retention of formality evident within the landscape parks and gardens in the North Riding (Johansen-Salters 2004).

In order to come to a closer understanding of the pattern, trends and evolution of design within the landscape parks and gardens they will be analyzed within a multi-tiered context driven by social constructs and the natural topography of the Riding. First they will be analyzed within the context of the landed gentry throughout the North Riding. By looking at the overall acres owned and annual income generated from rentals, the landscape parks and gardens will be separated into estates owned by the lesser gentry, greater gentry, great landowners and land magnates. Through dating, retrogressive map analysis and archival research, development of the overall design, the aesthetic choices made and the analysis of the total number of acres dedicated to design will be analyzed within this social context, allowing us to question whether social pressures of status and power drove initial designs and later changes in aesthetics. This construct will also elucidate whether design trends dissipated from the those with a higher status down to more local landowners or this context, the members of the greater and lesser gentry.

Following will be an analysis based upon the socio-political constructs of the landowners in order to establish regional or national connections namely through marital, political and social connections such as social clubs, Gentlemen's Clubs, universities and institutions. Additionally by noting the political leanings and religious beliefs of the landowners will potentially allow for the landowners to be placed in either a traditional or progressive framework. Analyzing the designed landscapes through this socio-political context will

not only allow for further elucidation of influences of the designs implemented, but, it will potentially highlight sources for the designs implemented.

Once analyzed within a social context the landscape parks and gardens will then be analyzed within their geographical context which will comprise of two elements. The first being the regional situation of the country house and designed landscape. By comparing the landscapes within a smaller regional contexts regardless of status or size of design, will potentially point out regional social influences on design trends. Following the landscapes will be placed within their topographical contexts, elucidating the influence of the regional topography on the design.

Analysis within this context will reveal patterns and design influences dictated by the natural topography within the North Riding. Analyzing the designed landscape within both their topographical and their social context, patterns of aesthetic choices influenced by the natural topography and dictated by issues of economic feasibility will be revealed. By studying the landscape parks in gardens of the North Riding within a context driven by social status and position against a physical and topographical context will reveal regional patterns and trends, giving voice to the designed landscapes and establishing a dialect distinctive to this region. By placing this dialect within a dialogue between other regions, the accepted teleological evolution of design over the eighteenth century will be questioned further.

## **1.2 LITERATURE REVIEW**

The literature for the study of the designed landscape parks and gardens is extensive and covers a breadth of disciplines from the histories including garden, art and architectural; geology, archaeology and landscape studies to name a few. Likewise a wide variety of people from different disciplines including academics, professionals, government organizations, county councils, local community groups, local historians, garden history societies and the landowners themselves have written about the designed landscape parks and gardens of England.



Modern research on this subject is rooted in the contemporary writings of Horace Walpole who in 1771 wrote *The History of Modern Taste in Gardening*. Within this book he reflected back on the progress of the designed landscapes of England, presenting an evolution from the formal walled gardens of the late-seventeenth century and early-eighteenth century through the designs of William Kent to his 'successor' Capability Brown who helped establish 'The English Designed Landscape'. From this basic source and the general evolution of designed landscapes established by Walpole, later historians have continued to source quote and build upon. It is quite possible the most frequently used quote in garden history is Walpole's quote regarding Kent who 'left the fence and saw that all nature was a garden' (1978 [1771], 264).

From this date historians have written about the evolution of the designed landscape garden, sourcing Walpole and each subsequent historian building upon and sourcing the writings of the other. There are numerous books detailing the history of gardens from Amherst's *A Brief History of Gardens in England* (1895) through to Mosser and Teyssot's *The History of Garden Design: The Western Tradition from the Renaissance to the Present Day* (2001). The most influential on the modern researcher being Christopher Hussey's *English Gardens and Landscapes 1700-1750* (1967). What has come out of this tradition is a continuation of Walpole's original writings discussing a similar development of the English landscape shifting from earlier formal garden designs to more naturalistic landscapes by the end of the eighteenth century. Eventually through this process an accepted chronology of design landscapes was established.

Garden and landscape researchers either focused on the development of English gardens over the eighteenth century, or they focused their research on individual sites or designers such as Stephen Daniels' book on *Humphrey Repton* (1999) and John Dixon Hunt's book on *William Kent* (1987) and Dorothy Stroud's book on *Capability Brown* (1975). However, they continued to focus on key landscapes and known designers continuing the established context for garden history.



Archaeology and heritage studies entered into the arena and conducted surveys which shed more light on numerous landscape parks and gardens. However, again this research tends to be site specific and often ends up lost in grey literature. Recent research has focused on exploring the designed landscape through alternative narratives such as Anne Bermingham's *Landscape and Ideology* which looked the evolution of gardens as a reaction to enclosures, Stephen Daniels *The Political Iconography of Woodland* (1988) and Nigel Everett's *The Tory View of the Landscape* (1994) which shifted the perspective of garden development from Whig to those of Tory political ideals.

Additionally designers have been explored through alternative narratives as well as alternative contexts, as with David Brown's research on *Lancelot Brown and his Associates* (2001) which examined his account books and noted specialization within different aspects of the garden design occurred, potentially placing Capability Brown as one of many in a broader movement rather than a leading figure in the forefront. Additionally Mowl examined the dynamic relationship between designer and landowner in the creation of designs in *Gentlemen and Players* (2001) presenting alternative narratives in which the designed landscape could be explored.

With Paul Stamper's *The Historic Parks and Gardens of Shropshire* (1996) we start to see a regional exploration of designed landscapes which allows for a more thorough understanding of the evolution of landscapes within particular regions. Subsequently Mowl carried out regional studies in *Cornwall* (2005), *Dorset* (2003), *Gloucestershire* (2002), *Wiltshire* (2004) and *Worcestershire* (2006) which documented and discussed the designed landscapes within the unique topographical and social contexts unique to each county. Whilst Mowl states that his research diverted from the accepted chronology, the structure of his books forced the designed landscapes into traditionally accepted styles; including Baroque gardens, Palladian gardens, Arcadian gardens, 'the age of Brown' and gardenesque gardens, preventing his research from completely breaking away from the established chronology.

It is not until Tom Williamson's *Garden History and Systematic Survey* (1992), *Polite Landscapes* (1995) and '18<sup>th</sup> Century Landscapes in Norfolk' in *There by Design* (1998) that we start to see more thorough analysis of designed landscape parks and gardens. By utilizing an inclusive approach, multi-contextual approach, and utilizing alternative narratives, Williamson's research has started to draw the accepted chronology of design into question. He started to break down the 'teleological' evolution of design.

In his article *Designed Landscapes: The Regional Dimension for Landscapes* (2004) Williamson explored landscapes through a regional narrative and within a topographical and geophysical context. It is within this article that he makes an appeal for archaeologists, historians and researchers to explore the designed landscapes more locally as well as nationally (2004). It is this appeal to which the following multi-contextual analysis of the designed landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding will aim to reply.

The main aims of this research will be to test the accepted chronology by placing the implementation and subsequent evolution of the designed landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding within this chronology. The traditional narratives of the influence of social status and economic factors of landowners upon designs implemented will be tested by analyzing the designed landscapes within a socio-economic status based upon the landed status of the individual landowners within the Riding. By analyzing the designed landscapes through the socio-political context of the individual landowners, proposed theories of the dissemination of national design trends radiating out from London to the more remote regions of the country will be tested. Additionally the influence of regional trends will be explored by exploring the designed landscapes within their topographical and geographical context throughout the Riding. Through this multi-contextual approach the designed landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding will be analyzed against each other placing their histories within the wider narrative of national trends.



### 1.3 METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach for this research will be a variation of the process utilized by Tom Williamson in his research of the landscape parks and gardens of Norfolk *The Archaeology of the Landscape Park: Garden Design in Norfolk, England c. 1680-1840*. The following will be an inclusive regional study of the designed landscapes of the North Riding. In order to come to a closer understanding of the pattern, trends and evolution of design they will be analyzed within a multi-tiered context driven by social constructs and the natural topography of the Riding.

By looking at regionally driven contexts the accepted teleological evolution can be tested further. In Norfolk, Williamson revealed that the choices made in design styles and aesthetics were more complex than those once accepted by garden historians. Choices in design were driven by economic circumstances and social layers more complex than just a division between the landed and the poor. These decisions were more individual and particular to the social, personal and economic situation of each landowner. Williamson also revealed that the designed landscapes were either inspired or limited by the natural and man-made landscapes particular to each area of Norfolk. To test Williamson's theories further this research will focus on the landscape parks and gardens in the topographically diverse and the 'socially remote' region of Yorkshire. Looking towards this diverse and remote region of England this research will test the accepted teleological evolution of the landscape parks and gardens further.

#### *Desk Based Assessment*

Although site visits have been carried out, the weight of this research will be on the analysis of the visual culture associated with designed landscapes including cartographic materials comprising: design plans, topographical maps, estate maps, tithe maps and contemporary county surveys such as John Speed's *County Map of the North Riding* (1610), Jeffery's *Map of Yorkshire* (1771), the First Edition Ordnance Surveys (1850s) and aerial images through Google-earth and similar resources. Additionally contemporary

paintings, illustrations and sketches of the house and grounds such as Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1715), Knyff and Kip's *Britannia Illustrata* (1707) and Samuel Buck's *Sketch Book* (1720) will be analyzed in conjunction with available maps and plans in order to ascertain the realized from the idealized landscape. Additionally written documents will be resourced including written descriptions of the landscape found in travel journals, publications, memoirs and family archival records held at the North Yorkshire County Records Office (NYCRO).

### *Selection of Landscapes*

The first phase of this selection will involve a sweep of literary sources and registers such as *The Victoria County Histories* (VCH) of the North Ridings; Pevsner's *Guides to the North, Riding*; and Waterson's *Lost Houses of York and the North Riding* looking for the mention of country houses and landscape parks and gardens. National Trust listings, English Heritage's Register of Listed Buildings and Register of Landscape Parks and Gardens will be utilized to compile a list of all the designed landscape parks and gardens within the North Riding. Additionally visual surveys of contemporary county maps of Yorkshire and the First Edition OS maps will be carried out for representation of designed landscape parks and gardens.

From this process a comprehensive a list of mentioned estates, manors, landscape parks and gardens created and existent during the long-eighteenth century (1690- 1820) within the North Riding will be created. As this research is pertaining to designed landscape parks and gardens of the long-eighteenth century, gardens encompassing an original design less than 50 acres in total, public parks and gardens and landscape parks and gardens created outside of the dates of the long-eighteenth century (1680-1820) will be eliminated from the data set.



### *Creating Time-Depth*

In order to create time-depth regarding the implementation and subsequent alterations for each designed landscape county records, archives, private collections, contemporary journals, publications and memoirs will be consulted. Any descriptions, maps, plans, paintings, illustrations and historic photographs associated with the landscape parks and gardens will be collected. From this information analysis of the implementation and subsequent improvements of the designed landscapes will be determined.

### *Socio-Economic Context and Establishing Ownership*

In order to test the influence of social and economic influences on the designs implemented the landscape will be placed within a socio-economic context based upon the landed status of each landowner. Unfortunately determining each owner's landed status based upon lands owned and annual income from these lands would be a difficult if not impossible task for the scale of this research project. The Local Government Board's *Return to Lands* (1873) for the North Riding and Bateman's *Great Landowners* (1883), both late-nineteenth century resources for determining landownership and income, admittedly, fall beyond the time-scope of the long-eighteenth century. Additionally information within these sources represents a static moment of the history for each landowner and their holdings, however, *The Return* and *Bateman* are currently the best available resource for the task.

In order to place each landscape within a socio-political context based upon the information derived from *The Return* and *Bateman* the late-nineteenth century owner will be identified. By utilizing the *Victoria County Histories* the descent of ownership will be recorded from the date in which the manor was first mentioned through to the late-nineteenth century. Each estate will then be placed within a socio-economic level based upon the owner's landed status of lesser gentry, greater gentry, great landowner and land magnate as reflected in *The Return* and *Bateman* (see page 20). The landscape parks and gardens will then be analyzed within these four levels of landed status in order to elucidate any design patterns or trends occurring within their socio-economic context.

### *Social, Political and Economic Context*

In order to test theories of disseminating design trends from London to the outer regions of the country was one of the primary reasons for selecting the designed landscapes of the North Riding. Assumptions have been made that landscape design trends would reach Yorkshire at a far later date than the national trends being established in the counties closer to London (Hoskins 1988, Girouard 1980, Williamson and Lyttleton 1907). This assumption depends upon the distance of Yorkshire and the North Riding from London and the dis-connection of the landowners of the Riding. This assumption will be tested by analyzing the designed landscapes within the socio-political context of the landowners. Utilizing sources such as Burke's *Landed Gentry* (1972), Joseph Foster's *Pedigrees of the County Families of Yorkshire* (1874), the *Dictionary of National Biographies* (2006) and online sources for peerage will be consulted to build the social context for each landowner, including marriages, club membership, education and political careers. Additionally Mark Ormrod's *Lord Lieutenants and High Sheriffs of Yorkshire 1066-2000* (2000) will be consulted to build political context. Literature on Catholicism and later Recusants will be consulted to build religious affiliations. Literature regarding Memorials of various London Clubs and Inns will be consulted to elucidate if the landowners of the North Riding moved within a wider social context beyond the bounds of the North Riding, the county of Yorkshire and the northern region of the country.

### *Distribution of designed landscapes*

The natural topography of the North Riding is varied potentially influenced choices made within the designed landscapes. To test for regional trends the final context will analyze the designed landscape parks in gardens based upon their geographical and topographical contexts. Utilizing Natural England's Countryside Commissions survey of Yorkshire, Tukes' *General View of the Agriculture of the North Riding* (1800) and Marshall's *Rural Economy of Yorkshire* (1796) a topographical context will be created. Using GIS,



Bartholomew and Natural England's character areas the designed landscape parks and gardens will be plotted within their regional and topographical context for analysis.

By scanning visual sources and literature the data-set of designed landscape parks and gardens will be compiled. The descent of ownership for each estate will be collected ending with the late-nineteenth century landowner for each estate. From this the landed status for each landowner will be ascertained, allowing for the estates to be analyzed within their landowner's socio-economic context elucidating influences of status and income on design choices. In addition the social and political contexts of the landowner will be added in attempts to verify or dispel delay of trends to the landscapes of the North Riding. Finally the landscapes will be plotted and analyzed within their geographical and topographical contexts looking for more regional trends within the parks and gardens of the North Riding. Studying the landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding within their social (particularly status-related) and physical (particularly topographical) context will reveal regional patterns and trends, giving voice to the designed landscapes and establishing a dialect distinctive to this region. By placing this dialect within a dialogue between other regions, the accepted teleological evolution of design over the eighteenth century will be questioned further.

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

As discussed above the landscape parks and gardens within the North Riding will be analyzed through a multi-contextual approach including social, political and economic constructs and the natural topography of the Riding. The first analysis will be through a socio-economic context, in which the designed landscapes will be analyzed within the context of the landed gentry throughout the North Riding. By looking at the overall acres owned and annual income generated from rentals, the landscape parks and gardens will be separated into estates owned by the lesser gentry, greater gentry, great landowners and land magnates. Through these social levels an analysis of the economic factors influencing the designed landscape will be carried out, looking for correlations between status, choices in design aesthetics and dates of implementation. Through this analysis we will start to be able to place the designed landscapes of the North Riding into the national chronology of design.

#### *Regional Analysis of the Landscape Parks and Gardens within the North Riding*

In order to achieve a deeper analysis within the scope of this research it was decided to focus on the designed landscape parks within a smaller contextual region within the county of Yorkshire. In the eighteenth century the gentry had strong regional connections to their county over their connection to the nation (Stone and Stone 1986, 26; Cannadine 1994, 10-11), for the gentlemen of Yorkshire there was the added connection to Riding. Each Riding contained its own social network, internal power centres all within three distinctive topographical contexts; it was only natural therefore to reorganize its three historical regions into the North, East and West Ridings.



The focus of this research will be centered on the designed landscape parks and gardens located within the North Riding, an area of Yorkshire covering 2,128 square miles lying to the north of the city of York. This riding (see appendix, map 3.1) ‘...extends westwards from the ocean to the confines of Westmoreland, and is bounded on the North by the River Tees, which separates it from the county of Durham; on the North-East and East by the North Sea; on the South-East by the East Riding and on the South by the River Ouse and the West Riding and in the west by the county of Westmoreland (Whellan, T. 1857, 3).’ When the riding was reallocated into the new county of North Yorkshire in April 1974 some parts of the old riding were lost to Yorkshire altogether, including Cleveland and the high country of Upper Teesdale. In attempts to keep the most accurate contemporary context the following regional study will analyze on the designed landscape parks and gardens contained within North Riding defined by the borders prior to 1974.

To compile a complete list of potential sites of landscape parks and gardens a combination of visual and secondary sources were utilized. First literary sources such as *The Victoria History of Counties* for the North Riding (VCH), Pevsner’s *Buildings of England* series *Yorkshire the North Riding* and Waterson’s *Lost Houses of York and the North Riding* were reviewed for any mention of possible landscape parks and gardens attached to the estates of the North Riding. Next cartographic sources such as eighteenth-century estate maps of the county and the first edition Ordnance Survey six inch maps were consulted looking for any visual evidence of designed landscape parks and garden. Databases of known landscape parks and gardens including English Heritage’s Registered Historic Buildings and Monuments, National Trust Listed Sites and *UK Database of Landscape Parks and Gardens* (UKDB) were consulted and utilized to verify evidence of designed landscapes of the eighteenth century within the region.

Since the focus of this research deals with the trends and evolution within the designed landscape parks and gardens, only country houses having associated wider landscape parks were retained. Halls within a village context with small gardens and without an associated parkland will not be looked at within this research unless there is a direct connection of ownership with a larger estate. Through these methods a total of 83 known

landowners held 126 separate country houses with associated designed landscape parks and gardens were located within the contemporary boundaries of the North Riding creating the total dataset for this research.

In order to come to a closer understanding of the pattern, trends and evolution of design within these 126 landscape parks and gardens they will be analyzed within a multi-tiered context driven by social constructs and the natural topography of the Riding. First they will be analyzed within the context of the landed status throughout the North Riding. By looking at the overall acres owned and annual income generated from rentals, the landscape parks and gardens will be separated into estates owned by the lesser gentry, greater gentry, great landowners and land magnates. Through dating, retrogressive map analysis and archival research, development of the overall design, the aesthetic choices made and the analysis of the total number of acres dedicated to design will be analyzed within this social context, allowing us to question whether social pressures of status and power drove initial designs and later changes in aesthetics.

### *The Designed Landscape Parks and Gardens of the North Riding Within Their Social Context*

#### *The Aristocracy*

Before analysis can begin, it is important to briefly discuss the terminology associated with the aristocracy and landownership. Many historians have written extensively on this topic, and there is a vast amount of literature regarding how one entered into, how one was elevated within, and how one maintained status within the aristocracy. Any one of these topics could be a main focus of research, however, it is only with intent to establish and define the terminology regarding levels within the landed gentry that 'aristocracy' with regard to landownership will be discussed within this research. Consisting of explicit rules of entry, maneuverability and sustainability, all of which hold exceptions, the aristocratic system is quite complex and difficult to fully comprehend. It is a subject matter that becomes further complicated by the multiple variances within the defining requirements utilized by each historian. Whether discussing the aristocracy, the gentry,



the nobility or the peerage; each historians use and terminology shifts slightly in dealing with the use of 'stages', 'levels' or 'ranks' within each group. This issue results in varying discussions of the division in status between major and minor gentry; local power elite and local status elite; greater and lesser gentry or the nobility and the landed gentry (Clemenson 1982; Stone and Stone 1986; Beckett 1986; Cannadine 1994; Rosenheim 1998). This lack of consistency of terminology makes for a more complicated task. It is therefore important to define the terminology and specifications for each level utilized within this research.

In order to glean a better understanding of who owned the lands of the North Riding, who was creating the landscape designs and what was motivating their creations and alterations over the eighteenth century, it is necessary to touch on the subject of the aristocracy. Hierarchy within the aristocracy is based upon a family's income, the lands owned and connection to the peerage. It must be noted that although income, land holdings and connections were elemental to one's acceptance within the aristocracy, loss of any one of these, or all of these factors would not have caused one to have been removed from the aristocracy. At the top of this social structure are the nobility or peerage consisting of dukes at the highest level, followed by marquises, earls, viscounts and barons. Located beneath the nobility but above the yeomanry, are the landed gentry who included the lesser titles of baronet and knighthood followed by esquires and gentlemen (Clemenson 1982; Rosenheim 1998).

For basic entry into the aristocracy there were minimal annual incomes and minimal acres of land owned in order to maintain annual fees to the crown (Beckett 1986; Stone and Stone 1986; Rosenheim 1998). According to James I, any man of the gentry worth £40 a year was expected 'to present themselves for knighthood.... [and] according to the rules drawn up in 1611, the baronetcy was limited to families owning land in possession of reversion worth £1000 a year' (Beckett 1986, 47). Even though basic laws and rules were created to restrict and/or govern the entry and mobility within the gentry these rules were not strictly adhered to. Issues of connection and loyalty to party and or regent also played a role in establishing oneself within the gentry. Often titles were created for involvement



and/or acts of heroism in the name of the crown and country (Beckett 1986, 47-48). It must also be kept in mind that even though landownership was vital for the aristocracy, it was not a guarantee, families also needed to show connection to the peerage and 'a general rule of three generations of armigerous relations was required' (Beckett 1986, 95). The income provided from the estates land was not only crucial for a family's initial entry into the aristocracy, it was also important to increase one's acquisitions and income in order to climb further up the social ladder. Through strict settlement, advantageous marital unions, inheritance from relatives or through the purchase of additional lands a member of society could increase their holdings and wealth, allowing for mobility up the social ladder (Clemenson 1982; Beckett 1986; Rosenheim 1998).

Land as a commodity came to represent not only a family's wealth, but also the family's status and ultimately its power. One priority of the landowner was not only to keep the estate intact, but it was also vital to increase profits in order to provide income and ensure family status for generations to come (Clemenson 1982; Stone and Stone 1984; Beckett 1986). It was the family's priority to maintain a 'continuity of the house', which consisted of keeping the five elemental components of the seat, the land, any heirlooms within the house, the family name and the hereditary title intact (Stone and Stone 1986). Laws of inheritance were established to provide security not only for the family and the estate, but to ensure the maintained integrity of the aristocracy. Inheritance of land was based upon the 'principle of primogeniture in tail male' with preferential portability, allowing for the 'seat and the bulk of the estate' to remain intact, yet enabling ancillary and smaller properties to remain 'free and at the disposal of the current owner' (Stone and Stone 1986, 45-46). These ancillary or secondary properties fell under the larger estate and often functioned as hunting residences, summer residences, the seat of dowagers, younger siblings or relations. Some of these estates earned additional income for the family as leased properties. In general their function was peripheral to the main seat and they remained separate from the main estate, such that they could be bought, sold and/or traded for further gains.

As visual extensions of the family, the seat, the heirlooms and the land all acted as venues for the expression of status. Through associations with designers, aesthetics and inclusions of literary, artistic and historical references within the park and garden, a family could visually establish their estate within a dialogue of status and power throughout the country. The designed landscape park and garden became a prevalent venue for the elite to express power and status through aesthetic agendas. Many historians have explored these design aesthetics within political and social contexts (Girouard 1980; Everett 1994; Taigel and Williamson 1993; Williamson 1995, 2002; Bending 1999 and Darby 2000). But like park and garden studies in general these explorations tended to be based upon the larger, well known parks and gardens of prominent people within the political and social history of Britain.

In an attempt to explore wider potential aesthetic trends and their relationship to social status the owners of the 126 landscape parks and gardens will be examined within the social hierarchy of the North Riding. It was necessary to establish the families and their estates in their appropriate level of status. Historians Stone and Stone utilize the size and scale of the manor house to determine status of the landowner, but this method has its flaws. Assumptions are made that unless a landowner has a large country house, he does not own a vast amount of wealth. This assumption disregards the decision of some landowners to maintain an existing hall with its associations to history and place rather than create a larger grander hall regardless of actual wealth of the family. This methodology also disregards choices of other landowners to create a grander house than the estate could sustain in order to reflect a status that was desired, but not yet achieved. The house - as a venue for the expression of status - is an important aspect of the overall aesthetic of the designed estate. Although analysis of mass and the size of the hall will be analyzed within the aesthetic of the wider estate, however, this will not function as the basis for placing landowners within the social hierarchy of the North Riding. Since the acceptance into status and maintenance of status was based upon annual income and the ability to maintain income, land was seen as an important aspect in establishing status. With this understanding, the amount of land owned and the income gained from this land



will be used to create an accurate social context in which to analyze the landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding.

### *The Sources*

The acquisition and consolidation of land was a continuous activity beyond the end of the eighteenth century. With the rise of radicalism resentment towards the 'great landowners grew' (Spring in Bateman, 1971 ed., 8). The findings from the 1861 census revealed that the land of the United Kingdom was owned by 'not more than 30,000 landowners' (Local Government Board 1873, A2) which was considered unacceptable to the rising middle classes. Several members of the House of Lords, including Lord Derby, felt that this number was an inaccurate representation of landowners power and that the actual number of landowners would be closer to 300,000 (Local Government Board 1873). In response *The Return of Owners of Land* was compiled by the Local Government Board for each county in England and Wales and was presented to Parliament in 1873 (here to referred to as *The Return*).

By utilizing public documents such as the Poor Rates and land valuation lists from each parish, the goal was to create a complete list of landowners for each county, including details of the land owner, the extent of their lands and their gross estimated rental income (Local Government Board 1873). A survey of this scale had not been carried out since the *Domesday Book* of 1086, and in light of this, *The Return* quickly became known as *The Modern Domesday Book* (Bateman 1883, vi; Clemenson 1982.). However, since the survey conducted in *The Return*, 'was simply a compilation from public documents available in each parish (Local Government Board 1873, B2),' instead of information gained from a direct survey, many errors and flaws occurred. There were many instances of multiple entries of one owner under various names and spellings, and incorrect names and titles associated with the landowners, not to mention inaccurate designations of land owned. All of these inaccuracies resulted in errors in the gross estimated income and overall statistics of landownership throughout the kingdom (Bateman 1883).



Due to these inaccuracies, members of the aristocracy and radicals questioned the statistics and results of *The Return*. John Bateman, a small landowner in Essex, responded with the publication of *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* in 1883 (hereto referred to as Bateman). By going back to the sources, Bateman corrected spellings, titles and addresses of the named owners, and consolidated the total acres owned and the gross annual value for each landowner. The initial focus of his survey was limited to great landowners and members of the upper gentry, defined by Bateman as landowners having both a minimum of 3000 acres *and* £3000 annual income. A later survey included landowners having a minimum of 2000 acres *and* £2000 (Bateman 1883).

Bateman used total holdings AND income earned from said lands in order to establish his levels of landed status comprising land magnate, great landowner, greater gentry and lesser gentry (Figure 1). It is important to mention that the income Bateman used did not include additional incomes derived from other sources such as financial ventures, income derived from colonial holdings and potentially income earned from mineral extraction from the lands held within the surveys (Williamson, pers com 2009). Considering these additional incomes could very well alter and elevate the land-status of many of the gentlemen included within Bateman's *Great Landowners*.

Even with these issues and inaccuracies, both *The Return* and Bateman's *Great Landowners* became vital sources (for contemporary and modern historians alike) regarding the ownership of land and the aristocracy throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. For example historians such as Clemenson (1982) and Beckett (1986) used *The Return* and Bateman to study patterns in the buying, selling and inheritance of land, attitude shifts towards marriage and country house ownership, and the overall patterns of distribution within the aristocracy across the country setting precedence for utilizing these resources for eighteenth-century economic studies.

There is a large disparity between the late-nineteenth century owner documented in *The Return* and Bateman and the eighteenth century landowners who are the focus of this research. Admittedly the status of the late-nineteenth century landowner could be far



from representative of the landed-status of earlier eighteenth-century landowners. As discussed in the introduction despite this variance and issues in regard to total income *The Return* and Bateman are the best resources to re-create an eighteenth century socio-economic context with which to review the designed landscape parks and gardens within this research.

*Relevance to Landowners of the North Riding*

Through the calculations of the value of the estate reported in *The Return* and *Great Landowners*, the levels of landownership and gentry for the estates within the North Riding will be established. Using the terminology of landownership established by Clemenson and Beckett, which was itself based upon Bateman's qualifications of total acres owned and annual income, a scale of landed gentry, a term generally 'used to describe all landowners who derived income from rent of land' (Clemenson 1982, 8) was established for this research (Figure 1).

Level	Size of Estate	Annual Income based upon rentals
Land Magnates	Greater than 30,000 acres	Greater than £30,000 per annum
Great Landowners	Between 10,000 - 29,999 acres	Minimum rental value: £10,000 per annum
Greater Gentry	Between 3000-9999 acres	Minimum rental value: £3000 per annum
Lesser gentry	Between 1,000 and 2,999 acres	Minimum rental value: £1,000 per annum
Greater Yeoman	Between 300 and 1000 acres	Below £1,000 per annum

*Figure 1: Levels of landownership*



Using the *Victoria County Histories* and GENUKI: UK & Ireland website (2007), the descent of ownership was established for each estate included within the dataset. The size and annual income for these estates were recorded and placed within the scale of landed gentry and landownership. Since the records regarding land ownership during the eighteenth century are not available, and it is not within the scope and scale of this thesis to do primary research on land ownership and income throughout the parishes of the North Riding, my primary resources for this information will be *The Return* and *Great Landowners*. It is not possible at this time to determine if the numbers compiled at the end of the nineteenth century reflect the peak of family holdings over a longer period. Despite limitations, *The Return* and *Great Landowners* are the first systematic and reliable dataset that can be used to place the eighteenth-century landowners of the North Riding into levels of gentry and landownership.

Bateman included lands owned in the county of Yorkshire as well as lands owned throughout the United Kingdom for his calculations. A total of thirty-eight landowners with estates in the North Riding also owned additional lands within the county of Yorkshire. Eight of these holdings are elsewhere within the other ridings of the county of Yorkshire, whilst a total of thirty held additional lands within the Riding. Since both *The Return* and *Greater Landowners* do not separate out primary estates owned from peripheral estates within their calculations, the individual size and value cannot be ascertained. However these secondary holdings estates will be included within the context of their primary estate within this analysis. Additionally a total of thirty-six landowners with had holdings beyond the county. Reviewing the landed gentry within this wider context of landownership changes the social context of the North Riding. For fourteen estates the total acreage of land owned throughout the United Kingdom did not cause a shift in status in regard to the level of landownership within this data set, whilst for seventeen landowners the level of their status was affected. This information has an intriguing impact upon the classification of status within the Riding and the later contextual analysis of aesthetic trends potentially dictated by status. This situation raises the question of not only how these landowners viewed and represented themselves, but in regard to this research it impacts how we should place and analyze these landowners within the social

context of the North Riding. Deciding whether they should be analyzed upon status based on their holdings within the North Riding or based upon the total amount of lands owned throughout the United Kingdom is an intriguing dilemma. Realizing status and income directly impact and govern the way a landowner visually represents his estate through design, it is important not to neglect the unique situation of these 36 landowners. The exploration of differing aesthetics between estates owned within the North Riding and estates owned beyond the riding will be noted and discussed within the contextual analysis of these 36 landowners. However, since the focus of this research is the landscape parks and gardens within the social context of the North Riding it has been decided to place these landowners into their social levels based upon lands owned and income vested within the boundaries of the North Riding. Additional analysis of the different treatment of the lands of these estates against other holdings will shed light on how their lands within the North Riding were viewed by the landed gentry during the eighteenth century.

In addition to these 36 landowners with parks and gardens in the North Riding an additional 59 landowners were listed in *The Return* and *Great Landowners* with seats elsewhere yet held unknown lands within Yorkshire. In both sources there was an indication that land was owned within the North Riding however, the primary place of residency was located elsewhere. Therefore, the location and extent of lands within the riding were not immediately available. By using The Peerage website (Oxford University Press 2006) and the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography website (Lundy 2006) connections between these fifty-nine landowners and the lands of the North Riding were attempted. Seven of these landowners were said to hold at least 1000 acres of land within the riding, but exact location of their holdings has remained elusive to date. A total of twenty-four of these landowners owned less than 1000 acres of land within the North Riding which was associated with larger estates, and the land was acquired through inheritance from relations or through a marital dowry. However, the size and location of the land for the remaining twenty-eight of these landowners remains unknown.

According to Bateman the North Riding consisted of a total of 1,278,884 acres of land. 994,488 acres were privately owned while 284,369 acres were owned by public bodies or



considered wasteland (1883). Discounting estates with unknown owners, estates with known owners not mentioned in *The Return* and Bateman, a total of eighty-three landowners held the 126 design landscape parks and gardens included in this research. The largest amount of lands owned are by the thirty landowners classified as the greater gentry with a total of 204,398 acres, accounting for 15.98% of the lands within the North Riding. Even though forty-one landowners were classified as lesser gentry, they held smaller amount of lands within the Riding, totaling 121,950 acres (9.54%) of the total land. Seven great landowners held 7.39% of the land and 3.07% was owned by the Earl of Feversham, the only land magnate within the Riding (Figure 2).

The descent of ownership was incomplete for a total of six estates. Unfortunately in these cases the nineteenth-century landowner remains unknown. Hauxwell Hall, Startforth Hall and Wood Hall Park had complete descent of ownership and the late-nineteenth-century owners were known, however they were not listed in either *The Return* or *Great Landowners* for reasons unknown, therefore the estate size and annual income are not available for these estates. Even though these designed landscape parks will not be analyzed within their social context, they will be included within the topographical contextual analysis and the later analysis of common regional trends. Likewise the descent of ownership for Norton Conyers, which was direct through the male line from 1624 to present, a brief break in ownership occurred between the years 1867 and 1883 when the estate was sold by Sir Bellingham Graham Bart to Viscount Downe of Danby Castle to cover debts (Jackson-Stops 1986). Whilst the 8<sup>th</sup> Baronet, Reginald Graham bought the estate back, at the time of Bateman the estate was calculated under the holdings of Viscount Downe.



Level of Landownership	Numbers of landowners holding estates in the North Riding	Total acres of land owned within the Riding	Percentage of North Riding Lands*
Land Magnates	1	39,312	3.07% (3.95%)
Great Landowners	7	94,502	7.39% (9.50%)
Greater Gentry	30	204,398	15.98% (20.55%)
Lesser Gentry	41	121,950	9.54% (11.66%)

*Figure 2: Breakdown of North Riding Estates into the levels of landownership*

\* A total of 1,278,884 acres of land (994,488 acres privately owned and 284,396 acres owned by public bodies or classified as wasteland) **Source:** 'Bateman's *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* (1883).

#### *Titled Landowners within the North Riding*

The division of these estates is based upon lands owned and the annual income earned from these lands. To stress again the levels of land magnate, great landowner, greater gentry and lesser gentry are based upon the calculation of landholdings and estate income alone. It is important to restate that landownership was vital to entry into the aristocracy, but was not a guarantee that a family would gain entry, therefore each level of landownership includes both non-titled and titular nobility. Of these, a total of fifty estates containing designed landscape parks and gardens belonged to members of the titular nobility, whilst twenty-four estates belonged to non-titled members of the landed gentry by the end of the nineteenth century. An additional three estates owned by non-titled members of the landed gentry at the time of the nineteenth-century census were at one time owned by members of the titular nobility (Figure 3).



Level of Landownership	Total	Families of Titular nobility	Non-Titled families	Land owned by prior families with title
Land Magnate	1	1	-	-
Great Landowner	7	7	-	-
Greater Gentry	30	24	5	1
Lesser Gentry	40	18	19	3

*Figure 3: Distribution of titled landowners within the North Riding*

In conclusion, the following chapters will analyze a total of 126 landscape parks and gardens within a social context based upon landed status within the North Riding. These estates include 83 primary estates of known owners and forty-three peripheral estates or secondary holdings. By analyzing these estates into levels of landownership, suspected patterns and trends within the design aesthetic associated with status and wealth may be revealed. As mentioned above, according to the data collected, several of the estates were maintained through direct (through male heir) or indirect descent (either through the male or female line) maintained continuity in familial ownership over the long-eighteenth century. This continuity in ownership potentially allows for the changing status and wealth of the family to be compared to any shifts in design. Estates which shifted in ownership from one family to another over the long-eighteenth century allow for analysis of design changes occurring with new ownership. The treatment of secondary estates affords us the opportunity to compare potential continuity of aesthetic choices within the family's holdings, as well as potential differentiation of status of lands within the estate.

The initial analysis will take place within each level of landownership starting with the land magnates and great landowners, followed by the greater gentry, the lesser gentry and concluding with a section covering the estates with unknown nineteenth century owners. The amount of land dedicated to designed landscapes will be analyzed within the wider context of the estate. The acreage of land dedicated to design within the estate was calculated by measuring the square miles of each landscape park and garden attached to



each house using the *First Edition OS maps*. Once measured this area was converted into acres from which the percentage of acres dedicated to a design aesthetic was calculated using the following formula of OS Acres / Bateman Acres. This calculation allows for exploration of land-use within each estate, enabling a comparison between the landowners within their social context, elucidating potential trends associated between status, either achieved or desired, and the use of land as the visual representation of said status. Differentiation of land-use as well as aesthetic trends within the designed landscape parks between the primary estates and peripheral estates of landowners will also be discussed, potentially revealing the level of importance of each estate. Patterns and trends occurring within the estates of each level of gentry will be analyzed, concluding with a comparison of these aesthetic trends amongst the various levels of landownership. Exploration of all variables within the North Riding will help shed light on social expectations and assumptions within the various levels of gentry, physically manifested within the designed aesthetics of the estates' associated landscape parks and gardens.

## 2.2 LAND MAGNATES AND GREAT LANDOWNERS

### *Introduction*

This section will analyze the implementation and the evolution of the designed landscape parks and gardens attached to the eight estates falling within the social status of great landowners and land magnates. There will be brief descriptions of the landscape design in the context of design evolution. More detailed descriptions including images of contemporary maps and plans discussed below are included in the attached *Gazetteer of Landscape Parks and Gardens of the North Riding*. In order to create a social context distinctive to this region the social status of each estate within this section will be based on lands owned within the natural boundaries of the North Riding attained from Bateman's *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* (1883) and *The Return* (1873) for landowners that are not included within Bateman's survey. Utilizing these two sources a total of seven estates fall within the social status of great landowners estates comprising between 10,000 and 29,999 acres with an annual income from land between £10,000 and



£29,999; and one land magnate, with an estate consisting of more than 30,000 acres bringing in an annual income greater than £30,000 per annum were located. However, none of the great landowners within the riding hold more than 20,000 acres placing their estate sizes within the lower half of this range of landownership (Figure 4).

Analyzing the income per annum in conjunction with the acres owned, value of land owned for each of these landowners creates a different context. Most of the estates earned an average of £1.16 per acre, with Swinton earning 98 pence per acre and Danby Castle earning £1.24 per acre. Even though Duncombe Park was the seat for the only land magnate within the context of the North Riding, the lands within the Duncombe estate only brought in 87 pence per acre, whereas the Earl of Zetland of Aske Hall held lands throughout the North Riding which brought in an average of £1.87 per acre. Charles Duncombe owned more lands within the Riding than the Earl of Zetland, but the Earl's lands were on average earning one pound more per acre. Even though these statistics are based upon averages, it does create a different context for the designed landscapes of these landowners. Deeper analysis of these statistics will occur in the following topographical contextual analysis. Exploration of land use and rentals placed against a topographical backdrop will attempt to elucidate potential income loss incurred, when arable lands were re-designated into designed landscape.



Estate Name	Location	Acres Owned	Income per Annum	Social status
Swinton Park	Masham, Hang East	11,441	£11,179	Great Landowner
Aske Hall	Easby, Gilling West	11,614	£21,674	Great Landowner
Newburgh Priory	Coxwold, Birdforth	12,226	£14,500	Great Landowner
Castle Howard	Bulmer, Bulmer	13,030	£14,502	Great Landowner
Danby Castle	Danby, Langbraugh East Division	15,271	£18,966	Great Landowner
Jervaulx Abbey	East Witton, Hang West	15,369	£17,696	Great Landowner
Castle Bolton	Wensley, Hang West	15,502	£17,879	Great Landowner
Duncombe Park	Helmsley, Ryedale	39,312	£34,328	Land Magnate

*Figure 4: great landowners and Land Magnates within the North Riding*

Representing 4.9% of the designed landscape parks and gardens studied within this research and accounting for 10.45% of the total land within the North Riding, these eight estates are located across the varied topographical regions of the North Riding. Newburgh Priory and Castle Howard are situated within the Howardian Hills near York; Duncombe a little further north-east in the swelling lands to the south of the North York Moors. Danby Castle rests further north within the North York Moors, near Guisborough whilst Aske Hall, Jervaulx Abbey and Castle Bolton are situated within the dramatic landscapes of the Dales in the west of the Riding within proximity to Richmond.

Men of great wealth and power within the social, political and economic contexts of the North Riding, these great landowners were also involved in the social, political and economic structures within the wider context of the United Kingdom. All but two of these



landowners, Sir George O. Wombwell, Bart of Newburgh Priory and the Earl of Feversham of Duncombe Park, owned lands outside the North Riding. However, when considering the lands owned beyond the boundaries of the North Riding, the hierarchal relationship between these landowners is restructured (Figure 5). The Earl of Zetland of Aske Hall is elevated from one of the lesser members of great landowners within the Riding to a status of land magnate following beneath only the Earl of Carlisle of Castle Howard in wealth and lands. Whilst the Earl of Feversham at Duncombe Park, the largest owner of lands within the North Riding drops down to the fourth largest landowner once lands beyond the North Riding are considered.

Hall	Location	UK Acres Owned	Income per Annum	UK Social status
Swinton Park	Masham, Masham	11,441*	£11,179	Great Landowner
Newburgh Priory	Coxwold, Birdforth	11,911*	£13,044	Great Landowner
Danby Castle	Danby, Langbraugh East Division	15,518	£19,262	Great Landowner
Castle Bolton	Wensley, Hang West	29,221	£27,552	Land Magnate
Duncombe Park	Helmsley, Ryedale	39,312*	34,328	Land Magnate
Jervaulx Abbey	East Witton, Hang West	55,051	£59,716	Land Magnate
Aske Hall	Easby, Gilling West	68,170	£49,324	Land Magnate
Castle Howard	Bulmer, Bulmer	78,540	£49,601	Land Magnate

*Figure 5: Status of Landownership based upon lands owned throughout the Kingdom*

\* *The acres owned represent lands in the North Riding of Yorkshire only.*

Upon evaluation, the landscape parks and gardens owned by these land magnates and great landowners reveals a conservative pattern of sustained formalism over the eighteenth century. The evidence of alterations occurring within the overall design near



the end of the century, and in some cases well into the nineteenth century, sheds further doubts on the once accepted chronology of landscape design. Analyzing the material culture and existing archaeological evidence, the theory that a shift towards a more natural aesthetic occurred on a national level in the 1760s does not seem to apply to the landscape parks and gardens of this social class. Alterations and subtle inclusions of natural elements occurred within the landscapes, but the wider retention of formal elements in the landscape parks and gardens within this social set raises important questions. Despite wealth, status, political and social connections within the wider context of the nation, are the landowners of Yorkshire behind in fashion and aesthetic trends? Can this retention of formal elements within the designed landscape be seen as a social and/or political statement connecting these landowners to tradition and conservative values? Or is the retention merely an aesthetic choice unique to the region of the North Riding? In order to reveal this pattern, the changing elements within the designed landscape parks and gardens of these eight estates will be discussed briefly, with reference to contemporary maps and plans included in the attached appendices. A deeper analysis of these patterns should allow us to attain answers for the above questions.

### *The Designed Landscape Parks and Gardens*

This section will analyze the park and garden associated with the primary hall for each estate followed by an analysis of parks and gardens associated with secondary estates. The location and descent of ownership for each hall will be discussed. The designed landscape for each hall will be analyzed, and this will be followed by a brief conclusion for each estate. A brief discussion of the parks and gardens of the great landowners and land magnates within the North Riding will conclude this section. Deeper analysis and discussion of the parks and gardens within socio-political and geographical contexts will occur later within the thesis.

#### *Aske Hall*

Aske Hall lies on the northern side of the valley along Aske Beck 1.5 km north of Richmond. The manor with extended views over the hills to the north of Richmond was



purchased by Sir Conyers D'Arcy from the trustees of Philip, Duke of Wharton's estates in 1727. Sir Conyers D'Arcy Bart., came from a long line of D'Arcys who had been highly active in the social, economic and political arenas within the North Riding and Great Britain. In 1763 inheriting the title of Earl of Holderness, D'Arcy's heir relocated to and focused his attentions towards improving the house and grounds at the D'Arcy seat of Hornby Castle and sold the estate of Aske to Lawrence Dundas, Lord of Uppleatham (GD2058). Dundas was a wealthy businessman from Edinburgh involved in politics and financing various adventures of the state. Even though Lawrence Dundas desired peerage it was not until 1794, when his son Sir Lawrence Dundas was elevated to the barony of Aske, that the family acquired a title. Sir Lawrence's son and heir - also named Lawrence - was created Earl of Zetland in 1873 and shortly after Marquis (Page 1914, 52).

By the time of Bateman's *Great Landowners*, the of Zetland owned a total of 11,614 acres throughout the North Riding, including Marske Hall in Marske by the Sea and their previous residence of Uppleatham Hall. Together these lands earned an annual income of £21,674. The Marquis owned an additional 12,948 acres in the region stretching across Scotland to the south of the Northern Uplands, 29,846 acres in Orkney and an additional 13,600 acres in Zetland, comprising the lands awarded to their ancestor Gospatrick, Earl of Northumberland, in 1066 by King Malcolm Canmore for his loyalty against William the Conqueror (Local Government Board 1873; Bateman [1883] 1971; Hinson 2007).

The analysis of the evolution of the design aesthetics at Aske Hall involved four maps and plans from the 1727 survey of the estate owned by the Duke of Wharton through the changes instituted between 1727 and 1761 during the ownership of Sir Conyers D'Arcy. Additionally the 1763 survey and First Edition OS Map details the later retention and evolution of this design by the Dundas family (NYCRO ZNK M1/1, NYCRO ZNK M1/3, NYCRO ZNK M1/4, OS 1857). Comparing the fields and designed elements of Aske Hall from the 1727 plan with the 1761 plan it can be seen that D'Arcy created an expensive landscape park and garden after his purchase of the estate. Tree-lined avenues were added to the original south-east approach and along a newly created approach from the east. These two approaches joined to the east of the hall along the ha-ha wall which was



retained from the design shown on the 1727 map, and from which prospects were made over the parkland to the south and south-east of the hall and to the wider working landscape beyond (Plates 1 and 2). To the north of the hall additional plantations were added around an open field labelled 'Coney Garth' on the 1727 map, creating an isolated open space. According to the English Heritage register, plans were drawn by Thomas Kent in c. 1748 for a temple which was to be added to this area of the parkland (Plate 6). The 1727 map portrays the hall situated within a woodland plantation surrounded by arable fields. The 'Wheat Close', to the east of Coney Garth on the 1727 map became the location of the kitchen garden. A plantation strip running south-west of the kitchen garden was increased to create a continuous belt joining the existing woodlands along Aske beck on the western edge of the park. According to Condillac (2004) in order to manage high water levels in the parkland, a series of stepped ponds and cascades and additional woodlands were added along the beck culminating in a formal pond with a classical temple situated within the park to the east of the hall.

The 1763 plan, created the same year the Dundas family purchased the estate, shows that a gothic temple, attributed to William Kent (GD2058, Condillac 2004) had been added to Coney Garth. Serpentine paths, a series of cabinets and classical statuary were added to the plantations surrounding the Garth (Plate 3). Plantations were added to visibly isolate the kitchen garden from the hall. Further plantations to the south-east and eastern boundary of the parkland were increased and reworked with serpentine paths and additional water features. A castellated tower was erected at Oliver Duckett, creating an eye-catcher within the 'outlying rising ground' (Condillac 2004) to the east of the parkland, suggesting that the woodland plantations along the beck were not to completely disconnect the hall from the wider landscape.

Capability Brown was approached by Sir Lawrence Dundas to redesign the landscape and reportedly visited the hall in 1769 (GD2058). Upon analysis of the 1857 first edition Ordnance Survey, very little of the existing landscape park and garden created by D'Arcy in the earlier part of the century had been altered. The avenue from the north-east of the hall was softened and reestablished as a gently curving approach, likewise the southern



avenue was softened and moved further south along the beck, and recreated as a curved approach through the park. A new gate, gatehouse and bridge were added and this approach was given a gentle curve through the parkland. Remnants of the tree-lined approach were allowed to remain. The pond added to the east of the hall by D'Arcy was enlarged slightly and given more naturalistic outlines. Beyond these subtle adjustments to the approach and pond, the overall design aesthetic of the landscape appears to have remained relatively unchanged between 1763 and 1857. The straight paths within the pleasure-ground to the north-west of the hall were softened but it is not possible to state if these changes were implemented by Brown, or just an eventual naturalization of the design over the nineteenth century. By the time of the Ordnance Survey the park and garden of Aske Hall incorporated 1683 acres of land comprising 14.49% of the entire estate lands within the North Riding. A visual survey of the site and analysis of aerial photographs suggests that this later design of the landscape park and garden at Aske remains relatively intact today; indicating that these plans and designs were accurate representations of the surrounding park and garden of Aske Hall.

### **Marske Hall**

Lord Dundas' peripheral estate of Marske Hall in Marske by the Sea, consisted of 400 acres of garden and parkland, comprised 3.44% of the entire lands owned within the North Riding. This estate was the seat of the Lowther family who lived there from 1650, until it was sold to Sir Lawrence Dundas in 1762, after the death of William Lowthar (Page 1923, 399). Unfortunately the only available map for Marske Hall is the 1857 first edition OS map. As implied by the number of acres involved within the designed landscape, Marske Hall is a small estate located on the main street running through the village with a small area dedicated to gardens and parkland. The OS map indicates a small garden to the north of the hall and a small area of woodland to the south. A wider open parkland is to the north-east, but there were very few plantations or designed elements detailed within this area. While the spaces within the woodland and the garden areas appear to be naturalistic on the OS map, earlier documentation or material culture is not available, and any analysis of the implementation of design over the long eighteenth century remains elusive.



## Upleatham Hall

According to Page, Upleatham Hall, which served as the former seat of the Dundas family up until the purchase of Aske Hall in 1763 (1923, 411-12). With a total of 4109 acres dedicated to landscaped park and gardens, Upleatham constituted 35.38% of the lands owned by the Dundas family. Even though this percentage is greater than the designed lands at Aske, it falls below Aske in overall designed area. The earliest map of Upleatham Hall dates from the 1773 (NYCRO ZNK M 1/27, NYCRO ZNK M 1/28 and Zetland Estates), with other key evidence coming from the 1856-57 first edition OS map, the landscape detailed on all three maps indicates that the designed landscape changes very little over the later part of the eighteenth century to mid-nineteenth century. The maps show what appears to be a walled kitchen garden to the north-east of the hall. A woodland area with walkways lies immediately to the south of the hall, and over time this increased to surround the hall by the mid-nineteenth century. The wider parkland contains a few ponds and is surrounded by woodland belts and a fir ridge. The overall aesthetic of this landscape seemed to focus more on the natural aesthetic of the parkland and woodland areas. Without earlier maps it is difficult to tell whether the woodlands were established early or were created later in the eighteenth century. Analysis of aerial photographs suggests that the later design was maintained to the present date.

Looking at the wider estates of Sir Lawrence Dundas we see a member of the landed gentry who, over the eighteenth century, gained wealth through business adventures, financing ventures and land acquisition leading to a title of peerage (Condillac 2004). In 1762 he purchased a smaller estate nearby located within the village of Marske by the Sea and a year later, the larger estate of Aske (across the Riding, just north of Richmond) from Robert D'Arcy, Earl of Holderness. Sir Dundas then moved his family seat from Upleatham to Aske Hall, with its established arcadian landscape. Dundas continued to increase and add to the designs established by Robert D'Arcy in the earlier part of the century. Later adjustments were made at the end of the eighteenth century, softening individual aspects of the wider landscape through naturalizing the pond and creating curved approaches. However, the overall design of the park and gardens were retained throughout the nineteenth century and later twentieth century.



### *Swinton Castle*

Swinton Castle (located within the township of Swinton with Wathwemarske, about a mile from Masham, and on the south bank of the river Burn) was formerly the property of the Scropes, lords of Masham and Upsall. From this family, Swinton was conveyed to Elizabeth widow of Thomas Danby in 1615 (Page 1914, 328). It is worthy of note that the ownership of this estate actually shifted between the time of *The Return* and Bateman's *Great Landowners*. In 1882 Samuel Cunliffe-Lister, the first Baron Masham, from Calverley Hall near Bradford, bought Swinton Castle at the time of Mrs. Danby-Harcourt's death. Therefore at the time of Bateman's *The Return* the Danby-Harcourt estate contained a total of 11,441 acres with an annual income of £11,179. By the time of Bateman the new owner of this estate held a total of 24,240 acres throughout the North and West Ridings with an annual income of £17,253. Since the Danby family was in residence at Swinton Castle from 1615, and the designed landscape was established and further altered during their ownership, the statistics of acreage and income will come from the Danby-Harcourt estates. The 144 acres of designed landscape at Swinton Castle accounted for 12.6% of the entire lands owned within the North Riding by the Danby's (Local Government Board 1873; Bateman [1883] 1971).

A total of four maps of Swinton are available, dating from the 1765 plan of Swinton to the mid-nineteenth century First Edition OS map (NYCRO ZS MIC 2018 228, NYCRO ZS, MIC 2018/255, NYCRO ZS, MIC 2023/73 and First Edition OS 1856). Swinton Castle, like Aske Hall, had formal gardens in the vicinity of the hall which were established, in 1714 based upon designs by George London detailed on Bucks sketch of Swinton (1720) (GD2076, 1998). The Hall and grounds were remodelled in 1764-7 by William Danby, at a time, according to historians, when the trend of creating a more natural aesthetic was starting to occur throughout the country. According to the 1765 map (Plate 48) the flower, kitchen and greenhouse gardens were located to the north-east of the hall. Beyond these formal gardens to the north-east was a woodland plantation containing an oblong pond narrowing to what appears to have been a duck decoy. A ha-ha separated the formal



areas near the hall from the wider parklands to the west and north-west of the hall. The parkland contained scattered clumps of trees and deer shelter, and was reportedly filled with fallow deer (GD2076, 1998). A more detailed survey of the estate dated 1770 revealed more information regarding field divisions within the parkland, and included additional woodland plantations on the far south-western edge of the park. At the time of the 1777 survey the woodland to the north-east of the formal gardens was cut with straight walks interspersed with serpentine paths creating a pleasure-ground similar to those at Aske Hall (Plates 49 and 50). Although this pleasure-ground at Swinton contained straight walks the overall design did not have an overwhelming rigidity or formal geometric design.

The house and grounds were once again redesigned in 1796 by Sir William Danby, the son of the aforementioned William. At this time Sir William Gothicized the Georgian exterior of the house and applied picturesque designs to the wider pleasure grounds (GD2076). There is not a plan or map of the estate available from this time. However written accounts and a plan of the estate from 1820 indicate that additional pleasure-grounds containing winding paths were added around the perimeter of the parkland to the north, west and south-west. Additional water features were added to the designed lands and serpentine paths wound through the woodland pleasure-grounds which encircled the wider parkland. Existing ponds located to the north-east of the hall on the 1777 plan were softened and given more natural edges (Plate 1820). According to the English Heritage Report a rockery, rustic bridges, ruins, Roman coffins, waterfalls and grottoes were included within the pleasure-grounds, adding neo-arcadian elements to the newly designed Swinton Park (GD2076, 1998). Site survey revealed that the kitchen, flower and greenhouse gardens located to the north-east of the hall on all of the maps remained. Both paths and the remnant of former paths portrayed on the 1777 map were located throughout the gardens and woodlands to the north-east of the hall. The neo-arcadian elements added between the end of the eighteenth century were still situated near the ponds and lakes within the pleasure-ground. From the ha-ha wall, views out over the deer park revealed remnant ridge and furrow visible from the hall and the gardens.



Analyzing the changes within the landscape park and garden surrounding Swinton Castle reveals an estate held by one family from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth century. Once again, like Aske Hall, the formality of the gardens near the hall was maintained throughout the eighteenth century. However, whilst maintaining these formal elements, a major shift in aesthetic occurred within wider parkland at the end of the eighteenth century. The deer park and run were retained, and additional plantings were added around the north, west, and south-west perimeters of this parkland, creating a belted pleasure-ground.

### *Newburgh Priory*

Newburgh Priory, a twelfth-century Augustinian priory, located in the Vale of York was acquired by Anthony Bellisas, the King's Chaplain, in 1529 after the dissolution. From this date Newburgh Priory served as the principle residence of the Bellasis family (Page 1923) which was elevated in status in 1611, when Sir William was made a baronet. The family was raised to the peerage when the title of Lord Fauconberg was created in 1627 later fashioned Viscount in 1643 and finally Earl of Fauconberg in 1689 (GD2068, SMR NYM1722, PAGE 1923, 19). In 1825 Newburgh Priory was the seat of Sir O. Wombwell Bart., indirect descendent of Bellasis. At the time of Bateman's *Great Landowners*, Wombwell's estates totaled 12,226 acres, earning £14,500 per annum (Local Government Board 1873; Bateman [1883] 1971). In addition to the lands associated with Newburgh Priory the Wombwells owned the smaller secondary estates of Huby Hall, Easigwold Hall and Thornton on the Hill (all located nearby) and Welburn Hall (in the eastern region of the Riding located in the Vale of Pickering).

At Newburgh, the design consisted of a total of 40 hectares designed gardens around the hall, and approximately 450 additional hectares allocated as parkland, consisting of plantations and a deer-park enclosed in 1383 (Jacques 2004). By the end of the nineteenth century the designed elements within the estate constituted a total of 69.62% of the entire lands owned by Sir George Wombwell.



The evolution of the designed landscape of Newburgh Priory can be traced through two early seventeenth-century paintings of the house and gardens (Plates 46 and 47), six maps spanning the early- seventeenth century, from a short time prior to the occupation of Sir William Bellasis Bart, through the eighteenth century and up to the nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey (NYCRO ZDV, MIC 1504/145; NYCRO ZDV VI 2, MIC 1504/160; NYCRO ZDV VI 4; NYCRO ZDV VI 6, MIC 1504/390; ZDV VI 17; First Edition OS 1856). 'The plat of Newburgh' made by Francis Mayson of Terrington in 1605 shows walled gardens and orchards to the south and south-west of the hall (Plate 43). Surrounding this area was a small walled park with lodge and further to the south-east a larger enclosed woodland. Throughout the evolution of Newburgh the formal gardens around the hall were not only maintained, but were actually increased over the century as additional parkland was incorporated into the design.

By 1722 common lands to the south of the estate were incorporated into the wider parkland and the formal gardens and pleasure-grounds increased further into the existent parkland to the south and south-east of the hall (Plate 44). The woodland to the east of the hall was redesigned into a pleasure ground with additional plantings cut with straight formal paths, square moated ponds and fish ponds. By 1744, the walls surrounding the formal gardens around the hall were removed, and the gardens were increased by absorbing parkland further to the south (Plate 45). The woodlands to the east of the hall were increased and restructured with straight avenues, winding paths, cabinets, water features and statuary throughout. A crenellated wall separated this area from the wider parklands which were enclosed by a woodland belt containing additional paths with cabinets and statuary. A bastion wall with radiating points, similar to the walls established at Castle Howard, separated the internal parkland, gardens and hall from the wider deer park to the east and south-east of the hall. At this time the formal elements also increased further north with the inclusion of a formal pond created in the field located to the north of the hall on the 1722 map of the estate.

By the nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey, the general shape of the woodland gardens and wider parklands were retained, however, their internal formality was softened with



tree growth obscuring the paths visible on the 1744 map. Without evidence dated between 1744 to 1845 it is difficult to ascertain whether the formal elements were indeed groomed into a more natural aesthetic. During a site survey the pleasure-grounds to the east of the hall were found to contain natural ponds and streams and serpentine paths throughout, but the patterns and internal aesthetics were more natural than the designs portrayed on the 1744 map. Site survey also revealed that the formal gardens and terraces to the south of the hall have been removed and grass lawns were established in their place. The outlying woodland belt and bastion wall no longer existed, and as the land is leased out to tenants, it was inaccessible at the time of the site survey. However, upon discussion with the current landowner there was recollection of a large ditch (suspected Ha Ha) at the southern boundary of the parkland. Analysis of aerial photographs and initial visual survey of the site indicate residual woodland formations matching the woodland pattern indicated on the 1744 survey of the estate. It would appear that the overall design of Newburgh Priory was not completely swept away for a more minimal and natural aesthetic at the end of the eighteenth century. In addition to the lands associated with Newburgh Priory, the Wombwells owned a total of four smaller peripheral estates, three of which contained designed gardens, whilst only one contained wider parklands. Unfortunately since the only cartographic evidence for all of these smaller estates comes from the First Edition OS Map, evolution of any associated parks and gardens remains elusive.

### **Thornton Hall**

Thornton Hall, located two-and-a-half miles to the south of Coxwold, was acquired by Sir Henry Bellasis in 1608 (Page 1923). This smaller estate consisted mostly of farmland. The only cartographic evidence available is the 1856 First Edition OS map which lacks any evidence of designed gardens or wider parklands associated with this hall.

### **Easingwold Hall**

Easingwold Hall, a small hall in the village of Easingwold, located to the south-east towards York, became part of the Newburgh estate in 1633 (Page 1923, 128-29). Once again there is very little evidence of gardens or attached parklands on the 1856 first edition



OS map. Nor is there evidence of remnant design on aerial photographs of the site showing earlier designed elements.

### **Huby Hall**

By 1859 Sir George O Wombwell was listed as the principle owner of Huby Hall, a small hall in the village of Huby with attached walled gardens. Over the eighteenth century it was the residence of William Wakefield, the architect for the North Riding estates of Duncombe Park and Gilling Castle (Hinson 2007). At the time of the 1856 OS map the hall was situated within a field with a small circular belt of trees to the north-east. Across the road from the hall are remnants of medieval fish ponds, once thought to be part of the grounds associated with the hall (Current Owner, 2006).

### **Welburn Hall**

Of the peripheral estates falling under the estate of Newburgh Priory Welburn Hall, located in Kirkdale has the largest area of designed landscape. This estate was a later addition, purchased by Wombwell in 1872 from Wrangram and Smith, both branches of the Gibson family who had owned the estate since 1605-06 (Page 1912, 520). According to *The Return* Wrangram and Smith owned a total of 1025 acres with an annual income of £338 placing this estate within the level of Greater Yeomen. However since *The Return* was published in 1873 a year after Wombwell purchased this estate it is uncertain if these statistics refer to the lands at Welburn or lands owned by Wrangram and Smith elsewhere in the Riding. Welburn Hall, located on the north-west end of the village of Welburn, it incorporated a substantial amount of land dedicated to gardens. Like the other secondary estates associated with Newburgh the only document available at this time which details the landscape is the 1856 OS map. In addition to designed gardens and terraces to the north and south of the hall, the OS map details a naturalistic edged pond lies immediately to the south of the garden, beyond which lies wider parkland scattered with clumps. The parklands continue to the east and north of the hall, and all of this is secluded by a perimeter belt. According to the OS map these areas included temples and winding paths creating a pleasure-ground within the perimeter woodland belt, smaller in scale but similar to the designs at Newburgh, Aske and Swinton. Since earlier maps are not



available it is uncertain as to whether this belt was cut out of established woodland or if it was created as a new plantation. With a total of 186 acres dedicated to design the landscape park and gardens at Welburn account for 1.52% of the total lands owned by the Wombwells at the end of the nineteenth century.

In conclusion, analysis of the landscape park and garden at Newburgh affords the opportunity to observe the implementation and development of design aesthetics over the eighteenth century by one family who maintained ownership and control from the sixteenth century to date. Unlike the landowners at Aske and Swinton, the Bellasis of Newburgh estate continued to absorb additional working lands and parkland into the designed landscape over the eighteenth century. However, once again the formal design of the landscape park and garden at Newburgh, like at Aske Hall and Swinton Castle, was not obliterated by the natural or the picturesque movements at the end of the eighteenth century. Rather, whilst maintaining the formal gardens surrounding the hall, subtle adjustments were made to the internal aesthetics of the wider parkland. Unfortunately the peripheral estates of Thornton on the Hill, Easingwold, and Huby Hall have little documentary or cartographic evidence in order to explore aesthetics applied to lesser estates of the same family. However, the later addition of Welburn Hall to the landholdings of the Wombwells indicates a continued interest in increasing the wider estates holdings up through the eighteenth century.

#### *Castle Howard*

The village of Henderskelfe and the associated castle located within the high rolling lands of the Howardian Hills approximately 20 km north-east of York was in the possession of the Howard family since 1569 when the properties passed through the female line of the Mauleverer family (Page 1923, 107). By the time of Bateman's *Great Landowners* the Earl of Carlisle owned a total of 78,540 acres throughout the United Kingdom with an annual income of £49,601. Only 13,030 of these acres were situated in the North Riding of Yorkshire, but these had a total annual income of £14,502 (Local Government Board 1873; Bateman [1883] 1971). The castle - described by Leland as a 'quadrangular building with



four towers' (Leland 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, 1770) - was destroyed by a fire in 1693. The remains of the hall and the attached village of Henderskelfe, portrayed in a late seventeenth-century plan (plate 27), were removed by the Earl of Carlisle at the beginning of the eighteenth century (around the same time that the grounds around Swinton were being laid out, and just prior to the implementation of the designed parks and gardens at Newburgh). The Earl built a grand baroque palace within an elaborate arcadian landscape. The landscape at Castle Howard was a creation of formal areas, accented with natural elements and placed within the wider working landscape. Therefore, calculating the ratio of designed lands to non-designed lands is a little difficult for this estate since the design aesthetic utilized the surrounding working landscape within the wider aesthetic.

As a monumental landscape designed by Vanbrugh for the Earl of Carlisle, Castle Howard is well known and has been much studied. However, this is the first attempt to study the designed landscape within its wider social and topographical context within the North Riding. The following analysis will observe the implementation of this design and the subsequent alterations to the landscape by analyzing an illustration by Colin Campbell, maps from 1694, 1720, 1770 and the nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey (Fowler 1727; Survey of Henderskelfe n.d., 1770; Campbell 1715; First Edition OS Map 1856). The 1720 map indicated formal elements within the gardens to the south of the hall including terraced walks and parterres, and Wray Wood, to the east of the hall, is considered to be the start of the natural style with its retention of ancient woodlands and inclusion of serpentine natural paths (Saumarez-Smith 1990; GD206, 1998). The formal parterres and Wray Wood were surrounded by a bastion wall, as seen at Newburgh, separating this designed area from the wider estate, yet affording views out over the working landscape, which was also adorned with tree-lined avenues, temples and ponds. The whole created an arcadian pleasure ground befitting the newly designed palace.

Two powerful families merged with the marriage of Elizabeth to Charles Howard in 1569, a gentleman with extensive lands and connections throughout the United Kingdom. After a fire in 1693 rendered the earlier hall uninhabitable the third Earl of Carlisle made the decision to create a grand palace on the site. The village of Henderskelfe was removed



and an elaborate Arcadian landscape was created in its place (Plates 27 and 28). Castle Howard offers an interesting landscape to explore meaning and permanence of place from both the perspective of the landowner and the tenants of the estate. Looking at the destruction of the castle-like hall and the erection of a palace in its place is an interesting statement of the Howard's attachment to modernity. Whilst it was the intention of the Earl to create a grand baroque palace, unprecedented in the North Riding, he called his finished hall 'Castle' Howard. Even though the village was removed, the main street was utilized as the foundation of the grand terrace that runs across the south of the hall. Switzer notes that the retention of the ancient woodland in Wray Wood was stressed as a dedicated attachment to permanence of place (Switzer 1718). The retention of ancient woodland, the title of Castle and the foundation of the main street of Henderskelfe which later served as the path of the Grand Terrace can be interpreted as subtle retentions of the history of place. Although Castle Howard acted as the family's seat since 1569, any attachments to history potentially would be related to the family's prior seat at Naworth Castle in Cumberland.

The 1772 map of Castle Howard revealed that like the estates mentioned so far, the original design was maintained (Plate 29). The lands to the north of the house were naturalized with sweeping lawns and the addition of a large lake with naturalistic edges. One of the most obvious alterations to the landscape was the removal of the geometric wilderness beyond the terrace to the south of the hall. However, it is debated if this wilderness, indicated on the 1720 map was actually realized within the landscape. Even though this designed element is shown on both the 1720 map and the illustration by Campbell in *Vitruvius Britannicus*, (Plate 36) without additional onsite archaeological surveys it is not possible to definitively state whether this wilderness was removed between 1720 and 1770 or if it was actually never implemented. If it is indeed a case of being removed this would be one of the only cases of the North Riding's Great Landowners purposefully removing formal elements near the hall within the eighteenth century.



## Easthorpe Hall

The only peripheral estate owned by the Howards was Easthorpe Hall, located between Castle Howard and the nearby village of Malton. It was sold by James Hebden and absorbed into the Castle Howard estate at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was occupied by various tenants until the house was sold in 1965, and unfortunately destroyed by a fire in 1971 (Page 1923, 537). The hall sat on the edge of an open parkland which is entirely encapsulated within a wider woodland plantation. Even though there are three maps available for this estate, a wider design aesthetic is not evident (East Thorpe n.d., 1831; First Edition OS Map 1854).

## *Bolton Hall*

Bolton Hall, also known as Little Bolton, and its 325 acre park are located on the northern slope of Wensleydale along the River Ure west of the village of Wensley in Gilling West. These lands once fell under the fees of Castle Bolton, located further to the west along the River Ure, which was held by the Le Scrope family since the thirteenth century. In 1630 John Scrope, captured as a Royalist, was forced to depart Castle Bolton and the castle was 'rendered unlivable (Page 1914, 273).' Mary Scrope, John's sister, and heir married Charles Paulet, Earl of Wiltshire who was later created the first Duke of Bolton in 1689. Shortly after Bolton Hall was constructed in parklands within the larger estate further east along the River Ure. The hall passed through the family to the sixth Duke of Bolton. Upon his death in 1794 the title died and the estate passed to Mary Powlett, his niece and heir and her husband Thomas Orde. In 1799 Thomas Orde-Powlett was created the first Baron Bolton (Page 1914, 268-273). At the time of Bateman's *Great Landowners* Lord Bolton owned a total of 15,418 acres within the North Riding, including the lands surrounding the former seat of Bolton Castle and nearby estates of Bear Park in Carperby, Wensley Hall in Wensley and Elm House in Redmire, lands which provided a total income of £13,824 per annum. In addition to these lands within the North Riding, Lord Bolton owned an additional 13,808 acres in Hampshire bringing in £13,728 per annum (Local Government Board 1873; Bateman [1883] 1971).



The 3251 acres of designed landscape at Bolton Hall constituted 25% of the total lands held throughout the North Riding. With the addition of 960 acres of designed land at Bear Park, 1069 acres at Wensley Hall and 134 acres at Elm House, the total amount of designed landscape within their estates totaled 5414 acres, or 35% of the lands owned in the North Riding. Even though the landscape park and garden at Bolton Hall is one of the smaller portions of land designated to pleasure grounds analyzed above, it is evident from the four maps spanning the eighteenth century that the overall aesthetic and evolution of design followed a pattern similar to that seen in the landscapes of the Great Landowners detailed thus far (NYCRO ZBO, MIC 2002/101; NYCRO ZBO M2/2, MIC 2002/177; NYCRO ZBO M2/1, MIC 2002/167, First Edition OS Map 1856). By 1678 the hall was completed (Pevsner 1966, 383; Page 1914) and by 1723 the surrounding grounds and parklands were well established (plate 15). Once again formal gardens were located in proximity to the hall. To the west there were extensive woodlands cut through with rides, straight avenues and open spaces. An avenue from the south of the hall acted as the main approach. By the mid-eighteenth century the woods to the west of the hall were cut with serpentine paths, though most of the original design was retained. Areas with prospects were marked on the later eighteenth-century map; of particular note is the creation of a large open area in the shape of an hourglass cut out of the woodland, thus opening prospects to the north of the estate and to the south over the River Ure (Plate 16).

The estate holds a map dated 1707 with alterations made in 1792 (Plate 14) still has an avenue from the south. By the 1823 map of the estate details that a serpentine path replaced the southern approach within the lawn to the south of the house, however part of the avenue was retained in the distance where the earlier approach crossed the river Ure (Plate 21). By the 1856 Ordnance Survey, many of the woodlands appear to be cut with serpentine paths. A fish pond was added to Haremire wood just to the west of the hall. A gently curving approach replaced the straight avenue evident on the mid nineteenth-century estate map. The formal elements around the hall had been maintained and the overall design of the woodlands to the west of the hall remained fairly untouched. Once



again, even though some design elements within the landscape park and garden appear to have been softened and naturalized between the 1793 map and the First Edition OS map, the traditional formal elements seem to have been retained. The kitchen garden was relocated from the vicinity of the house to the north-east, north of which Two circular stables were built.

The landscape park and garden of Bolton Hall, though quite different in overall layout; followed a similar design and subsequent alterations discussed so far. Like the landscapes created at Castle Howard, the addition of new blood into the Scope family with the marriage between Mary and Charles Paulet, in combination with the forceful removal of the Scropes from Bolton Castle, afforded the lord of the manor the opportunity to create a new seat. The Paulett-Scropes utilized the same formal design aesthetics when creating the designed landscape at Bolton Hall. Like the designed landscape parks and gardens analyzed above, the subsequent owners maintained that formal aesthetic over the eighteenth century.

Within the estate grounds across the River Ure to the south-east is Polly Peechum's Tower (Plate 25) thought by some to have been erected for Lord Bolton's second wife Lavenia Barnes, an actress portrayed in William Hogarth's *Beggar's Opera* (Plate 23). However, the current Lord and Lady Bolton, suspect that it was a viewing stand (Pers comm. January 2006) . Although this could be considered an eye-catcher in the wider working landscape it is difficult to see from the house (Plate 23). However views from the tower have a very good prospect of the house and former deer park, situated to the south of the house (Plate 23) supporting the ideas of the current Lord and Lady Bolton.

### **Elm House**

The urban estate of Elm House has been in possession of the Bolton estate since the middle of the fourteenth century (Page 1914). Elm House sits away from the village of Redmire. Small gardens are on the south-east of the hall and it appears that a ha-ha separates the hall from the parkland beyond. The parkland is small and contains no formal design. Hedgerows along prior field boundaries exist within this park (First Edition OS 1856).



## **Bear Park**

Located in nearby Carperby, Bear Park has been associated with the manor of Bolton since the fifteenth century (Page 1914, 207). This estate functioned mainly as a hunting lodge and the park itself comprises several fields with remnants of hedgerow boundaries. Beyond a formal tree-lined approach indicated on the First Edition OS map (1856), there are few designed elements to this estate.

## **Wensley Hall**

Falling under the manor of Bolton since the fifteenth century Wensley Hall, Wensley has the second largest amount of lands dedicated to designed aesthetic within the wider estate of Bolton falling beneath Bolton Hall (Page 1914). The 1856 First Edition OS map portrays the hall on the western edge of the village of Wensley. Small gardens lie to the north of the hall with wider parkland stretching to the west, the boundary of which meets up with the eastern edge of the designed landscape at Bolton Hall. To date Wensley Hall has traditionally served as the residence of the eldest son prior to his inheritance of Bolton Hall (Lord Bolton, pers comm. 2005).

## *Danby Castle and the Dawnay family estates*

Unlike the estates explored above the holdings of the Dawnay family are quite convoluted in regard to primary and secondary holdings at the time of Bateman who placed the family seat at Danby Lodge (Plate 169). The original seat of the Dawnay family was located at Sessay Park, which had an established deer park, however never evolved into a designed landscape over the eighteenth century. Cowick Hall located in the West Riding was leased by the Dawnays from the fifteenth century. In the 1680s Sir John Dawnay was fashioned Viscount Downe and bought Cowick Hall which served as the family seat until 1869, when the estate was sold and the family relocated to Baldersby Park in the North Riding (Dawnay 2009). According to Bateman and *The Return* Danby Castle, located in Danby, Langbaugh East Division, which served as the family's the North Riding shooting box since the 1680s, was the main family seat, however, sources have described Danby Castle as the residence of Lord Dawnay during the hunting season only (Hinson 2007). By



this time the family also held the additional North Riding manors of Baldersby Park, Constable Burton (for a short time), Hutton Bushell, Sessay and Wykeham Abbey, all except for Sessay, were purchased during the 1840s and 1850s. According to the VCH Baldersby Park served as the residence of the Dowager Viscountess Downe (Page 1923, 338).

### Danby Castle

In 1655 the estate of Danby was purchased by John Dawnay from Sir John Chelsea, owner since 1647. John Dawnay was knighted in 1660 and created Viscount in 1680-81 and John Christopher Dawnay, created Lord Dawnay in 1780. From 1655 the estate passed through direct inheritance up to the present owner at the time of *Bateman's Great Landowners*, except for one indirect inheritance by John Dawnay, brother to Henry Pleydell Dawnay in 1760 (Page 1923, 338). At the time of *Bateman's Great Landowners* the Dawnay family owned a total of 15,271 acres in the North Riding with an annual income of £18,966. These lands include the estates of Baldersby Park in Baldersby, Birdforth and Hutton Buschel in Hutton Buschell and Wykeham Abbey in Wykham, both located in Pickering Lythe. Lord Dawnay also owned an additional 244 acres in the East and West Ridings and three acres in Essex adding a further £296 to his annual income (Local Government Board 1873, Page 1923, 338 ; Bateman [1883] 1971, 137).

Originally this estate was centered on the castle erected by Robert de Brus at Castleton which continued as the baronial residence until the erection of Danby Castle in the mid-thirteenth century. By the fourteenth century both castles were in ruins and the estate was centered on Danby Lodge across the River Esk from Castleton. Unlike the rest of the estates discussed within this section, Danby Castle estate consisted of lands scattered throughout the moors, in and around the townships of Castleton and Danby (NYCRO ZDS M1/1 (a), MIC 1738/374; NYCRO ZDS, MIC 1738/50; NYCRO ZDS M1/5, MIC 1738/68-93). Besides a small terraced garden near the lodge the rest of the estate never evolved into a larger designed landscape park and garden. The fact that the lands were never consolidated and remained scattered across the northern moors most likely accounted for the lack of a unified design.



### **Baldersby Park**

Located in Baldersby, Birdforth, Baldersby Park was purchased by the Perrot family in 1661 through to 1747. The descent of ownership is unknown from 1747 until records show the estate being sold to Viscount Downe in 1853 (Page 1923) when the family sold their West Riding estate of Cowick. At the time of *The Return* it was the residence of the Dowager Viscountess Downe, however it is this researcher's opinion that the Baldersby served as the family seat for a short. Again the only cartographic record of this estate is the First Edition OS map (1856). A perimeter fence surrounds parkland with remnant hedgerows, tree clumps, deer runs, a fish pond to the south of the hall, stables, lodge and park house. There is an area to the north of the hall which appears to be woodland, but analysis of the OS map does not distinguish between formal gardens or pleasure-grounds in this area. It would appear that although this estate is more consolidated than Danby Castle, Baldersby also functioned mainly as hunting parkland.

### **Hutton Buscel (Hutton Bushel)**

Located in Hutton Buscel, this estate was conveyed to Marmaduke Langley, an ancestor of Viscount Downe, in 1840 (Page 1923). The hall sits on the south-western edge of the village street. The OS map shows extensive gardens around the hall with a small park to the south and south-west. There is an ice house within the park and a few scattered plantings but an overall design is not implemented (OS map 1854).

*Wykeham Abbey* is located in Wykeham, and was bequeathed to Marmaduke Dawnay in 1817 by his cousin Richard Langley (Page 1923). The Abbey park sits on the southern edge of the village. The hall sits further south within the parkland and is situated within formal gardens, as portrayed in the 1854 First Edition OS map.

### *Jervaulx Abbey and the estates of the Marquis of Ailesbury*

Like Danby Castle, the last estate to be discussed is unique in this dataset. Jervaulx Abbey was owned by the Marquis of Ailesbury, along with Kilgram and Tanfield Halls, yet none of these estates acted as the family seat. Rather, the family estate of Tottenham Park in



Wiltshire remained the family's seat after the Marquis' inheritance of the estates within the North Riding. Nonetheless his North Riding holdings totaling 15,369 acres still qualify Ailesbury as a Great Landowner within the Riding. By the time of Bateman's *Great Landowners*, the Marquis owned a total of 55,051 acres throughout Great Britain with an annual income of £59,716. These were associated with the estates of Jervaulx Abbey and Tanfield Park and Kilgram Hall, and account for £17,696 of the Marquis' annual income (Local Government Board 1873, Bateman [1883] 1971).

### Jervaulx Abbey

Located 1¾ miles east of East Witton within the wapentake of Hang West, Jervaulx Abbey was 'founded in the year 1156, by Akarius, the son of Bardolph, and dedicated to the Virgin Mary. At the general dissolution this monastery was seized, and its revenues, valued by Speed, at £455. 10s. 5d. granted to the King (Hinson 2007)'. In 1603, Edward Bruce, Lord Kinloss was granted the lands of Jervaulx Abbey. From this date the estate stayed within the Bruce family. In 1663 the title Earl of Ailesbury was created, but this lapsed in 1746 with the death of the third Earl. Thomas Bruce Brundell (Lord of Tottenham Park in Wiltshire, and nephew to the third Earl) inherited the estate, took the name of Bruce and was created Earl of Ailesbury in 1746, acquiring the new title of Marquis of Ailesbury in 1814 (Page 1914, 284). Numerous maps of East Witton and Jervaulx Abbey dating from 1627 to 1886 detail the evolution of the design around the house, abbey ruins and within the wider landscape (NYCRO ZJX 10/1/4; ZS, MIC 2018/225-227; NYCRO ZJX, MIC 1930/144-148; NYCRO ZJX 10/12, MIC 1930/126-129; NYCRO ZJX 10/22, MIC 1930/218-219; NYCRO 10/25, MIC 1930/239-43; NYCRO ZJX 10/73, MIC 1931/232-38; NYCRO ZJX 10/83 I, MIC 1931/305). Even though a mansion was built near the Abbey, the main occupant was the steward of the estate. There are numerous letters from the stewards to the Marquis throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries discussing hunting on the estate, the status of the game and the general status of the estate interspersed with multiple inquiries as to whether the Marquis would be visiting Jervaulx. The only apparent alteration to the landscape was the addition of a formal garden to the west of the mansion and the abbey ruins, which are evident on the 1807 survey of the estate (see figures 5.20 to 5.22).



## **Tanfield Hall**

Tanfield Hall came into the possession of the Bruce family in 1622 when Thomas Bruce, the Earl of Elgin married Diana the daughter of the Earl of Exeter, whose family had owned it since 1571 (Page 1914, 385). Tanfield Hall lies within the curve of a woodland belt running along the northern bank of the River Ure. Both the 1792 map and the First Edition OS map indicate areas near the hall dedicated to formal gardens, although there is a lack of detail on both of these sources. Views from the hall to the north-west look out over the wider working landscape. Since the earliest map available is dated from 1792, it is not possible to understand the full evolution of design within this parkland (NYCRO MIC1930/40, OS map 1856).

## **Kilgram Grange**

This country house was granted by James I to Edward Bruce in 1603 and stayed within the family's possession until 1887, when it was sold to Samuel Cunliffe-Lister, Lord Masham, of Swinton Park. The Grange is situated on the eastern edge of the lands of Jervaulx Abbey along the River Ure. There are gardens to the east of the hall and what appears to be an arched line of trees to the south, which could either be remnants of a prior avenue or possible remnants of woodland. This house appears on the 1793 map of Jervaulx Abbey (see appendix, figure 5.21) however, the detail is very light, so it is not possible to come to any conclusion.

Despite the length of ownership it appears the Marquis did not spend a vast amount of funds on the designed landscapes of his properties within the North Riding. It would be easy to explain this as the result of an absentee landowner. However, when placed against the fact that Brudenell- Bruce turned down grand designs for his seat in Wiltshire because he:

was not comfortable with the idea that the landowner and his seat should be focal points around which avenues and vistas were made to radiate. That would call attention to the landowner's capacity to command the estate and all its surrounds rather than to express his function as steward and conservator. Brudenell preferred the less assertive statement. He was determined to set his generation an example of



the "improving landlord," one intent on demonstrating that responsible landlordship served the interests of a wider community (Winter 1999).

Placed in this light the lack of interference with the landscape at Jervaulx could have been seen as an extension of Brundell-Bruce's aim for his 'plantations to blur rather than accentuate the boundaries between "working" parts of the estate and parts set aside for enjoyment and display' (Winter 1999).

#### *Duncombe Park*

Helmsley Castle was built in 1190 by Robert de Roos to the west of the town of Helmsley along the River Rye in the wapentake of Ryedale. In 1634 the lands and Roos Barony descended to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham who had his estates sequestered as a Royalist during the English Civil War. In 1650 the castle, manor and lands were granted to Sir Thomas Fairfax, the Commonwealth Commander in Chief, but George Villiers' son recovered the estates through his marriage to Fairfax's daughter, Mary. In 1695 the castle and manors within the parish, totaling 16,500 hectares were conveyed to Charles Duncombe a London banker, by the trustees of the estate in order to pay for debts incurred by George Villiers (Page 1917, 491-93).

At this time Charles built a grand house upon the scarp above village of Helmsley. In 1711 Thomas Brown, Duncombe's nephew and business partner, inherited the lands and took the name of Duncombe (Hussey 1967, 141) and continued with the designs started by his uncle. Whilst the designer of the landscape at Duncombe is not known, Vanbrugh, Switzer and Bridgeman have all been suggested (Hussey 1967, GD2063 and Feversham 2003). The ha-ha wall with a terrace walk was created 1718-23 (Plate 59) and the two temples at each end of this terrace walk were added c. 1730.

By the time of Bateman's *Great Landowners* William Earnest Duncombe, the Earl of Feversham owned a total of 39,312 acres in the North Riding earning a total income of £34,328 per annum. Even though the Earl was a Land Magnate, he did not own any lands beyond the boundaries of the North Riding. The extent of his holdings consisted of the



estate of Duncombe Park, stretching from the twelfth-century Castle of Helmsley to the abbey ruins of Rievaulx, further west along the River Rye. Even though it was the intention of Charles and later Thomas Duncombe to connect these two features through with the creation of a long terrace it was not realize to its fullest measure.

The analysis of the implementation and evolution of the design aesthetic within this landscape is limited to written descriptions and three maps all dating from the end of the eighteenth century (NYCRO ZEW M6, MIC 1599/73; NYCRO ZEW, MIC 1599/208; First Edition OS Map 1856). This park and garden, though containing and maintaining formal elements, did not appear to contain the strict formal geometric paths and patterns seen elsewhere in the North Riding. Unfortunately, the 1792 map does not include the hall, terraces and gardens, but it does include the wooded scarp and the land near the River Rye. Although the formal elements around the hall appear on the 1822 map, there appears to be a natural quality to this landscape park and garden embodying the elements of what Williamson terms as a serpentine-style landscape (1995), a style not yet encountered within the Riding (Plate 55). Peter Goodchild has suggested that the designs of Duncombe actually belong to Bridgman since the design is very similar to Amesbury Park in Wiltshire, which was laid out by Bridgman. However, unlike Duncombe Park, the hall and gardens of Amesbury are situated at the base of an embankment whereas Duncombe is established upon a rise looking out over the Rye valley below (pers comm. 2007).

By analyzing descriptions of the landscape park and garden and the 1822 survey of the estate we find evidence of a sunken parterre to the east separated by the hall from a raised grass ride known as 'Broad Walk' (GD2063). Two blocks of woodland were situated to the north and south of the parterre and hall. A 'massive rusticated serpentine ha-ha wall' separated this 'formal' area from the wooded escarpment to the east, affording views out over the valley of the River Rye to the east (Plate 59 and 60), with additional views of the castle ruins to the north. To the west of the hall is extensive parkland surrounded by a belt of woodlands interspersed with walks and rides (GD2063). It must be restated that at the time of this map, none of these elements appear to have been included a rigid geometric



formality and by the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey the gardens and woodlands had been softened even further. Once again, even though the internal aesthetics were softened, the overall layout and pattern of the designed landscape park and garden were not altered.

It was originally Charles Duncombe's intention to extend the landscape park towards the ruins of Rievaulx Abbey, a twelfth-century Cistercian abbey located 1.9 miles to the west of the house by creating a terrace walk connecting the two (Hussy 1967, GD2063). Although this plan was not carried out, Charles' nephew and heir, Thomas Duncombe was able to create a small terrace walk above the ruins of Rievaulx Abbey in 1758 mirroring Duncombe Terrace. Not extensive in design, Rievaulx Terrace created upon an escarpment above the Abbey ruins utilized a manipulation of the moving prospect (Hussey 1967). A Doric and Ionic temple were placed at the ends of the terrace and as visitors walked along the terrace from one temple to the other, views out over the ruins of Rievaulx Abbey could be afforded whilst contemplating the dynamics between loss of architecture, religious order and national history against the ideas of power, improvement and modernism (NYCRO MIC 1599/100; First Edition OS Map 1857).

Duncombe, unlike the other landscape parks and gardens discussed so far, allows us the opportunity to compare the implementation and subsequent alterations of a designed parkland by a rising wealthy merchant into the status of landed gentry. However, the only detailed information regarding the landscape park and garden of Duncombe comes from the end of the eighteenth century. While earlier maps for the house do not exist, it is possible to state that this landscape was indeed an early serpentine-style landscape. It resembles the upper walk at Studley Royal (1700-1720) and the terrace walk at Kirkby Fleetham in the North Riding, both of these designs were created by created by William Aislaby. It is known that Charles did opt to create a new hall on the escarpment, abandoning the sixteenth-century hall existing within the Castle ruins at Helmsley. This choice was not made by force as in the case of Bolton Castle, but neither did the new construction attach itself to the historic site (as was the case at Newburgh Priory). However, it must be noted that unlike the designs at Castle Howard, which completely



removed all traces of the earlier castle, Duncombe not only retained the ruins of Helmsley Castle and Rievaulx Abbey, but utilized them within the overall design aesthetic. Possibly due to the lack of lineal attachment to place via inheritance, the Duncombes utilized existing heritage and antiquity within the designed aesthetic in order to connect to continuity and history of the place.

### *Conclusion*

With the exception of Danby Castle and Jervaulx Abbey, which were peripheral estates and both functioned as hunting residences, the rest of the country houses of the 'land magnates' and 'great landowners' within the North Riding established parks and gardens with similar design aesthetics and followed similar design trajectories over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Notwithstanding the status of the landowner; whether the estate was passed by direct inheritance through the same family, whether the families were well-established within the landed gentry or newly enriched merchants, similar decisions and designs were being carried out within their landscape parks and gardens.

Castle Howard, Aske Hall, Duncombe Park, Bolton Hall, Swinton Castle and Newburgh Priory all contained similar elements of formality in the grounds near the house. Each established pleasure-grounds which were embellished with avenues, serpentine paths, cabinets, statuary and water features. Duncombe, Swinton and Aske included terraced walks along bastion walls which separated the formal elements near the house from the wider parkland. Castle Howard and Newburgh Priory utilized both medieval crenellated walls and Renaissance-styled bastion walls. All of these estates explored and retained a connection to the wider working landscape and at Castle Howard, Aske and Bolton the use of distant eye-catchers within the working landscape created a visual connection with the wider lands. The houses at Aske, Swinton and Newburgh maintained and built upon established medieval castles, pele towers or priories; whilst at Castle Howard, Bolton Hall and Duncombe Park grand new palaces or country houses were constructed, however a connection to place were maintained in the landscapes at all three. At Bolton and Duncombe Park the landowners included the castle ruins within the designed landscape



and in the later development of Rievaulx Terrace the Duncombes incorporated the abbey ruins within their design. The development of Wray Wood as a pleasure-ground and utilization of the route of the former village street as the foundation for the 'terrace walk' the Howards were able to establish connection to place within the designed landscape at Castle Howard.

Analysis of the documents, maps and plans associated with these eight estates indicated that the areas of formality around the hall were retained, whilst naturalistic designs were added to the wider parklands over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A softening and gentle curving of straight approaches occurred in the landscape parks of Aske Hall and Bolton. Where Castle Howard and Newburgh Priory maintained their formal approaches, Swinton Castle and Duncombe Park established sweeping approaches relatively early on. Ponds - regardless of whether they were established medieval or early eighteenth-century additions to the landscape - at Castle Howard, Aske Hall, Swinton Park, Duncombe Park and Newburgh Priory were reformed with softer, more natural edges by the later part of the eighteenth century and at Bolton Hall a naturalistic pond added within the landscapes near the end of the eighteenth century.

This retention of formal aesthetics is quite distinct, and has not been recognized within the accepted chronology. In Tom Williamson's *Survey of the parks and gardens of Norfolk* he noted the landowners were moving towards a more natural aesthetic over the eighteenth century. He also noted that formal designed were retained over longer periods than once proposed, however very few of the landowners retained formal aesthetics over the eighteenth century (1990). One might suppose that the later retention of formality in Norfolk and even later retention within the parks and gardens of the North Riding might be the result of a delay in trends reaching these regions.

Whether this retention of formal elements with the addition of naturalistic designs within the wider landscapes was driven by an attachment to conservative traditions or a rejection of a later aesthetic trend remains uncertain. Retaining this formality could be construed as a visible statement of wealth and power. Presumably, with high levels of annual income,



for these landowners the issue of expense of design would not hinder aesthetic choices. Therefore by maintaining a more expensive design aesthetic, the parks and gardens of these landowners could potentially reflect this lack of economic concern.

The following contextual analysis between the designs of the great landowners, the land magnates and other levels of the landed gentry will help clarify if this retention of formal elements within the designed landscape is a regional trend, a social trend or a choice made by economic factors. Having established the social benchmark of design within the North Riding, an analysis of design aesthetics within the landscape parks and gardens of the greater and the lesser gentry will follow. By analyzing the estates of the greater gentry and lesser gentry, additional economic contexts imposed upon the designs instituted within the North Riding will be added.

## **2.3 THE ESTATES OF THE GREATER GENTRY**

### *Introduction*

The following section will analyze the eighteenth-century designed landscape parks and gardens created, maintained and/or improved by members of the greater gentry within the North Riding. These landowners held estates ranging from 3,000 to 10,000 acres and earned an annual income of £3,000 to £10,000 per annum. There were a total of forty-four country houses with designed parks and gardens within the North Riding held by a total of thirty-one landowners of the greater gentry (Table 6). These landowners owned a total of 15.98% of the lands within the North Riding by the end of the eighteenth century. The following analysis will analyze the cartographic material available for these estates in order to place the parks and gardens of the greater gentry within the contextual dialogue created within the proceeding chapter such that we might in order to further question the teleological evolution mentioned above.



### *The Landowners and their Estates*

Twelve of the landowners within the greater gentry owned additional lands outside the North Riding. Four of these lands fell within the wider boundaries of Yorkshire while the remaining nine landowners' holdings fell beyond the county of Yorkshire (Table 7). Two of these landowners' primary seats fall beyond the North Riding, meaning that their estates within the Riding acted as secondary estates. Of these twelve landowners, only five can be perceived at a higher status within the landed gentry when considering their additional holdings. With additional funds available this potentially had an impact on the choices of design aesthetic implemented.

### *Cartographic Material*

Within the analysis of the cartographic material available for the parks and gardens of the greater gentry a lesser number of estate surveys and plans were available for analysis. Only nine of the thirty-one estates of the greater gentry have documentation, cartographic evidence and material culture available at this time relating to the implementation and evolution of their designed landscapes over the long eighteenth century (Table 8). The level of time-depth has been further defined as deep, shallow and hollow. Deep time-depth consists of material spanning the early, middle and later part of the eighteenth century, capturing various phases of the designed landscape. Shallow time-depth consists of at least two pieces of cartographic evidence for the later part of the eighteenth century, which captured a change within the designed landscape. Hollow time-depth consists of material from the earlier part of the eighteenth century and the later part of the eighteenth century or nineteenth century, yet nothing in-between, portraying different design elements, yet, not capturing the time of the changes. The remaining twenty-two parks and gardens of the greater gentry only have the First Edition OS map available for analysis.

The general lack of cartographic evidence, paintings and illustrations within this social data group is an interesting aspect of this research. As a two dimensional representation of the country seat, estate surveys, plans, paintings and illustrations were utilized as a medium of legitimizing ownership as well as a material manifestation of power over



people, place and time (Cosgrove 1999). We observed this phenomenon not only within the amount of cartographic material available for the parks and gardens of the great landowners and land magnates, but also in the methodology of representation utilized. The greater gentry, with smaller holdings and income and in many cases lesser members of the peerage than the great landowners and land magnates, one would expect to see a similar if not an increased use of maps and plans as a venue in which the landowner could legitimize his place within the social context of the North Riding and the country in general. However, within the estates of the greater gentry there is a lack of cartographic evidence available for analysis.

One explanation for this dearth could be the expense of having estate plans created during the early and middle part of the eighteenth century. An optional representation of the country house was inclusion within publications such as and Knyff and Kip's *Britannia Illustrata* (1714-15) which included birds-eye views of the hall, gardens, and surrounding lands of country houses for a small subscription fee and Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1725). Even though an illustration of the south parterre and wilderness at Castle Howard was included in *Vitruvius Britannicus*, we start to see a rise in the number of greater gentry who utilized such illustrations as a medium in which to represent their country house and gardens. Five of the country houses with time-depth are actually represented in Knyff and Kip's *Britannia Illustrata*. For three of these estates (Constable Burton, Kirkleatham and Ingleby Manor) the Knyff and Kip illustration acts as the only early-eighteenth-century representation of the designed landscape.

In the latter half of the century regional and county maps of England acted as additional forms of legitimization in which landowners could represent their country seats in two-dimensional form. T. Jeffrey's *County Map of Yorkshire* (1771) allowed for the halls, parks and gardens of the landowners of the North Riding to be represented within the wider context of the North Riding. However there are different levels of representation that were utilized by Jeffrey's from a simple mention of the landowner, to a representation of the hall, a representation of the park with a fenced woodland and finally an accurate



representation of key design features within the park and garden such as avenues and pleasure-grounds.

Further analysis of the documentation for each of the estates within the greater gentry, the descent of ownership for each estate, lands owned elsewhere and annual income was carried out in order to ascertain possible causes for the lack of evidence within this data set. It might be considered that estates which were sold throughout the eighteenth century would have estate maps and plans detailing the lands in question. Whilst seven of the estates within the greater gentry saw a change of ownership through sale, only two have known estate maps and plans currently available. Although estates with continuous descent throughout the eighteenth century would not necessarily have the need to create estate maps and plans unless improvements were being carried out in the grounds or wider estate, more of the estates held by the same family from at least the seventeenth century through to the nineteenth century had increased time-depth, regardless of whether this descent was direct or indirect passing through the female line.

A potential explanation for the lack of available material culture could be related to the fourteen estates which held lands elsewhere. Only three of these had time-depth, whereas the remaining only have OS maps available for analysis. In many cases the North Riding estate acts as a peripheral holding to the family seat, so it is quite possible that cartographic evidence is located within the records and estate papers of the primary seats outside the North Riding. It is just as likely that the lack of maps and plans could be explained as a lesser interest in their North Riding holdings and a greater focus on their primary seat. In the instances where the North Riding estate acted as the primary seat, it could be possible that the cartographic evidence has been lost, destroyed or scattered throughout the private collections of distant relations. The lack of cartographic evidence and material culture available for the parks and gardens within this social data set cannot be conclusively explained. It could be representative of an absence of contemporary recording and representation of the designed landscape and estates or the later loss or displacement of potential material evidence beyond the scope of estate archives.



Due to the varying level of cartographic material available the following analysis of the designed landscape parks and gardens within this chapter will occur on several levels. Nine of the parks and gardens have cartographic evidence available throughout the eighteenth century allowing for detailed analysis of their designed landscapes. However, the remaining 22 parks and gardens only have cartographic representation on First Edition OS maps, and therefore will be analyzed with broad strokes based upon context and aesthetics recorded during the nineteenth-century survey.

### *Analysis of the Designed Landscapes with Time Depth*

As mentioned above, nine estates within the greater gentry which have cartographic material with representations of the designed landscape available throughout the eighteenth century, however, only four of the parks and gardens have cartographic evidence which either captured the development of, and/or subsequent improvements to the designed landscapes over the century. For the estates of Ebberston, Guisborough, Kirkleatham and Newby Hall there is a level of time-depth spanning the long eighteenth century, allowing for an understanding of the changes occurring within the landscape throughout the century. Even though Hackness Hall, Marske Hall and Kiplin Hall have a shallow time depth, consisting of maps from the later part of the eighteenth century, they still record the implementation of a later design aesthetic to the surrounding grounds. Constable Burton and Ingleby Manor have a hollow depth of time comprising early eighteenth century maps or illustrations and the mid nineteenth-century First Edition OS Map with no evidence throughout the mid to later part of the eighteenth century. These two cartographic sources indicate that changes were made to the designed landscape; however, the chronology for these changes remains elusive.

### *Landscapes with Time-Depth*

First to be discussed, are the five country houses Ebberston Hall, Guisborough Priory, Hackness Hall, Kirkleatham and Newby Hall, which all have a level of time depth



allowing for a more thorough analysis of their designed landscapes. All five of these landowners earned over £7,800 per annum and held at least 7,200 acres of land by the end of the nineteenth century. Only Guisborough Priory was maintained through direct descent from the late seventeenth century. Ebberston Lodge was likewise passed through direct descent from this time until its purchase by George Osbaldston in 1814. Hackness Hall passed from the Vanden Bempedes to the Johnstones in 1720 through a second marriage of the wife of William Vanden-Bempde. Newby Hall was purchased in 1698 by Sir Edward Blackett was later sold to William Weddell in 1748 and descended indirectly to Sir Henry Vyner, the late nineteenth-century owner. The landscapes instituted at each of these four country houses were varied in date, design implemented and the subsequent aesthetic choices made to the over all design. Although the following will go into greater detail of these changes, for a full description of the designed landscape for these parks and gardens please refer to the attached Gazetteer.

*Ebberston Lodge* (Pickering Lythe) was owned by the Thompson family from the late seventeenth century and was utilized as a hunting seat. There was only one instance of indirect descent occurring at the end of the eighteenth century, when a nephew Charles Hotham (bart) of Scarborough inherited, assumed the family name and utilized Ebberston as his seat. The ownership of Ebberston continued through the Thompson family until 1814 when the estate was sold to George Osbaldston, a celebrated sportsman, who used the Ebberston for his 'sporting activities' (Hepworth, 1995). In 1845 the estate was sold the Cayleys of nearby High Hall, Brompton by Sawdon. Even though Ebberston existed as a peripheral estate at the time of Bateman's *Return to Land*, it was owned and maintained by one family throughout the eighteenth century, during which little alterations were made to the formal design implemented in c. 1718.

The landscape evident on the mid seventeenth century estate map was replaced with a grand water garden consisting of a central canal with cascades to the north of the hall with lawn to the south facing onto the village main street with village buildings opposite (Plate 66). A series of three paintings attributed to Setting (c. 1745) detail the water



gardens north and south of the house (Plates 63 to 65). The Setting painting of the south lawn details a water garden south of the house and crossing approach. It has been debated as to whether the southern water gardens were ever realized (Hepworth 1995, GD2064, Hussey 1967) and there was no evidence of these water gardens visible on the ground during a general site visit. Although a 1770 Enclosure map details houses situated along the southern side of the village main street, opposite the house, there is open land, now serving as a paddock, which potentially has enough land for the water garden and terraces to have been located.

By the First Edition OS Map, the houses along the main street, mentioned above, had been removed allowing for open parkland affording unobstructed views out over the Vale of Pickering to the south. It is not certain if the houses were removed by Charles Hotham at the end of the eighteenth century when the house functioned as his main seat or by George Osbaldston, who made alterations to the house and ground for his sporting activities (Hepworth 1995). Although the village lands to the south were incorporated into the parkland, little to no alterations were made to the formal landscape to the north of the house. With Eberston we see an instance where a landscape dictated by formalism was maintained, not only throughout the eighteenth century but has survived to date.

Unfortunately the landscape at **High Hall**, which served as the seat of the Cayley family from 1638 only has cartographic representation on the First Edition OS map which portrays a house with a modest sized garden and small parkland to the south of the house.

*Guisborough Priory* (Langbaugh West Division) was purchased by Sir Thomas Chaloner in 1550 and descended directly to Admiral T Chaloner Bt., the owner at the time of Bateman. The designed landscape of *Guisborough Priory* maintained a connection with the ruins of the fourteenth-century Augustinian Priory within its formal garden (see figure 13). By maintaining and even highlighting the Priory ruins amongst formal gardens, straight paths and avenues, rectilinear water features and pyramid follies, a contraposition of control and variety, old and new regimes were created; all set against an agrarian backdrop.



At Guisborough, beyond a naturalizing of the water features, there was a total retention of the formal aesthetics surrounding the hall and priory ruins (see figure 14). As late as 1773 the Chaloners were applying formal walks within the gardens (Plates 116 and 118). By 1805 the all but the east window of the old hall was demolished and the Chaloners had a new house built in within the estate lands to the east (Tees Archaeology). It was within the grounds of this new house where the landowner was able to explore a more naturalistic aesthetic. Village houses evident on the Knyff and Kip illustration were no longer existent by the time of the First Edition OS map. In their place lay the new house surrounded by woodland pleasure-grounds on the east, north-east and south sides. Gardens and lawns to the west open up views back on the priory ruins and its surrounding formal gardens.

Newby Hall (Topcliffe) likewise has a wide range of maps, plans and illustrations from 1682 through to the First Edition OS Map which reveal the development and phases of the designed landscape surrounding the house. Unlike, Ebberston Lodge, Newby Hall was owned by two families through out the eighteenth century; the Blacketts who owned the estate from 1689- 1748 when the hall and estate was sold to the Weddell family.

Near the end of the seventeenth century Sir Edward Blackett, MP for Ripon purchased the estate of Newby (plate 66) and had a grand house built by John Etty (Compton 2004). In addition a new landscape aesthetic was applied to the ground around the house with formal gardens, avenues radiating from the house woodland plantations and a kitchen garden located to the south of the hall and along the northern bank of the River Ure as illustrated in Knyff and Kips 1715 illustration detailing a late-geometric landscape (Plate 70). In 1748, shortly after a recent inheritance of a modest fortune, with a condition that he invested the money in land, Richard (Elcock) Weddell, a successful merchant from York, purchased Newby Hall from the Blacketts (Compton 2004). With a gap in the cartographic material for Newby from 1715 to 1766 is not certain if any design alterations occurred within the landscape during this time.

According to Compton, William Weddell, who inherited Newby in 1762, was a dilettante, a collector of art and fancier of architecture, reportedly he 'was not much of a gardener



and did not care much for the formality of the surrounding Newby Park ' (2004). It was at this time that 'Newby "moved with the times" and a *Plan of Alterations* by Thomas White dated 1766 (Plate 67) shows almost all the avenue of trees swept aside to make way for an English landscaped Park, typical of that date (Compton 2004)'. This map indicates an internal belt enclosing the lawn with a naturalistic pond to the east of the house and an external belt enclosing parkland beyond. Alterations were made to the house with the addition of two wings, the focus of the house was flipped by changing the main entrance from the western elevation of the house to the eastern elevation looking out on this newly created lawn. A *Plan of Newby* dated 1772 (Plate 68) shows the removal of the formal gardens near the house, incorporation of plantations surrounding the lawn and pond proposed on the 1766 plan. However, the existence of fields labeled pasture, grass and moor lands to the east of the lawn, and fields belonging to Train Holme to the north-east of the lawn indicates that the parkland and external belt were not realized at this time.

In 1792, a cousin, Thomas Robinson (Lord Grantham, later Earl de Grey), of nearby Baldersby Park (formerly known as Newby Park) inherited Newby Hall. According to Compton in 1807 he commissioned work on the interior of the house 'but did not concern himself much with the parks or garden' (2004). However, there is a *Plan of Alterations designed for Newby Hall* dated 1803 (see figure 35) which proposes increased woodlands within the belt to the north of the house and within the area of land between the house and the kitchen garden as well as lands further east along the river. It also details an altered version of the parkland and external belts, in a more linear shape. Comparing this new plan with the 1772 map of the estate the park was to be created out of the eastern fields labelled grass, close, pasture and moor, leaving the fields belonging to Train Holme to the north-east untouched.

Analysis of the First Edition OS Map, aerial photographs and site survey of Newby Hall, shows the realization of the aesthetics proposed on the 1803 plan (Plate 69), with the addition of later Victorian parterre gardens established to the south and west of the hall by a daughter Lady Mary Vyner, wife to Henry Vyner of Studley Royal, and owner by the time of Bateman (Compton 2004). However, closer analysis of these sources, indicates that



not all of the formal avenues were removed by William Weddell as proposed above by Compton. Upon personal analysis and verified in English Heritage survey, the formal avenue to the south-west of the hall was retained and incorporated into later plantations. Further analysis of aerial photographs, indicates remnants of the double-avenues running from the east from the hall were incorporated into the naturalistic planting scheme.

In addition to Newby Hall, Henry Vyner also owned the three smaller estates of **Fairfield Lodge (Bulmer) Askrigg Hall and Nappa Hall**, all of which were located near the village of Askrigg, Hang West. Descent of ownership through to Henry Vyner is unknown for Fairfield Lodge and Askrigg Hall, whereas Nappa, owned by the Metcalfes since the fifteenth century, passed to their kinsmen the Weddells at the beginning of the eighteenth century, eventually following the descent of Newby Hall.

All three of these estates received little to no attention in the way of designed parks and gardens. Of these three, only Fairfield Lodge, served as the residence of Robert Charles De Grey Vyner, the younger son of Henry Vyner, of Newby Hall, had a hint of a small woodland and garden in proximity to the house represented on the First Edition OS Map. There was little, to no design within the landscapes represented on the First Edition OS Map for either Askrigg or Nappa Hall. This is not to say that a designed landscape did not exist at one time near the house, it is just not evident within the cartographic material available at this time. With only the First Edition OS map available for these three estates, it is not possible to determine how the landscape was treated prior to the mid-nineteenth century. It is evident by this time, that these three estates were indeed treated as ancillary properties for the Robinsons and later the Vyners, while focus was being directed towards the design landscapes of their seat at Newby Hall.

Within the park and gardens at Newby Hall, we experience an estate which changes hands from the gentry to the ownership of a member of the rising merchant class. Instead of a retention of the formal aesthetics, with the inheritance of his son, a learned and well traveled man, a dilettante; we see a new rendering to the designed landscape of North



Riding. This is the first instance of a North Riding landscapes discussed so far receiving a naturalistic aesthetic contemporary with the latter part of the eighteenth century.

Kirkleatham Hall (Langbaugh East Division) followed the descent of the Turner family from the early-seventeenth century, passing indirectly through a second marriage of Lady Teresa (Gleadowe-Newcomen) Turner to Henry Vansiltert in 1812 and later to the Newcomen family with the marriage of their only daughter in 1844. Arthur Newcomen was the owner of Kirkleatham at the time of Bateman, owning a total of 4,545 acres within the North Riding earning £5,431.

At Kirkleatham Hall we see a shift from a designed landscape of contained formalism within a village setting to a large, sweeping naturalistic landscaped park over the eighteenth century. At the start of the century the house is situated within walled gardens and is surrounded by the roads and village buildings of Kirkleatham as seen in the Knyff and Kip illustration of the estate (Plate 73). Charles Turner, like his ancestors, who were active in early-eighteenth century social, health and educational reforms (Young [1770] 1967) focused his attentions instead towards agricultural and estate reforms. In the 1760s he not only made alterations and improvements to the agricultural production of the estate of Kirkleatham (Young [1770] 1967), he also made improvements to the house and designed landscape (Kirkleatham Local History Museum). With the removal of village roads, neighboring farms houses and enclosed fields, the addition of fortification-walls and monumental gates the boundaries of the aesthetic landscape were extended (Plate 71). Although more space was given to the lawns near the house, and sweeping lawns replaced the formal gardens near the house, much in the same naturalistic design, the new designed landscape instituted by Charles Turner did not isolate the house from the wider working landscapes.

It was not until the 1840s when the estate was owned by Arthur Newcomen, a husband and kinsman through the female line, that a shift towards isolation and disconnection with the wider working landscape occurred. Newcommen had the roadways moved away from the house. He created on once arable land and surrounded the house and grounds with plantation belts and woodlands. With this naturalistic landscape with pleasure-



ground, Newcommen created a secluded setting for the house (Plate 72). This disconnection from the wider working landscape potentially explains when and why the Temple (Plate 79) was moved from the distant parkland (Jeffreys 1775, Young 1769, Britton 1812) into the grounds near the house (First Edition OS MAP) questioned by Karen Lynch in her recent research on the estate for the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (2007).

When the temple folly was located within the distant parkland on the hill views were described as being of ' a most noble prospect of the country around these edifices; you look down upon them in the midst of a fine extensive vale intersected with enclosures, and bounded by the sea and the river Tees; the higher lands of Durham filling the distant view: The new farmhouses raised by Mr Turner render the prospect neatly pleasing (Young 1769)' as well as 'commanding a charming prospect over an extensive and fertile vale, variegated with rich inclosures...(Britton 1812)' These describe a fitting settings for a folly created by a man dedicated to the land, agricultural improvements and estate reforms. However, these are not fitting prospects for the gentleman wishing to have a more isolated landscape experience.

#### *Estates with Shallow Time-Depth*

**Hackness Hall, Whitby Strand** owned by Sir H Johnstone (Lord Derwent) the only cartographic evidence available dates from 1774, 1804 and the mid-eighteenth century First Edition OS Map. Even though all of this evidence is from the later part of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth century, it is during this time that dramatic changes occurred, changing the rural landscape which once surrounded the house and village to a naturalistic landscape visually disconnected from the village and working land.

In 1696 Hackness Hall was purchased by Jon Vanden Bempde, a wealthy merchant. His daughter, Charlotte, first married William Van Lore, the Marquess of Annadel, bringing with her a large fortune in return for a connection to title and peerage. Upon the Marquess' death she married Col John Johnstone. Their son and heir Richard Johnstone received a small fortune from his grandmother under the stipulation that he assumed the



surname of Vanden-Bempde. In 1795 he was created Baronet and resumed the name of Johnstone styled Richard Vanden-Bempde Johnstone. Shortly after in 1797 the old manor house which was situated within arable lands south of the village (Plates 85 and 87) was dismantled and a new house built in a style typical of the mid-eighteenth century. The former village was removed and re-established further to the south-west from the hall and separated from view with a plantation belt and a kitchen garden (Plate 88) and sweeping lawn were placed on the former sites of the village and the manor house respectively (see figure 86).

### *Estates With Hollow Time-Depth*

The four remaining estates within this section consisting of Constable Burton (Hang West), Ingleby Manor (Langbaugh West Division), Kiplin Hall (Gilling East) and Marske Hall (Gilling West) have a time-depth consisting of maps, plans and/or illustrations from the early-eighteenth century and the First Edition OS map. Between these two sources there is evidence of changes made within their designed landscapes, however, without cartographic material and records throughout the eighteenth century, it is not possible to pinpoint when these changes occurred.

Cartographic representation for both Marske Hall and Kiplin Hall consists of early to mid-eighteenth century estates maps and First Edition OS Maps. Both of these estates had continuity of ownership from the late sixteenth century through to the end of the nineteenth century. Marske's saw a direct descent from 1597 when Timothy Hutton purchased the estate through to Mrs John Timothy D'Arcy Hutton who was the listed owner at the time of Bateman. Whereas, Kiplin's descent was indirect through the female line from 1578 when Sir George Calvert, 1<sup>st</sup> Lord Baltimore, was in possession, through to Cristopher Crowe, second husband of Lady Charlotte Calvert, who purchased the estate from his step-son, to the Carpenter family through marriage. Although both of the two landowners for these estates fell within the landed status of the greater gentry by the end of the nineteenth century, economically these two families were quite different. By the end of the eighteenth century Mrs. Hutton of Marske Hall held 12,048 acres of land within



the North Riding earning £8,683 per annum; whilst Captain WC Carpenter of Kiplin Hall held a total of 4,186 acres within the riding earning a total of £6,785 per annum.

Samuel Buck's sketch of Marske portrays a walled garden in front of the house with a small plantation, a walled kitchen garden and the avenue or potential deer run within the parkland. On the 1732 *Survey of the Manor of Marske* (Plate 94) details the garden, lawn and small woodland in proximity to the hall, but main aesthetic throughout the wider landscape maintained that of the deer park which was established at least since the early seventeenth century. By the First Edition OS Map (Plate 95) additional woodlands were added near the house connecting to existent woodlands within the wider parkland in order to create a sheltered situation for the house. Additional plantations were added along Marske Beck to create a pleasure ground with ponds. Beyond these plantations the overall aesthetic within the park and gardens at Marske was maintained. However, without cartographic material available throughout the later half of the eighteenth century it is not possible to discern when these alterations were made.

The neighboring estate of *Clints* was purchased by Timothy Hutton of Marske in 1840 and shortly after demolished the house and used the stables as a stud (Plate 95). The ownership of this house passed from hand to hand via purchase and sale from 1761 through to 1840. The estate was purchased by Charles Turner of Kirkleatham, who commissioned Carr to redesign the house (Wragg 2000) and removed the walled gardens pictured in Buck's Sketchbook (Plate 99) to create a naturalistic landscape (Plate 98). Carr built the stables at the same time and Turner used the house as a Stud. Shortly after in 1767 the house was sold to Viscount Downe of Danby Castle. In 1768 it was sold to Miles Stapleton of Bedale who then sold it to Thomas Errington in 1800. It is from Thomas's son that Timothy Hutton purchased the estate.

Like Marske, at the time of the 1723 map of Kiplin Hall (Plates 101 and 102) there is very little evidence of a designed landscape. Beyond a small plantation near the house, the estate is dominated by an agrarian landscape with a woodland off to the south-east of the house. By 1857 First Edition OS Map and later 1893 OS map (Plate 104), the landscape



around the house had dramatically changed. With the addition of a pleasure ground with ponds and a summer house, plantation belts with an entrance lodge, gardens, a large serpentine fish pond and ha-ha wall, the landscape at Kiplin was transformed into a naturalistic designed park and garden associated with trends prevalent in the later half of the eighteenth century, however the exact date of implementation of these designs remains illusive apart from a painting of Kiplin by George Cuit the Elder (1780) portrays the landscape with sweeping lawns up the front of house instead of formal walled gardens and a serpentine lake beyond. In 1793 a diversion order was granted for to remove the road from passing near the house and a wall was built around the boundary (Webster 2005).

For Constable Burton and Ingleby Manor the only known cartographic representation consists of Knyff and Kip illustrations and the First Edition OS map. The early-eighteenth century landscapes for these two country houses detailed in the illustrations by Knyff and Kip (Figured 110 and 121) were driven by formalism, with walled gardens, parterres, avenues and rectilinear water features all with views of the wider working landscape. By the mid-nineteenth century there was an incorporation of a more naturalistic landscape with retention of earlier formality.

Both estates maintained continuity in ownership throughout the long eighteenth century. *Constable Burton* (Hang West) was given to Geoffrey le Scrope in 1321 and descended indirectly through marriage to the Wyvilles, who held the estate at the end of the nineteenth century. *Ingleby Manor* (Langbaugh West Division) was purchased in 1608 by James Foulis, a lawyer from Colinton, and descended indirectly through marriage to Lord DeLisle and Dudley. By the end of the nineteenth century the landowners of these two estates owned between 3,100 to 4,900 acres within the North Riding and earned at least £4,000 off these lands.

Both of these designed landscapes contained gardens and parterres around the hall, woodlands, avenues and water features creating a similar aesthetic detailed on the Knyff and Kip illustrations. The lands of Constable Burton, were emparked in 1392 and served



as a hunting lodge at least until 1517 (Page 1914, 233-35) The hunting parkland and its associated features and aesthetics were incorporated within the wider lands beyond the formal gardens near the house. The incorporation of long avenues radiating outward and inclusion of garden towers, the designed landscape of Ingleby Manor, stamped with formal terraces, parterres and water gardens, connected this formal experience with the wider landscape projecting views outward over the low lying lands of the Greenhow Valley to the rising Cleveland Hills beyond.

By the First Edition OS Map we see the incorporation of a more natural aesthetic applied to the lands around the house at both Constable Burton and Ingleby Manor, with little to no change to the aesthetics within the wider parklands. Without having cartographic representation or documentation of changes, it is not possible to elucidate when these changes were carried out.

### *Analysis of Estates with Nineteenth Century Maps*

Twenty-two parks and gardens of the greater gentry have late eighteenth century and/or nineteenth-century cartographic material available for analysis, mostly in the form of the First Edition OS map. Two of these estates, Gilling Castle and Rokeby Hall have late eighteenth century maps in addition to the OS map, unfortunately, these two sources do not cover the implementation of improvements to their designed landscapes. For the remaining estates only nineteenth-century cartographic evidence is available at this time.

Since there is not any known record of the implementation of or subsequent alterations to the designed landscapes for these estates, the following section will be an analysis based purely upon the overall aesthetic of the design landscapes as represented on the First Edition OS map. These estates divide into three groups, each with varying levels of implemented design. The first group, with a total of six estates, which have minimal design within the grounds around the house; the second group, consists of eight estates with designed elements in the grounds within proximity to the house, the inclusion of woodlands and plantings within the wider parkland, however, these elements do not



isolate the house from the wider working landscape beyond nor do they form a connected designed aesthetic. Whereas, the final group of eight estates, have landscapes which contain an overall design aesthetic connecting the gardens around the hall to the surrounding parkland and woodlands, all within one unified aesthetic isolated from the wider working landscape. The following analysis will look at the design aesthetic within the gardens and/or parks within these three groupings in conjunction with the status, income and size of each estate enabling these twenty-two estates to be included within the social context discussed above.

*Landscapes with minimal design within the grounds near the hall*

This first group of five estates, even with minimal implementation of a designed landscape can be further divided into two sub groupings: the first comprises three estates which had gardens and small woodland plantations. The second group of landscapes had gardens, woodlands and the start of a delineated parkland. The first group consists of the estates of Hartforth Hall (Gilling West) owned by Christopher Cradock, Kirklington Hall (Hallikeld) owned by Henry Butler Clarke Southwell Wandesforde and Langton Hall (Gilling East) owned by the Duke of Leeds (Osbourne). All three of these landscapes had gardens by the house with woodlands in the wider parkland by the time of the Ordinance Survey. Beyond these woodland features there is not any evidence of an overall design aesthetic applied to the wider parkland.

The history of descent for these three estates indicates that these estates did not hold a prominent place in familial holdings. *Langton Hall*, according to the VCH was not called a 'manor' until the 1820s was one of the many estates owned by the Duke of Leeds. Totalling 3,234 acres of land valued at £5,105 per annum, Langton was a small portion of the total 24,237 acres of land held by the Duke of Leeds throughout Yorkshire, Cornwall, Buckinghamshire, Cambridge and Middlesex earning £33,381 per annum. *Kirklington* was the seat of Wandesforde family since 1086, until Christopher Wandesforde worked in Ireland in 1633. In 1637 he purchased and relocated the family seat to Castle Cromer in County Kilkenny. From this date forward Kirklington, although maintained, served as a secondary estate within the familial holdings totaling 13,000 acres of land in Derby, Kent,



and Ireland, valued at £8,141 per annum. At the end of the nineteenth century Henry Wandesforde held 5,163 acres of land in the North Riding which earned £4,687 per annum. The secondary or ancillary function for both of these estates might account for a lack of a grander design aesthetic. The descent and function of *Hartforth Hall* is uncertain before 1720 when the estate was purchased by William Craddock. By the end of the nineteenth century Christopher Craddock, owned a total of 3,983 acres of land in the valued at £4,634 per annum along with an additional 430 acres in County Durham earning £579 per annum. Beyond the knowledge of continuity of descent from 1720 through the end of the nineteenth century, little is known about the function of Hartforth Hall and the lack of a grander design aesthetic cannot be explained.

The following sub group consists of Bedale Hall (Hang East) and Wycliffe Hall (Gilling West). Both country houses had gardens near the house and the start of a more defined area of parkland than what has been discussed so far within this grouping. At *Bedale Hall*, the parkland mainly consists of wide open ground. Even though the parkland area to the south-west of the house had an isolation belt and woodland plantations to the north-west, the internal lands still do not contain an overall design. Likewise the parkland at Wycliffe, consisting mainly of woodlands and some small areas of isolated lawn, does not contain design elements within.

Bedale Hall was held by the Stapleton family for the eleventh century until the late nineteenth century when it was sold to Sir Henry-Beresford-Peirce. Even though the estate of Bedale was owned by Beresford-Peirce by the time of Bateman, the landscape portrayed on the First Edition OS map is that of the Stapleton family. Prior to owning Bedale Hall the Beresford-Peirce family owned *Hutton Bonville Hall* (Allerton) from the later part of the seventeenth-century until 1780, when Thomas Peirse purchased and moved to Easby Hall (Langbrough West Division). The earliest evidence for a designed landscape at Hutton Bonville is an 1814 Map of the Estate which portrays the house with a garden and small wooded pleasure-ground. Although the landscape at *Easby Hall* now contains a garden and wider a parkland surrounded by woodlands and plantation belts with internal plantings, the landscape portrayed on the first Edition OS map detailed just the gardens



and woodlands to the east and north and parkland with enclosed fields. By 1889 Beresford-Peirse sold Easby and purchased Bedale Hall. As described above, the landscape at Bedale had a more involved design aesthetic from this landowner's earlier Yorkshire holdings. With shifting in seats of the Beresford-Peirse family from Hutton Bonville to Bedale we see an increase in size of and the level of design aesthetics within their country house parks and gardens throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. By the end of the nineteenth century Beresford-Peirse held a total of 6,199 acres of land earning £7,500 per annum these lands consisted of his holdings at Bedale. According to Bateman Henry W Hildyard, who owned Hutton Bonville held a total of 3,200 acres in County Durham earning £3,524 per annum. Whereas Easby was owned by Mr. James Emmerson with a total of 938 acres of land valued at £737 per annum.

*Wycliffe Hall*, held by Robert de Wycliffe in 1286 descended indirectly through marriage to the Tunstall family in the seventeenth century from whom the estate descended to the late-nineteenth-century owner, Marmaduke Wycliffe. Marmaduke Tunstall, the younger brother of Sir Frederick Augustus Talbot [Tunstall] Clifford-Constable of Burton Constable (East Riding), lived at *Scargill Castle* (Gilling West) until 1728, when he inherited his uncle's estates at Wycliffe he took the ancient family name of Wycliffe and by the end of the nineteenth century he held a total of 3,188 acres earning £4048 per annum. Although Scargill Castle was still in the holdings of the Tunstall family, it is not certain if it fell under the holdings of Sir Clifford- Constable or if it was still in the possession of Marmaduke Wycliffe at the end of the nineteenth century. The family seat of Burton Constable with a 300 acre park had a very involved designed aesthetic throughout the eighteenth century from formal gardens created around the house in 1715 with geometrical paths to the 1770s designed parkland of Capability Brown. Wycliffe in comparison, with gardens small avenues, a small area of open lawn and wooded parkland held little in the way of an overall design. Scargill Castle, Marmaduke's earlier seat, was demolished by the First Edition OS map, which portrays remnants of the former hall greens surrounded by wider parkland of enclosed fields and woodlands beyond.



Within this group we see evidence of a direct correlation between increased social and economic status with an increase in designed landscape aesthetic. In the first instance the Beresford-Peirce family, buy and sell various estates over the century ending with a country house with a larger and more developed designed landscape. In the second instance, although a second son, of a wealthy and landed family, marries into another established family of Yorkshire. Although the Wycliffe's holdings do not compare to those of his family, this landowner takes on the Wycliffe name and shifts his seat to their established seat. Although Wycliffe has a modest landscape in comparison to Burton-Constable, Marmaduke's childhood home, it has a grander design than Marmaduke's earlier seat of Scargill Castle.

*Landscapes with designed gardens and wider parkland*

There are a total of three estates with landscapes with gardens and wider designs parkland including Barningham Manor (Gilling West), Myton Hall (Bulmer) and Newby Wiske (Gilling East) within this group. The parks and gardens of these country houses are similar to those of the prior sub-group with gardens near the house and the start of a wider parkland. In addition all three include designed pleasure grounds near the house and/or surrounding the parkland. However, there is still an absence of an overlying aesthetic which unifies these, the gardens with the wider parkland. Myton and Newby Wiske, although different in layout, both contain formal gardens and lawns near the house, curved pleasure-grounds which sheltered the parkland from views of the village with an open connection with the wider working landscape beyond the park. At Barningham the house located near the village, although with evidence of trees near the house, there was not a complete disconnection from the village and the working landscape beyond. Like Myton and Newby Wiske there were gardens near the house but the wider parkland consists of a pleasure-ground created out of existant woodland evident on the John Speed's 1610 *Map of the Riding* in similar situation and shape.

*Barningham Hall* was purchased by the Milbank family in the late-seventeenth to early eighteenth century from the Tunstall family (of the aforementioned Wycliffe Hall) who



held the estate since 1564. Lady Dorothy and Ralph Milbank fled the court of Queen Mary of Scotland after a duel between Ralph Milbank (Lord Darnley) and David Rizzo confidant to Queen Mary and father of her unborn child which ended in Rizzo's death. The Milbanks reestablished themselves in Newcastle and by the mid-seventeenth their son Mark became the Lord Mayor of Newcastle. In 1661 he was created baronet by Charles II and married Place Heiress and inherited Halnaby Hall in 1649 (Page 1914). In 1678 he purchased Seaham Hall in County Durham after which Seaham became the family seat and Halanby Hall functioned as a rural retreat. In 1699 the Milbankes purchased the estate of Thorpe Perrow (to be discussed within the landscapes of the lesser gentry below) with its associated estate of Snape and by the end of the seventeenth to early-eighteenth century the estate of Barningham. .

By the late nineteenth century Halnaby and Seaham Halls were sold, the family had connections with the Vanes of Barnard Castle (Co Durham) through marriage and the family seat became centered around Thorpe Perrow. According to Bateman Sir Fred Acclom Milbank (first Baronet of Barnard) held Thorpe Perrow and lands in Durham (see gazetteer) and his younger brother Mark Milbanke 'of Barningham and Barnard Castle' owned 9,026 acres of land in the North Riding worth £8,500 per annum including the estates of Snape and Barningham.

The history of the Milbankes details a family which had its roots in Durham/Northern-Yorkshire whilst exiled from the Scottish court then its subsequent ascension to prosperity during which a continued acquisition of lands, estates and country houses throughout the seventeenth century occurred as they increased their status as landed gentry. Although Mark Milbanke owned more property within the North Riding than his titled brother, Marks country houses do not have near the level of design aesthetic as seen at Thorpe Perrow. In actuality, of all the familial holdings current and past, the landscapes at Barningham Hall and Snape Castle had minimal design within their landscapes.

Even though the design of their landscapes and the owners for Myton and Newby Wiske had similar holdings at the end of the nineteenth century, their associated histories with



their estates were quite different. Sir Henry Stapylton, whose family held the estate of *Myton* since its purchase in 1614, owned a total of 5,119 acres valued at £8,280 per annum by the end of the nineteenth century. Whereas *Newby Wiske*, was held by various families throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries up through to 1879 when the estate was purchased by John Ruston, who held a total of 5,351 acres of land in the North Riding valued at £8,885 per annum. Included in these holdings were the estates of Nunnington Hall and Ness Hall, both located in Ryedale, which were purchased by his father William Ruston, a Liverpool businessman in 1827 from the Graham family which held these estates since 1655. The landscape of Nunnington Hall, situated on the village main-street, consisted of formal gardens and terraces with a small parkland where as Ness hall set back from the south-each side of the village sat within gardens and had an open parkland with a fox covert and enclosed fields. Again we see a family that purchased and shifted their seats to estates with increasing levels of designed landscapes.

#### *Landscapes with Evidence of a Designed Aesthetic within the Parkland*

The following sub-group consists of the estates of Cliffe Hall (Gilling East), Lartington Hall (Gilling West), Thornton Hall (Pickering Lythe) and Wilton Castle (Langbaugh East Division). All four of these country houses had gardens near the hall, woodlands and/or woodland pleasure grounds and wider parkland in which a grander design starts to appear. With the inclusion of plantations and belts surrounding the parkland we start to see a separation occurring between the designed landscapes near the house from the wider working landscape beyond.

None of the landowners of these four estates earned over £5,000 per annum and the size of the estates of John Gerald Wilson at Cliffe Hall and Sir Charles Lowther at Wilton Castle were just over 3,200 while John Hills of Thornton and Rev Monsignor Wiltham of Lartington held 7,000 by the end of the nineteenth century. Of these landowners only Sir Charles Lowther had substantial holdings outside of the North Riding consisting of 2,855 acres of land (£14,543 per annum) associated with the family's ancient seat of Swillington near Leeds. Wilton Castle, which was purchased in 1748 by Katherine Lowther for her



eldest son James, became the seat of Charles, her second son, when James inherited the lands and house of Swillington. James later succeeded to the title of Baron and later Viscount Lonsdale through a distant cousin and shortly after moved to the Lowther family's ancient seat Lowther Castle in Penrith at which time Charles purchased Swillington House from his brother. Once Charles purchased and moved to Swillington House, Wilton Castle functioned as a secondary holding.

Lartington Hall was purchased in 1639 by Francis Appleyby, from which time the estate passed indirectly through marriage to Thomas Maire of Hardwick and again to Sir Henry [Lawson] Maire of Brough Hall whose son and heir, John Maire later succeeded to the Baroncy in 1811 and reclaimed his father's family name of Lawson. His sister married John Silvertop whose son Henry Thomas Maire Lawson Silvertop married Elizabeth, the daughter of Thomas Witham of Headlam (Co Durham), niece and sole heir to William Witham of Cliffe Hall. Assuming the family name of Witham, Henry and Elizabeth opted to maintain their seat at *Lartington Hall* and sold Cliffe Hall (held by the Witham family since 1420) to John Gerald Wilson in 1825. Whereas *Thornton Hall* descended indirectly from the Latimers who purchased the estate in 1325 to John Hill, the late nineteenth-century owner.

Without further cartographic evidence detailing the implementation of and/or design improvements over the eighteenth century it is difficult to understand why and how these four estates with varied familial histories had similar design aesthetics by the mid-nineteenth century. With the exception of the Lowther's at Wilton Castle, these landowners utilized these country houses as primary seats. But beyond this information little else is known.

*Landscapes with designed gardens and parkland separated from the wider working landscape*

The final grouping consists of the eight estates of Beningbrough Hall (Bulmer), Gilling Castle (Ryedale), Mulgrave Castle (Langbaugh East Division), Rokeby Hall (Gilling West), Sedbury Park (Gilling West) Skelton Castle (Langbaugh East Division), Stanwick

Park (Gilling West) and Sutton Park (Bulmer) all of which have very detailed design landscapes with formal gardens, terraces, pleasure-grounds, parklands with clumps, naturalistic ponds and plantation belts completely isolating the house from the wider working landscape. All of these landscapes, except Mulgrave Castle and Gilling Castle embraced naturalistic landscape aesthetics prevalent at the later part of the eighteenth century. *Gilling* maintained the formal elements within the parkland including terraces, viewing platform looking out over a wide double avenue running through the open parkland. Whereas the terraces near the house at, *Mulgrave Castle* were maintained the landowners embraced the rustic natural landscape by the North Sea to create a landscape which was described as 'romantic, picturesque and even sublime' by contemporary visitors (Goodchild 1986), quite different from the other estates within this group. Beningbrough, although improved by Gilpin in 1825 to a more naturalistic design maintained the formal elements of the avenue and terraces near the house.

The North Riding holdings of eight these landowners ranged from 3,348 acres (Gilling Castle) to 10,647 acres (Skelton Castle) of land with valued between £3,140 to £10,000 per annum. Only Hon A. Duncombe of Sutton Park had substantial holdings beyond the North Riding, whereas George Giplin-Brown of Sedbury Park and W.J.S. Morritt of Rokeby Hall had small holdings (less than 60 acres) outside the County of Yorkshire. Descent for Stanwick Park passed from the Cattericks to the Smithsons in the fifteenth century and Gilling Castle descended from the Fairfax family to the Barnes at the same time. Sedbury Park descended indirectly from the Gascoigne family who purchased the estate in 1497 until its sale to the Gilpin-Browns in 1826. Mulgrave Castle and Beningbrough had indirect descent to the Phipps and Bouchiers respectively from the mid to late sixteenth century. Whereas Rokeby Hall only saw continuous descent of ownership from 1610 when it was held by the Robinsons until its sale in 1770 to the Morritts from whom it descended to its late nineteenth century owner John Sawrey Morritt.

Even though there are not currently any known maps and/or plans available for these landscapes from throughout the eighteenth century we can glean from records, work and



improvements which were carried out during the eighteenth century for Stanwick, Mulgrave and Beningbrough. There is record of work occurring in the design landscape of *Stanwick Park* during the 1740s which coincides with Hugh Smithson's succession to his father-in-law's title of Earl of Northumberland. It was thought that the integration of the pre-historic earthworks within the design aesthetic was the influence of his wife (later known as the Duchess of Northumberland) (Bowden 1998). In the 1790s Repton created a Red Book for *Mulgrave Castle* from which the approach past the castle ruins was developed (GD2067, Goodchild 1986). A *Designer Theme Study on William Sawrey Gilpin* (GD 2059 site file) compares the landscape of the Beningbrough with Gilpin's sketches and notes dating from c1827 indicating that some of these proposals like the planting of and curving of the eastern approach, were carried out (Piebenga, S 1994). In addition several garden features such as garden seats, gateways, garden walls, and parkland structures date from the mid-eighteenth century at Gilling Castle, Beningbrough Hall, Stanwick Park and Mulgrave Castle (GD 2059 EH box files) indicating that attention was focused on the garden and parkland during this time and gives indication of vague dates when the work was being done. However, beyond a detail of a formal terrace at Beningbrough hall by Samuel Buck (1720) we do not have details regarding the eighteenth century designed landscapes for these estates. As for *Rokeby Hall*, *Sutton Park*, and *Skelton Castle* the date of design implementation or later improvements remain elusive. It is possible that the park and garden of Rokeby might have seen a change towards or original implementation of the naturalistic landscape evident on the First Edition OS maps, around 1770, when the estate was sold. Likewise, at Sutton Park, when the Harland family received a title of Baronet, in 1808, might have prompted changes within the designed landscape.

While cartographic evidence has not been located for the twenty-two estates discussed above beyond the First Edition OS Map or early-nineteenth century maps and plans, we are able to glean some understanding of when and why designs were being implemented within the designed landscape parks and gardens. Looking at the design aesthetics portrayed on the OS map in conjunction with descent of ownership and in some cases, known history of the estate, we can start to elucidate, to some measure, the date and possible influences for aesthetic choices made within the landscape.

## *Conclusion*

Unlike the landscapes of the land magnates and great landowners discussed above, within there is less cartographic material available detailing the implementation and subsequent maintenance and/or alterations to the designed landscapes of the greater gentry. Whether this absence is due to lack of maps and plans being produced or the later loss, sale or scattered placement of such materials amongst scattered descendents it is not certain. It is known that only 20% of the landscapes owned by the greater gentry currently have detailed cartographic representation available creating time-depth. On an alternative note, we see representation of these designed landscapes within illustrations such as Knyff and Kip's *Britannia Illustrata*, which was not a venue utilized by the great landowners and land magnates and an increased amount of paintings detailing the house and surrounding landscape

However, analysis of the designed landscapes of the greater gentry represented within the material culture available, we are able to see some patterns occurring within this social set. Although some estates, such as Ebberston Lodge Gilling Castle and Guisborough Priory we see a vast retention of formal design aesthetics over the eighteenth century. At country houses like Ingleby Manor, Constable Burton and to some extent Newby Hall, although we see a shift towards a more naturalistic aesthetic, we see a retention and reworking of early-eighteenth century formal elements within the later designs.

Another prevalent theme within the designed landscapes of the greater gentry is an increased level of landscapes created in a manner completely dictated by naturalistic aesthetics. Whether purchased, inherited or acquired through marriage, we see several instances where landowners were creating landscapes opting for the contemporary aesthetic of the later eighteenth century. In some instances, such as at Kirkleatham Hall, the earlier formal gardens were completely removed and supplanted by a naturalistic design. Within other estates, like Marske we see a naturalistic aesthetic applied to but not overwhelming the earlier landscape aesthetic of a hunting estate. There are several



instances where parks and gardens were not created, until the later part of the eighteenth century or even the early-nineteenth century utilizing naturalistic aesthetics which were prevalent at this time. For still other estates we saw elements of a designed landscape, such as gardens, lawns and/or plantation belts, were evident by the mid-nineteenth century however, their country houses never received an overall- grand designed landscape. A similar association between status and designed landscape can be seen in the patterns of selling, purchasing and the relocating to new seats, by moving from country houses with smaller design aesthetics to country houses with grander landscapes. By looking at the designed landscapes of the greater gentry within this socio-economic context we are able to reveal distinctive patterns of development towards a naturalistic design complying with design trends which occurred within the parks and gardens of Norfolk researched by Tom Williamson.

## **2.4 THE ESTATES OF THE LESSER GENTRY**

### *Introduction*

This section will analyze the landscape parks and gardens of the lesser gentry within the North Riding. As members of the lesser gentry, these landowners held a total of 1,000-2,999 acres of land earning an income of £1,000 to £2,999 per annum. There were a total of sixty-two country houses owned by fifty-one landowners falling within the lesser gentry (Table 9) accounting for 11.66% of the privately owned lands within the North Riding. The following analysis will look at the cartographic evidence available for the estates of the lesser gentry in order to place them into the contextual dialogue created within the sections above.

### *The Landowners and their Estates*

There were a total of eighteen landowners within the landed status of the lesser gentry whose holdings extend beyond the North Riding. Two of these landowners had

additional holdings within Yorkshire, whilst sixteen held estates beyond the county. Of these eighteen members of the lesser gentry with holdings beyond the North Riding, sixteen, shift to a higher level of landed status (Table 10). The most dramatic shift in a landed status occurred with the estates of Levenson- Gower (the Duke of Sutherland) of High Stittenham Hall, his North Riding estates consisted of 1,853 valued at £2,323. When considering his additional holdings beyond the North Riding, his landed status was elevated to the level of a land magnate owning a total of 1,358,545 acres of land throughout Sutherland, Ross, Shropshire and Staffordshire earning a total of £141,667 per annum. Eleven of the lesser gentry shifted to the level of greater gentry, whilst six landowners including: Marmaduke Stalkartt (Lord Walshingham) of Aldwark Hall, Lord John Hotham of Fyling Hall, Sir Charles W Strickland Bart. of Hildenley Hall and Sir Edward Blakett Bart. of Hornby Grange shifted to the status of Great Landowner. For eleven of these landowners the North Riding estates acted as the family seat. For the remaining five landowners the country seat was outside the boundaries of the North Riding and the North Riding estates of High Stittenham, Hornby Grange, Kirkby, Westerdale and West Layton were considered peripheral holdings by the landowner and his family.

The six landowners with dramatic shifts in their landed status based upon their additional holdings outside of the Riding, create an interesting sub-group from which to analyze the implementation and evolution of their North Riding designed landscapes. For these six their North Riding estates were smaller holdings which did not add significance to the total income, status or power of these landlords, however, these landowners come to these North Riding estates with elevated levels of wealth, status and power. The manner in which they approached these smaller Yorkshire holdings would have been influenced by the landowner's status within a wider social, economic and political context. The time, effort and expense vested into these smaller estates will potentially differ from the investment made by regional lesser gentry whose North Riding estates acted as the primary or only property, through which they could negotiate and reflect status. Analysis of these estates must occur within both a regional context and national context potentially revealing if design and/or aesthetic intentions were different between a regional and a



wider national context. This analysis will help elucidate how these landowners viewed their North Riding estates and how they viewed themselves within this regional context.

### *Cartographic Material Available*

Sixteen of the forty-one estates had cartographic evidence available over and above the First Edition OS map. They divide between seven parks and gardens with deep time-depth comprised of maps and plans available throughout the eighteenth century for analysis and six parks and gardens with shallow time-depth consisting of maps and plans available from the later part of the eighteenth century and the mid-nineteenth century (Table 11). The remaining twenty-five landscapes within this group only have nineteenth century maps and plans, three of which have maps and/or plans available from the early-nineteenth century in addition to the First Edition OS map. The remaining twenty-two estates only have the First Edition OS map available for analysis. A deeper understanding of the design and evolution of these twenty-five landscapes remains elusive, however, through a discussion of aesthetics within the designed landscape represented at the time of the Ordnance Survey, a general idea of regional trends within the parks and gardens of the lesser gentry can be attained.

Five of the country houses within the lesser gentry (Aldby Park, Arncliffe, Forcett Hall, Sheriff Hutton and Thrope Perrow) are registered with English Heritage. Arncliffe is listed as a Grade I, whilst the remaining four are listed Grade II. Unfortunately, only Aldby Park has cartographic evidence available throughout the long-eighteenth century spanning from 1720 to the mid-nineteenth century. Thorpe Perrow has a late-eighteenth century estate map, whilst Arncliffe and Forcett only have First Edition OS maps available. Within the landscapes of the lesser gentry six of these country houses comprising-Hildenley Hall, Gilmonby Hall, Newton House, Sand Hutton, Wiganthorpe and Woodend (Thornton-le-Street)-have been demolished and their gardens are considered lost. Of these lost houses, only Clervaulx Castle has cartographic evidence available for understanding the implementation and evolution of the designed landscape.

There are seven estates with maps and plans dating from throughout the eighteenth century, allowing for a more thorough analysis of the designed landscape. Unlike the five estates within the greater gentry with time-depth, three of which relied on Knyff and Kip's *Britannia Illustrata* (1714-16) in order to achieve this time depth, of the seven estates within the lesser gentry with time-depth, only one estate, Acklam Hall was illustrated by Knyff and Kip. Like Constable Burton, Ingleby Manor and Kirkleatham Hall the Knyff and Kip illustration of Acklam Hall is the only material evidence of the designed landscape from the early part of the eighteenth century. For the remaining six estates of the lesser gentry with time depth, there are several maps and plans through out the eighteenth century detailing the designed landscape and the wider estate.

As discussed in the last section the inclusion of an estate within Knyff and Kip's publication by subscription was potentially seen as venue through which to legitimize one's seat and designed landscape to an exclusive social audience across Great Britain. Decreased representation within this publication of the estates of the lesser gentry could be seen as indicative of less expendable income to pay for the subscription and inclusion in such publications. One must also remember that nineteen landowners within this social set, held and maintained additional holdings, eighteen of which fell beyond the boundaries of the North Riding. In considering these additional lands the status of twelve of these lesser gentry are elevated to a higher social status. Even though three of these estates have cartographic evidence available throughout the eighteenth century, it is interesting to note that none of these landowners, even with elevated social status, held a subscription to *Britannia Illustrata* either for their North Riding estates or the holdings beyond. It draws to question why this publication was more popular with the members of the greater gentry than the lesser gentry or even the greater landowners.

Of the estates with time depth only Aldby Park and Busby Hall have plans of the designed landscape parks and gardens. The evidence typically available for the lesser gentry consists of surveys of the wider estate which included details of the designed landscape near the house. Therefore the following analysis of the implementation and evolution of the designed landscaped parks and gardens of the lesser gentry primarily occurs through



analysis of details represented on estate maps and surveys as well as the First Edition OS map. As discussed above, the lack of known cartographic evidence within the public archives for either the North Riding estates or the estates beyond, does not mean that maps and plans of the estates were not created. It is possible that cartographic evidence did exist, but has been lost, damaged or held within private collections not accessible at this time.

### *Analysis of the Designed Landscapes with Time Depth:*

The following section will analyze the estates of Acklam Hall, Aldby Park (Buttercrambe), Brandsby Hall, Brough, Busby Hall, Hovingham Hall and Thornton Steward (Danby Hall). In addition to estate surveys, the landlords of Busby and Aldby commissioned plans specifically detailing the designed landscapes associated with their country houses. This section will discuss the general design trends of the parks and gardens within this group. A more thorough description of each park and garden is included within the attached Gazetteer.

Six of these estates held consistency of ownership throughout the eighteenth century; whereas Busby Hall had various shifts of ownership with the last occurring in 1764. With direct descent and continuity of ownership, a sense of consistency, tradition and heritage unique to each estate would be expected. As a visible representation of identity, the hall and surrounding designed landscape would serve as a likely venue for this expression of continuity. Little to no alterations were known to have been carried out to the house and grounds at Acklam. At Brough and Thornton Steward the owners maintained and expanded upon earlier halls; whilst for the remaining five estates the landowners constructed new country houses during the long eighteenth century. In conjunction with these renovations or the building of new country houses, there was either a redesign of, or implementation of newly designed naturalistic landscape parks and gardens.

The formal gardens evident on early eighteenth-century maps and plans for Acklam Hall and Thornton Steward, appear to have been maintained throughout the century. Acklam

Hall, constructed in 1684 (Pevsner 1966, 55) had a formal landscape by the early part of the eighteenth century as portrayed in the 1707 illustration by Knyff and Kip. Analysis of the landscape detailed on Jeffrey's 1770 Map of Yorkshire and The First Edition OS Map (1856) reveals that formality was maintained throughout the eighteenth century.

The hall at Thornton Steward was substantially remodelled in 1658 retain the fourteenth-century pele tower. The estate descended with the Scrope family, passing indirectly to the Bolton branch of the family in 1691 (VCH 1923). A 1692 map shows the parkland, avenue approach and gardens near the hall which appear to have been maintained throughout the eighteenth century. Even though the lack of cartographic evidence between the 1726 survey and the First Edition OS map, does not allow us to ascertain whether these features were consistently maintained throughout this period. The continuity of family, house and the continuity of form within the designed landscape represented on the maps available from 1692 to the 1898 estate survey, suggests that the overall aesthetic of the park and garden were maintained.

The remaining landscape parks and gardens within this group have mid-to-late eighteenth century date of design implementation. Even though the designed landscape at Aldby Park was not created until the 1740s a tradition of formal design aesthetics was implemented within the grounds surrounding the newly built hall. A map detailing a late-geometric design for the grounds around the house, which has been attributed to Knowlton (Wickham 2006) details a very different design from the one realized (Plate 140). In 1726 the earlier manor house situated on the main street of Buttercrambe was destroyed and a 'typical early Georgian North Riding house' (Pevsner 1966, 93-4) was constructed set back within the estate lands, .15 miles from the village road. In 1746, shortly after the estate passed to the Brewster family through marriage, Thomas Knowlton was hired to design the park and gardens. A map of the estate and detailed drawings of the gardens near the house of this same date, portray formal gardens, avenues and woodlands (Plate 139). Like the parks and gardens of the Great Landowners there was a connection to the wider landscape beyond the formal gardens, with views out over the wolds and the working landscape of the estate. Unlike the designs of parks and gardens discussed so far,



the placement of Aldby Hall at the central intersection of eight avenues, put a central emphasis inwards onto the hall, a design of which we have not seen in the other parks and gardens of the North Riding.

Aldby Park is the only park and garden within this group which implemented a formal design aesthetic during the mid- later part of the eighteenth century. Whereas the rest of the parks and gardens within this group were created with a more natural design aesthetic typically associated with the middle to later part of the eighteenth century. The 1746 estate map of Brandsby Hall (Plate 144), constructed c. 1730 (Pevsner 1966, 87) shows very little in the way of a designed landscape. Unfortunately, beyond the introduction of a curved approach, a rectilinear pond, there is very little detail about the landscape garden near the hall. It is not until the First Edition OS map (1856) and the 1876 estate plan (Plate 145) that it is possible to discern detail of the gardens and plantations around the house. Both the landlords of Brandsby and Aldby had earlier houses established along the village street removed and their attached plots of land integrated into the landscape (Page 123, GD2057).

Busby Hall, the only estate within the group to be sold during the eighteenth century, was purchased by the Marwood family in 1764. According to Pevsner, the hall was constructed in the same year after the original hall was destroyed by a fire (Pevsner 1966, 104). There is an eighteenth-century plan of an unknown date made by Sparrow titled: *A plan of improvements for the ground adjoining Buzby Hall the seat of Wm Marwood*, therefore it must date after William Marwood inherited the estate in 1764 (Plate 146). This estate plan, like 1746 plan for Aldby, detailed the designed park and gardens near the hall rather than the wider estate. Views from the hall were afforded out over a lawn with scattered plantations to both the east and west. However, it is not until the First Edition OS map that details are apparent of the entire estate which indicates that the wider working landscape to the west is hidden from view of the hall behind woodland plantations. However, without cartographic evidence prior to 1764, it is not possible to discern whether these were improvements to an existent landscape park and garden or an implementation of a new design by the Marwoods.

Brough Hall has cartographic evidence from 1727 which portrays the estate without an associated designed landscape park and garden. The hall originally dates from the fifteenth century and was substantially remodelled in the 1730s (Pevsner 1966, 91). An 1836 estate map is the earliest map of Brough which details a designed landscape associated with the hall. However the woodlands to the north-east of the hall appear on Jeffrey's *Yorkshire County Map* from 1771. It is possible that elements of the landscape were established in the 1730s when the hall was converted, however, an exact date of implementation remains elusive at this time. Like Brandsby and Busby, Brough Hall had a naturalistic design aesthetic associated with landscape designs created in the later part of the eighteenth century, with lawns and woodlands established near the hall and views out over the parkland. Unlike the belted landscapes thought to be prevalent in the later part of the eighteenth century, Brandsby, Brough and Busby maintained a visual connection to the wider working landscape beyond the parkland.

Croft Hall/ Clervaulx Abbey, the final site analyzed within this group is an estate that makes a visual and physical break from formality and tradition. In 1770 the Chaytor family abandoned the fifteenth-century hall located in proximity to the village, with formal gardens and small parkland. They reinvented their seat as a castellated hall within the wider working landscape to the south-west of the village. Interestingly, the family named their new country house after the Clervaulx branch of the family who established the estate at Croft. Maps from 1843 and the First Edition OS map indicate little in the way of design within the landscape around Clervaulx Castle. According to Waterson the Neo-Norman castle was demolished in 1950 (1990, 35). Little evidence of the landscape appears on photographs and aerial photographs.

### *Analysis of the Designed Parks and Gardens of Estates with Late Eighteenth Century Maps and Plans*

The following section will analyze the three estates of Clifton Castle, Marrick Priory and Thorpe Perrow, all of which have maps and plans created in the later part of the eighteenth century. Unfortunately, with a lack of cartographic evidence from the early-



eighteenth century, it is not possible to discuss the implementation and evolution of earlier designs which might have been established. However, unlike many of the estates discussed above, which retained design elements implemented from the early-eighteenth century, Clifton Castle and Thrope Perrow see dramatic changes occurring within the designed landscape at the end of the eighteenth century and/or the beginning of the nineteenth century. At Clifton Castle this change within the landscape appears to have occurred sometime between the 1792 and the 1817 estate maps. During this time there is a shift from a working landscape with orchards and plantations near the hall, towards a design which isolated the hall from the wider working landscape. Areas formerly labelled as a garth, close and ings located near the hall were maintained, but reworked as walled kitchen gardens and lawns. A pleasure-ground was established to the west while woodland plantations along the river were increased to surround the hall separating this area from the wider working landscape of the estate. All of which was encircled with a plantation belt isolating the estate from the lands beyond.

The designed landscape at Thorpe Perrow was dramatically altered at the start of the nineteenth century. English Heritage states that the parkland was established in the seventeenth century (GD 2077) however cartographic evidence of an earlier parkland is unknown at this time. A 1783 map of the area portrays lands to the west of Thorpe Perrow. Beyond a small sliver of woodland located on the south-west of the parkland little else is detailed on this map. Analysis of the 1803 estate plan (Plate 157) and the First Edition OS map (Plate 158) reveal a softening of the ponds near the hall, the establishment of the woodland pleasure-grounds near the ponds and the location of parkland within the wider landscape with a serpentine approach from the south-east. Since little cartographic evidence throughout the eighteenth century exists it is not possible to discern when the woodlands, ponds and gardens near the hall were incorporated into the design.

The last estate to be discussed within this group is Marrick Priory which has a later-eighteenth century map and plan which details gardens near the hall and woodland plantations. The landscape around Marrick Priory portrayed in the 1782 plan of the manor was maintained through to the First Edition OS map. Aerial photographs detail

remnant boundaries of the woodlands, yet a depletion of internal plantations occurred since the mid-eighteenth century.

### *Estates with Nineteenth Century Maps and Plans*

The remaining thirty-seven parks and gardens within the lesser gentry, including both primary and secondary estates have nineteenth-century maps and plans available for analysis. For a total of thirty-seven of these estates the First Edition OS map is the only extant cartographic evidence. Scruton Hall, Thirkleby Hall and Westerdale Hall have early nineteenth-century cartographic representations of their estates in addition to the First Edition OS map. With a shallow depth of time, the date and design implemented within these parks and gardens and later evolution of the landscape can not be revealed. Despite a lack of time-depth, a base analysis of design at the time of the First Edition Ordinance Survey, will help reveal regional trends in design styles within the nineteenth-century landscapes of these 37 estates, thus allowing placement within the social context discussed above.

Three groups of design were revealed based upon the extent of design occurring within the landscape. The first group, a total of eleven estates had minimal design within the grounds around the house; the second group, of thirteen estates had designed elements in the grounds within proximity to the house, the inclusion of woodlands and wider plantings however, these elements do not isolate the house from the wider working landscape beyond. Whereas, the final group of thirteen landscapes contained an overall design connecting the gardens around the hall to the surrounding parkland and woodlands, all within one unified aesthetic isolated from the wider working landscape. The following analysis will look at the design aesthetic within the gardens and parks within these three groupings in conjunction with the status, income and size of each estate enabling these thirty-seven estates to be included within the social context discussed above.



### *Landscapes with minimal design within the grounds near the hall*

This first group of eleven estates, even with minimal implementation of design can be further divided into three sub groupings: three which only implement gardens near the house, four with gardens and the addition of a small lawn area near the house and four with gardens and small woodlands/ plantations (See Table 2.4 - 8). In all three of these sub groupings the house and grounds are not isolated from the surrounding working landscape.

*Gilmonby Hall* (Bowes, Gilling West) no longer extant, had a small area of garden near the house. *Gilmonby* was owned by the Headlam family since 1728 had additional plantations near the house containing a summer house, *Gilmonby* situated on a prominent hill site is well seated with views and connections out over the wider working landscape. Like most of the estates to be discussed within this section, there is very little in the way of cartographic representation and estate records, so a comprehensive understanding of how this family viewed its estates, how this influenced the designs within the associated landscapes

The next four estates including: *Westerdale Hall*, *Patrick Brompton Hall*, *Kilvington Hall* and *Normanby Park* all had gardens and plantations near the house, as well as a lawn or small parkland area. Aesthetically all four of these estates were very similar in design yet their descent of ownership and functions were varied. *Westerdale* is the largest estate having a total of 2,145 acres valued at £2,018. *Westerdale Hall* owned by the Honourable Col. Octavius Duncombe, of *Waresley Park* (Cambridgeshire), son of the first Lord of *Feversham*, at the time of *Bateman* held an additional 5833 acres of land throughout *Cambridgeshire*, *Huntingdon* and *Bedford* earning £ 7,057 per annum, placing him well within the status level of the greater gentry. Situated within a the forest of *Stokesly*, this estate functioned as a shooting box for Col. Duncombe who had familial ties to the *North Riding*. From the sixteenth century through to the end of the nineteenth century, this estate was owned by various prominent *North Riding* landowners, such as the *Pennymans* of *Ormesby Hall* during the sixteenth century and the *Turner* family of *Kirkleatham* during late eighteenth century. This shifting ownership and use of the hall as

a hunting box might explain the absence of a grander design with the landscape surrounding the house.

Unlike Westerdale both Kilvington Hall and Normanby Park had more consistent descent of ownership each remaining within one family for over 200 years. *Kilvington Hall*, the seat to the Meynell family since 1544, saw a new house constructed in 1835 one mile north-east of the site of the old hall (Hinson 2007), the former park and moat of which were present on the First Edition OS map. *Normanby Park*, the seat of the Consett family from 1633, descended indirectly through marriage to the Drydens, whose family maintained descent until 1867 when the estate was sold to Reverend W. Ward-Jackson of *Upsall Hall* (Lang. West Division) an additional estate within this group. Once the property of the Pennymans, Upsall Wood was purchased by Ward-Jackson in 1799 and in 1870-71 a new house was built within the grounds, extensive, yet without an overall design (Hinson 2007).

Unfortunately the final estate within this sub-group has an incomplete descent of ownership. *Patrick Brompton* owned by the Conyers of Hornby in the fifteenth century was listed as the property of Charles Elsley by the end of the nineteenth century. The First Edition OS map portrays a modest landscape with a curved avenue approach, gardens and plantations near the hall, a small distant woodland and scattered plantings within the wider parkland. This potentially appears have been part of a grander design, but there is not any visible trace on the OS map. The lack of total isolation from the working landscape and the modest size and implementation of the designed elements places the landscape at Patrick Brompton within this grouping. This design displays some similarities to designs of William Kent, however, the lack of cartographic evidence and records available for this estate is not possible to verify Kent's direct influence in regard to the implementation and evolution of this designed landscape

The last sub-grouping within this set consists of *Hutton Hall* (Langbarugh East Division) and *High Stittenham*. Both of these landscapes have gardens and plantations near the house. What separates these from the landscapes mentioned earlier, is the presence of



extensive woodlands within the designed landscape. However, despite the presence of these woodlands the houses all remain within view of, and are connected to the wider working landscape. Whether this is an intentional designed element based upon aesthetic choice or economic restraints remains uncertain.

### *Landscapes with designed gardens and wider parkland*

The following group contains fourteen estates with designed landscapes consisting of gardens and plantations near the house, as well as features such as plantations, alleys and ponds within the wider landscape. Although these 14 landscapes contain gardens near the hall and designed elements within the wider parkland on the First Edition OS map, they are not represented as an isolated design separated both visually and physically from the wider working landscape. Within this group there are two distinctive sub-sets divided into the six landscapes which incorporate woodland areas within landscape and eight landscapes that do not contain woodlands.

The first sub-set contains eight landscapes which include gardens and plantations near the hall and the inclusion of wider parkland within the overall design. Within this group we start to see the appearance of a designed aesthetic within the wider landscape, yet we do not see the detachment of the house from the wider working lands. Within this sub-grouping are the estates of Brockfield Hall (Bulmer), Cotesque (Hang West), Easby Abbey (Gilling East), Halanby Hall (Gilling East), Kildale (Langbaugh West Division), Kirkby Misperton (Pickering Lythe), Middleton Lodge (Gilling East) and Thornton Watlass (Hang East).

All of the estates except Brockfield Hall had over 2,200 acres of land earning at least £2,400 per annum at the time of Bateman. *Kildale*, the largest estate in this sub-set with 3,792 acres of land earned the least income per annum at £2,425, the percentage of lands utilized within the designed landscape fell at .94% at the time of the First Edition OS map. *Cotesque* utilized 1.14% of the estate lands within the designed landscape, Easby Abbey

utilized the highest amount of lands at 2.06% whilst the remaining four estates fell within the 1.23%- 1.56% range.

The estates with complete information regarding descent vary from being held by various landowners over the centuries as in Kirkby Misperton and Middleton Lodge, to descending lineally from father to son since the mid-fourteenth century. In the case of Halanby Hall, Thornton Watlass and Kildale, were estates which descended lineally from the seventeenth century until its sale in the mid-nineteenth century; Brockfield Hall which was held by the Prebendary from the restoration until its sale to a local Yorkshire landowner who moved from his former seat at Holtby Hall to Brockfield Hall. All of these estates acted as the primary seat for the landowners except in the instance of Leonard Lawley-Hartley the owner of Middleton Lodge whose family seat was located at his West Riding estate of Parkland.

Analysis of the designed landscapes of these estates as represented on the First Edition OS map portrays a similar aesthetic throughout all of these parks and gardens. They all contained gardens and plantations near the house, additionally the inclusion of avenues, ponds and plantations appear within the wider parkland. However, despite the use of additional design elements, hedgerows delineating former field boundaries still appear within the parkland. In all of the designed landscapes within this sub-grouping a physical and visual connection to the wider working landscape appears to have remained.

The second sub-grouping comprising six landscapes with designed gardens and wider parkland had similar aesthetics to the parks and gardens discussed above. In addition to these design elements Arden Hall (Birdforth), Cowesby Hall (Birdforth), Grinkle Park (Langbaugh East Division), Hildenley Hall (Ryedale), Kirkby Hall (Hang East) and Woodlands (Whitby Strand) included woodland plantations within their design. Even though the inclusion of woodlands allow for some element of separation, neither the woodlands, the inclusion of additional plantations or belts separated the house completely from the wider working landscape. Like the group discussed above there was retention of former field boundaries and hedgerows within the parkland setting.



Two of the landowners within this set lived at seats located outside of the North Riding: Sir Charles W. Strickland (Bart.) owner of Hildenley Hall and York House in Malton lived at Boynton Hall located in the East Riding and Edmond Waller owner of Kirkby Hall lived at Farmington Lodge in North Leach, Gloucestershire. Whilst both of their North Riding estates were beneath 3,000 acres in size and earn less than £3,000 per annum, with the addition of the lands owned elsewhere Sir Strickland was considered a land magnate within a national context with a total of 16,000 acres of land valued at £17,000 per annum (Bateman 1883); whilst Mr. Waller increases to the level of greater gentry owning a total of 6,904 acres of land earning £7,972 per annum (Bateman 1883) within a national context. Within this group only Henry W. Yeoman of Woodlands owned the additional North Riding estates of Newton Hall and Newbiggin Hall.

When considering these landowners' North Riding holdings Arden Hall, Cowesby Hall and Kirkby Hall were smaller estates with less than 1,200 acres of land, whilst the landowners of Grinkle Park, Hildenley Hall and Woodlands held over 2,600 acres of land. In spite of the difference in size of estate all but two of the landowners, Hy. W. Yeoman of Woodlands at .95 % and Sir Charles Strickland of Hildenley Hall at 1.49%, utilized an average of 1.13% of the entire estate's lands to create their designed landscapes. The descent for ownership for Woodlands and Kirkby Hall are incomplete whilst the remaining four estates followed a lineal descent of ownership from the mid-to-late sixteenth century through to the nineteenth century, with Cowesby and Grinkle Park being sold before the time of Bateman (Page 1923).

Looking at earlier maps representing the North Riding, none of these six estates existed as earlier woodlands or parks (Speed 1610, Buck 1720). When comparing the design between these six landscapes as represented on the First Edition OS Maps all of the landscapes contained a narrow strip of woodland plantation with the houses situated within small gardens on the edges of these plantations. At Arden and Cowesby Hall the woodland plantations appear on the OS map as a crescent shape, the houses with surrounding plantations and gardens are situated within the concave curve of the crescent affording views to working landscapes.

*Landscapes with designed gardens and parkland separated from the wider working landscape*

The last group within this section consists of twelve estates which contain gardens and plantations near the house and designed elements within the wider parkland. Plantations within the parkland and/or plantation belts around the perimeter created a designed landscape park separated from the wider working lands beyond. Like the groups discussed above, the only cartographic evidence available for these thirteen estates are designs represented on the First Edition OS Map. Like the fourteen estates with designed gardens and parkland discussed immediately above, there is a division between those estates which incorporate woodlands within the designed landscape and those which did not.

The first sub-grouping includes a total of seven estates: Arnecliffe Hall (Langbaugh West Division), Hornby Grange (Allertonshire), Ormesby Hall (Langbaugh West Division), Pepper Hall (Gilling West), Sowber (Solberge) Hill (Gilling East), Stillington Hall (Bulmer) and Wydale (Weldale) (Pickering Lythe). These landscapes incorporated gardens, plantations, belts and designed elements with the wider parkland creating an overall aesthetic isolated from the wider working landscape. Within this group there was more consistency concerning estate size, income and descent of ownership. With the exception of Wydale, whose descent of ownership is incomplete, all of these estates had continuity of descent of ownership from at least the early- seventeenth century through to the mid-nineteenth century. Four of these landowners held 2,000 acres of land and earned at least £2,900 pounds per annum at the time of Bateman and utilised 1.30% to 1.94% of their estate's lands within the designed landscape. Whereas Hornby Grange, a peripheral estate for the Blackett family of Maften, Newcastle, and Wydale Hall, owned by Edward S Cayley consisted of 1,569 and 1,866 acres of land consecutively and were valued at £1,400 and £1821 per annum. Even though, both of these estates utilized less than .99% of the overall estate lands within in the designed landscape, like the other estates within this sub-



grouping, these two landowners created a designed park and garden isolated the house from the wider working lands by including plantation belts surrounding the parkland.

Unlike the other six estates within this group, Hornby Grange was the only landscape represented on the First Edition OS map without extensive gardens and plantations within direct vicinity of the house. Instead of incorporating a woodland belt around the perimeter of the parkland, Sowber (Solberge) Hill utilized woodlands and strategic wooded clumps to create an isolated setting for the house separated from the working landscape beyond. The rest of the designed landscapes within this group consist of gardens near the house, with wider open parklands surrounded by isolating plantation belts. However, beyond the inclusion of the occasional clump, the interior parkland within these six estates, received little in the way of design embellishments.

The last grouping of designed landscapes within this section, contain extensive design embellishments within the parks and gardens surrounding the house. This last group includes the estates of Forcett Hall (Gilling West), Scruton Hall (Hang East), Thirkleby Hall (Birdforth) Wigganthorpe (Bulmer) and Woodend (aka Thornton Le Street) (Allertonshire). All these estates were maintained through a continuity of ownership from at least the start of the seventeenth century. The Earl of Cathcart, owner of Woodend, was the only landowner to hold additional lands in Staffordshire and Renfrew, however, all of the estates within this group act as the country seat for these landowners. These five estates vary in size from 1,064 acres at Woodend to the 2,868 acres at Forcett Hall and vary from the modest annual income of Hy Coore at Scruton Hall of £1,217 to the £3,585 earned by Sir Robert Frankland-Russell of Thirkelby Hall.

There is a variation in the amount of estate lands utilized within the designed landscape, from the 1.14% of estate lands at Wigganthorpe to the 1.99% used at Scruton Hall. despite these variances in overall size of estate, income generate and percent of lands dedicated to design there was a consistency in regard to the level of embellishment within the designed landscape with the inclusion of ponds, garden structures, plantation clumps, gardens, woodlands and plantation belts. Within these final five estates, regardless of modest

acreage and income in comparison to the estates owned by greater gentry, great landowners and the land magnates of the North Riding, we see landscape designs, placing their modest estates within similar design aesthetics found within the parks and gardens of the greater landowners of the North Riding.

### *Conclusion*

Analysis of the parks and gardens of the lesser gentry suggests that there were varied designs occurring throughout the Riding. There were estates such as Acklam Hall and Thronton Steward, which established formal gardens at the turn of the seventeenth century, which were maintained throughout the eighteenth century. At Aldby Park formal designs were established within the designed landscape in the late 1740s and this formalism was maintained through to the middle of the nineteenth century. Other halls like Thorpe Perrow continued to embellish the park and gardens to create naturalistic pleasure-grounds. Busby and Clifton Castle had naturalistic parks and gardens created within the later half of the eighteenth century associated with contemporary landscape designs. There were similar naturalistic aesthetics within Brough and Brandsby Hall, both designed in the later part of the century, however, the owners of these two landscapes established a connection between the house, the estate and the wider working landscape. Clearvaux saw an abandonment of the ancient family house situated within the village of Croft and the relocation of the seat to lands within the wider working landscape where a modest, naturalistic landscape park and garden was created.

Without additional cartographic evidence a clearer understanding of how the designs were implemented and the later retention, destruction or evolution of the designs within the parks and gardens of the lesser gentry cannot be fully understood. Even with the level of cartographic evidence available we can see that there is no correlation between the status, power and income of each landowner, the size of the landscape and the design aesthetic implemented. With a variety of aesthetics occurring within the designed landscape of these estates, it is evident that the landowners within the lesser gentry were individuals creating designed landscapes with varied intentions.



## 2.5 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

### *Introduction*

The proceeding chapters have analyzed the designed landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding within a socio-economic context. This analysis was a response to Williamson's research on the landscape parks of Norfolk. By looking at an inclusive set of designed landscapes regardless of status or size, Williamson revealed that although there was a shift towards a naturalistic design throughout the Norfolk estates, this did not occur as a unified movement. He revealed variation not only in the chronology of changes, but also in the overall use of naturalistic features applied to each landscape. This variation developed out of a complex combination of individual circumstances such as income, status, personal taste, and natural topography (Williamson 1998).

The first step towards elucidating similar patterns within the designed landscapes of the North Riding was to analyze them within a socio-economic context. In Norfolk, Williamson divided his country houses into status levels of the 'elite' (having an annual income of £10,000 or greater, with a wide-reaching social network) and the 'local gentry' (with an income of less than £10,000 per annum, and a more locally-based social network). Within this research, I have attempted to analyze the designed landscapes of the North Riding within a contemporary social context by dividing the landowners into four levels of landed status, based upon total lands owned and annual income. By doing so the landowners classified by Williamson as the 'elite' have been divided further into the levels of land magnates and great landowners and the 'local gentry' into the greater gentry and the lesser gentry (see table 2.1.1 and section 2.1 for more details). By focusing on a division purely based upon lands owned and income earned, the previous section has tested the hypothesis that choices within the designed landscape were driven by status and economics. Dividing the landowners into four levels of landed gentry for analysis has revealed patterns and trends within the designed landscapes of the North Riding that are quite unique, and different from those that Williamson revealed in the landscapes of Norfolk.

### *Analysis and Discussion*

Initially, 126 designed landscape parks and gardens were located and researched within the North Riding. The preceding sections have focused upon the thirty-six landscapes (owned by thirty-five landowners) that had available documentation throughout the long eighteenth century, thus enabling a more thorough analysis of the implementation and subsequent evolution of the designed landscape over the century. Within this group there was one land magnate, seven great landowners, thirteen greater gentry and fourteen lesser gentry. Analysis of their designed landscapes revealed a higher incidence of retention and/or maintained formality over the long-eighteenth century. Several factors could explain this phenomenon: lack of available finances to dedicate towards the designed landscape, an association with conservative and traditional ideals, or a material representation of what some historians have described as 'backwater' (a social disconnection from trends and fashion radiating from the social epicentre of London (Girouard 1980, Hoskins 1988, Williamson and Lytleton 1907)). The following analysis and discussion will question the veracity of these explanations.

### *Great Landowners and Land Magnates*

All of the great landowners and land magnates (except the owners of Aske Hall, which was sold twice) maintained a descent of ownership either directly or indirectly throughout the long-eighteenth century. In addition, all of these landowners established an early association with antiquity within their designed landscapes. The country houses of Swinton, Aske and Newburgh were created out of additions and enhancements to earlier strongholds and abbeys respectively; while Bolton, Duncombe, Danby and Jervaulx maintained visible connectivity to ancient familial castles or abbeys within their designed landscape. Even though the Howards of Castle Howard dismantled the earlier stronghold of Henderskelfe due to fire damage, and created an eighteenth-century grand palace in its place (Saumarez-Smith 1990), they maintained ancient woodland within their designed park and garden.



Instead of shifting towards more naturalistic designs over the long-eighteenth century, the great landowners and land magnates of the North Riding were maintaining the designed landscapes established at the early part of the eighteenth century. Where as the Howards retained nearly all formal elements within their wider landscape, the landscape to the north of the house was naturalized in the 1790s and if the south parterre illustrated in the 1715 sketch by Colin Campbell was indeed realized and subsequently removed, this would have been the only formal element which was removed from the early-eighteenth century landscape within this group. The owners of Aske Hall, Bolton Hall and Swinton Castle added naturalistic elements to their designed landscapes, but the formal features established in the earlier part of the eighteenth century were not totally swept away. At Aske Hall and Bolton Hall the formal avenues were replaced with serpentine approaches by 1763 and 1856 respectively; an open lawn was created on the southern side of Bolton Hall, and by 1820 additional pleasure grounds with seats, follies and winding paths were established around the perimeter of the parkland at Swinton Castle. Despite the addition of these naturalistic features within the designed landscape, these landowners maintained many of the avenues, formal gardens and terraces that lay close to their houses and had been established in the early-eighteenth century.

At Duncombe Park, the implementation of the Broad walk, the terrace to the east, and the ha-ha wall and temples have been dated to 1713 and 1730 respectively indicating an early creation of a serpentine-style landscape. A detailed history of this designed landscape is unknown, but it is this researcher's opinion that this early landscape was maintained. Beyond the moving of the kitchen garden from the Rye Valley to the grounds near Helmsley Castle in 1754, the incorporation of Rievaulx Terrace into the design in 1758, and the later mid-nineteenth century additions of Helmsley gates and lodge, the conservatory within the established pleasure-grounds and the addition of sunken terraces near the house, little alterations were made to the overall design. Jervaulx Abbey and Danby Castle were both established hunting estates by the start of the eighteenth century and both had formal gardens near the hall. At Jervaulx in 1807, a naturalistic landscape was developed within the wider parklands however, at Danby, very little design was applied to the wider parkland at anytime over the century.

The retention of early-eighteenth-century designs throughout these estates raises an interesting question as to whether these decisions were being made because the great landowners and land magnates were conservative, traditional or even 'backwater'. Looking at this retention of formality, one might deduce that the trend to shift towards a natural aesthetic over the century was late in reaching the landscapes of the North Riding. However, when considering the dates of initial design implementation, the ingenuity of design, the aesthetics utilized, and the use of prominent garden designers (such as Loudon, Switzer, Pope and Bridgeman), it is evident that these landowners were right on the pulse, if not on the forefront of early-eighteenth-century designed landscape trends. Some of these landowners approached popular designers such as Kent and Brown to make improvements to their landscape in the mid to later part of the eighteenth century. Although alterations occurred within their designed landscapes, specific decisions were made to maintain most of the overall aesthetics established at the start of the century. The choices of these landowners to either maintain earlier landscape aesthetics or retain prominent elements of these aesthetics were influenced by something other than a delay in stylistic trends.

The Howards of Castle Howard, Duncombes of Duncombe Park, Dundas family of Aske Hall, Danbys and Cunliffe-Listers of Swinton Park, Bellisas of Newburgh Priory, Poulets (later Orde-Powletts) of Bolton Hall, Dawnays of Danby Castle and the Bruce family of Jervaulx Abbey represented the established 'elite' of the North Riding. If the patterns seen within Williamson's research in Norfolk could be applied to the North Riding, one would expect that the trends these 'elite' were setting within their designed landscapes would have set the tone and pattern that inspired the designed landscapes of the greater and lesser gentry throughout the riding.

### *Greater Gentry*

When we analyze the thirteen designed landscapes of the greater gentry with time-depth, some different patterns start to become apparent. Firstly, continuity within descent of ownership was less marked. Within this socio-economic group, five of the estates



(Beningbrough, Constable Burton, Gilling Castle, Guisborough Priory and Marske Hall) had direct descent; the five estates of Ingleby Manor, Hackness Hall, Kirkleatham Hall, Kiplin Hall and Mulgrave Castle passed through marriage or indirect descent through the male line, whilst Newby Hall, Clints and Ebberston Lodge were sold and purchased throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Six of these landowners retained and remodelled earlier manors houses, including Gilling Castle which had an early fourteenth-century tower-house. Clints Hall and Ingleby Manor were maintained sixteenth-century manor houses, while Newby Hall, Kirkleatham Hall and Kiplin Hall were remodelled seventeenth-century houses. The remaining seven landowners had new country houses built in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. Within this socio-economic group there was also a lesser degree of reference to antiquity. Only Gilling Castle, Guisborough Priory and Mulgrave Castle maintained an association with antiquity, either through the main house (as in Gilling), through nearby abbey ruins (at Guisborough), or through both castle and abbey ruins within the designed landscape and wider prospect at Mulgrave Castle.

However, as in the designed landscapes of the land magnates and great landowners, earlier designs were maintained within the parks and gardens of the greater gentry. Gilling Castle retained early garden features around the house, including terraces and a viewing platform, as well as the double avenue within the parkland. Marske Hall maintained a hunting estate aesthetic within the wider parkland throughout the eighteenth-century (similar to the design patterns at Jervaulx Abbey and Danby Castle discussed above). Although the village houses were removed to create open parkland to the south of Ebberston Lodge, the formal water garden to the north of the house created c.1712 was maintained. Likewise the formal gardens, terraces and geometric ponds surrounding Guisborough Abbey were maintained throughout the eighteenth century. There were even additional formal gardens designed and added to the landscape as late as 1770 due to issues with dampness the house had become unlivable (Roe, 2008), was demolished and a new house was built in 1845, situated within the wider parklands south of the former hall. Even though a naturalistic landscape was created around this new house, there were open views across the parkland back to the abbey ruins, formal gardens and terraces associated with the grounds of the former house.



Even though the early design aesthetics were maintained within some of the landscapes of the greater gentry, we start to see more shifts towards an overall naturalistic aesthetic over the long-eighteenth century. The landscapes of Beningbrough Hall, Ingleby Manor and Constable Burton all moved from a formal landscape towards a naturalistic design aesthetic, yet there was still retention of some of these earlier formal elements. A total of five designed landscapes within the properties of the greater gentry became naturalistic by the mid-eighteenth century, completely replacing their earlier formal designed landscapes. Newby Hall (by 1689) and Kirkleatham Hall by (1707) had formal gardens developed in the grounds of the house. Throughout the eighteenth century, many adjustments and improvements were made within these two landscapes. By the 1760s, village houses around Kirkleatham, and farmsteads within the wider landscapes of both country houses were removed to increase the size of - and incorporate wider parkland into - the designed landscape. By 1803 Newby Hall was in effect a Brownian landscape, and shortly after 1844 (following inheritance through marriage), Kirkleatham had a naturalistic landscape developed around the house and parkland, effectively isolating the house from the wider working landscape. Although the landscape at Newby was naturalistic by 1803, unlike Kirkleatham which had a total removal of formal elements, parts of the radiating avenues were retained within the new 'Brownian' landscape design.

Three of these landowners established designed parks and gardens within the later part of the eighteenth century, and all three were designed with a naturalistic aesthetic. Prior to 1797 the manor of Hackness sat within an agricultural landscape. Shortly after receiving a substantial inheritance and title of Baronet (Page 1923), Richard Bempde-Johnstone demolished the old hall, moved the village houses, and created a new country house within a 'Brownian' landscape. By 1723, beyond two small forecourts to the east, and woodland to the south of the house, the landscape of Kiplin Hall was mainly agricultural. By the mid-eighteenth century a naturalistic parkland with a serpentine lake was created within once arable lands to the west of the house. Further parkland and woodland belts were added to the north and east of the house in 1797. In the 1880s, Nesfield reintroduced formal elements to the area around the hall including a lime avenue, terraces and entrance gates similar to those that appeared on the 1723 map of the house (Webster 2005). The



sketch by Samuel Buck of Clints details a small walled garden in front of the house. By 1759 the house was sitting in a naturalistic landscape (represented on an estate map of the same date and within a painting by W. Agnus dated 1787).

In summation, four of these landowners maintained early-eighteenth century designs within their landscapes, and six changed their landscapes towards a naturalistic design, although the earlier formal elements were retained with a varying degree. By building a new house within a naturalistic landscape the Chaloners of Guisborough were able to completely maintain the formal elements associated with the earlier house. At Newby and Kirkleatham naturalistic landscapes were created with some retention of earlier formal features. In contrast, at Hackness and Kiplin, naturalistic landscapes were created towards the end of the century out of lands once dedicated to agriculture. At Clints Hall a natural landscape was evident by the end of the eighteenth century replacing the earlier walled garden.

Even though there is a higher degree of naturalistic design occurring within the landscapes of the greater gentry than seen within the designed landscapes of the great landowners and land magnates, there was still a trend to maintain or retain formal elements throughout the eighteenth century. A total of nine of these country houses had landscapes with formal elements at the earlier part of the eighteenth century. Of these nine landscapes, seven maintained or retained at least some of their formal elements. Although influenced by the great landowners and land magnates this increased instance of embracing naturalistic designed landscapes indicates that the greater gentry were also making aesthetic choices based upon other influences. Within this socio-economic group we start to encounter a higher incidence of indirect inheritance and the transfer of ownership through sale. Of the landscapes which shifted completely from formal to naturalistic designs, or the newly created naturalistic landscapes in the later part of the century, Clints, Ingleby, Newby, Kirkleatham and Kiplin had a shift in ownership just prior to changes made within the landscape. In the case of Hackness, alterations to the landscape were made just after a large inheritance of funds and the creation of a Baronetcy.

### *Lesser Gentry*

Within this socio-economic group we see a higher level of direct descent, with only Acklam Hall, Arncliffe and Thornton Steward having inheritance through indirect descent, while Clifton Castle, Forcett Hall and Marrick Priory were sold and purchased during the eighteenth century. Unlike those of the greater gentry, the properties of the lesser gentry observed a close association with antiquity within their designed landscapes often retaining earlier manor houses (as seen at Alby Park, Arnecliffe Hall, Brough, Forcett Hall, Marrick Priory, Sheriff Hutton, Thornton Steward and Thorpe Perrow). Within the fourteen analyzed landscapes of the lesser gentry, there was a greater retention and/or maintenance of formal designs within the landscape. Nine of these landowners had formal landscapes established between the later part of the seventeenth century and the earlier part of the eighteenth. At Aldby Park, formal elements designed by Thomas Knowlton were added to the landscape as late as 1746. Although the landscapes at Arncliffe and Sheriff Hutton were added to and embellished over the eighteenth century, the changes carried out were not to the detriment of the formal features established earlier.

Only five properties of the lesser gentry had purely naturalistic designed landscapes, four of which were newly designed. In the later part of the eighteenth century, naturalistic landscapes were created out of lands once dedicated to agriculture at Brandsby Hall and Clervaux Castle. Marrick Priory and Clifton Castle, both still agricultural landscapes by the end of the eighteenth century, were developed into naturalistic landscapes by the mid-nineteenth century. The history of the landscape and descent of Busby Hall remains unclear. It is known that a new house was erected in 1764, shortly after the former hall was destroyed by fire, but it is not certain if the naturalistic landscape established at this time replaced an earlier formal or an agrarian landscape. Of these five 'lesser gentry' estates, only Marrick and Clifton saw a shift in ownership through purchase prior to the implementation of design. The ownership of Busby Hall shifted from the Turner family of Kirkleatham to William Marwood at the time of the new build, but the particulars of this shift and any possible relationship between these two owners remains unknown. Both Brandsby and Clervaux maintained continuous descent from the thirteenth century.



As seen in the estates of the great landowners and land magnates, more of the estates of the lesser gentry had a continuity of ownership. Similarly, a greater number of the lesser gentry retained and/or maintained earlier formal elements within their designed landscapes than those who did not. Additionally more of the lesser gentry maintained an association to antiquity than the greater gentry. In total there were nine landowners with formal landscapes established in the earlier part of the eighteenth century, and formal elements were maintained at three of these in their entirety. Six of the landowners created naturalistic designs in the later half of the eighteenth century, whilst maintaining earlier formal features, much in a manner seen in the landscapes of the greater gentry. In addition within the lesser gentry, four landowners created naturalistic landscapes on once arable lands.

### *Conclusion*

Within all of these socio-economic sets there is a continuation of design esthetics over the course of the eighteenth century. Within the landscapes of the great landowners and the land magnates, this retention occurred throughout all of the landscapes, though not all of these early-eighteenth-century designs were initially driven by formality. Two were maintained as hunting estates, and one maintained the serpentine landscape created in the early eighteenth century. Three of these eight landowners applied naturalistic features to their landscapes but they still maintained the earlier formal design.

When we get to the thirteen landowners of the greater gentry we still see this maintenance of design within eight landscapes; again one of these maintained a hunting landscape, and one maintained an early natural aesthetic, however, within this social set there were a greater number of landowners choosing to create naturalistic designed landscapes. Nine of the thirteen landscapes within this group were naturalistic by the end of the long eighteenth century, six of these were created replacing the earlier formal landscapes. Four of these landowners, whilst creating their naturalistic landscapes, made decisions to maintain formal features within their design, one retained subtle traces of formal avenues within the parkland, whilst another chose to eradicate all traces of this earlier formalism.

In addition, three of the landowners of the greater gentry developed naturalistic landscapes out of once arable land in the later part of the century.

When we consider the landowners of the lesser gentry, once again the tendency to maintain or retain earlier-eighteenth century features is apparent. By the 1720s a total of nine formal landscapes had been established by the lesser gentry, and three of which dated back to the late-seventeenth century. All of these had either maintained and/or retained formal elements within a later design. Acklam maintained the same landscape throughout the eighteenth century, with little to few alterations made. The remaining nine formal landscapes were either altered or improved over the course of the eighteenth century, while the other landscapes shifted towards a naturalistic design, yet retained earlier formal features. Three of the lesser gentry developed naturalistic landscapes out of once arable land. Finally, there is uncertainty surrounding the existence of an established landscape at Busby prior to the creation of the naturalistic landscape recorded in 1764. Although following the trend towards naturalistic designs prevalent in the landscapes of the greater gentry, the properties of the lesser gentry seem more similar to those of the great landowners and land magnates in descent of ownership, attachment to antiquity, and the level of retention of earlier-eighteenth century features.

There is an observable pattern within all of these socio-economic levels for landowners to have moved towards more naturalistic designs, the pattern of their maintaining or retaining early-eighteenth-century features and designs is nonetheless tangible. In the designed landscapes of the land magnates and great landowners more chose to apply naturalistic features within the wider landscape maintaining formal designs near the house. Although within the designed landscapes of the greater gentry we see a similar application or addition of naturalistic aesthetics into formal landscapes, a larger number of parks and gardens shifted from formal towards a more naturalistic aesthetic. However, only some of these retained earlier formal features. Within the lesser gentry -although two landowners retained their formal landscapes completely, and one applied naturalistic features to his formal landscape - a greater number of landowners shifted their formal



landscapes towards a naturalistic design. Unlike the greater gentry, a larger number of the lesser gentry maintained formal elements.

The patterns of aesthetics and change within the landscapes of the North Riding are unique. Though there is clearly a connection with the national trend to move towards a more naturalistic landscape, there is also evidence of a unique attachment to, and association with earlier designs, formal elements and even the early use of antiquity. This retained association appears strongest within the designed landscapes of the great landowners and land magnates. A similar pattern of connectivity was seen in the designed landscapes of the lesser gentry, but this phenomenon seems to have had less of an impact within the parks and gardens of the middle socio-economic tier of the greater gentry. In the case of the land magnates, great landowners and the lesser gentry, a larger number of estates had continuous descent of ownership, whereas with the greater gentry there was a higher level of new ownership through either marriage or purchase. This could explain the disparity in aesthetic choices made by these socio-economic groups.

Many of these landowners utilized prominent designers throughout the century. Analysis of the initial dates of design implementation, the dates of subsequent changes within the landscape, the use of unique features and natural topography, and the early use of antiquity aesthetically place these landowners within pace -if not, in some cases, ahead- of national trends in landscape design. Over the course of the century there is evidence for continuous improvement of not only the designed landscapes, but also the houses. This, together with the evident increases in the extent of parkland, indicates that these landowners had access to considerable funds for investment in aesthetic improvements. Their aesthetic decisions were, therefore, not determined chiefly by economic restriction, therefore the retention of formal elements within their design was influenced by other forces. In an attempt to elucidate these influences, the following section will analyze our thirty-six designed landscapes within a range of contextual frameworks: social networks (including those of familial ties), and social and political connections (on both a regional and national level). In so doing, it is hoped that we may reveal patterning that will allow us to elucidate the relationship between aesthetic choices and social connectivity, and

which should allow us to explain the unique aesthetic phenomena that characterise the designed parks and gardens of the North Riding.



## three

# SOCIAL CONTEXT

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

The proceeding analysis revealed that although North Riding landowners within all of the status levels were gradually adding naturalistic aesthetics to their landscapes, there was still clearly a desire to retain early eighteenth-century features and designs. This reveals a connection to the national chronology of design, yet indicating a clear attachment and association with earlier designs, formal elements and even the early use of antiquity which were distinctive to the region. Through out all of these socio-economic levels there were varying degrees of attachment to these earlier designs. As traditionally expected within the accepted chronology, some of the landowners created naturalistic parklands, completely replacing the earlier, established formal gardens and parks, like the Bempde-Johnstones at Hackness. Other landowners, whilst removing the majority of the earlier formal designs, incorporated elements of the earlier formal designs within the wider naturalistic design, as the lime avenue retained at Newby Hall. A rather large portion of landowners applied naturalistic designs to the wider parkland, whilst maintaining the earlier formal gardens in the ground near the house, as seen in the landscape improvements made by Chares Turner at Kirkleatham. In some instances the design landscapes established at the beginning of the eighteenth century appear to have been completely maintained, with the incorporation of some naturalistic elements within the wider landscape for example Gilling Castle and Duncombe Park. This retention of earlier designs appears to occur regardless of the landowner's income or level of status, however, the option to completely remove earlier formal gardens and parklands was carried out by members of the greater gentry and the lesser gentry. Of the landowners who created naturalistic landscapes which completely replaced earlier formal designs, three were members of the greater gentry whilst four were lesser gentry; indicating a stronger desire within these status levels to associate with wider national trends.

Whereas the above chapter examined the landscapes within contemporary socio-economic levels, the following section will examine these same designed landscapes within a socio-political context. Although structured around levels of wealth and landownership, the social network of the eighteenth century was also built around various networks of political, religious and familial connections. The following will take into account how these varying aspects of eighteenth-century society influenced the landowner and decisions made regarding their designed landscapes. The emphasis of the data sets will be shifted from landed status to aesthetics. While the socio-economic context was structured around the landed status of the late nineteenth-century landowner (see above), the following analysis will focus on each owner associated with these parks and gardens from the late-seventeenth century through to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, taking into account both the phases of stasis and change within the designed landscapes.

By reviewing various sources including, but not limited to, available estate records, *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies*; the *Victorian County Histories*; *Burke's Peerage, Baronetage & Knightage*; *Burke's Landed Gentry*, *The Ridings of York*; the *Pedigrees of Yorkshire Families*; *White's 1693-1950* and *The Lord Lieutenants and High Sheriffs of Yorkshire 1066-2000* information regarding each landowner's association with political, religious and social organizations will be reviewed in an attempt to create social networks. Networks of architects and landscape designers utilized will be examined. Particular attention will be paid to the variance of maintained, retained and naturalistic designs in conjunction with the landowners' conservative stance revealed by their religious and political connections. Familial and social connections both created and maintained through marriage, will be analyzed in relation to varying aesthetic choices made within the landscapes through out the families' estates. Where applicable, this will include an analysis of aesthetic designs within primary and secondary estates owned by the same landowner.

A comparison of the geographical range of each landowner's social and political network, whether they moved in regional networks contained within the boundaries of the riding or within a wider national network, will allow an examination of a proposed delay in trends reaching the 'backwaters' of Yorkshire (Hoskins 1988, Girouard 1980, Williamson



1907). Where a correlation appeared between the implementation of a more naturalistic aesthetic following shortly after an estates' shift in ownership through purchase, the reason for these choices remained uncertain. It is uncertain if these owners were new to the North Riding and unaware of regional trends; or if they were new to landed status and thus choosing to implement designs dictated by the 'mode' rather than those of the region. By examining who these landowners were, what their social networks were and where they were from might help to elucidate their aesthetic choices. The following analysis will be discussed through the socio-political constructs.

## 3.2 DISCUSSION

### *Introduction*

The following will introduce and explore some of the alternative narratives through which the designed landscapes of the North Riding will be explored. A discussion of the landscapes and design trends occurring within in the landscapes of the members of the peerage versus local gentry will explore whether the designs trends were filtered down through the levels of society. National versus local connections of these landowners will be explored through memberships to Gentlemen's Clubs, Universities and the Inns of London in order to place the North Riding landowners within a wider national or more regional social context. The analysis of their conservative versus liberal stances of will be explored through the political and religious beliefs of these landowners. The designed landscapes will be viewed through these narratives potentially revealing social factors and influences which influenced the individual landowner's design choices and motivations. This will be a brief discussion of these narratives as they will continue to be explored through a geographical and topographical context in the following chapter.

### *Landscapes of the Peerage and Local Gentry*

As Williamson found in the designed landscapes of Norfolk, the local gentry, who moved within a regional context, shifted their designs towards a naturalistic aesthetic later than

the elite (Williamson 1990, 166). It is understood that lower members within eighteenth-century society would try to associate and emulate the practices, mannerisms and styles of the elite social structure by adopting their habits, styles, aesthetics and trends (Williamson 1990, 93). Therefore we would expect to see a similar pattern occurring within the designed landscapes of the North Riding, with the landscapes of the peers or elite quickly following wider national trends, to be copied and simulated, within the parks and gardens of the local gentry.

The status of the families which owned estates were broken down into those of the peerage; baronets; esquires; landed gentlemen with out title; and estates where a shift in status occurred, either through marriage, inheritance, or through recognition by the crown. There were nine estates owned by peers, seven by baronets, eight by esquires and six by gentlemen without title. A total of nine families demonstrated a shift between status over the long-eighteenth century, three of which occurred with the inheritance of the estate by titled relations.

As discussed above, whilst landownership and income were vital to entry into the aristocracy, having a large amount of holdings and income would not automatically constitute entry into the Peerage. Additionally loss of said lands and/or income was not immediate cause for loss of title, therefore presence of a title did not always reflect an individual's income especially in regard to those received through inheritance (see page 18).

### *Peers*

Of the ten estates owned by peers, all but Beningbrough, Jervaulx Abbey, Mulgrave Castle and Newburgh Priory, were owned by titled members of the peerage which passed through lineal descent from father to son throughout the long-eighteenth century. For Beningbrough and Jervaulx Abbey, the change in status occurred at periods of indirect inheritance tale general, in which a nephew from the male line inherited the estates and



title. The shift in title occurred at Mulgrave and Newburgh through marriage or indirect inheritance through the female line.

Eight of the formal landscapes within this data set were created by peers, six of which were established by 1723, whilst the designed landscape at Mulgrave Castle was established by 1735 and the landscape at Aske Hall by 1758. Seven of these formal landscapes were subsequently maintained throughout the eighteenth century. The Dawnay family of Danby Castle maintained the earlier hunting landscape established towards the end of the seventeenth century, without change or alteration throughout the eighteenth century, even after the family moved their seat to the estate in the nineteenth century. At Gilling castle and Castle Howard the simplified geometric landscapes established in the first part of the century were maintained whilst naturalistic elements were added to the wider landscape during the 1770s. In 1792 picturesque aesthetics were added to the wider landscape at Mulgrave. For the landscapes at Aske and Newburgh evolved throughout the eighteenth century shifting from one design to another. By the end of the century they both had naturalistic designs added to the wider parkland whilst the formal elements near the house were maintained. Although the formal landscape at Beningbrough Hall was greatly altered by the time of the First Edition OS map, earlier formal elements were retained within the design. Similarly, the Bruce family of Tottenham Park Wiltshire, maintained the earlier hunting landscape established at Jervaulx even after the inheritance of the estate by a nephew in 1746 excavations were carried out in the abbey ruins and naturalistic designs were added to the grounds near the house and parkland was created within the wider landscape (Page 1914).

If it was the desire for lesser members of the peerage and gentlemen landowners to emulate the designs of greater members of the peerage, this pattern of maintained formalism, or retained formal elements seen within the landscapes of these Marquis, Dukes and Earls would set the precedence of landscape design trends within the Riding. To verify if these seven landscapes acted as inspiration for the baronets, esquires and gentlemen landowners of the North Riding further analysis of the types of landscape designs they implemented will follow.

### *Baronets*

There were a total of five landscapes held by baronets within this group including - Brough, Croft/Clervaulx Castle, Constable Burton, Ingleby and Stanwick. At Brough, Constable Burton and Ingleby the title of baronet passed via lineal descent from the early seventeenth century. Sir Hugh Smithson was a Baronet when he created the serpentine-style landscape at Stanwick. He was later succeeded his wife's maternal grandfather as Earl of Northumberland in 1750 and elevated to Duke in 1766, while the serpentine-style landscape developed in the 1740s was maintained through to the mid-nineteenth century. Although there was a similar maintenance or retention of earlier designs within the landscapes of the Baronets, within this level of peerage we start to see a desire for more naturalistic designed landscapes. Sir William Chaytor of Croft/ Clervaulx, created baronet in 1831 and during the 1840s had a new house built to designs by Ignatius Bonomi (Waterson and Meadows 1990) with a naturalistic park south-west of the old hall (see Gazetteer). Whilst Sir John Lawson completely removed the earlier formal gardens in order to establish a naturalistic landscape at Brough; Sir William Foulis of Ingleby Manor and Sir William Wyville of Constable Burton retained and incorporated some of the earlier formal elements within their naturalistic designs. This divergence from the prescribed maintenance or retention of earlier designs indicates that influence is derived from other inspirations other than greater members of the Peerage within the region.

### *Esquires*

Within the nine estates held by families styled as esquires, for four of these families the title passed via lineal descent from the late-seventeenth century, where as the remaining families comprised of landowners who rose from the status of gentlemen over the eighteenth century. The Worsleys of Hovingham and the Milbankes of Thrope Perrow were raised further to the status of baronet by the end of the nineteenth century however; all of their landscapes were established or altered by esquires. Within this group there



was a higher incidence of direct descent, with seven estates passing lineally from father to son from at least the mid-sixteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century. Only two estates passed indirectly through either male-general or through the female line in the 1780s.

Six of these landscapes had late-geometric landscapes established around the house by 1707. While the Mauleverers of Arncliffe, who were paying off family debts incurred in the 1660s, did not establish their formal walled gardens until the 1750s. This delay in design is the first landscape within this data set which fell behind the national chronology. It must be noted, that shortly after a naturalistic landscape was established in the wider parkland during the 1770s whilst the formal gardens near the hall were maintained throughout the long-eighteenth century; placing the Mauleverers well within the accepted national chronology, whilst implementing regional trends seen in the landscapes of the peerage discussed above. Unlike the landscape at Arncliffe, the walled garden Acklam c. 1683 was maintained without alteration through to the mid-eighteenth century; representing the only landscape established at the family seat which did not evolve over the century, reasons for which can not be reasonably explained by reasons of finance or status.

Although naturalistic elements were added within the parklands at Guisborough, Thornton Steward and Sheriff Hutton, the earlier formal designs were maintained and at Guisborough additional formal elements were added during the 1770s (Guisborough Report 2004). At the same time Thomas Worsley Esq was establishing a naturalistic landscape at Hovingham Hall, removing all but a few elements of the earlier formal design. Of the six esquires who added naturalistic designs to their landscape, only the Cholmleys of Brandsby Hall established newly designed landscape out of agricultural land c. 1798.

Within this group there were delays in the development of naturalistic designed landscapes. Only the landscape at Hovingham, shifted towards a naturalistic aesthetic in the 1770s. The landscape at Acklam was never altered from the late-geometric landscape

established by the time of Knyff and Kip's illustration. Thorpe Perrow in 1805, while Guisborough and Thornton Steward had naturalistic parklands by the 1850s and the naturalistic landscapes at Marske Hall and Brandsby were created between 1782-1841 and 1791-1856 respectively. These later designs stylistically compared more to contemporary nineteenth-century natural landscapes with pleasure grounds near the house indicating that by the time these landowners were able to create or improve their designs they were in tune with contemporary trends. At Arncliffe, a late-geometric landscape was established in the 1750s. Unlike the designs developed at Thorpe Perrow, Guisborough, Thornton Steward and Marske; Arncliffe represents the first landscape within this data set with a delayed implementation of design well beyond the accepted chronology, potentially showing a disconnection with wider national trends.

#### *Gentlemen Landowners*

Eleven of the estates were held by gentlemen including –Aldby, Busby, Clifton, Forcett, Hackness Hall, Kiplin, Kirkleatham and Clints Hall, Marrick Priory Newby and Swinton Castle at the time of design implementation. Although Richard Vanden Bempde Johnstone of Hackness Hall, was created Baronet in 1795, when he altered the designed landscape, he did not yet hold a title. At Kiplin the house (1622) and walled garden were created by Sir George Calvert (Baron) however subsequent alterations were all carried out by gentlemen. The parks and gardens at Kirkleatham were created and subsequently altered by the gentlemen including Charles Turner who during the 1760s carried out extensive alterations to the houses and landscapes at Kirkleatham and Clints Hall. Whilst his son, another Charles Turner was created Baronet in 1782 he did not carry out any alterations or improvements within the designed landscape. In 1845 Arthur Newcomen, a gentleman, inherited the estate of Kirkleatham through marriage, made additional changes within the designed landscape, therefore all alterations to the landscape were carried out by gentlemen.

Due to lack of available maps and plans, the landscapes prior to the Serpentine-style landscape at Forcett (1740s) and the naturalistic landscapes at Marrick Priory and Busby



remain unknown. The remaining had known walled gardens or late-geometric landscapes established by the early eighteenth century. The formal gardens were maintained at Kirkleatham (until the shift in ownership discussed above) and Swinton Park whilst naturalistic designs were added to the wider parklands. Henry Brewster of Aldby Park, although presented with a baroque design by Thomas Knowlton, chose to apply only part of the design creating a simplified-geometric landscape in 1746. The formal terraces and elements of this design near the house were maintained whilst naturalistic designs were added to the wider landscape. Likewise, the serpentine-style landscape established at Forcett during the 1740s was maintained through to the time of the First Edition OS map. This maintenance of earlier designs potentially indicates the desire of these gentlemen owners to emulate trends occurring in the larger landscapes of the North Riding Peers.

Naturalistic landscapes were created at Clifton, Clints (held by Charles Turner of Kirkleatham), Hackness, Kiplin and Newby, all of which replaced the earlier formal gardens which were established near the house. Only the Weddells at Newby retained elements of the earlier formal design within the wider landscape. The improvements at Clifton were later nineteenth-century naturalistic landscapes with pleasure grounds near the house, whilst the rest applied naturalistic designs to their landscapes during the 1760s, 70s and 90s. It is not certain if this pattern indicates that these gentlemen landowners held a greater connection to national trends or if it indicates a disconnection or disassociation with the peers and baronets of the North Riding.

#### *Elevation in status*

Four of the estates- Beningbrough, Duncombe Park and Ebberston Lodge were owned by families whose status changed over the eighteenth century, either through inheritance, marriage, purchase or recognition from the Crown. The changes in status occurred between implementation of design, therefore analysis of these landscapes might further elucidate how attitudes towards design might have changed in conjunction with shifts in status. At Duncombe Park Thomas Duncombe, a gentleman banker from London, built the house and established an early serpentine-style landscape in 1713. During the 1750s his son, another Thomas established the terrace at Rievaulx, continuing the aesthetic of the

design set out by his father. In 1826 the second Thomas' grandson, Charles Duncombe was created 1<sup>st</sup> Baron of Feversham. He added wings to the house, the Helmsley gates and lodges, sunken parterres and a conservatory within grounds, all alterations which blended in with the earlier designs rather than replacements (see Gazetteer).

Beningbrough Hall was built and the formal gardens established by Barrington Bouchier who was fashioned esquire in 1697. The wider landscape was developed into a designed parkland during the mid-to late eighteenth century. The status of esquire was maintained through lineal descent until 1827 when the estate was bequeathed to Rev Hon. William Henry Dawnay the 6<sup>th</sup> Viscount Downe, reportedly a distant relation of the family according to Page (1911). Shortly after inheriting the estate, William Dawnay approached Gilpin to readdress the south parkland, however retaining earlier formal elements near the house and within the wider landscape to the north (GD2059). Like Duncombe, we see a respect for the earlier designed landscape, however we do see with a shift in ownership to an elevated member of the peerage, an 'updating' of the designed landscape to reflect contemporary trends.

The house and water formal water terrace at Ebberston Lodge was developed c. 1713. Unlike the changes in status at Duncombe and Beningbrough which occurred through elevation or inheritance, the change in status at Ebberston occurred first through inheritance then through purchase. The Thompson family utilized Ebberston as a hunting lodge until 1771, when a relation Sir Charles (Holtham) Thompson (Bart) inherited and made the lodge his home. It was mostly likely during this time that the village houses were removed from the main street in order to create a naturalistic landscape to the south, whilst maintaining the water garden to the north (see Gazetteer). In 1814 Ebberston was then sold to Geroge Osbadlston who carried out additional alterations turning the house back into a hunting lodge.

In all three cases, the instances where the house was inherited by a relation or acquired by purchase, a shift in design occurred. For both Beningbrough and Ebberston, where the estates descended through indirect inheritance (tale general) to relations with a higher title



within the peerage, alterations were made, updating the landscapes to contemporary naturalistic styles.

In summation eight of the designed landscapes were created by members of the peerage. Over the long-eighteenth century for all but Danby Castle, choices were made to maintain the earlier formal designs near the house whilst creating naturalist designs within the wider landscapes. The development of these naturalistic elements occurred well within the accepted chronology; however this maintained formalism which diverts from this accepted chronology. As landscapes held by members of the peerage, this pattern of retention would potentially set the bench mark for landscape design trends within the North Riding. There were a total of five landscapes designed and subsequently developed by Baronets. Stanwick Park was the only landscape which was completely maintained throughout. For the rest of the Baronets their landscapes were altered to create naturalistic landscapes by the end of the eighteenth century, indicating a desire to associate with wider national trends in landscape design, rather than the precedence set by the North Riding landscapes designed by members of the Peerage. It must be noted that although the Foulises of Ingleby and the Wyvilles of Constable Burton created naturalistic designed landscapes, elements of the earlier formal designs were retained within the wider design.

A different pattern opposite occurred within the nine designed landscapes created by Esquires. Whilst eight of these Esquires chose to embrace naturalistic designs, six opted to follow the trends established by the Peers within the Riding, and maintained earlier formal designs near the house. Although at Hovingham, the Worsleys created a naturalistic landscape park and gardens, they retained earlier formal elements within the designed. The landscape at Brandsby was not developed until 1798 when a new naturalistic landscape with pleasure grounds developed in the grounds near the house, showing a similar delay in the development of national design trends which Williamson saw in Norfolk (1990).

Within the landscapes designed and developed by gentlemen landowners only the landscape at Forcett Hall was maintained throughout. The rest of the gentlemen

landowners within this group developed naturalistic designs within their landscapes. However, the extent to which these naturalistic designs were applied were split between four landowners who maintained the earlier formal gardens near the house to six landowners who applied naturalistic designs throughout their parks and gardens. While the Vyners applied an overall naturalistic design to their landscape, removing the formal gardens near the house, they retained the earlier formal lime avenue within the parkland to the south-west of the house.

This overall pattern indicates that throughout all of these social levels the landowners developed their parks and gardens utilizing naturalistic designs, in line with national trends. Additionally there was a strong regional trend of maintaining or retaining earlier formal elements within their designed landscapes throughout all levels of social status from Peers down to the gentlemen landowners. Although two of the Baronets retained formal elements within their naturalistic designs, the majority of the landscapes within this social level did not follow the regional trend of maintenance of earlier designs, opting rather to follow national design trends. As landowners who were part of the Peerage, these Baronets were not yet members of an elevated status within the hierarchy. This implementation of wider rather than regional trends could potentially be seen as a physical manifestation of desired elevation through association with wider national trends rather than local, regional, North Riding trends.

Throughout all of these landscapes national trends were implemented well within the chronology, indicating that despite the landowners' place within, and beyond, the hierarchy of Peerage, they had an awareness and association with national trends. As discussed in the previous chapter, the landed status was established by utilizing late-nineteenth century sources, although the limitations of these sources are understood, they are currently the best resource available for such analysis (see above, 18). In most cases there was understandably a great length of time between the implementation of design and the late-nineteenth century survey of lands, however, analysis of landed status and social level within the Peerage for each of these estates and their landowners did not reveal a direct correlation between title and income. Amongst the members of the



Peerage, the owners at Beningbrough, Gilling and Mulgrave, were considered members of the greater gentry in regard to landed status, whilst the owners of Aske, Castle Howard, Danby, Jervaulx and Newburgh were great landowners. Additionally the Baronets, Esquires and Gentlemen landowners were evenly divided amongst the landed status levels of greater gentry and lesser gentry. These variances reflected that regardless of one's holdings and income, whether lost or gained over the long-eighteenth century, did not always constitute entry into, or dismissal from the Peerage. For this reason, analysis of the designed landscapes should not be carried out solely within a context of the Peerage. Whilst it does elucidate some design trends occurring regardless of social level, and it further established a regional precedence for maintained or retained formality, beyond the landscapes of the Baronets, analysis within this context did not completely explain individual motivations in design choices.

#### *Landscapes of Landowners with Local versus National Contexts*

As explored above, whilst there was a strong regional trend to maintain or retain formal elements the thirty-two of the landowners were creating naturalistic landscapes or apply naturalistic designs to their wider landscapes. This maintained formality was evident throughout all of the landscapes held by members of the Peerage, whilst within the landscapes of the Baronets more were choosing to remove the earlier formal gardens in favour of naturalistic landscape designs following closer to wider national trends rather than local, more regional ones. While this option for national design trends also occurred within the landscapes of the Esquires and Gentlemen landowners, there were also more landowners within these two levels who chose to follow more regional trends with the maintenance or retention of formality within their designs.

This retention could be explained by the distance of the North Riding from London and the disconnection of these landowners from this social centre. In order to test this, the social, political and marital networks for each of the landowners over the eighteenth century were recorded and analyzed. Williamson noted that the elite landowners of

Norfolk, whose estates were at least 10,000 acres, were generally well connected with the political and social arenas of London, an aspect of eighteenth-century social life in Norfolk which, in part, explained the earlier adaptation of naturalistic designs within their parks and gardens. Whilst the local gentry, who lived within a more regional network, within close proximity to their estates tended to maintain walled gardens near their house much later (1990, 14-15). In regard to the application of naturalistic landscape designs within the North Riding, sixteen of the landowners carried out their designs before 1780, whilst fifteen created naturalistic landscapes or applied naturalistic designs later. This variance occurred regardless of landed status in regard to lands owned and income generated off those lands or social level within the Peerage indicating the landowners of the North Riding gained national connectivity through networks beyond status and title.

#### *National and Local Connections through Political and Marital networks*

Analysis of the social, political and marital networks for each of these families over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries revealed that twenty-two of these estates were owned by families with connections on a national level both socially and politically, whilst thirteen appeared to have been moving within local Yorkshire context. The estate of Clints passed via purchase through various owners throughout the eighteenth century, some of which had national connections, whilst others were more local. Like the elite in Norfolk, the great landowners and land magnates with North Riding estates over 10,000 acres, were politically active, spent much of the year in London and maintained connections on a national level. Although some of the local gentry in Norfolk had national connections such as Sir Roger Pratt of Ryston and Roger North of Rougham estate (Williamson 1990, 29), the majority of the local gentry maintained more regional political and social networks (1990, 14-15). Unlike the local gentry in Norfolk, a different social pattern occurred with the landowners of the greater gentry and lesser gentry who held less than 10,000 acres of land. Only two landowners -The Hustlers of Acklam and Pulleines of Clifton Castle -



maintained regional social and political networks, whilst the landowners of eleven estates<sup>1</sup> -maintained local social and political networks, they potentially acquired national connections through marriage. For the remaining twelve estates<sup>2</sup> - the landowners had known established national connections.

By the 1730s fifteen out of the twenty-three landowners with national connections, established walled gardens, early-geometric landscapes or at Duncombe Park, serpentine style landscapes, all well within the accepted chronology. Additionally eight of the fourteen local landowners, likewise developed walled gardens or early-geometric landscapes within the accepted chronology.

Within both groups, the same number of landowners created naturalistic landscapes however, more of the landowners who had national connections retained earlier formal elements within the design, whilst the landowners with regional contexts tended to shift their gardens completely towards naturalistic designs. Although more of the local landowners replaced their formal designs with naturalistic landscapes, they generally did so later than those created by landowners with national connections.

Of the twelve naturalistic landscapes created by local landowners, only three were established in the 1770s, whilst the remaining were created after 1790, whilst these landscapes were created later, the designs implemented were more on line with contemporary late-eighteenth century to nineteenth-century landscapes rather than the delayed implementation of earlier naturalistic-‘Brownian’ designs. Although we see a larger incidence of local landowners opting for a naturalistic aesthetic, indicating that these local landowners were following national trends; they, like the local gentry in Norfolk (Williamson 1998) were adding these designs later than those with national

---

<sup>1</sup> Aldby, Arncliffe, Beningbrough, Brandsby, Brough, Forcett, Hackness, Kiplin, Marrick Priory, Marske and Thornton Steward

<sup>2</sup> Busby, Croft/Clervaulx, Constable Burton, Forcett, Gilling, Guisborough, Hovingham, Ingleby, Kirkleatham, Mulgrave, Newby, Sheriff Hutton, Stanwick and Thrope Perrow

connections. This analysis reveals that the landowners functioning within a local or regional context were not only aware of, but in their implementation of contemporary naturalistic designs indicates a greater connectivity to national landscape trends. This is a knowledge and connection which has been presumed to not exist, due to the distance of the North Riding from London (Williamson 1907, Hoskins 1988 and Girouard 1980, Williamson 1998).

As local landowners, they did not necessarily travel to London frequently, however news of trends and fashions would have been acquired via socialization with North Riding landowners who did have the opportunity to travel to London, as well as information disseminated throughout the country via contemporary journals and literature. This experience of trends through secondhand information could account for the delay in implementation. However, it does not explain why more of the landowners functioning within this local regional context chose to completely apply naturalistic designs, whilst the landowners with wider social contexts opted to maintain a more traditional, formal aesthetic. Regardless of this unresolved issue, the fact that both national and local landowners were creating naturalistic landscapes indicates the North Riding was not so remote from London, nor were the landowners disconnected from design trends established elsewhere in the country. It does raise the question of who the local landowners were following. When we look at national and local marital connections made by these landowners there appears to be little effect on the designs chosen or the date of implementation. The only instances where marital connections appear to have had an direct effect of the design were at Arncliffe and Guisborough. The landscape was developed at Arncliffe shortly after a profitable marriage to an heiress brought the family out of financial debt; the design applied was a late example of a late-geometric landscape. In this instance the social influence through marriage was more on the financial ability to create a design, not on the aesthetics utilized. At Guisborough, shortly after Robert Chaloner Esq married the daughter of Lord Dundas of Aske Hall in 1805 the old hall was demolished, a new house was built a half-a-mile to the south-east within a newly established pleasure-ground (see Gazetteer) (Foster 1874).



### *Landscapes of Tory and Whig Landowners*

Another reason for the sustained formality within the designed landscapes of the North Riding has been attributed to a potential traditional nature of these Yorkshire landowners (Aveling 1966). The political stance of these landowners as Tory or Whig would be a good indicator of each individual's stance, however, the political association for each of the landowners involved with the landscape designs remains elusive. Utilizing sources such as *The Lord Lieutenants and their Deputies* (2007) *The Lord Lieutenants and High Sheriffs of Yorkshire 1066-2000* (2000), information was gathered regarding the offices held by the landowners, such as Lord Lieutenant, High Sheriff, local judge and what seats the landowners held in Parliament, if any. Information regarding political affiliations of the landowner is only known for twelve of the thirty-six landscapes, of these, the information is only available for only five of the landowners who were involved with implementing designs. Two of these landowners were Torys, two were Whigs and one shifted from the Whig party to the Tory party during the eighteenth century. For the two landowners who were Tory, one designed a serpentine-style landscape and one created a naturalistic area within a formal landscape. Similarly one of the landscapes of the Whig landowners, the formal design was maintained throughout the eighteenth century, whilst the other landscape was altered from a formal towards a naturalistic design. Although efforts were made to uncover the political affiliation for all of the key landowners, the information gained was very minimal. Additionally with the information gained did not create a convincing link between politics and design within the landscapes of the North Riding as explored by Bending (1999), Jacques (1983), Taigel and Williamson (1993) and Taylor (1983).

### *Landscapes of Catholic and Protestant Landowners*

Another potential influence on the choice between formal (traditional) and naturalistic designs would be the religious affiliation of these landowners. As a county known for its large population of Catholics in the eighteenth century (Aveling 1966), the analysis of each landowner's religious affiliation could potentially explain cultural conservatism.

According to Aveling, the number of Catholic Recusants within the Riding rose from 2,200 in 1702 to 2,620 in 1767; whilst the overall number of Catholic gentry families within the Riding dropped from 120 in the 1620s, to 109 in 1642, to 60 in 1702 and down to 25-27 in 1770-80 (Aveling 1966, 196). Of the families included within this analysis, thirteen were Catholic at the start of the seventeenth century. Six of which conformed to Protestantism by the beginning of the eighteenth century whilst six maintained their Catholic faith through to the end of the nineteenth century. The religious affiliation for the family at Kiplin shifted from Catholic to Protestant through purchase. Although the family at Newburgh Priory remained Catholic, the heads-of-household shifted between Protestantism and Catholicism throughout (see chart 3.3-2).

In the years following the 1606 Parliamentary Oath of Allegiance, several of the North Riding Catholic gentry converted to the Protestant faith including the Howard family of Castle Howard who had Catholic family members in the early seventeenth-century (Peacock 1872 edition). The D'Arcys of Aske Hall and Hornby Castle, the Metcalfs of Aldburgh, the Danbys of Swinton Castle, and the Wyvilles of Constable Burton, all of which were located in the Dales Fringe and the Chaytors of Croft within the Tees Lowlands (Peacock 1872 edition) converted to the Protestant faith by the end of the seventeenth century (Aveling 1966 and 1970). While The Wyvilles at Constable Burton, headed by Rev Christopher Wyville, who led the Reform movement in the Riding, actually banned their Catholic Relations from the house (Aveling 1966, 354), the remaining families who converted to the Protestant faith maintained ties and close links to relations and associates who remained faithful Catholics (Aveling 1966 and 1970).

Some of the estates of Catholics and later Recusants were confiscated and given over to possession of Protestant families as at Norton Conyers which was held by the Norton family since the eleventh century. As 'staunch Catholics', their properties were confiscated in 1569 and granted to Sir Thomas Musgrave whose descendants later sold the estate to Richard Graham, Baronet (Oliver and Boyd 1957, pg 68, Page 1923, Wood 1957, Peacock 1872,). Hovingham Hall, held by the Worsley family, who were declared Protestants as early as the mid-sixteenth century however Thomas Worsley, a practicing



Catholic, had his land seized between 1598 to 1612 (Aveling 1966, p211). After converting to the Protestant faith, these lands were restored to the family. Other Catholics under pressure to convert had to resort to selling their estates to Protestant families, as at Carlton Hall in the Tees Lowlands. This estate was held by the Catterick family since 1564, however, their 'family's long agony of decline ended in 1680 when a Catholic heiress sold Carlton' (Aveling 1966, 353). Kiplin Hall owned by the Calvert family was sold to a Protestant landowner, however this was not under duress, rather Charles Calvert, the 5<sup>th</sup> Baron, sold the estate to his mother's second husband Christopher Crowe in 1722 (Page 1914, Aveling 1966 and 1970, Webster 2005, Kiplin Hall Archive).

Not all of the Catholic families converted their faith, nor were their lands seized by the King nor did their families under pressure, lose power wealth and the ability to maintain their estates. Five estates within the North Riding remained faithful to their faith, maintained their estates and some like the Fairfax family at Gilling Castle the Belayse family at Newburgh Priory, both located within the Howardian Hills and the Lawsons of Brough, located in the Vale of Mowbray increased their status and wealth throughout the long-eighteenth century. On the other hand, the Chomleys of Brandsby (Howardian Hills), the Scropes of Thornton Steward in the Dales Fringe and the Stapletons of Bedale Hall and Clints in the Dales Fringe and Dales did not increase their wealth or their status, they maintained their property and carried out improvements to their house and grounds over the eighteenth century.

Although the six families which remained Catholic sometimes married into other Catholic families of the North Riding, they were not overly connected to each other through this context. Connections were made between the Scropes of Thornton Steward and the Smithsons of Stanwick. Members of the Lawson family of Brough married to the Howards of Castle Howard in the early seventeenth century and later the Cholmleys of Brandsby during the nineteenth century. Likewise marriages occurred between members of the Belayse family of Newburgh and the Fairfax family of Gilling, however, for both families, the majority of marital connections were made with other Catholic families outside of the North Riding. It is important to note, not all of these landowners married with other

Catholic families, in the case of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Baron Fauconberg at Newburgh his second wife was the daughter of Oliver Cromwell and the Chaloners of Guisborough married into the local Protestant families of Aske and Ingleby Manor.

Although the Fairfax family of Gilling and the Belayse family of Newburgh were considered 'bastions of Catholic influence in the country,' (Aveling 1966, 357) they were very different in consideration of their conservative stance. The Belayse family, loyal to their faith, maintained stability of their house and holdings by being more liberal with the religious stance of their heads of house, allowing them to shift from Catholic to Protestant as needed. In two instances with Sir Thomas Belayse (Bart), head of house from 1621-1641, who converted outwardly to Protestantism, and his grandson, Sir Thomas Belayse, inherited in 1652, although raised Catholic, was likewise outwardly Protestant; both gentlemen were elevated in status, raising their title from Baronet to that of Baron Fauconberg in 1627, Viscount Fauconberg in 1643 and Earl of Fauconberg in 1689. Although these two gentlemen converted to Protestantism, the rest of the family remained Catholic and just prior to death, both of these gentlemen converted back to the Catholic faith (Aveling 1966). The Fairfaxes, like other Catholics in the North Riding including the Lawsons of Brough, the Cholmleys of Brandsby and the Scropes of Thornton Steward both conservative and loyal to their Catholic faith. While their strong associations to the Catholic faith can be seen in the building of permanent chapels within their houses at Brough, Brandsby and Thornton Steward after 1742, the conservative stance of these Catholic landowners on this level of analysis did not appear to translate into their designed landscapes.

The late-geometric landscape at Gilling, established by 1715 and the seventeenth-century walled gardens at Brough and Thornton Steward were maintained through out the eighteenth century, even after the landowners, albeit a little later during the accepted chronology, added either naturalistic or gardenesque elements to their landscapes. The Lawsons at Brough replaced their walled garden with a naturalistic landscape during the 1770s while the Scropes of Thornton Steward and the Fairfaxes of Gilling maintained their earlier formal designs but added naturalistic elements within the wider landscape. The



Cholmleys of Brandsby created a natural landscape with pleasure-grounds near the house between 1798 and 1854. For the two 'liberal' families - Belayses of Newburgh and the Chaloners of Guisborough - maintained late-geometric landscapes throughout the long-eighteenth century and adding additional formal elements to the design as late as the 1770s. During the 1840s both families applied naturalistic elements within their landscapes, yet continued to maintain their earlier formal designs.

Likewise the aesthetics within the landscapes of the families which shifted from Catholicism to Protestantism by the early-eighteenth century were quite varied: One was created as a serpentine-style landscape, four shifted from formal to naturalistic landscapes, two created naturalistic landscapes during the later part of the century, but retained earlier formal elements within the design whilst three of these landowners maintained earlier formal designs near the house whilst adding naturalistic designs to the wider landscape. In all of these cases these alterations were carried out by later Protestant members of the family. It would be tempting to show this overall shift from formality as an indication of the liberalism of Protestants versus the traditionalism of Catholics, however, similar shifts occurred within the landscapes of traditionally conservative Catholics. In regard to the conservative stance of the landowners influencing design choices the above general analysis of the overall aesthetic within the designed landscapes of Catholics versus Protestants did not show an overall association between formal and Catholic versus Protestant and naturalistic as expected.

#### *Universities and Inns of Court and London Gentlemen's Clubs*

Analysis of Landowners attendance of university or at the Inns of Court showed very few attended at the same time, suggesting that these institutions were not venues for associations between patrons to be made. However, analysis of the dates of membership and interconnection between members within the London based Gentlemen's Clubs proved to be quite informative. Although attempts were made to gain access in regard to the memberships of various London Clubs, however the only clubs with available list of

members were White's, established in 1693, and Brooks's, formed in 1767 by members of Whites. Both started as social rather than political clubs, Whites and Brooks's both became associated with the Whig party, however, membership within either club did not mean a gentleman was necessarily a Whig. Although membership did not give indication of political affiliation of the members, the very nature of receiving membership tells us a great deal about the economic and social status and connectivity of the members. The gentlemen admitted to White's and Brooks's were the heirs and younger sons of prominent landowners or people deemed worthy of their society as interesting and entertaining gentlemen (Lejune 1993, Williamson and Bellamy 1907, Colson 1951). Both were well known for gambling and Brooks's eventually instituted rules requiring all members to maintain a certain level of bids in order to maintain membership (Lejeune 1993, Williamson and Bellamy 1907).

Fifty-five landowners associated with eighteen of the thirty-six North Riding estates maintained memberships at either one or both of these Clubs. Their attendance overlapped and in several cases their admittance was due to proposals and the support of other landowners within the North Riding and Yorkshire. According to Williamson and Bellamy the rules of admission were 'evidently inspired by the caution of social... prudence' (1907). In order for a gentleman to be admitted into Brooks's he need to have a proposal from a current member and he had to have a seconder. Traditionally the ballot took place between 11:00 and 1:00am, and a candidate could be excluded from membership with a single black ball in the vote. Lists for new members averaged about 12 a year (Lejune 1993). Looking at the relationship between the candidate, the proposing member and the seconder not only elucidated some interesting networks throughout the Riding, but revealed a bit on the nature of the individuals promoting new members. Several members of the Dundas family of Aske and the Howards of Castle Howard were members of Whites and Brooks's. Over the long eighteenth century, the Dundases proposed fourteen North Riding landowners for membership whilst the Howards promoted each other, one distant relation and Percy Shelley, a friend of Lord Byron, another relation (Lejune 1993, Williamson and Bellamy 1907, Oxford University Press 2006).



Fourteen club members were involved with the creation or alteration of their designed landscapes in Yorkshire. For thirteen they were the first members of their family to be accepted into the club through nomination and were the landowners who instituted major designs within the designed landscapes. James Hugh Smithson for example created a serpentine-style landscape at Stanwick in the 1740s and whilst the 3<sup>rd</sup> Viscount Downe maintained the hunting aesthetic at Danby Castle he completely redesigned the parkland at the family seat of Cowick in the West Riding in the national style. Although Sir Charles Duncombe (Bart), the first member of the Duncombe family to join Whites in 1812 did not make any alterations to the landscape at Duncombe Park, his son, Sir William, also a member of Whites, was the first Duncombe to apply gardenesque designs within the terraces and pleasure-grounds near the house, since their inception in 1713. The remaining ten landowners were all the first of their family to join either White's or Brooks's and they were also responsible for redesigning the landscapes of Yorkshire in the new national styles.

In the case of Clints Hall, it was through Whites and Brooks's that we get a better understanding of how the property passed hands. According to the VCH in the late seventeenth century Clints was held by Charles Bathurst, in 1761 the estate was purchased by Sir Charles Turner of Kirkleatham. After spending great expense updating the house (building works carried out by John Carr), naturalizing the landscape, building a new stable and establishing the estate as racing stables, he sold Clints to Viscount Downe of Danby Castle in 1767. In 1768 it was purchased by Miles Stapleton of Bedale, who in 1800 sold it to Thomas Errington of London, who made Clints his home. Eventually the estate was purchased by Timothy Hutton of the neighboring estate of Marske for £12,250 in 1842 (Page 1912). Timothy Hutton demolished the house and amalgamated the lands of Clints into Marske and utilized the estate as a stud. When we analyze the five landowners who bought and sold the estate over the latter half of the eighteenth century, we see that Charles Turner, Viscount Downe, Miles Stapleton, Thomas Errington were all members of Whites. It is possible that Charles Bathurst was a member as well, as the roster lists a 'Mr Bathurst', but it is not certain that it is the same gentleman (Williamson 1907). The fact that all of these gentlemen were members of Whites brings to light a couple of possible

narratives for the transfer of ownership. It is very possible that these gentlemen simply utilized Whites as a venue to conduct business, however, as property was often used as collateral for gambling, it is also possible that the estate was passed from hand to hand over a game of cards. Future investigation into the club rate books could potentially help elucidate this history.

As highlighted above, there was strong correlation between membership in these clubs and the redesigning landscapes of Yorkshire in new national styles. This is an social aspect of the life of eighteenth-century landowners which could use more research. The rosters of members and records of games and stakes for Gentlemen's Clubs such as Whites and Brooks's are, to date, an underutilized resource in elucidating the associations between social spheres and landscape design trends. Through gambling records, we are afforded a glimpse of the ways in which ideas about landscape design were transferred, and we are able to discern the attitudes of individuals about their country estates.

### 3.3 CONCLUSION

The analysis of landscapes implemented by members of the Peerage, Baronets, Esquires and Gentlemen landowners revealed that all of the peers created and maintained their formal landscapes. This retention of formal aesthetics was evident within all of the status levels, however it did not reveal a traditionally accepted chronology implementation with the Peers establishing their formal landscapes first followed by the Baronets, etc.... Analysis of the implementation of naturalistic landscapes indicated that throughout all levels of status, naturalistic designs were applied, with the highest percentage occurring within the landscapes of the Peers and Gentlemen landowners. Regarding date of implementation the Esquires were the only status which had a delay in applying naturalistic designs within their landscapes. Whilst the Peers retained earlier formal elements within their later naturalistic designs, a majority of the Baronets, half of the Esquire and Gentlemen landowners tended to completely remove earlier formal designs when establishing their later landscapes.



Analysis of the traditional stance of these landowners through religious association did not reveal a consistent pattern. Landowners with Catholic beliefs did not always maintain traditional formal aesthetics within their designed landscapes. In general this maintenance or retention of formal designs over the eighteenth century was a strong trend throughout the landscapes of the North Riding, regardless of local or national connections, the status of the landowner, their political or religious affiliations. The only context in which some insight was gained was in the analysis of London social clubs evident in the strong correlation between membership in Gentlemen's Clubs such as Whites and Brooks's and the implementation of new national styles within the designed landscapes of Yorkshire.

Despite the lack of answers regarding a trend of maintained formalism within the designed landscapes of the North Riding, the above analysis has conclusively indicated that the North Riding landowners were not disconnected, nor were they unaware of national landscape trends. When analyzing the scope of these landowners' social and political contexts interesting patterns were revealed indicating that more of local landowners were favouring purely naturalistic designed landscapes over formal designs, opposed to the landowners functioning within national social and political contexts. Although they implemented these national trends, as expected, the naturalistic landscapes of the 'local' landowners were established later than naturalistic designs implemented by nationally functioning landowners.

Since this trend of maintained and retained formalism, has not been explained by either the socio-economic analysis or the socio-political analysis discussed above, the following chapter will explore potential geographical and topographical influences on aesthetic choices made within the designed landscapes of the North Riding. We will look first at a general distribution of the all 126 landscapes throughout the Riding, followed by distribution patterns of design based upon date of implementation. For the thirty-six landscapes with time-depth, additional distributions of landscapes based upon the social networks will be plotted looking for regional patterns followed by a chronological analysis of design implementation within these social contexts. The chapter will conclude with an

analysis of all 126 landscapes in regard to regional trends including the analysis and study of geographical and topographical influences throughout the Riding.



## GEOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT

## 4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter analyzed the influence of social, political and economic factors on the aesthetic choices made by the landowners of the North Riding with regard to their designed landscapes. Although this analysis revealed a shift towards naturalistic designs within the landscape parks and gardens of the region, it also revealed a strong regional trend of retaining established designs throughout the long-eighteenth century. Although some light was shed on the reasons and motivations behind those trends, they could not be explained by pure social, political or economic factors. To further elucidate these trends, the following chapter will analyze the varied geographical regions of the Riding, the influence of the social networks dictated by this regionality, and the influence of the physical topography on the aesthetic choices made by the landowners of the North Riding.

The historic region of Yorkshire known as the North Riding was bound by Cumbria to the west, the North Sea to the east and is divided from County Durham to the north by the River Tees, and from the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire by the River Ouse in the south (Plate 169). These political boundaries of the Riding, established in the ninth century along geographical lines had changed very little up to the recent restructuring of the county in 1974 (Hinson 2009, Ormond 2000, Yorkshire Ridings Society 2009). Within these boundaries the natural topography is quite varied, creating distinctive geographical regions which influenced regional land-use, settlement patterns and vernacular building trends (Hey 2005, Marshall 1796, Natural England 2009, Tuke 1800). As elsewhere within the country, historically there was a strong localized association with place, throughout the North Riding: ‘...people felt that they belonged to their parish and to a wider neighbourhood that was bounded by the nearest market towns and which they called their ‘country’, a term that survived well into the twentieth century’ (Hey 2005, 2). In order to test if this regional affiliation with ‘country’ was reflected within the houses and

designed landscapes of the landed-gentry, the landscape parks and gardens will be analyzed within a geographical distribution based upon these varying regions.

## 4.2 TOPOGRAPHY OF THE NORTH RIDING

The precedence for dividing the Riding into topographical and geographical regions was established in 1782 with Marshall's survey of Yorkshire for *Rural Economy of Yorkshire* (1796). During this survey he divided the North Riding into five regions- 'Cleveland', 'Eastern Morelands', 'Western Morelands', the 'Vale of Pickering' and the 'Vale of York' (Plate 171). He noted 'a range of hills which rise at Malton, and fill up the space between the wolds and the heights of Hambledon, which at present are without a name, but I shall term them the Howardian Hills (1796, 14)'. Marshall's regions reflected the topography of the Riding, but the divisions between these regions were not delineated clearly, preventing accurate distributions of the designed landscape parks and gardens within their appropriate regions. Shortly after, in 1793, John Tuke carried out a survey for *The General View of the Agriculture of the North Riding* (1800) and likewise divided the Riding into regions. These regions did not conform exactly to the natural topographical features within the Riding. His regions included- 'The Coast', 'Cleveland', 'The Vale of York with Howardian Hills', 'Ryedale with East and West Marishes', 'Eastern Moorlands' and the 'Western Moorlands' and often included both upland and lowland regions. The mixed context within his regions would make it impossible to carry out a proper analysis of the designed landscapes within an accurate geographical and topographical context. In addition ambiguity of the boundaries for each region makes it impossible to carry out a systematical analysis.

During their National Mapping Project of England carried out in 2009 the Countryside Commission divided the Riding into nine distinctive Character Areas. Like Marshall's regions of the county, the Countryside Commission adhered to the natural topography of the Riding creating three upland regions of the 'Yorkshire Dales', 'North York Moors and Cleveland Hills' and Marshall's defined region of the 'Howardian Hills'; four lowland



regions of the 'Tees Lowlands', 'Vale of Mowbray', 'Vale of Pickering' and 'Vale of York' and two transitional Character Areas of the 'South Magnesian Limestone' and the 'Dales Fringe' (Plate 172). The following section will be utilizing these nine Character Areas as a framework upon which to analyze the designed landscapes within their geographical and topographical contexts. Whilst Natural England's Character Areas conform closer to Marshall's regions rather than Tuke's, Natural England divides Marshall's regions into additional upland, lowland and includes transitional regions by strictly adhering to geological features throughout the Riding. This further division allows for regional analysis of the designed landscape parks and gardens to occur within a higher resolution than would be achieved with the regions designated by Marshall.

### *Natural England's Character Areas of the North Riding*

In the north-east corner of the North Riding is the region defined by the Countryside Commission as the 'Tees Lowlands'. It is a broad open lowland bound by the North Sea to the east, the 'Pennine Dales Fringe' to the west, and the River Tees and the 'Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau' to the north. In the south-west, it blends with the 'Vale of Mowbray,' and it is bounded directly to the south by the ridge of the Cleveland Hills. This ridge rises 360 metres above sea-level to the upland plateau of the 'North York Moors and Cleveland Hills' and merges with the Hambleton Hills, which drop 250 metres to the 'Vales of Mowbray and York' lying to the west (Natural England 2009). To the east of this region are the 'Howardian Hills', a diverse landscape of rolling hills, valleys, open plateaux and ridges offering views out over the 'Vale of Pickering' to the east and the 'Vale of York' to the west (Natural England 2009). A cut in the landscape known as the Coxwold-Gilling Gap divides the 'Howardian Hills' from the Hambleton Hills to the north. The 'Vale of Pickering' located in the south-east region of the Riding. It is a broad low-lying valley oriented from east to west which is bound by the scarp of the 'Yorkshire Wolds' to the south, the 'Howardian Hills' to the west and the Tabular Hills of the 'North York Moors' to the north.

From the 'Howardian Hills' the landscape of the North Riding drops down to the 'Vale of York', a wide open valley lying to the west. The western edge of the vale is bound by the ridges of the 'South Magnesian Limestone'. It is situated between the 'Vale of Mowbray' to the north and the 'Humberhead Levels' to the south. The majority of the vale is included within the boundaries of the North Riding, with a small portion lying south of the city of York. The 'Vale of Mowbray' lies along the north-eastern edge of the 'Pennine Dales Fringe' and is bounded to the north-east by the 'Tees Lowlands' the south-east by the 'North York Moors' and the west by the 'Dales Fringe'. Although an open low-lying valley, the Vale of Mowbray has varied landscape character with views out over the neighbouring up-lands (2009). To the west of this lowland region lies the northern tip of the 'South Magnesian Limestone', a geological feature which runs from Bedale at its most northern point, down to the village of Hucknall in Nottinghamshire. This area consists of a narrow ridge between the low lying 'Vale of York' to the east and the rising topography of the 'Pennine Dales Fringe' to the west and is cut by dry valleys, river valleys and gorges (Natural England 2009).

Further to the west is the 'Pennine Dales Fringe,' a transitional landscape between the upland landscape of the 'Yorkshire Dales' to the west and the low elevations of the South Magnesian Limestone region and the Vales of York and Mowbray to the east. Like the 'South Magnesian Limestone', the 'Pennine Dales Fringe' is a long narrow zone which stretches from Barnard Castle in County Durham in the north to the River Wharfe located in the West Riding of Yorkshire. The natural landscape within this region is again, quite diverse including wide valleys dedicated to arable crops and smaller, steeper tributary valleys with pasture, grassland and tree lined streams with open plateaux between the valleys and the hills (Natural England 2009).

The western most area of the Riding consists of the 'Yorkshire Dales', an upland landscape comprised of part of the north-south running Pennine hills which divide Northern England from east to west. The 'Yorkshire Dales' are divided from the 'North Pennines', in County Durham, by the Stainmore Trough fault, and from the 'Southern Pennines,' in the West Riding, by the Craven fault. The landscape to the south-west dips



down to the plains of Lancashire, while the north-western edge of the Dales is bounded by the Lake District (Natural England 2009). This region contains lower elevations within the vales and dales which are set against the dramatic elevations of the moor tops which rise up to 1,900 feet within the western areas of this region.

It is within these varied topographical regions that the 126 designed landscapes included within this research were situated. This topographical variety provided a range of contexts, which not only influenced settlement land use and potentially influenced designs of the landscape parks and gardens which could not be explained purely by social, economical or political contexts explored above. The following analysis will first look at the distribution of the designed landscape parks and gardens throughout the Riding, focusing in particular on any distribution patterns occurring within landed status, social networks and/or design aesthetics. With the 36 landscapes where time-depth allows, a further analysis of the distribution of the designed landscapes based upon the dates of implementation and evolution of the designed landscapes will be explored. All 126 landscapes will then be analyzed within regional clusters based upon the nine Character Areas listed above, in order to further elucidate more localized trends based upon the topographical contexts of the estates. Although the main focus of this analysis will be on the 36 landscapes with time-depth, it will also include an analysis of the 81 landscapes for which we do not have time-depth beyond the First Edition OS map.

### **4.3 DISTRIBUTION THROUGH THE NORTH RIDING**

Before we can analyze any trends associated with topographical and geographical contexts, it is important to first look at the distribution of the designed landscapes throughout the Riding. The following section will not only discuss the general distribution of the 126 designed landscape parks and gardens, it will also discuss a deeper analysis of distribution patterns in regard to the status of the landowner, overall size of the designed landscape, and the style of design evident on the First Edition OS map. For the

36 landscapes with time-depth, it will be possible to plot the development of the landscapes over time by the dates of design implementation for both formal and naturalistic elements. In addition, it will then be possible to analyze the overall distribution of landowners who maintained or retained earlier design aesthetics throughout the long-eighteenth century, versus those which shifted their formal landscapes towards a more naturalistic style. This analysis will not only help to elucidate any design trends occurring within the region, it can potentially track how these trends spread through the Riding.

A general distribution of the 126 designed landscapes throughout the North Riding (Plate 175) reveals that the majority of the landscapes lie in the north-western and south-eastern regions of the Riding. This distribution reveals a wide diagonal strip of estates which runs across the Riding from Malton and York in the south-east to just beyond Richmond to the north-west. A small trail of landscapes continues further west from Bedale, while in the south-east of the Riding a narrow strip of estates runs between Pickering and Scarborough located on the coast. A linear group of estates is distributed across the northern part of the Riding from Whitby on the North Sea to Richmond in the north-west, whilst a final group of landscapes is clustered around the town of Guisborough. There is a noticeable lack of designed landscapes located in the region between Whitby, Scarborough, Northallerton and Pickering, as well as the area to the west of Bedale and north-west of Richmond.

Above is a general distribution of the designed landscapes as they sit on a two-dimensional map of the riding. Even though some interesting patterns occur at this resolution, these patterns can only be thoroughly explained when their distribution is applied to a topographical map of the North Riding. Elevations in the Riding range from 0- 200 feet above sea level in the lowland regions of the central plains, the Tees Lowlands and the Vale of Pickering, to the higher elevations of the Western Dales, reaching a height of 2,585 feet at Mickle Fell and Roseberry Topping at 1,049 within the North York Moors. The elevations of the Hambleton Hills, lying along the western fringe of the Moors plateau, range between 575 feet and 830 feet, while the highest elevation in the Howardian Hills reaches 558 feet. When the designed landscapes are plotted within this



topographical and geographical context, the general distribution points discussed above can be clarified (Plate 176).

Firstly, one will note the wide strip of landscapes, mentioned above, distributed diagonally across the Riding, falls within the Howardian Hills and covers the majority of the Vales of Mowbray and the Vale of York. The landscapes are situated along the rivers located within the Vales, including the Swale; the Wiske, the upper stretches of the Ure as it leaves the Dales and heads south-east through the Vale of York; along the River Ouse on the south-western boundary of the Riding; and along the River Derwent, situated near the south-eastern edge of the Vale of York.

The linear series of estates stretching from Whitby to Richmond follows the courses of the River Eske flowing from Westerdale Moor down to Whitby; the River Leven which descends the escarpment of the Cleveland Hills down to the River Tees; and along the River Wiske as it flows from the Hills westward into the middle reaches of the Vale of Mowbray. The strip of landscapes from Scarborough to the north of Malton follows the modern road A170 which runs along the base of the North York Moors. This road was established along the route of an earlier Roman road connecting the settlements established on the higher lands above Lake Pickering (Natural England 2009, 45). This topographical distribution reveals that the majority of the designed landscapes within the Riding were situated along major water courses or transportation routes. A total of 75 out of the 126 estates were situated along water courses, fifty-six of which are along the major rivers of the Derwent (4), Esk (2), Ouse (4), Rye (5), Swale (10), Tees (8) Ure (15) and Wiske (5), whilst twenty-two were along smaller rivers, tributaries or becks.

Fifty-five of these designed landscapes incorporated the rivers, becks and tributaries into the design. At Aldby, Constable Burton, Newby, and Sion Hill, terraces stepped down from the house to the rivers below, whilst becks were dammed to create ponds within the parklands, such as those at Brough, Hornby, Kiplin and Swinton. Some of the landowners, such as the Earl of Zetland at Aske, Earl of Aislabye of Kirkby Fleetham, Sir William Foulis of Ingleby and Timothy Hutton at Marske added cascades and pleasure grounds were added along the banks of becks. Some landowners utilized the waterways

within the distant views, like the Ure at Aldburgh and Clifton Castle, whilst other landowners established their houses and gardens along the banks., as at Nunnington and Baldersby. In addition to waterways, a few landowners utilized views of the North Sea within their designs. At Marske by the Sea and Mulgrave Castle views of the sea are afforded from the house whilst at Kirkleatham views of the sea were achieved from the Gothic Eye-catcher located on higher elevations within the park. For twenty landowners views of these waterways were not included within their designs. Unlike the pleasure-ground established at Aske, Ingleby, Kirkby Fleetham and Marske, these landowners tended to establish plantations in order to obstruct views of the waterways beyond. This mixed approach might have been influenced by issues of varied use and condition of the rivers, varied natural aesthetic and flood patterns for the different rivers. Research of these variances has potential for further research.

Following historic settlement patterns throughout the Riding, there were no designed landscapes upon the fell tops of the dales and the moors which were utilized for summer grazing and grouse shooting (Page 1923). Instead the pasture-lands of the slopes, the fertile river valleys within both these regions were dotted with designed landscapes. In the Yorkshire Dales an especially large number fell within the wide-valley base of Wensleydale. Likewise, the designed landscapes of the Howardian Hills were situated within and along the slopes of the fertile upland valleys, along the ridge dropping down into the Vale of York to the west, and along the north-facing escarpment running along the Coxwold-Gilling Gap. Whilst three landscapes were situated within fairly level ground near the rivers, the majority of the landscapes were situated upon rising or transitional topography. Six designed landscapes were all situated along ridgelines of mid-to-high grounds throughout the Riding, whilst the remaining designed landscapes within the Riding fall at the base of escarpments, along gentle slopes, within valley bases or on gently rolling landscapes. In general the majority of the landscapes were situated within, and along areas which could be classified as 'fringe' regions of the varying Character Areas.

Looking at the geographical distribution of estates based upon landed status, the designed landscapes of Duncombe Park, held by a landed magnate, were found along an upland



ridge. The landscapes of the great landowners at Aske Hall, Bolton Hall, Castle Howard, Danby Castle, Jervaulx Abbey and Swinton Park were situated within upland valleys around sites of medieval planned towns and castles. The thirty designed landscapes of the greater gentry were located amongst the lowlands of the Riding and the fringe areas between the lowland valleys and the upland regions. A total of thirteen landscapes of the greater gentry (Bedale Hall, Beningbrough Hall, Hutton Bonville, Kiplin Hall, Kirkleatham, Kirklington, Langton Hall, Myton Hall, Newby Hall, Newby Wiske, Sand Hutton, Sutton Manor, and Wycliffe) fell within the low-lands of the Vales of York, Mowbray and the transitional region of the South Magnesian Limestone. While Guisborough Hall, Ingleby Manor, Kirkleatham Hall and Wilton Castle were situated in the lowlands nestled at the base of the Cleveland Hills. The remainder of the estates of the greater gentry were located within the higher grounds throughout the riding. Even though the designed landscapes of the lesser gentry and the secondary estates of landowners of North Riding also exist within the fringe and upland regions of the Riding, these two levels of landed status hold the majority of the designed landscapes situated within the middle reaches of the Vales of York and Mowbray.

Analysis of how the designed landscapes were distributed throughout these varied elevations reveals that over half were situated below 400 feet in elevation, including the open lowlands, along the base of rising grounds, and within valley bottoms. Half of the larger designed landscape parks and gardens (over 2000 acres in size) fell within these lowlands as well, including Beningbrough (2,214 acres) and Kirkleatham (9,856 acres), which lie within flat terrain, Thorpe Perrow at 2,640 acres and Newburgh with 3,512 acres lie at the base of rising ground, and Castle Howard, the largest designed landscape of the Riding over 10,300 acres lies within rolling landscape situated within an up-land valley. The five remaining designed landscapes over 2,000 acres fell within slightly higher - grounds, however, they did not exceed elevations over 250 metres.

In general, the distributions of landscapes by status, landscape size, and elevation all indicate that the majority of the designed landscapes fell within the rural lowland regions of the Riding. As these were typically the regions within the Riding which were the most

agriculturally productive, it suggests that these landowners were willing to sacrifice large portions of valuable farmland in order to create their designed landscapes. The following sections will look more closely at the land-use within these regions, and how the landscapes were distributed through starting with analysis of the 36 landscapes with greater time-depth.

### *Estates with Time-Depth*

The discussion above gave a general description of the distribution of the 126 landscapes throughout the Riding, looking at patterns along geographical features, and the general situation of the parks and gardens based upon status of the landowner and size of the designed landscape. However, for 36 estates there is more information regarding the history of the owners, their houses and the development of their designed landscape parks and gardens. Although this will only represent a small portion of the designed landscapes in the North Riding, this information will allow a more thorough analysis of any patterns of geographical distribution influence by socio-political aspects of the landowner, aesthetic choices, and the patterns of the design choices as they spread throughout the Riding.

The general distribution of the 36 landscapes, reveals that the majority, (19) were located on higher grounds and upland regions within the Riding. The remaining fifteen are located within the lower lands, including Acklam Hall, Arnecliffe, Busby, Croft/Clervaulx, Ingleby, Forcett, Kirkleatham and Stanwick within the Tees Lowlands; Kiplin in the Vale of Mowbray; Ebberston in the Vale of Pickering; Thorpe Perrow and Newby Hall in the South Magnesian Limestone; and Aldby, Beningbrough and Sheriff Hutton in the Vale of York. Of these fifteen, Acklam, Beningbrough, Croft/Clervaulx, Kiplin and Newby were within gently undulating grounds, whilst Kirkleatham is situated within level grounds with views of gently rising grounds in the distance. The remaining designed landscapes within the lowlands were situated within close proximity to, or along the base of, the upland regions. It must be noted that although the majority of the landscapes were distributed within the wide strip which cuts across the central plain (see above), the general lack of information and cartographic evidence available for these



landscapes skews the following distribution of the socio-political context to higher ground and upland regions.

#### *Distribution of Aesthetic Choices throughout the Riding*

Although a general distribution of the designed landscape parks and gardens based upon either formal or naturalistic designs does not reveal any regional trends in regard to aesthetic choices, the distribution based on the dates and styles of designs starts to elucidate some interesting patterns. There were a total of twenty-five country houses with walled gardens by the 1720s<sup>3</sup>. It is important to note that for ten of these landscapes the only source was Buck's sketches from c. 1719, thus, it is quite possible that many of these walled gardens were established before the start of the century. By 1707, Knyff and Kip illustrated six Late-Geometric styled gardens around the houses of Acklam, Constable Burton, Guisborough, Ingleby, Kirkleatham and Newby. By 1700, a late-geometric garden was established at Hovingham (Worsley 2004), and terraced gardens at Danby Castle. At Castle Howard, although the development of the designed landscape continued through to the 1730s, implementation of the design started in 1700 (GD2061; Saumarez-Smith 1990). Castle Howard, the Riding's first designed landscape park and garden designed on a grand scale, and constitutes what Williamson classifies as simplified or stark geometry, which did not come into fashion until the 1730s-40s (Williamson 1995). There were formal parks and gardens established at both Swinton (1706) and Gilling (1715), a water garden established at Ebberston (1713), and a very early serpentine-style landscape at Duncombe Park from (1713-1722) (GD2066, GD2064, GD2063, GD2076). By 1720 there were thirty-two designs established which could be classified as 'formal' within the North Riding, including thirteen designed landscape parks and gardens, twenty walled gardens, and one

---

<sup>3</sup> Newburgh (1615), Sheriff Hutton (1620), Jervaulx (by 1627), Kirkleatham (1669), Acklam (1680s), Hovingham (1684), Swinton (by 1689), Thornton Steward (1692), Castle Howard (by 1694), Ebberston and Hackness (17<sup>th</sup> century), Danby Castle (1700), Croft (by 1713), Beningbrough (1716), and represented in Buck's Sketches (1719) Aldby, Arncliffe, Aske, Bolton, Brough, Busby, Clints, Marske, Stanwick and Thorpe Perrow.

terraced garden, leaving the four country houses of Brandsby, Forcett and Marrick Priory without any known walled or geometric gardens. However, just because there currently are not any known maps, illustrations or records detailing landscapes for these four country houses, it does not mean that designs did not exist.

Analyzing the general distribution of the late-geometric gardens established by the 1720s situates all of these gardens within three clusters. The first group comprising of Acklam, Guisborough, Ingleby and Kirkleatham, all of which were illustrated by Knyff and Kip, and were located in the northern Cleveland Plain, within a five mile radius of Guisborough. Castle Howard, Ebberston and Hovingham were situated in the south-east, all within thirteen miles of Malton in or near the and Constable Burton, Newby and Swinton Park were in the transitional topography located west of the Vale of York. Since we do not have the exact dates of design for the six landscapes represented in 1707 by Knyff and Kip, it is difficult to state where the exact starting point for these late-geometric landscapes was within the Riding but it does give indication that there were some regional trends occurring within the designed landscapes of the Riding. By 1730, three additional late-geometric landscapes were established at Newburgh (1722), Bolton (1723) and Aske (1727), shifting the implementation of formal parks and gardens over to the north-western region by Richmond. During the 1730s, another late-geometric landscape was established at Mulgrave Castle, by Whitby. According to Williamson the late-geometric was a style of designed landscape which was popular until the 1730s (1995). The implementation of the late-geometric within the designed landscapes of the North Riding fell well within the accepted dates of this design trend, with only Mulgrave Castle falling at the very end of the design as proposed

Between 1713 and 1720 a serpentine style landscape was developed at Duncombe Park its implementation started just prior to the style's dates of 1715-1730s ascribed by Williamson (1995). At Marske (1732) near Richmond and Sheriff Hutton just west of the Howardian Hills irregular-styled landscapes were developed during the 1730s, While not abandoning the formal elements near the house, these two landscapes indicated the start towards naturalistic design. Again placing the designs implemented within the landscapes of the



North Riding will within the accepted dates of the 1730s and 1740s for this landscape style (Williamson 1995). In 1744, the earlier late-geometric landscape at Newburgh was altered creating a simplified-geometric landscape. In 1746 at Aldby Park influenced by designs by Knowlton (GD 2057, Wickham 2006) another simplified-geometric landscape was developed. Both at Newburgh and Aldby the designs implemented were well within the accepted dates associated with the simplified-geometric.

Not all of the designs implemented fell within the dates associated with each trend. It was not until the 1740s, that serpentine-style landscapes were established at Stanwick Park and Forcett Park, two neighbouring estates five miles north-east of Richmond. For Stanwick, the implementation of this design reflects a recent rise in status from a Baronet due to marital connections. It was created shortly after Hugh Smithson married Elizabeth Seymour, the daughter of the 7<sup>th</sup> Duke of Somerset (a title that Hugh was later to acquire). In 1753 a late-geometric landscape, a style typical of the 1720s and 30s, was established at Arncliffe, and a very late implementation of formal design was laid out in the gardens of Guisborough in 1773 (Plates 115 and 116).

Analysis of distribution in conjunction with date of implementation further elucidates discrimination patterns of design trends throughout the Riding, including the six late-geometric landscapes illustrated by Knyff and Kip, the regions by Guisborough in the north-east and along the south-western edge of the Vale of York are relatively early in the pattern. Either contemporary to, or shortly thereafter, from 1700 to 1722, the majority, comprising six of the seven formal landscapes during this period, were created in the region around the Howardian Hills. Included within this group was Duncombe Park (1713-20), an early serpentine-style landscape (see Gazetteer), and Castle Howard (1700-1730), the first large-scale and grand designed landscape park and garden within the Riding (see Gazetteer). The pattern shifts up to the area around Richmond in the north-west from 1723 to 1732 including Marske Hall, an irregular-style landscape garden. Shortly after Sheriff Hutton (1730s), located near the base of the Howardian Hills in the south-east region of the Riding, was also re-designed as an irregular-style landscape. The pattern moves back over to the Richmond area during the 1740s with the implementation

of two serpentine-style landscapes at Stanwick and Forcett. From this point the distribution pattern moves to the north-east with the development of a late-formal landscape in 1753 and ends with the last formal design being implemented in Guisborough in 1773.

This distribution by trend and date of implementation reveals a pattern which volleys back and forth between the landscapes situated around the Howardian Hills and those around Richmond. This pattern potentially highlights evidence of a dialogue or possible rivalry occurring between the landowners within these two regions. Unfortunately with a lack of time-depth for the majority of landscapes which were in the low-land regions of the Vales between these two regions, it is not possible to explore any wider impacts that this dialogue has upon other design choices throughout the region. While some later implementations of formal designs occurred, as at Arncliffe and Guisborough, the majority of the dates of implementation for these designed landscapes, places the development of early-eighteenth century landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding within the accepted chronology. In some cases, the North Riding landowners appear to be ahead of the chronology, as seen with landscapes like Castle Howard, which has early elements of a simplified-style landscape established between 1700-1720, and at Duncombe Park (c. 1713) and later Forcett and Stanwick in the 1740s, where early serpentine-style landscapes were being created sooner than the accepted chronology suggests (Hussey 1967; Williamson 1995).

As highlighted above, the landowners in the North Riding were starting to implement naturalistic landscapes earlier in the century, and the first landscapes which were starting to 'open up' the gardens near the house were Marske in 1732 and Sheriff Hutton in the 1730s. Other than the landscape developed at Arncliffe (1753), no other landscapes within this group were created or improved during the later part of the 1740s and during the 1750s. This could be a reflection of the contemporary political atmosphere surrounding the Jacobite Rising of 1745, specific to this region, as landowners within the region such as the Scropes of Thornton Steward held loyalties to a Stuart restoration (Hinson 2008). It does not explain a total absence of designs being implemented during this period, and this



void in the development of designed landscapes within the North Riding has potential for future research.

The 1760s saw a return to the development and improvements of the designed landscapes within the Riding. From this date forward, except for the later addition of the Monks' walk within the gardens of Guisborough c. 1773, all of the designed landscape parks and gardens within this dataset were created with naturalistic designs. At the start of 1760 Charles Turner of Kirkleatham established a naturalistic parkland within the wider landscape east of the house. Shortly after purchasing Clints located in the Dales, he removed the walled gardens portrayed by Samuel Buck (Plate 99) and developed a naturalistic landscape within the grounds (1762-3), creating two of the first 'Brownian' style landscapes within this data-set. Around the same time at Aske a late-eighteenth century pleasure ground was completed, and at Constable Burton (1762-8) a naturalistic Brownian-style landscape was developed within the wider landscape. Between 1762 and 1770, a late-eighteenth century pleasure ground was developed in the woodlands of Swinton Park, and at Newby between 1766 and 1772 design by Thomas White in 1766 (Plate 67) was developed which involved the removal of the formal elements near the house and the development of wider agricultural lands in order to create a Brownian-style landscape park and garden. All of these were developed out of earlier formal landscapes and the incorporation of surrounding agricultural landscapes. With these landscapes we are starting to see the implementation of naturalistic designs with in the North Riding, however these landowners were still opting to maintain or retain earlier formal elements within their designs. At Kirkleatham, Aske and Swinton, instead of a complete removal of the earlier designs, the formal gardens around the houses were maintained whilst naturalistic landscapes were being developed within the wider parklands. Whilst the landowners of Clints, Constable Burton and Newby, opted to remove a majority of the earlier formal gardens in order to create naturalistic landscape parks and gardens. Whilst at Constable Burton and Newby small elements of the earlier formal designs were incorporated into the overall aesthetic; at Clints, for the first time within the Riding, we see the complete removal of the earlier formal design for a naturalistic design.

The implementation of naturalistic landscapes in either a Brownian or late-eighteenth century pleasure ground styles continued through out the 1770s. At Castle Howard (1770), Hovingham (c. 1770) and in Busby (c. 1774), Naturalistic landscapes were created. While the formal gardens near the house at Castle Howard were swept away for grass lawns, the remainder of the earlier landscape was maintained; likewise at Hovingham formal elements were retained (see Gazetteer). At Busby, like Clints, we see the total removal of the earlier walled garden in order to establish a naturalistic design. Late-eighteenth century pleasure grounds were developed within the woodlands at Arncliffe (1770) and Gilling (1770s), however, both of these landowners maintained formal elements near the house whilst adapting the wider landscapes.

Again a pause in the development of design landscapes within the North Riding occurred during the later part of the 1770s and during the 1780s, work was not being carried out within the designed landscape parks and gardens within this group. A time rife with revolutions and the later fear of potential unrest in Britain, the late 1770s and 1780s could likely explain this lack of developments in designed landscapes. A wider analysis of the development of designs throughout the landscapes without time-depth and within other regions of the country conjointly with broader contemporary trends within the political climate would potentially explain the impact of contemporary political factors on design. Activity within the designed landscapes of this data-set picked up again during the 1790s with Marrick Priory, which was designed as a late-eighteenth century pleasure ground in 1792. In 1793 Kiplin, and later in 1797 Hackness, were developed into Brownian style landscapes. At both the walled gardens were removed, additionally at Hackness the prior house was demolished and in its place Bempde-Johnstone developed a naturalistic landscape park and gardens. At Mulgrave and Swinton, in 1792 and 1796 respectively, picturesque landscapes were being developed within the wider parklands, whilst the earlier formal elements were retained.

In 1798, landscape parks with pleasure grounds near the house were developed at Marske (Plate 145). Although this was naturalistic in the overall design, the new pleasure grounds started to relate more to the nineteenth-century pleasure-grounds than ones developed



earlier in the eighteenth century as seen at Aske. Between 1798 and 1856, a pleasure ground and landscape park were developed around Brandsby out of once arable fields. This is the last of the houses without walled gardens to have a design applied to the grounds near the house and wider landscape.

From 1802 through 1827, six landscape parks with pleasure grounds near the house were created at Thorpe Perrow (1802), Guisborough (1805), Jervaulx (1805), Clifton (1805-10), Kiplin (1823) and Beningbrough (1827). All of these pleasure-grounds replaced earlier walled gardens established near the house. At Beningbrough the walled garden to the north was maintained, and the pleasure ground was developed to the south and south-east of the house per Gilpin's designs (GD2059). Whilst at Guisborough, which had a late-geometric landscape developed before Knyff and Kip's 1707 illustration (Plate 114), later embellished in 1773 (Plates 115 and 116), the formal gardens were maintained as the Chaloners built a new house within a newly developed a new house within pleasure-grounds located 1 mile east of the old hall. In 1845 the Chaytors of Croft likewise built a new house within pleasure grounds about a mile south-west from the old hall within once arable lands.

A Brownian-style approach and parkland was added to the lands to the south of Bolton Hall (1823), allowing for the formal gardens near the house to be maintained to the north. At Brough between 1798 and 1836, and at Croft/Clervaulx, earlier walled gardens were replaced by pleasure grounds. At Kirkleatham, whilst naturalistic elements were added to the wider parkland in 1760, the earlier formal gardens near the house were maintained until 1845, when the new owner swept away these formal elements in order to create a pleasure-ground and open lawns. In 1845 and 1853, Sheriff Hutton and Castle Howard respectively had terraces designed by Nesfield added to the grounds, reintroducing formality to grounds by the house. The last landscapes to be altered were Newburgh (1854) and Aldby (1855), which had pleasure grounds added within the design, whilst maintaining earlier formal designs around the house.

The distribution of these landscapes indicates that the majority of landowners who were first to apply naturalistic designs, starting with Marske in 1732, were situated around

Richmond and within the western half of the Riding. By 1767 the landowners within the Howardian Hills started to apply naturalistic designs followed by Busby located in the Tees Lowlands. The implementation of naturalistic designs remained within the eastern side of the Riding until 1792, when naturalistic landscapes were again being created in the region around Richmond. From this time forward, with the exception of Hackness (1797), Brandsby (1792), Beningbrough (1827) and Kirkleatham (1845), the majority of the sixteen naturalistic landscapes which were created between 1792 and 1845 landscapes were located in the western half of the Riding.

Beyond the late-geometric landscape established at Arncliffe (1753), and the later additions of formal elements within Guisborough (c. 1773), the remainder of the landscapes designed after this time were either Brownian-styled landscape parks or pleasure grounds. Nine of the formal walled gardens established by the 1720s were retained at Clints until 1760, Busby (1774), Hackness (1797), Brough (1798-1836), Jervaulx (1803), Thorpe Perrow and Clifton in 1805, Kiplin in 1823, and at Croft/Clervaulx as late as 1845. Including the terraces at Danby, which were maintained through to the mid-eighteenth century, a total ten walled gardens that were retained until the later half of the eighteenth century to the first part of the nineteenth century. Although the Dawnays of Danby were great landowners the retention of the terraces around the house could be explained by the function of Danby as a hunting box rather than serving as their primary seat as stated by Bateman (1883) as discussed above. This retention of earlier walled gardens gives credence to Williamson's statement that 'lesser landowners in the remoter parts of England continued to maintain or even create much more archaic gardens well beyond 1750' (1990, 73).

From 1750, thirty-four different landscapes were designed or altered through to 1855. Of these thirty four designs, only Arncliffe and Guisborough added formal elements to their designs, both of which were later redesigned with naturalistic landscapes. The remaining thirty-two landscapes designed during this time were either Brownian-styled landscape parks, late-eighteenth-century pleasure grounds, or nineteenth-century pleasure grounds. Even though eight of the members of the 'lesser landowners' (Williamson 1990) retained



their formal gardens, they only count for 22% of the landscapes developed during this time.

It must be mentioned that for these eight landscapes, the formal walled gardens were completely replaced with naturalistic designs, these were the only landowners doing so within this data set. All of the other landowners were either retaining earlier, formal elements within their naturalistic landscapes such as the avenue retained at Newby or maintaining the earlier formal elements near the house, whilst adding naturalistic designs to the wider landscape regardless of status such as at Newburgh Priory.

#### *Distribution of Country Houses Owned by Catholics and Protestants*

The first socio-political analysis to be carried out will look at the distribution of the estates of known Catholic, and later Recusant families, against those held by Protestants. As secondary estates of Stanwick and Marske, Carlton and Aldburgh will be included as their earlier owners were Catholic. There were twenty-three landscapes owned by thirteen landowners who were Catholic and/or later Recusant landowners during the long-eighteenth century.

The overall distribution demonstrates that more Protestant estates were located in the open expanses of the Tees Lowlands and the Vale of York. Of the estates of the Catholic landowners, four were situated in the Howardian Hills, and the region around the Rye Valley was considered the 'Bastion of Catholic influence' (Aveling 1966, 357). Five Catholic families were situated within the Dales Fringe, two in the Vale of York, four in the Vale of Mowbray and seven in the Tees Lowlands. Whilst there were not any Catholic landowners with country houses and designed landscapes in the Vale of Pickering, the South Magnesian Limestone, neither were they located within the upland regions of the Dales and the North York Moors. This pattern seems to indicate that whilst Recusant landowners were not located within the vulnerable lowlands, neither did they relocate, as John Bossy proposed, into the 'safer' narrow valleys 'with a good stretch of moorland coming down to the back of the house' (1976, 85). According to Aveling, Richmond and

the region of Richmondshire became fashionable for Catholics, however, by the 1680s the numbers of Catholics within this region were in rapid decline (Aveling 1966, 353-355). Of the thirteen estates whose landowners converted to Protestantism or whose estates were sold to Protestant landowners, ten were located within close proximity to Richmond, including the estates of Kiplin and Carlton Hall, which were both sold.

Looking at the general distribution of Catholic landowners, the two regions with a large number of recusants were Richmond and the Howardian Hills, in particular the areas around the Rye valley. By the 1680s many of the Catholic families around the Richmond area converted to Protestantism, whilst the landowners within the Howardian Hills remained recusants with exception of the Howards of Castle Howard who converted to the Protestant faith during the late-seventeenth century. This pattern starts to apply a vocabulary to the dialogue which occurred between the designs of the landscaped parks and gardens in area around Richmond and the Howardian Hills discussed above. With a higher incidence of early naturalistic designs created by the landowners situated around Richmond opposed to those situated near the Howardian Hills could be perceived as a reflection of the acceptance of more liberal Protestant beliefs occurring amongst the landowners near Richmond versus the idea of 'tradition' associated with a continued faith in Catholicism seen with the landowners of the Howardian Hills. Analyzed in this manner highlights potential correlations between religious belief and formal and naturalistic design choices not elucidated within the general analysis of design aesthetics discussed in the prior chapter. Interestingly correlations appear to be between Recusants who later converted to the Protestant faith and Recusants; rather than between Protestants and Catholics in general. The choice of landowners who later converted to the Protestant faith to establish naturalistic trends might elucidate the need for these landowners to utilize national landscape design trends to validate their place within society.

*Distribution of Country Houses Owned by Members of Whites and Brooks*



As the only London social clubs with known members, the distribution of the landscapes of members of White's and Brooks' might further clarify any patterns within design trends based upon influences of social networks. The country houses belonging to the members of the London Gentlemen's Clubs of Whites and/or Brooks during the long-eighteenth century were located in four clusters, two of which lie in the northern parts of the Riding around the cities of Richmond and Guisborough, and two to the south around Bedale in the south-west, and the Howardian Hills in the south-east (see figure 4.3-9). The first group located around Richmond comprises of Aske Hall, Clints Hall, Forcett Park, Hornby Castle and Stanwick Park. Four country houses including Danby Castle, Guisborough Priory, Kirkleatham Hall and Mulgrave Castle were situated in the north-east near Guisborough. Another group of estates were situated near Bedale, west of the Vale of York including Bolton Hall, Constable Burton Hall, Swinton Park Newby Hall. The final group of estates were located within and around the Howardian Hills comprises Brandsby Hall, Castle Howard, Duncombe Park, Newburgh Priory and Sheriff Hutton, with the estates of Ebberston Lodge and Hackness Hall lying a little further to the east of this group.

Analysis of the distribution of landscapes based upon the owner's entry into the above clubs reveals a distinctive pattern. The progression of membership starts in the north-west near Richmond with Robert D'Arcy, 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Holderness, of Aske Hall and Hornby, who was admitted to Whites in 1742. The following year Hugh Smithson Bart, later the 12<sup>th</sup> Earl of Northumberland, of the neighbouring estate of Stanwick Park, was also admitted to Whites. From this region the pattern jumps down to the Howardian Hills with Richard Thompson of Sheriff Hutton joining in the same year, followed by Sir Henry Dawnay, 3<sup>rd</sup> Viscount of Cowick, of Danby Castle who became a member of the same club in 1747. Charles Powlett, 5<sup>th</sup> Duke of Bolton, of Bolton Hall, which was situated in Wensleydale, joined in 1754. From this time the progression continues on, back and forth across the Riding again, revealing a communication or dialogue occurring between the landowners following a similar pattern of dialogue revealed within the landscapes of the Catholic and Protestant landowners discussed above.

An analysis of membership between landowners with northern estates against southern estates, reveals yet another pattern. Ten of the nineteen landowners became members of Whites and/or Brooks between 1742 and 1790. Seven of these ten landowners held estates in the Northern half of the Riding, while three held estates in the south. The remaining nine landowners were admitted to Whites and/or Brooks between the years 1804 and 1856. Of these, seven held estates in the southern half of the Riding and three in the North. In broad terms analysis of this distribution, the general pattern of membership spreads from the north-west of the Riding near Richmond to the north-east, from where the pattern travels to the southern regions of the Riding. This strongly reflects a similar pattern between the implementation of naturalistic designs within the landscapes discussed above.

#### *Distribution of John Carr Commissions*

The last distribution to be analyzed involves the 21 landowners who commissioned local York architect John Carr (b. 1723- d. 1807) to design and build their country houses, stables, as well as various estate and garden buildings (Plate 186). Included within this set is Thirsk Hall, owned by Reginald Bell. With a small garden without an associated wider parkland, this house was not included within the overall data set of 126 designed landscape parks and gardens. Since Mr. Bell commissioned Carr to design his new house in 1771, it was felt that Thirsk Hall should be included within this distribution set, so as to make a complete and accurate analysis of the work carried out by John Carr within the North Riding.

Although the majority of Carr's commissions were for Yorkshire landowners, his work (between 1748 and 1807) included designs, alterations to and the building of numerous country houses, town houses, estate and garden buildings, hospitals, churches, bridges, assembly rooms, and race courses throughout England, Ireland and Scotland (Wragg 2000). His work within the North Riding consisted of designing six new country houses, one unexecuted design at Busby, alterations of both exterior and interior for thirteen country houses, two town houses including alterations for the 9<sup>th</sup> Viscount Fairfax at



Fairfax House in York (1761-65) and unexecuted designs for Dundas House in Edinburgh, for Sir Lawrence Dundas. He designed six stables, various estate buildings including Foal Park farm, the coach house and laundry at Constable Burton as well as Home Farm, Arbour Hill and Street Farm at Hornby Castle. In addition, Carr's work included alterations to the churches at Kirkleatham and Rokeby, and he produced unexecuted designs for the school house at Thirsk. His work also included landscape structures and garden buildings.

Although his commissions tended to be for individual buildings or structures, Carr also carried out multiple projects including the responsibility for updating and upkeep of bridges through the Riding (Marshall 1796). Additionally Carr carried out multiple projects for a few key families including the Dundases of Aske, the Fairfaxes at Gilling, the D'Albys at Hornby, the Wyvilles at Constable Burton, and various larger scale projects for the Turner family of Kirkleatham. One of his key patrons included the Lascelles family of Harewood House in the West Riding, for whom he carried out extensive work including alterations to Gawthorpe Hall (1754-55), the building of Harewood House (1759-71), rebuilding of Harewood village (1750-1805), Lofthouse Gate (1771), the menagerie and rotunda (1774), the temple of Venus (1780) and the main gateway (1801) (Wragg 2000, 155).

The majority of Carr's work in the North Riding was carried out for members of the lesser and greater gentry. Although he did have several commissions from great landowners, these works did not occur until after his work at Harewood House started in 1759. From this date, the first great landowner to commission Carr was Lord Dundas of Aske Hall in 1763. Although he carried out works for Lord Dundas, the 5<sup>th</sup> Earl of Carlisle of Castle Howard, and William Danby at Swinton Park, none of these commissions were on a scale as grand as the work he carried out for the Turners of Kirkleatham or the Lascelles in the West Riding.

The distribution patterns seen within Carr's commissions start in the eastern side of the Riding and eventually move over to the west. Carr's third commission overall, and his

first commission within the North Riding, was in 1753 for Thomas Maulever, for whom he designed and built a new house at Arnecliffe, located in the Tees Lowlands (Wragg 2000, 9). Before 1757 Carr carried out four other commissions for landowners with estates located in the eastern half of the Riding. These included commissions for James Hebden of East Thorpe, attributed to Carr, (Waterson and Meadows 1990), and for Charles Gregory Fairfax, the 9<sup>th</sup> Viscount Fairfax at Gilling Castle, both of which were located within the Howardian Hills. In 1759 William Turner of Kirkleatham hired Carr to rebuild the tower and carry out alterations to St Cuthbert's Church. Around 1757 Carr also proposed designs for Jane Turner of Busby, widow of William Turner's older brother Cholmley Turner of Kirkleatham. These designs were rejected as too grand, and instead they used a local carpenter and joiner Robert Corney, who worked on the hospital and church at Kirkleatham (Wragg 2000, 120-21).

Carr then shifted to the west side of the Riding where he mainly focused his energies throughout the 1760s. His work included commissions for landowners with estates within the South Magnesian Limestone, Dales Fringe, and within higher grounds along the western regions of the Tees Lowlands, including work for the 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Holderness at Hornby (1760), Sir Marmaduke Wyville at Constable Burton (1762), Sir Lawrence Dundas at Aske (1763) and additional work for the Turner family at Charles Turner's Swaledale residence of Clints Hall (1762). In 1764, while Carr was working on alterations to the houses at Swinton Castle and Newby Hall, he carried out additional work at Kirkleatham Hall including remodeling and Gothicizing the house (Plate 74), and is thought to have created other Gothic structures in the parkland including the dovecote (Plate 78), entrance gate (Plate 77) and corner bastions (Plates 75-76) (Wragg 2000, 166-168). During the 1770s, although Carr continued to work on estates mainly located in the western regions, he also built stables at Ormesby (1772) and Forcett (between 1773 and 1785), located in the Tees Lowlands, and at Castle Howard (1774). In addition he continued to carry out additional works for the Turner family at Kirkleatham. In the 1780s Carr worked at Sand Hutton (1786) in the Vale of York and Upleatham (between 1781 and 1791) located in the Tees Lowlands (Wragg 2000).



Carr was a Palladian architect, and a majority of his work in the North Riding was within this classical style. However he also created Gothic structures and added Gothic embellishments to the country houses at Gilling Castle, Hornby Castle and Kirkleatham Hall, indicating that Carr was an agent of change reflecting national styles. With a total of fourteen, the majority of the landowners who hired Carr either created naturalistic landscapes at the time of, or shortly after Carr's work was carried out. Additionally, five landowners added naturalistic elements within their wider landscapes. Only two landowners refrained from adding any naturalistic elements to their designs, including the Mauleverers at Arnecliffe who at the time of Carr's building, created a late-geometric landscape and Frances Michell at Forcett, who maintained the serpentine-style landscape established by the Shuttleworths in the 1730s.

The distribution pattern for Carr's commissions is quite distinct. The majority of the estates where Carr worked were situated at the base of, or within the fringe areas between the lowlands of the Riding and the upland regions of the Riding. Sixteen of these estates were situated within rolling landscapes, on the ridges or along the bottom of escarpments of upland regions, while Kirkleatham, Newby and Sand Hutton were located within relatively flat lands with little to no undulation. Only Aske Hall and Clints were situated within upland valleys. Although Carr carried out numerous commissions within the City of York, the country house at Sand Hutton is the only North Riding commission of Carr's lying within a ten mile radius of the city.

### *Conclusion*

Whilst a general distribution of the designed landscape parks and gardens within the North Riding revealed interesting patterns, it was not until the landscapes were plotted within their topographical and geographical context that distinctive patterns driven by elevation and situation are revealed. The landscapes of the great landowners and land magnates were situated within upland regions whilst the landscapes of the greater gentry, also within the upland regions, mainly sat along the marginal edges of these regions.

Likewise, whilst the landscapes of the lesser gentry existed within these marginal areas, the majority were situated within the lowland regions.

For the thirty-six landscapes with time depth, additional information regarding dates of implementation and design styles were recorded, allowing for a higher resolution to be created. Distinct patterns occurred within the implementation of formal landscapes throughout the Riding. First a general analysis of the dates of implementation of formal landscapes in the North Riding placed the development of these earlier landscapes well within the accepted chronology. Analysis of the distribution of these formal landscapes revealed clusters of development occurring first in the Howardian Hills, then shifting over to the landscapes situated by Richmond, then shifting back to the Howardian Hills. This continued back and forth, volleying in regard to the implementation of design across the Vales highlights two interesting points. Firstly, it indicates that the landowners within these two regions were socially connected to each other regardless of situation across the Vale, indicating a wider social network beyond their regional areas. Secondly, it established a very interesting dynamic which existed between the landowners of the Howardian Hills and those near Richmond. Whilst the trend was shifted back and forth, it was not necessarily a direct duplication of trends from one region to the other; rather it was more of an awareness and response resulting in a pattern of development of designs in line with developments in national trends.

In regard to the implementation of naturalistic designs, again the landowners within the North Riding were creating designed landscapes within the accepted chronology, and in some instances as at Duncombe, Forcett, Marske, Sheriff Hutton and Stanwick their designs were earlier than the chronology would suggest. From the 1750s, with exception of the Mauleverers at Arncliffe and the Chaloners at Guisborough, who both introduced formal designs to their landscapes, the rest of the landowners created naturalistic designed landscapes in either a Brownian-style or late-eighteenth century and nineteenth-century pleasure grounds. Again a shifting pattern with the dates of development occurred between the landowners with estates near Richmond and those in the Howardian Hills. With the implementation of naturalistic designs, the pattern was led by the landowners



near Richmond and then followed by the landscapes situated around and near to the Howardian Hills. As discussed above this starts to highlight a connectivity between the landowners within these two regions, indicating larger social systems beyond the individual regions. Additionally, the incorporation of naturalistic designs well within and in some cases well before the accepted chronology, establishes a connectivity to wider national social networks and design trends. It must be noted that whilst the landowners of the Riding were creating naturalistic, there was a general trend throughout of maintaining formal gardens or retaining earlier formal elements within their designs.

When socio-political information was applied to this distribution, it potentially elucidated some of the reasons for this 'dialogue' of design. There was a strong correlation between the landowner's development of a naturalistic landscape and commissioning John Carr to build or rebuild their country house, stables and garden buildings. Since the majority of Carr's architecture was Palladian, elucidates these North Riding landowners desires to update both the house and grounds utilizing wider national trends. There was also a strong correlation between Carr's commissions and topographical situation of the house and landscape within marginal lands of rising elevations between the lowland and upland regions of the Riding. Additionally the analysis of the distribution of commissions of Carr based upon date of design highlights the progress of his work leading from the eastern edge of the Riding over to the West highlighting an almost linear progress of Carr's work. These patterns potentially reveals the influence of design choices made from social pressures of neighbour upon neighbour or simply elucidates the pattern of how one professional architect advertised and gained commissions during the eighteenth century.

In regard to religious networks, Richmond and the Howardian Hills were traditionally important centres of Catholicism. The landowners around Richmond who converted to Protestantism were also the same landowners who were leading the national trends in naturalistic landscape designs, whilst the recusant landowners within the Howardian Hills followed behind in the implementation of naturalistic trends. Additionally, the distribution of the designed landscapes of the member's of the gentlemen's clubs White's and Brooks followed a similar pattern of progression in the implementation of naturalistic

designs throughout the landscapes within the Riding. Indicating that study of these wider social networks not only connected the landowners of the North Riding to larger social networks, but also potentially indicates that national architectural and landscape trends were disseminated through these very networks.

The above explored general distribution patterns of design landscapes, design trends, social networks and the progression of design trends throughout the Riding. In order to understand and to potentially further reveal local geological and social regional influences on landscape trends, the following section will analyze the designed landscapes within their regional contexts throughout the Riding.

#### **4.4 REGIONAL DIALECTS**

The preceding section discussed the overall distribution of the designed landscapes throughout the North Riding. Whilst, general observations of the location and topographical situations were discussed, the following section will look with more detail into the influences of this varied topography and regional influence on the 126 designed landscape parks and gardens included within this research. As discussed above, the Riding has been divided into nine separate regions dictated by the geological and topographical variations throughout the Riding. These include three upland regions comprising the Howardian Hills, the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills, and the Yorkshire Dales; four lowland regions consisting of the Tees Lowlands and the Vales of Mowbray, Pickering, and York; and two transitional regions comprising of the South Mangesian Limestone and Dales Fringe (Plate 172).

Each region contains distinctive topographical and underlying geology which had a direct impact on the land-use and settlement patterns (Hey 2005, Marshall 1796, Tuke 1800, Natural England 2009). By analyzing the designed landscapes within these regions, these natural influences and regional social influences can potentially further explain design trends occurring within the North Riding. This analysis will look at patterns within each region, including the topographical situation for each landscape, trends in acquisition of



the estates, and subsequent descent of ownership within in each region, in an attempt to reveal distinctive regional trends. Both landscapes with time-depth and those with only cartographic representation on the First Edition OS map will be included. For the later, additional resources will be utilized, including, but not limited to Pevsner and the VCH to build a known history of the house. As a visual extension of the country house, the development and evolution of the designed landscape should be explored not separately from, but in conjunction with, the associated country house (Girouard 1980). With this in mind, any information on the dates of and types of work carried out to the house and estate buildings might potentially elucidate periods when improvements were made to the designed landscapes. Attention will be paid to building materials utilized through out the regions in hopes to validate regional trends revealed by the Land-Use Surveys carried out by Natural England. Through this regional context, the following will explore the influences of regional trends, social identity and the natural topography within each region. This section will detail the patterns and regional trends occurring throughout the Character Areas, establishing a base for discussion and analysis to occur within the following section. The progression of this analysis will start with the lowland regions, followed by the upland regions, and will conclude with the transitional regions of the South Magnesian Limestone and Dales Fringe.

### *Lowland Regions*

There are a total of four lowland regions within this group containing a total of 66 designed landscape parks and gardens from this data set. The regions included within the lowlands comprise of the Tees Lowlands in the north-eastern area of the Riding, the Vale of Pickering in the south-east and finally the central plain which was divided into the Vale of Mowbray to the north and the Vale of York to the south (Plate 172). Although these four regions can be classified as 'lowland,' they each have distinctive geological and topographical characters.

The Vales of York and Mowbray were classified by both Marshall and Tuke as one topographical region (1796, 1800). During the Character Landscape Assessment, however,

Natural England noted a subtle difference between the topography between these two regions. The majority of the Vale of York is comprised of flat lands, lying between sea-level and 200 feet with small areas of elevated land along the eastern boundary of the region, where the Vale borders 'The Howardian Hills'. In this region elevations rise above 300 feet above sea-level including Crayke Hill, the highest land feature within the Vale lying just above 370 feet. The borders of the Vale of Mowbray, situated to the north, are based upon social boundaries of lands once held by the Norman Barons of Mowbray (Hinson 2008, Lewis 1831). Like the Vale of York, just over half of the lands lie between sea-level and 200 feet above. In the north-west, north and along the eastern half of the Vale of Mowbray, the land rises to elevations between 200 and 400 feet above sea-level with a small strip of land along the eastern edge rising to elevations between 400 and 600 feet containing small areas with elevations between 600 to 800 feet and 800 to 1000 feet above sea-level. Whilst both Vales are known for their fertile lands, the Vale of Mowbray is frequently characterized by its gently rolling hills and 'picturesque beauty' (Lewis 1831, Hinson 2008, Natural England 2009).

To the north of the Vale of Mowbray are the Tees Lowlands, which stretch from the foothills of the Pennines to the west, the 'Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau' to the north, the North Sea to the east and the Cleveland Hills to the south-east (Natural England 2008). The majority of this region comprises of gently rolling lands falling between 200 and 400 feet above sea-level, whilst the central region of land is between sea-level and 200 feet. The highest lands, which reach to elevations between 400-600 feet, lie in the north-western area of the region which are comprised of mainly arable land, whereas the eastern areas contain extensive areas of mud flats, saltmarsh wetlands and dunes (Natural England 2008).

The final lowland region within the Riding is the Vale of Pickering, a narrow lowland valley lying on an east-west orientation and bound by the uplands of the 'North York Moors' to the north, the 'Howardian Hills' to the west, the 'Yorkshire Wolds' to the south and the North Sea to the east. Except for a very small area of land rising above 200 feet between Seamer and Osgodby in the north-eastern corner of the Vale, the rest of this



region is comprised of lands below 200 feet above sea-level. The lands in the western area of the Vale are more undulating and varied than the flat lands in the east.

Even though these regions all qualify as 'lowlands,' with the majority of their elevations falling below 200 feet above sea-level, they each have very distinct topographical and geological features which influenced settlement patterns and land-use. These same factors and natural conditions would have had an impact on not only the number of acres available, and the type of lands available for designed landscapes, but they would also have had an effect on the success and ability to create, maintain and sustain designed landscape features.

### *Vale of Pickering*

The first lowland region to be discussed is the Vale of Pickering. The former Lake Pickering, which drained during the last glaciation, has had a long lasting impact on the settlement patterns and land-use within the vale. As described by Natural England, the landscapes are dramatically different between the western and eastern halves of the vale. In the east the views are wide and open, whilst the views in the western region are enclosed by the Howardian Hills to the east, the Hambleton Hills of the moors to the north and the scarp of the Yorkshire Wolds to the south (Natural England 2009). This region was historically dominated by waters and flood plains and settlement patterns in the north and south of the vale have traditionally followed the boundaries of the marshy land left by the former glacial Lake Pickering which covered much of the Vale. The south-western region, north Malton, where the Rivers Rye, Derwent and their tributaries converge, is mainly dedicated to pastoral floodplain. In the east, earlier marshes, moors and wet meadows which once dominated the region have been drained, and the water levels are currently controlled by a series of canals, cuts and drainage dykes (Marshall 1796, 16; Natural England 2008).

The majority of the land was held by yeomen and small landholders, many of whom were 'adverse to an enclosure' (Marshall 1796, 54). As such there were fewer chances in which

lands were consolidated, creating an absence of larger centralized estates which resulted in a fewer number of large designed landscape parks and gardens throughout the region (Marshall 1796). Marshall mentions that the only large estate within in the region was Duncombe Park and the Earl of Feversham's holdings within the Vale (1796). It is important to note that although some of the secondary estates held by the Earl were located within the western regions of the Vale of Pickering, namely Welburn and at the time of Marshall's publication, Kirkby Moorside, but the main seat of Duncombe Park lies within the Hambleton Hills, included within the 'North York Moors'.

There were a total of nine estates within the Vale of Pickering. The ownership for these estates were mixed with High Hall since 1639, Kirkby Misperton (1642), Thornton Hall (1669), and Wykeham since 1544 (Page 1923) descending indirectly through to the late-nineteenth century landowner, and Ebberston, Hutton Buscel, Nunnington, Ness and Welburn passed through multiple owners via sale, all of which were last purchased in the nineteenth century. Most of the houses except Ebberston (1713) and Ness Hall (1720-50) were built prior to the seventeenth century, and all but Ness, which was a brick built, were constructed of stone.

Within this region we see how the traditional methods of landownership affected the later consolidation of lands, resulting in a lack of large landscape parks and gardens within the region. The size of the landscapes ranged from 80 acres at Nunnington to 836 at Ebberston and 1,946 acres at Wykeham. All of the landscapes were situated in proximity to their associated village, therefore like the settlement patterns, the designed landscapes tended to be situated along the edges of the scarp of the North York Moors and the Howardian Hills, with only Kirby Misperton lying within the middle reaches of the Vale in the western region.

At Ebberston in 1770 Sir Charles Hotham Thompson removed the village buildings to the south of the house evident in the seventeenth century map, (Plate 62) in order to create a wider parkland whilst maintaining the water garden developed to the north of the house in 1713 (GD 2046). Whilst being the most elaborate design within the region, this house



historically served as a hunting lodge, except during the ownership of Charles Hotham, mentioned above, who utilized Ebberston as his seat. The landscapes of Thornton Hall, Kirkby Misperton and Wykeham detailed on the First Edition OS map are naturalistic landscapes with nineteenth-century-styled pleasure grounds near the house. Welburn is a small linear serpentine-style landscape, whilst the remainder had formal walled gardens, including the landscape at Ness which according to Pevsner was a Georgian house, placing its construction between 1720 and 1750 (see Gazetteer for detailed descriptions). Within the Vale, water was historically been a dominant feature, from Lake Pickering to the later rivers, becks and marshes. However, only at Ebberston, with spring-fed water sources; Thornton Dale situated along the edge of Thornton Beck and Kirkby Misperton located near Costa Beck, were water features prominent within the landscape design. Whilst rivers flow in close proximity to Welburn and Ness Hall, only at the neighbouring landscape of Nunnington was the river in close proximity to the house.

#### *Vale of York*

The Vale of York, 'nature's grand division of the county' (Marshall 1796), is a wide open valley bound by the ridges of the 'Howardian Hills' and the Hambleton Hills to the east and the 'South Magnesian Limestone' to the west and lies between the 'Vale of Mowbray' to the north and the 'Humberhead Levels' to the south. The majority of the vale is included within the boundaries of the North Riding, with a small portion lying south of the city of York, which transitions into the 'Humberhead Levels'. Along the north-eastern boundary of the region, where the vale meets up with the 'Howardian Hills' are little pockets of higher elevations, with the highest elevation being that of Crayke Hill, to the east of Easingwold. However, the majority consists mainly of flat lands created by the floodplains of the rivers Derwent, Foss, Nidd, Ouse, Ure and Warfe (Natural England 2008). The majority of the land within the vale is working agricultural landscape and during his *General Survey* Tuke, noted that one-third of the lands within the vale were under tillage while two-thirds were under grass (1800, 101).

There were a total of 13 estates located within the Vale of York. The four estates of Easingwold, Holtby, Huby, Fairfield, and Overton were all secondary holdings. Aldby, Sheriff Hutton and Stillington were owned by members of the lesser gentry, while the landowners of Beningbrough, Myton, Sand Hutton, Sheriff Hutton and Sutton Park were all members of the greater gentry. With the exception of Holtby and Brockfield, which the manner of acquisition remains unknown, and Beningbrough which was acquired by grant in 1544, all of the estates within the Vale of York were purchased: Albdy in 1557, Easingwold, Myton, Sheriff Hutton, Sutton and Stillington during the early-to-mid seventeenth century; Huby, slowly over the eighteenth century, and Sand Hutton in 1838. The eight estates acquired during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries passed by lineal descent through to the end of the nineteenth century. Sand Hutton previously passed through lineal descent from 1316 through to 1626, at which time the descent becomes uncertain until 1838, when it was purchased by James Walker, a merchant's son from Lancashire (Page 1923). The date in which Fairfield was purchased by the Vyners is not known, and although we know the house at Brockfield was built in 1800 (Pevsner, 1966), it is not certain how and when the estate fell in to the ownership of the Agar family.

By the 1870s Easingwold and Huby Hall were both properties of Sir George Wombwell Bart of Newburgh Priory, located six to seven miles to the north-east in the Howardian Hills. Holtby House belonged to Mrs. John Agar of the neighbouring estate Brockfield located less than a mile north, and Fairfield Lodge fell under the holdings of Sir Henry Frederick Vyner of Newby Hall located fifteen miles west further along the River Ure within the South Magnesian Limestone region. Although the history of when and how Fairfield was acquired by the Vyners, remains illusive, it is known that the estate served as a Horse Stud for the estate (Hinson 2007) and was the residence of Robert Charles DeGrey-Vyner the second son of Sir Vyner. Likewise, it is uncertain how Holtby came into the possessions of the Agar family, however it was their residence from the late sixteenth century until 1800 when the family constructed and relocated to their new house situated within the neighbouring estate of Brockfield (Page 1923 and Pevsner 1966, 378).



Whilst Myton Hall and Stillington Hall were rendered buildings, all of these houses were constructed of brick, reflecting a similar pattern seen within the vernacular architecture within the Vale noted during the survey carried out by Natural England (2008). Myton Hall, Huby Hall and Sheriff Hutton were all constructed during the seventeenth century. New houses were built during the eighteenth century at Beningbrough (1716), Aldby (1726), Sutton Park (1750) and Sand Hutton on the site of, or near to the site of, the earlier halls (GD 2057, GD 2059, Sheffield 2008) and the house at Brockfield was constructed around 1800 (Page 1923). The dates of the houses at Easingwold, Fairfield, Holtby and Stillington are unknown, however, Stillington is described as Georgian by Pevsner, placing its construction sometime between 1720 and 1840. The houses of Aldby Park, Beningbrough Hall, Sand Hutton, Sheriff Hutton and Sutton Park were altered during the later part of the eighteenth century and during the mid-nineteenth century.

All the estates except for Aldby Park and Sheriff Hutton were situated in undulating topography in the south-eastern part of the Vale. In regard to the development and subsequent improvements to the designed landscapes within this region, there is more detailed information available for Aldby Park, Beningbrough Hall, Sheriff Hutton and to some extent Sutton Park (see Gazetteer). For these estates, when alterations were being made to the country house, improvements were being carried out within the designed landscape. For the remaining eight estates the only information available is the First Edition OS map. Easingwold, Fairfield, Holtby and Huby, all of which are secondary estates, have very little in the way of associated designed landscape parks and gardens. These secondary estates were located more centrally within the Vale of York with Fairfield three miles west of the City of York, Holtby four north-east of York, while Easingwold and Huby were situated centrally within the northern part of the Vale. Huby Hall and Easingwold, which were situated along the main village streets, had very little in the way of gardens represented on the First Edition OS map beyond small linear ponds within their grounds. Holtby House located on the eastern side of the village street, was surrounded by a small garden. Fairfield Lodge, situated on the northern bank of the River Ure, about half a mile south of the village of Skelton, is the only house of these four which has the start of a wider design occurring within the wider landscape. However, beyond a

small plantation around the site of the house and scattered clumps throughout the fields of the stud farm, there is very little evidence of a wider design aesthetic within the grounds.

By 1720, Aldby, Beningbrough, Sheriff Hutton and Sutton Parks had formal walled gardens established near the houses. By the 1730s the walled gardens at Sheriff Hutton were opened-up to create an early irregular-style landscape in which the wider parkland and distant castle ruins were incorporated into the design. By 1746 the old house at Aldby was demolished, a new house was created, parts of the village removed and a landscape of simplified-geometry, attributed to Thomas Knowlton, was created within the grounds incorporating the earthwork remains of a motte (GD 2057, Wickham 2006) (Plates 139 and 140). Further alterations were carried out within the landscape during the 1750s and 1770s, and by 1829 the terraces near the house were altered to create a pleasure ground, incorporating the earthwork into the design. Both Aldby and Sheriff Hutton likewise, utilized earlier features of British antiquity within their designs, including distant views of the fourteenth-century Castle ruins across the parkland at Sheriff Hutton.

During the mid-eighteenth century the house at Sutton was remodeled, designs attributed to Adam Mickle, neighbouring village houses, evident on the earlier estate map, were removed and a Brownian-style landscape park was established. At Beningbrough the landscape was altered during the 1830s, incorporating some of the suggestions of William Sawrey Gilpin for the pleasure grounds, approach and the southern parklands (GD 2059, Piebenga 1985). At Sheriff Hutton designed terraces were re-introduced near the house during the nineteenth century according to designs by Nesfield (GD 2948, Dennison 2005).

The only evidence available for the designed landscape parks and gardens at Brockfield Hall, Myton Hall, and Stillington Hall is the First Edition OS map. By this time, all three houses were situated within pleasure-grounds surrounded by belted wider parklands. At Brockfield and Stillington the wider parkland was rectilinear potentially indicating that the design conformed to earlier field boundaries. All three had scattered plantings within and small belts around the perimeter, however, there was not a strong overall design aesthetic, as evident in the landscapes of Aldby, Beningbrough and Sheriff Hutton.



All of the landscapes within this region, with the exception of Huby, Easingwold and Fairfield had naturalistic designs by the mid-nineteenth century. Although naturalistic designs were created at Aldby, Beningbrough, Sheriff Hutton and Sutton; at Beningbrough and Sutton some of the earlier formal features were retained within their naturalistic landscapes. Aldby Park and Sheriff Hutton maintained earlier formal elements, whilst naturalistic elements were added within the wider parkland. Although these four landscapes were naturalistic by the mid-nineteenth century First Edition OS Map, all four utilized prominent landscape designers, who created four distinct landscapes whose overall styles were quite varied, indicating that appeared to be little influence between landowners in regard to their design choices. Even the landscape at Sand Hutton, although naturalistic, was quite unique in character from the other larger landscapes within the Vale. It is only within the landscapes of Brockfield, Myton and Stillington that we start to see a stronger sense of similarity within the designs.

With the exception of Brockfield and Holtby, all of the landscapes within the Vale of York contained water features within the design. The First Edition OS map shows a fountain on the terrace to the south of the house at Sutton, however it is unclear if there was a larger water feature beyond the fountain at this time. A rectangular pond was indicated on the 1911 OS map, and the current pond on this site was reported to have been added in the early part of the twentieth century (Sheffield 2009). Oblong fishponds were located within the gardens and landscapes at Beningbrough, Easingwold, Huby, Myton and Stillington. At Sand Hutton and Sheriff Hutton naturalistic lakes were established within the landscape parks, views of which were afforded from the house. Aldby Park, Beningbrough Hall, Fairfield Lodge, and Myton Hall were situated within close proximity to major rivers and at Aldby and Myton the rivers Derwent and Ure respectively acted as prominent features within the design of the landscape. At Fairfield, the River Ure was viewed in the distance, whereas at Beningbrough a belt obscured views to the River Ure south of the house. The majority of these landscapes were completely isolated from views of the working landscape beyond the park, however, at Aldby, Fairfield and Myton unrestricted views were afforded out over the river features to the working landscape beyond.

### *Vale of Mowbray*

The Vale of Mowbray lies to the north of the Vale of York. Although the natural topography is more varied than that of Vale of York, the division between the two regions is not based upon a particular geographical feature, rather the boundaries are dictated by the historic holdings of the Norman Barons de Mowbray (Lewis 1831). The dividing border between the Character Areas of the Vale of Mowbray and the Vale of York starts in the west just above Dishforth. It continues north-east to the village of Topcliffe, and from there continues eastward through Dalton, terminating on its eastern-most border just north of the village of Angram Grange near Coxwold. The Vale is bound to the east by the escarpments of the North York Moors and in the west it meets with the rolling transitional landscapes of the South Magnesian Limestone in the south-west and the northern Dales Fringe in the north. Glacial deposits forming a minor watershed divide the vale from the Tees Lowlands to the north-west. As mentioned above, the lands along the eastern edge of the vale are higher in elevation and more varied. There is also a triangular-shaped area of higher elevations in the north-western corner of the vale between Catterick, North Cowton, and Middleton Tyas. The River Swale and its tributaries the Wiske and Cod Beck flow down the vale and in the north the valleys of these rivers are quite narrow and tree-lined, offering a variety to the flat low-lying landscape in the south of the vale (Countryside Commission 2008).

There were a total of twenty-one estates with designed landscape parks and gardens held by nineteen different landowners within the Vale of Mowbray. Five of these estates were owned by members of the greater gentry, nine by members of the lesser gentry, and seven were secondary holdings of North Riding landowners. The history of the descent for these estates reflects a relatively stable pattern of ownership throughout the long-eighteenth century. Although the date of acquisition is unknown for Newton House and Leases Hall, eleven of the remaining estates were acquired before the eighteenth century. Seventeen of the estates within the Vale of Mowbray passed through lineal descent through to the late-nineteenth century landowner. Kirklington, Brough and Langton, all of which were



acquired through grants during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, descended indirectly through marriage in 1434, 1574 and 1820 respectively, whilst Kiplin, purchased in 1620 by George Calvert, descended indirectly through marriage to the Carpenters. For the remaining estates five were acquired during the eighteenth century, whilst the remaining three estates were purchased during the first half of the nineteenth century

Whilst there was a general trend in continuity of ownership through lineal descent, fifteen of the estates within the Vale were part of wider holdings. Captain Walter Carpenter of Kiplin and Henry Ruston of Newby Wiske, both held additional lands within the North Riding. In addition to Kiplin Hall, Captain Carpenter inherited the estate of Bolton-upon-Swale, located three miles to the north-east within the Vale of Mowbray from his cousin John Delaval Carpenter, 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Tryconnel (Webster 2005). Hy Ruston, a businessman from Liverpool, purchased the estate of Newby Wiske in 1829, and ten years later purchased the estates of Nunnington and Ness, both located in the Vale of Pickering. In the 1850s he updated the exterior of Newby Wiske, rendering it in stone. At Ness, although the old hall represented on Jeffrey's *Map of Yorkshire* (1770) was removed and a new house built to the west as represented on the 1856 First Edition OS map, it is not certain if Hy Ruston carried out these changes. While the landscape at Nunnington retained formal elements from earlier garden designs, the landscapes at Newby Wiske and Ness apparently retained little formality, and are indicative of landscape designs of the late-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century (see Gazetteer), however, the only cartographic material available which details the designed landscapes for all three of his estates is the First Edition OS survey. Nunnington and Ness were illustrated by Buck which were altered and/or removed by the First Edition OS map, with the lack of cartographic material it is not possible to state exactly when changes occurred within their design (Buck 1979, orig. 1720).

Of the remaining thirteen estates which are part of larger holdings; Baldersby, Langton, Leases and Mount Grace Priory were held by North Riding landowners whose primary seats were located in other regions of the Riding. Whilst the main seats for Viscount Downe, who held Baldersby, and the Duke of Leeds, who held Langton, were within the

Riding, they held additional lands beyond. Likewise the Duke of Northumberland, who held Sion Hill and also maintained the old family seat of Stanwick Park in the Tees Lowlands, his main seat moved to Alnwick Castle, Northumberland in 1766. For the remaining estates within this region, including Hornby Grange, Hutton Bonville, Kirkby Fleetham, Kirklington, Lazenby Hall, Newton House and Woodend, these estates were considered secondary for landowners with country seats beyond the county of Yorkshire. Although the majority of these country houses served as secondary estates, the still owners designed and maintained parks and gardens within the grounds.

Bolton-Upon-Swale, owned by the Carpenters of Kiplin; Kirklington Hall, owned by the Honorable Charles Wadesforde of Cromer, Ireland and Lazenby Hall, owned by John R Hilyard of Horsley Hall, Durham, all had formal walled gardens near the house at the time of the First Edition OS map. The only mention of design or alterations to the landscape at Bolton-upon-Swale dates to the 1680s, when the house fell under ownership of the John Howe (Gatehouse website, 2009). The family archives indicate that the Crowe family of Kiplin Hall actively acquired adjoining lands to the north and north-west of Kiplin, and by 1818 they had increased their holdings from 800 acres of to a total of 4,500 acres in the area, including the neighbouring estates of North Ellerton, South Ellerton and Bolton-Upon-Swale. The Carpenters, to whom the estate descended through marriage, continued to increase the estate holdings throughout the nineteenth century (Webster 2005, NYCRO ZBL), however, Kiplin Hall, remained their family seat and was their only estate with a designed landscape park and garden.

At Kirklington the maintenance of the walled garden can be explained by the shift of the Wandesford's focus from Kirklington, the family seat since the early-fifteenth century, towards their estate in Ireland. In 1633 Christopher Wandesforde was appointed Master of the Rolls in Ireland, shortly after he purchased Comer Castle in 1637. In 1662 he was created baronet and his son advanced to the peerage of Ireland as Viscount Castle Cromer (Page 1914, Lundy 2006). Although the seventeenth-century gardens at Lazenby Hall represented in Buck's 1719 sketch detailed walled garden near the house, (Plate 162) the wider landscape was not developed into a designed landscape over the eighteenth



century. Rather, the house was held by the Hilyard's as one of their North Riding hunting estates and was visited frequently throughout the year (Page 1914, Anon 2009). The landscape at Mount Grace Priory contained the gardens, ponds and ruins from the fourteenth-century priory and woodlands on the escarpment of the Hambleton Hills to the east. The estate was purchased in 1744 by Timothy Mauleverer of the neighbouring estate of Arnecliffe Hall, located in the Tees Lowlands.

Although there is currently very little history regarding the establishment and evolution of the designed landscape at Leases Hall, the landscape represented on the First Edition OS maps appears to be *ferme ornée* as seen at Shetstone's Leasowes, with small belts with internal garden buildings and pleasure-grounds surrounding arable lands. Although the designed landscape at Hornby Grange, within the holdings of the Blckett family of Matfen, Newcastle since 1682, is smaller in scale, it did not appear to sit untouched over the long eighteenth century. Likewise the aesthetic at Hornby is more associated with the *ferme ornée* (see Gazetteer), whilst Matfen Hall has a naturalistic landscape which employed some of the design elements associated with Gilpin during the early-mid nineteenth century.

For the nine remaining country houses within this group, the landowners established gardens and designed parklands within the wider landscape. Six of which, including Baldersby Park, Kiplin Hall, Kirkby Fleetham, Langton Hall, Sion Hill and Woodend, were substantial designs. Six of the estates including Bedale Hall, Brough Hall, Kilvington Hall, Pepper Arden, Scruton Hall and Thirkleby Hall, served as the only holding and served as the country seats for their landowners. Although the Peirse family of Bedale also held the estates of Hutton Bonville and Lazenby Hall, these two estates were sold to the Hildyards in 1699 and the 1850s respectively (Page, 1914). All six of these country houses had designed landscape parks and gardens.

In total there are twenty-one country houses within the Vale of Mowbray within this data set. Of these, seven houses including Bolton-Upon-Swale, Brough, Hutton Bonville, Kirklington, Lazenby, Thirkleby and Woodend all had walled gardens (Buck 1979 orig.

1720, Waterson E, et al 1990, Davis P 2000, Page 1914). The gardens at Bolton, Kirklington and Lazenby were maintained throughout the long-eighteenth century (see above) whilst the walled gardens around Kiplin Hall evident on the 1723 map of the estate (see Plates 101 and 102), were no longer evident by 1780, when George Cuitt the elder painted the house and grounds (see Plate 103). By the time of the First Edition OS map the sixteenth-century walled gardens at Brough, Hutton Bonville and Thirkleby had been replaced by naturalistic landscapes. The dates of naturalization for each of these country houses occurred during the 1770s at Brough (Cornforth 1967a, 1967b), at Woodend in 1778, at Thirkleby between 1787 and 1792 (Waterson E, et al 1990), and by the 1816 plan of Hutton Bonville (NYCRO M (MIC 1496/472-3).

By the mid-nineteenth century fourteen of the landowners had landscapes with a naturalistic design or had added naturalistic elements into the wider parklands. Whilst, Brough (1770s), Kiplin (1820), Hutton Bonville (1819), Kilvington (1835), Pepper Hall (1857), Bedale (unknown) and Langton (unknown) had shifted earlier formal landscapes towards a complete naturalistic design, the naturalistic landscapes created at Woodend in 1778, Baldersby (unknown date) and Kiplin Hall up until the 1820 improvements, retained earlier formal elements within their designs. At Scruton, which had a naturalistic landscape established by the 1839 survey (NYCRO ZCI ( MIC 2066/ 109-124) and Newby Wiske, which was redesigned in 1850, it is uncertain if the naturalistic design was newly created or replaced earlier formal landscapes. Newton House, the family seat for Russell family, was held by Elizabeth, even after her marriage to Henry Vane, The Duke of Cleveland, in 1813. From this date the estate was utilized by the Duke as a hunting box, and naturalistic elements were applied to the landscape when the house and grounds were improved in the 1820s (Waterson 1990). Naturalistic elements were added by 1856 to the landscape at Sion Hill, which was owned by the Duke of Northumberland, but again, earlier formal elements were retained within the design.

Five of these houses were constructed during the sixteenth century and five during the early-seventeenth century. The sixteenth and early-seventeenth-century houses at Bolton, Kirklington Hall, Lazenby and Mount Grace Priory, like their earlier gardens, were



maintained with little to no alterations throughout the long eighteenth century. The remaining seven country houses within this grouping were later altered in conjunction with improvements within their associated designed landscapes. According to the Natural England survey, brick was the main building material within the vale and the underlying clays have supported brickworks in the area at various times (2009), however, only six of the country houses within this dataset were known to have been constructed out of brick. These include the original hall at Sion Hill, built in 1561; Kiplin Hall in 1622; Scruton in 1718; Langton between 1750 and 1800; Hornby in 1767, and Kilvington in 1823. Although Pepper Arden and Kirkby Fleetham were rendered, it is not certain if they were of brick or rough stone construction at this time. Ten of the houses were constructed out of stone whilst Bedale and Woodend were clad in stone. Eight of the twelve houses which were either rendered or stone-built were situated along within the fringe regions at the base of, or along rising grounds. Seven were located along the western edge of the Vale whilst, Marrick Priory sat along the base of the Hambleton Hills in the east. This distribution potentially indicates an association in building construction traditions seen within these neighbouring upland regions rather than building trends found throughout the Vale.

Fifteen of the designed landscapes within the Vale of Mowbray were situated in the western half of the vale, eleven within the middle reaches of the Vale of Mowbray. They were relatively scattered throughout this middle region, with a cluster of five landscapes around Catterick in the north-east and four landscapes situated around Bedale in the south-west. There was a large section of land in the north-east region of the vale, which had a distinct lack of designed landscapes (Plate 176) This area stretches from Knayton in the south-east, Gatenby in the south-west, and runs up to East Cowton and along the eastern border of the vale to the north-east, just below Ingleby Arncliffe, and included the market-town of Northallerton. The only estate within this group was Mount Grace Priory, situated along the base of the escarpment of the Hambleton Hills to the east, whose priory garden and ponds were maintained and incorporated into the design of Arncliffe Hall to the north-east (see above). Beyond Marrick Priory, there were no designed landscapes within this area of the vale. Although the reasons for this pattern are not evident at this time, it might be result of both geological and social development of landownership.

According to the Countryside Commission survey (2009), the Vale of Mowbray is divided from the Tees Lowlands to the north by a minor watershed formed from glacial deposits. Instead of villages and settlements, this area is mainly dominated by scattered farmsteads, indicative of landscapes developed from drainage, flood control and parliamentary enclosure. With scattered farmsteads within this region, it is very possible that land-use and landownership were shaped by this watershed, and subsequent enclosures, similar to the settlement patterns seen above in the Vale of Pickering. Like in the Vale of Pickering, this region this settlement pattern could have been counter conducive to the amalgamation of lands to create larger estates.

Unlike the relatively flat topography associated with the Vale of York, the Vale of Mowbray is quite varied and has been described as 'a tract of country remarkable for ...the picturesque beauty and richness of its scenery' (Lewis, 1831). Despite this varied topography, the majority of the landscapes were situated within relatively level or flat elevations except for eight country houses which were situated within these varied landscapes. The landscapes of Hornby Grange, Kirkby Fleetham, Kilvington, Pepper Hall, Thirkleby Hall were developed within in lands which had twenty to thirty metres difference in their elevations.

Brough Hall, which was situated on lands eighty-five metres above sea level. The approach to the house was from lower ground-levels to the north-east. The house was orientated allowing views out over the lower-lying parkland to the north. Elevations ranged from eighty metres in the north and north-west to seventy-two metres to the north-east. Views were afforded out over the lowlands and the village of Catterick, located one mile to the east. The house was situated within a plantation labeled 'High Garden Wood' on the OS map, which surrounded the house and kitchen garden and block plantation were situated to the south-west, separating views from the house to the higher elevations beyond. Like the designed landscape at Brough, the houses of Kiplin Hall, Thirkleby and Kilvington Hall, were situated within rising elevations within the landscape allowing views out over the parklands within lower elevations. The parkland and house at Thirkleby, like Brough, was approached from lower grounds via an avenue situated in the



south-east of the estate (Plate 164). Whilst at Baldersby Park, where the house and landscape were within relatively flat lands along the southern bank of the River Swale, scattered trees within the parkland and plantation belts were utilized to offer variety within the landscape.

Some of the most dramatic topography was found at Mount Grace Priory, situated eighty-two metres above sea-level along the base of the wooded escarpment of the Hambleton Hills, an escarpment which rises to elevations over 250 metres. However, the most dramatic use of the natural topography was found at Kirkby Fleetham Hall. Shortly after purchasing the estate for his son in 1720, Lord Aislabie of Studley Royal, West Riding, constructed a new house on a ridge twenty metres above the surrounding landscape (Plates 167 and 168). In addition, he created a serpentine-style landscape within the grounds surrounding the house including a terrace walk along the ridge similar to his 'High Walk' at Studley (1720s) and the Terrace Walk at Duncombe Park (1713). As at Studley and Duncombe, temples were situated along the terrace at Kirkby Fleetham, allowing for views across the Vale to the Moors in the east and to the Dales in the west (McLeod 2001, Evers 1981).

Hunting and field sports have historically been popular within the region which led to the introduction of numerous small blocks of woodland, planted as game coverts (Natural England 2009). A number of these block plantations can be seen within the designed landscapes of Hornby Grange, Pepper Arden, Wood End and within the wider landscapes around Bedale Hall, Newby Wiske and Sion Hill. According to Page, Henry Wilson Todd of Leases Hall was the Master of Hounds for the Bedale Hunt (1914). As mentioned above, Newton House served as the hunting box for the Duke of Cleveland during the early-nineteenth century. The Hildyards of Horsley Hall, Durham maintained Hutton Bonville Hall as a hunting seat since 1699, and later purchased the Lazenby Hall in 1850 for the same purpose (anon 2009 horsleyhall.co.uk). The Hildyards annually visited their North Riding estates over the hunting seasons (2009), this interest was not only reflected within the design of the landscape at Hutton Bonville, which was filled with coverts (Page 1914, 399), but it was also represented in the painting of *The Hutton Bonville Dog* (1725) by the

Master of the Hutton Bonville Dog (Plate 107), which portrays the dog in the foreground on a hill with the house and grounds viewed beyond the dog to the north. Even though this estate served as a hunting seat, the Hildyards improved the house between the sketch by Samuel Buck in 1719 (Plate 106) and the above painting. In addition, the 1819 plan (Plate 105) and aerial images of the designed landscape reveal that the formal gardens represented on Buck's sketch were removed in order to create a naturalistic design within the landscape. Although this estate served as a hunting estate, the Hildyards still put energy, income and time into updating the house and designed landscape following contemporary modes.

Viscount Downe and the Dawnay family were also historically known as a hunting family. Cowick Hall in the West Riding, which served as the family's seat until 1869, was originally a Royal hunting estate, was granted to the Dawnays in the fifteenth century. The estate records detail the relocation of deer from the family estate of Sessay Park in the North Riding down to Cowick in the 1720s (Dawnay 2009). Danby Castle, the main seat at the time of Bateman served as a shooting box for the family (Page 1923, Dawnay Estates 2000). Baldersby Park, which served as the Viscount's primary seat for a brief time between 1869 and 1883, although one of the larger designed landscapes within the region, additionally contained features and elements associated with a hunting estate, such as coverts and deer runs.

The Vale is traversed by the rivers Swale, Wiske, Cod Beck and numerous tributaries of the three. Fourteen of the houses were situated near, or along these rivers. At Hornby Grange, Hutton Bonville, Kilvington Hall, and Kirklington Hall, becks and rivers were within view of the house. Rivers and becks were within the wider landscapes at Bolton Hall and Thirkleby Park, but they are not in view from the house. Likewise at Mount Grace Priory, Newby Wiske and Scruton Hall, the waterways were not in view of the house, but they passed through the woodlands within the wider parklands, and were utilized to feed ponds within. The parklands at Brough Kiplin and Kirkby Fleetham contained becks, all of which were not only in view from the house, but were also dammed in order to create dominant water features within the designed landscape.



Terraces at Sion Hill stepped down towards the River Wiske, which flowed past the southern side of the house and gardens. At Baldersby the house sat prominently along the southern edge of the River Swale whereas, at Langton, Mantledam Beck ran along the southern edge of the park within a small woodland, which contained a series of cascades throughout. Although Bedale, Leases, Pepper Arden and Wood End were not in close proximity to waterways, water features were prominent features within the design. Only Newton House was not situated near, or along a river, nor was a water feature prominent within the design.

### *Tees Lowlands*

There were a total of twenty-two estates owned by seventeen different landowners within the Tees Lowlands (Plate 180). Seven of the landscapes were owned by the greater gentry, ten by members of the lesser gentry, and six were secondary estates for North Riding landowners. Barring Carleton Hall, for which the descent of ownership remains incomplete, and Worsall Hall, which changed ownership via multiple sales from 1654 through to 1856, the remainder of the estates within this region passed through continuous descent up until the latter half of the eighteenth century. Over the later half of the eighteenth century through to 1845, ten estates, four situated around Stapleton in the west of the region and six around Middlesbrough and Guisborough in the east, were sold by their landowners. The majority of these properties had been within their family's holdings for at least 200 years. For the remaining eleven estates, their descent of ownership was maintained through to the end of the nineteenth century. Of the twenty three estates within the Tees Lowlands, thirteen were part of additional holdings for their landowners. Although there was a large portion of estates within this region which were part of wider holdings for the majority of the landowners, these North Riding estates served as their primary seat. Only three served as secondary holdings, including Middleton Lodge, held by Leonard Hartley of Parklane, West Riding; Wilton Castle, held by Sir C J Lowther (Bart) of Swillington House, Leeds and the manors of Carlton and Stanwick, held by the Duke of Northumberland of Alnwick Castle, Northumberland.

In keeping with local building traditions revealed within the Natural England survey (2009), twenty-two of the country houses within the Tees lowlands were constructed of local sandstone. Whilst only four houses were made of brick, including Acklam, built in 1678, Clervaulx in 1840, Halnaby, made of 'brick block', was constructed in 1660 around a late-gothic house (Waterson, et al 1990) and Ormesby was built in 1754. With varied dates of construction, the use of brick cannot be attributed to a particular phase in building styles within the region. Likewise, as Acklam was located to the west of Middlesbrough and Ormesby to the south, whilst Clervaulx and Halnaby were located near to Middleton Tyas in the south-west, the use of brick cannot be attributed to a particular region of the Tees Lowlands. Further research into the building practices and styles surrounding these particular country houses might help to explain the use of brick, in these instances.

Unfortunately, the date of construction for seven of the country houses within this region remains unknown. The house at Normanby Park is known to have been built by Rev. William Consett, placing the date of construction between 1690 and 1762 (Page 1923, 280). The date of construction is not known for Upleatham Hall, but John Carr carried out alterations to the house around 1764 (Wragg 2000, 215). Ten of the remaining country houses were constructed prior to the eighteenth century, including Wilton Castle and Skelton Castle, both built during the fourteenth century.<sup>4</sup> All of these houses, with the exception of Arncliffe Hall, Acklam Hall and Marske Hall, were added onto, or were altered throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Middleton Lodge and Ormesby Hall were constructed during the eighteenth century whilst four houses were constructed during the nineteenth century comprising Clervaulx Castle (1840), Cliffe Hall (1840), the new hall at Guisborough (1857), and Upsall Hall (1870). These nineteenth constructions at Clervaulx and Guisborough New Hall replaced earlier houses.

The general distribution of the country houses within the Tees Lowlands fall into distinct regions of the area. Before this can be discussed further, it must be stated that there were

---

<sup>4</sup> Wilton Castle (13<sup>th</sup> century), Skelton (14<sup>th</sup> century), Halnaby (late gothic), Ingleby (16<sup>th</sup> century), Busby (1582), Arncliffe (1584), Kirkleatham (1620), Marske (1625) and Stanwick (1662)



some issues with the Countryside Commission survey for the North York Moors with regard to the character boundaries. For instance, in the Tees Lowlands, the estates of Grinkle Park, Guisborough, Hutton Hall, Skelton Castle, Tocketts and Upleatham were situated on the lower elevations well below the escarpment of the North York Moors, however, they fall within the boundaries for Natural England's North York Moors Character Area, rather than the Tees Lowlands. The natural topography within these regions fits more closely to those of the Tees lowlands than those of the North York Moors. This discrepancy is reflected within the distribution maps for this area of the Riding with several estates appearing to be situated outside the bounds of the region.

A group of seven country houses were situated in the western area of this region: Forcett, Stanwick and Carlton Hall were situated within undulating topography near the Dales Fringe; Middleton Tyas and Halnaby near the Vale of Mowbray; and Cliffe Hall, Croft whose later house of Clervaulx Castle, were situated within relatively flat terrains along the southern bank of the River Tees. Further along the Tees to the east was Worsall Hall, again within relatively flat lands. The remaining country houses were located in the eastern region of the Lowlands. A group of six landscapes stretched from Acklam Hall, situated within relatively flat lands to the south-west of Middlesbrough, to Kirkleatham and Marske on flat grounds near the North Sea. Included within this grouping were Normanby Hall, Ormesby Hall, Upsall Castle, and Wilton Castle, which were situated in close proximity to each other along a ridge-line running east to west. Upsall Hall and Upleatham Hall located south of this ridge on transitional lands within the higher elevations, situated between Middlesbrough and Guisborough. Although Guisborough Hall and Tocketts were located within these higher elevations, they were situated on relatively flat terrain.

Of the twenty-two designed landscape parks and gardens within this region, nine had small walled gardens near the house prior to the start of the eighteenth century, as represented in sketches by Buck and/or Knyff and Kip. The landowners of Arncliffe Hall maintained their walled garden until 1753, when a late-geometric landscape was created within the grounds, and at Acklam the late-geometric gardens established by 1707 were

maintained through to 1856. At Guisborough (1805) and Skelton (n.d.) these late-geometric, formal gardens were likewise maintained, but naturalistic designs were applied within the wider parkland. A similar maintenance of these earlier gardens within a wider naturalistic design occurred at Kirkleatham Hall during the ownership of the Turner gentlemen. However, with the passing of the house from the Turners to Mr. Newcomen through marriage, the formal elements were removed in favour of a naturalistic design near the house. While at Ingleby Manor, which had a naturalistic landscape by 1856, only elements of the earlier, formal design were retained. Forcett Hall and Stanwick Park were both developed into serpentine-style landscapes during the 1740s, which were likewise maintained until the mid-nineteenth century.

At Busby, Croft/Clervaulx, Ormesby, Wilton and with the ownership of Kirkleatham by Mr Newcomen (see above), these formal landscapes were completely replaced with naturalistic designs. At Busby and Ormesby these alterations occurred during the 1770s, where as this naturalization of the designed landscape did not occur until the first half of the nineteenth century at Croft, Kirkleatham and Wilton Castle. By the First Edition OS map, naturalistic designed landscapes were established within the grounds for the remaining eight landscapes. Without earlier cartographic evidence available for these landscapes, it is not certain if these were newly created out of arable lands or a shift from earlier formal designs. However, for Tocketts, Carlton, Upleatham, Middleton and Halnaby, we do have dates when the landowners were carrying out major works to the house, and from these dates we can potentially estimate when the naturalistic designs were applied to the grounds. Of these, Tocketts and Upleatham were possibly created during the 1760s, Middleton the 1770s, Carlton around 1800, and Halnaby during the 1740s (Page, 1912, 1928; Pevsner 1966; Waterson et al 1990; Wragg 2000). In total, sixteen of the designed landscapes within this region had either naturalistic elements and/or designs within their parks and gardens. Seven were created during the 1760s and 1770s, whilst the remainder, were established during the first half of the nineteenth century. As detailed in the previous section, all of the later designed landscapes, except for the 1753 late-geometric design established at Arncliffe and the 1773 formal elements added in the grounds of Guisborough were created well within the accepted chronology. Although



these landowners were developing and altering their landscapes within the accepted chronology, again we see evidence of this North Riding trend towards a retention and/or maintenance of earlier formal designs

Analysis of the designed landscapes with respect to topography and other neighbouring landscapes begins to reveal regional similarities and trends within the Tees Lowlands. At the neighbouring estates of Forcett and Stanwick, the landowners both utilized Iron Age features to create serpentine-style designed landscapes (see gazetter). Ingleby Hall (by 1719) and Arncliffe Hall, although developed in 1753, both of these designed landscapes had formal gardens with small rectilinear ponds. Similar formal landscapes with water canals were created at Acklam, Kirkleatham and Guisborough, however for these, situated within flatter grounds, longer and more dominant water canals were able to be established within the designs (see Gazetteer). Lastly, naturalistic designs were developed within the grounds of Ormesby, Wilton and Normanby. All the houses were situated midway up the ridge, and at Ormesby and Normanby the shelter belts of one merged with the belts of the other. Even though the neighbouring landscape at Marton Hall is not included within the dataset of this research due to guidelines established in regard to date of design, Marton's the internal design falls in line with the neighbouring estates of Ormesby and Normanby. For all of these landscapes the higher elevations created a backdrop for their designs, either within the design or within the wider prospect. Landscapes such as Ingleby, Kirkleatham and Tocketts utilized distant eye-catchers within these higher elevations effectively incorporating the distant uplands into the design.

### *Upland Regions*

Within the North Riding there are three upland regions including the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills situated to the south of the Tees Lowlands, The Howardian Hills, to the south of the North York Moors and the Yorkshire Dales located across the Vales of York and Mowbray in the western region of the Riding. These upland regions contain twenty-nine of the total of the designed landscape parks and gardens included within this research. The Moors and Dales provided dramatic natural landscapes in which the

landowners could create their parks and gardens. While the climates and winds along the tops of the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales are quite extreme, the valleys and dales which cut through these dramatic landscapes provided a more hospitable climate and varied situations in which landowners could create their designed landscapes.

#### *The North York Moors and Cleveland Hills*

The first upland region to be discussed is the 'North York Moors and Cleveland Hills,' a plateau which lies over 360 metres above sea level. The top of the moors is comprised of heather moorlands, which are cut by a series of dales typically in a north-south direction. The natural aesthetic is quite varied, from the wide open views available over the moorlands and sea, to the open valleys in the north, and the steep sided river valleys to the south. According to Hey, the dale tops 'provided the roughest of grazing and even its dales have never afforded easy living. The farmers had limited opportunities to combine husbandry with a craft and were always amongst the poorest and most backward in the nation' (2005, 5).

This region, as defined by the Natural England and Countryside Commission Survey has proven to be problematic for this research. The report for the North York Moors includes the market towns of Guisborough and Pickering (2009, 99), however, these settlements are actually located on the plain of the Tees Lowlands and on the northern edge of the Vale of Pickering, respectively. Additionally, a total of seven estates including Guisborough, Hutton, Grinkle Park, Skelton, Tocketts and Upleatham in the north-east of the region, and Hutton Buscel in the south-east, have been located within the Moors boundaries as defined on the Countryside Commission map. However, upon analysis of the geographical and topographical situations for these estates, they do not belong geographically within the region of the North York Moors. The estates in the north-east lie on lower elevations along the base of the North York Moors, and have therefore been placed in the Tees Lowlands (see above). Not only were they situated at lower elevations, the designs incorporated within the landscape parks and gardens appear to be more closely associated with the other estates within the Tees Lowlands as opposed to those within the Moors. Likewise, the estate of Hutton Buscel has been judged to be more



suitably assigned to the lowlands of the Vale of Pickering, and is included with this group of landscapes.

After taking these estates into consideration, there were a total of nine estates within the boundaries of the North Yorkshire Moors and Cleveland Hills (Plate 181). Within this group, the estate of Duncombe Park belonged to the Earl of Feversham, a land magnate, Danby Castle to a member of the great landowners, Hackness Hall and Mulgrave were held by members of the greater gentry, and the estates of Arden, Kildale, and Westerdale were held by members of the lesser gentry. Downthwaite Dale was owned by Sir Henry Brewster Darley (Bart) of Aldby Park, and Westerdale was the seat of Col Walter Henry Octavius Duncombe, the younger son of the Earl of Feversham. Both of these were considered secondary estates to their landowners. Additionally the Earl of Feversham of Duncombe Park also owned the adjoining estate of Rievaulx, and Viscount Downe of Danby Castle held the estates of Baldersby, Sessay, Hutton Buscel, and Wykeham Abbey, all located in other regions within the North Riding. The remaining estates of Arden, Hackness, Kildale, and Mulgrave not only served as primary seats, but were also the only lands held by the end of the nineteenth century. The ownership for most of these estates was stable throughout the long-eighteenth century. Downthwaite Dale came into the ownership of Mr Cecil Darley through conveyance in 1784, and Kildale was in the possession of the Turner Family of Kirkleatham Hall from 1662 until it was sold to Robert Bell Livesey of Thirsk in 1870. Only Westerdale Hall was held by a series of owners from 1659 through to 1857, including the Pennymans of Ormesby Hall, and the Turners of Kirkleatham Hall, both located in the Tees Lowlands.

Within this group the houses at Duncombe Park (1713), Mulgrave (c. 1735) and Hackness Hall (1791-8) were newly built during the eighteenth century. At Duncombe and Mulgrave, the eighteenth century manor houses replaced the function of Helmsley Castle and Mulgrave Castle respectively, as the main residence, whilst, the remains of these two castles were maintained and utilized within both landscape designs. At Hackness the former manor house (Plate 87) was demolished when the new house was built. Danby Castle was originally a seventeenth-century stone cottage, which was altered and

increased in 1758 and during the mid-nineteenth century, creating 'a warren of rooms' (Dawnay Estate 2009) which served as the Dawnay family's shooting lodge (Plate 169). While extensive alterations were carried out at Arden during the seventeenth century and at Kildale during the nineteenth century, the original date of construction is not known at either site.

When the new houses were constructed at Duncombe, Mulgrave and Hackness, new landscapes were also created within the surrounding grounds. Since the site of the new houses shifted at Duncombe and Mulgrave from the prior site of the Castle, these landscapes were created out of once arable lands. In both instances, the landowners utilized the topography of the Hambleton Hills and Moorlands in the creation of parks and gardens. At Duncombe Park, the serpentine-style landscape (1713) with the classical temples, and the Terrace Walk situated along the ridge of an upland plateau, was designed in harmony with the natural topography of the river valley below. Likewise at Mulgrave Castle, although Humphry Repton produced a Red Book for the Earl of Mulgrave in 1792-93, only some of the proposed improvements were realized, as the Earl of Mulgrave opted for a more picturesque design than proposed, keeping in line with the dramatic natural topography of the valleys of Sand Beck and East Row Beck (GD 2067, Goodchild P, 1987). Even though these two owners had new houses constructed, they maintained an association with British antiquity which lay within the estate and the lands beyond, including the earlier castles. To further this aesthetic at Duncombe, a secondary terrace was created on the plateau above the ruins of Rievaulx Abbey, which lie two miles to the north-west. And at Mulgrave, views from the house were afforded out over the valley and across the sea to Whitby Abbey, which was located six miles to the south-east of the new house.

A very different approach to improvements to house and grounds was carried out by Sir Richard Vanden Bempde Johnstone at Hackness Hall from 1791-98. Although he retained the village church within the parkland, he created a Brownian-style landscape park, and he removed the earlier manor house, its gardens, and the village which was formerly located north-west of the house (Plate 85). He built a new village to the south-east, outside



the valley and beyond view. Additionally, in keeping with prevailing fashions in landscape design, albeit slightly delayed, Johnstone created a naturalistic landscape with sweeping lawns, scattered trees and a serpentine lake within a narrow valley with natural topography. This design leaned more towards the idyllic and picturesque (Plates 85-88), showing a disassociation from place in favour of implementing national landscape trends.

Danby Castle, prior to becoming the seat of Viscount Downe, was the family's shooting lodge, and had very little in the way of a designed landscape beyond the terraced gardens to the east of the house. The remaining landscapes within this region utilized later-eighteenth century naturalistic designs within their parks and gardens. Duncombe, Rievaulx, and Mulgrave incorporated the natural setting within their design. The serpentine-style landscapes established at Duncombe and Rievaulx incorporated an early natural approach which allowed for the incorporation of the natural topography involving little to no improvements. Similarly, in the landscape at Mulgrave Castle, naturalistic designs were incorporated within the grounds around the house, but the natural picturesque qualities of the topography were embraced within the wider parkland.

Whilst the details regarding the creation of the designed landscapes at Arden and Kildale remain elusive, the layout of their designs represented on the First Edition OS map, resemble naturalistic style landscapes. Both contained what looks to be an early-nineteenth century approaches, the house situated within pleasure-grounds with open parklands beyond. In contrast, the designed landscapes at Downthwaite Dale and Hackness were more like late eighteenth-century naturalistic landscapes associated with the designs of Brown and his contemporaries. While the landowners of Downthwaite and Hackness utilized late eighteenth-century aesthetics within their naturalistic designs, upon survey it has become clear that the natural topography created quite different experiences within each landscape park. Hackness is situated within a small, but wide valley base, with five projecting narrow valleys around its perimeter. The lands within the valley are undulating and utilized as pasture, the narrow valleys projecting off into the distance, and the steep valley walls with hanging woodlands create an idyllic setting. Within this

terrain, the naturalistic appears to be more applied to the natural topography rather than created out of it. The valley setting in which the designed landscape of Downtwaite Dale was created, although steep-sided, was long and narrow. This allowed for the perception of depth within the design, which was accented by scattered clumps and plantations, creating a more natural look to the design.

### *Howardian Hills*

The area comprises rolling upland valleys and central plateaux. Although an upland region, the Howardian Hills offered a more gentle situation for the designed landscape parks and gardens than the other upland regions in the Riding. The land-use of the Howardian Hills has historically been arable, with pasture occurring on the steeper slopes, along the fringes of the plateau, and within the damp valley floors. Over fifteen percent of the area is covered by ancient woodland and varied species, half of which are growing on sites which have been under cover since 1600 AD (Countryside Commission 2008).

As with the Moors and Tees Lowlands, there are some discrepancies in regard to the exact boundaries of this region as defined by Natural England. Although the escarpment along the western edge of the Hills naturally defines the boundaries of the upland area with the Vale of York, the Countryside Commission report for the Howardian Hills mentions the development of Crayke Castle (2008, 61), a distinctive hill situated well within the lowland region of the Vale. Furthermore, the Commission has also included in its Howardian Hills region the two estates of Nunnington and Ness, which in actuality are situated on the far lower elevations of the Vale of Pickering. As above, since these estates were clearly situated within lower elevations along the base of the hills, they have been included in the Vale of Pickering estate grouping.

Within this Character Area there were ten estates owned by nine different landowners. In addition to their estates within the Howardian Hills, Earl of Carlisle of Castle Howard, Harley Lechmere of Whitwell on the Hill, the Stricklands of Hildenley, and the Duke of Sutherland at High Stittenham held lands beyond the boundaries of the North Riding,



while George Wombwell of Newburgh Priory held three additional estates within the Vale of York. Except for Hildenely Hall and High Stittenham, which were considered secondary estates, by their landowners, the remainder of the country houses within the Hills were considered primary seats. George Wombwell of Newburgh and the Earl of Carlisle of Castle Howard were both considered great landowners. The Fairfaxes of Gilling Castle were members of the greater gentry, and the remaining six landowners within the region were considered lesser gentry. The descent of ownership for these estates was very stable throughout. Even with the estate of East Thorpe, which was sold to the Earl of Carlisle sometime during the late-eighteenth century or early-nineteenth, Wiganthorpe purchased in 1857 and Whitwell-on-the-Hill in 1829, the descent of ownership prior to the sale of these estates was continuous through lineal descent from the mid-seventeenth century.

With the exception of Wiganthorpe and High Stittenham, for which information regarding construction remains elusive, and Whitwell-on-the-Hill which was constructed in 1830, the remaining seven country houses were either constructed or altered during the eighteenth century. Local stone was utilized within all of these houses, and some was even quarried from sites located within their estates, as at Hovingham Hall, which was built from limestone quarried in the 'South Wood' approximately a mile west of the house (Wood 1957). Limestone at Hildenley was quarried extensively throughout the Roman period and during the later Norman period. This limestone was utilized in the construction of the local monasteries of Old Malton and Kirkham Priory (Senior 1990, 160). There was decline in the extraction of the limestone at Hildenley shortly after the Dissolution, and according to J.R. Senior, this was in part due to the reuse of the stones of these local monasteries (1990). However many local houses utilized Hildenley limestone for their construction, such as Howsham Hall (built in 1619) in the East Riding, Slingsby Castle (remodeled 1620s) and Nunnington Hall (remodeled 1685), and the Strickland properties at York House (Malton) and Boynton Hall (remodeled 1684), located in the East Riding (Burrows 2007, Copsey 2006 Senior 1990). Although it is not certain if the Hildenley stone used at Howsham, Nunnington and Slingsby was freshly cut or re-use from the local monasteries

(Senior 1990), it would be difficult to believe that the Stricklands were not quarrying new stone for the work carried out within their holdings.

Whilst Hildenley was constructed during the seventeenth century, Castle Howard (1700-08), Hovingham (1751), Brandsby (1767) and Whitwell-on-the-Hill were newly built during the eighteenth century and the early part of the nineteenth century. The date of construction for East Thrope is unknown, but extensive remodeling occurred during 1755, which has been attributed to John Carr by some historians and Thomas Atkinson by others (Waterson 1990, 13). The construction dates for Wiganthorpe and High Stittenham remain elusive. Five of the remaining country houses were constructed during the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century, indicating that the eighteenth to early-nineteenth centuries were quite busy with building new houses and the construction of designed landscapes within this region.

The majority of the country houses and designed landscapes within this region were situated along the ridges of the Howardian Hills, with the exception of Castle Howard, which was situated within the undulating landscape of the upland valley which comprises the central area of the region (Plate 182). As discussed in the previous section, some of the landscapes within the region of the Howardian Hills were particularly early examples of formal designs. Included within this group was Castle Howard (1700-1730), the first landscape park and garden to be designed on a grand scale in the Riding. Additionally the stark geometric design applied within the landscape (see Gazetteer), was quite early in terms of the national chronology (Plates 27-29).

At Newburgh Priory the Bellasises established a Renaissance-style garden by the late-seventeenth century (Plates 46-47), and had late-geometric designs established within the wider parkland by the 1722 map (Plate 44). By 1744, an elaborate landscape of stark geometry was established within the gardens and grounds (Plate 45). Although it was within the same 'style' or 'type' of design as that of Castle Howard, demonstrating the influence of the Earl of Carlisle's designed landscape, the internal designs created at Newburgh were more compact and compartmentalized, similar to other Bridgeman



designs such as Claremount in Surrey, Eastbury House (1718) in Dorset and Stowe (early 1720s).

It is not certain if the compactness of design was dictated by choice or situation. The Bellasis family of Newburgh were buying neighbouring estates from the mid-fifteenth century onwards (Page 1923, NYCRO ZDV), the amount of lands which were dedicated to design increased from the early seventeenth century through to 1744, this decision did not appear to be based upon lands available, nor expense. The house was situated at the base of rising lands near Coxwold, whilst the later gardens, bastion walls and pleasure grounds were extended towards rising lands to the south, so it is possible that the scope of the design was dictated in part by the natural topography. On the 1744 map (Plate 45), there is a series of circular woodlands dotted throughout the wider parkland and working landscape to the south and south-east. This demonstrates an interest in incorporating design into the wider landscape without impacting land-use, indicating that the dimensions of a designed landscape were most likely influenced by varied land-use.

Additionally, within this region was the designed landscape at Gilling Castle. Although details for the development of the landscape park have remained elusive, the terraces and gardens were known to have been established by 1713 (GD 2066, Hartwell 1998). The wider parkland to the west of the house contained a terrace and a wide avenue which ran toward woodlands on raised elevations beyond (Plate 128). The design of this parkland appears to be similar in style and design to that of Castle Hill, South Moulton, Devon, painted by J. Langs in 1741 (Harris 1979). During the 1730s and 40s, Charles Fairfax, 5<sup>th</sup> Viscount Fairfax, carried out alterations on the house, redesigning the house so the main entrance faced to the west (Cramer 2008), this alteration potentially provides a date for the avenue. Like Castle Hill, the Fairfaxes had a temple constructed within the woodland at the western end of this avenue as seen on the First Edition OS map (Plate 129). This temple is attributed to Carr who was working on the estate during the 1750s (Wragg 2000). Since the temple is no longer existent and records regarding the development of the landscape remain elusive, it is possible that additional garden structures were set within the wider parkland. Whilst, at Castle Hill, temples and garden structures were situated on

the grounds to either side of the avenue, according to the mid-eighteenth century map of Gilling (Plate 128), the grounds to either side of the avenue were dedicated to agriculture. This landscape again shows the creation of a simple-geometric landscape within the accepted chronology.

The formal water garden with canal which was established at Hovingham Hall by 1700, although earlier in date of construction, was more similar to the designs at Ebberston (1713) in the Vale of Pickering and Guisborough (by 1707) in the Tees Lowlands, than to any of the designs within the Howardian Hills. In 1770, this formal landscape was removed in favour of a naturalistic landscape in a Brownian style. Likewise, all of these landowners within the Howardian Hills either maintained their earlier designs whilst adding naturalistic elements within the wider parkland, or retained earlier elements when the landscape was reworked into a naturalistic park and garden. Brandsby did not have a walled garden or designed landscape prior to the implementation of a naturalistic landscape in 1767. This involved the removal of the village to the north of the house, which is evident on the 1746 map of the estate (Plates 144). By 1856 the house at Brandsby was situated within a pleasure ground, but it is not certain if a more naturalistic landscape was designed in 1767 with the pleasure grounds added later, or at this time. For Wiganthorpe and High Stittenham the dates of design implementation remain unknown, and without construction dates for the houses, it is not possible to ascertain when the landscapes were designed. However, by the 1850s both had naturalistic landscapes with the house surrounded by pleasure ground. At Wiganthorpe, the existence of block plantations and linear strips of woodland indicates that hunting was a primary function of the landscape.

The designed landscapes within this region were very large, very elaborate and were situated in the upland fringes, creating a circle of landscapes around the perimeter of the Howardian Hills, with Wiganthorpe and Castle Howard situated centrally within the upland valley. The landscapes developed within the region of the Howardian Hills tended to be very early in regard to creating formal gardens, late-geometric, and simplified-geometric gardens. Although Castle Howard was the first simplified-geometric



landscape created in the region and the wider Riding, the analysis of the landscapes established at Gilling (1740) and Newburgh (by 1744) were both simplified-geometric landscapes, although the internal aesthetics were quite different from those at Castle Howard.

In regard to the implementation of naturalistic landscapes, all of the landowners within this region either maintained their earlier designs whilst adding naturalistic elements within the wider landscape, or they retained elements of these earlier designs within their naturalistic landscapes. However, as discussed in the preceding section, they were much later to accept the naturalistic than landowners within other regions of the Riding.

### *Yorkshire Dales*

The last of the upland regions to be discussed is the Yorkshire Dales, located in the western-most area of the Riding. The character of the landscape within this region is of contrasting aesthetics, featuring wide-open moorland tops in the west and fertile sheltered valleys or dales in the east. Although the region is comprised of many valleys and dales, two of these are the primary locations of landscape sites. Clints, Marrick Priory, and Marske were situated within Swaledale, whilst the remaining seven landscapes of Askrigg Hall, Bolton Hall, Bear Park, Elm House, Nappa Hall, Wensley Hall and Wood Hall were located within the wider and a more varied topography of Wensleydale, none of which were situated west of Askrigg. Likewise, the three landscapes within Swaledale were located within the eastern opening of the dale, and all three were located within five miles of Richmond (Plate 183).

At the time of Bateman, all ten of these estates were held by five individual landowners: William Henry Orde-Powlett (Lord Bolton) of Bolton Hall, Mrs JTD Hutton of Marske Hall, Lady Mary Vyner of Newby Hall, Mr Lightfoot of Wood Hall Park, and Major Morley of Marrick Priory. The ownership for the estates within Wensleydale was relatively stable, and many were interconnected through ownership from at least the fifteenth century through to the late-nineteenth century. The only exception is Wood Hall

Park, which was purchased from the Metcalfes of Nappa Hall in 1748. Shortly afterwards, a portion of the Metcalfe's estates of Nappa and Askrigg passed to Lord Grantham of Newby Hall through reversion, and by 1809 he was the sole owner of the estates (Page 1914). Elm House was granted to the Scropes in 1344 and the estate of Bolton, shortly after in 1344, Bear Park in 1421 and Wensley in the fifteenth century. These estates passed from the Scropes to the Paulets in the early 1600s to the Orde-Powletts through marriage in the early eighteenth century.

In Swaledale, Marske was the only estate which had consistency in ownership through lineal descent from 1598 through to the late-nineteenth century owner John T Darcy Hutton, who inherited the hall in 1841. Clints and Marrick Priory were held by various families throughout the long eighteenth century. Indeed Clints, which is situated half-a-mile to the north of Marske, changed hands over five times between 1761 and 1842. It was held by various North Riding landowners including Charles Turner (who was responsible for redesigning the landscape in the 1760s), Viscount Downe and Miles Stapleton. As discussed above, all of these landowners were contemporary members of Whites Gentleman's Club in London, an association which may have played a vital role in the sale and acquisition of this estate. In 1842, shortly after inheriting Marske, John T Darcy Hutton purchased Clints Hall, demolished the house, amalgamated the landscape into Marske, and utilized the stables and lands as a stud. Marrick Priory, which was in the ownership of the Paulets from 1670, was sold to Josias Morley of Beamsley in 1817 (Page 1914).

For the majority of the estates within this region, very little information has been located to date which details the creation of, and potential, later alterations to the landscape designs. By the mid-nineteenth century, most of the landscapes were small in scale, including the walled gardens at Nappa and Bear Park. Even with the implementation of smaller parklands at Askrigg, Elm, and Wood Hall Park, the landscape at Askrigg remained formal throughout, whilst at Elm and Wood Hall Park the designs were naturalistic, although all of these were on a very small scale. Larger designed landscape parks and gardens were established at Clints, Marske, Marrick Priory and Wensley Hall. However,



none of the designed landscapes within this region were near in size, scale or grandness of design to that of Bolton Hall, which was established by 1723. The formal gardens near the house were maintained through to the time of the mid-nineteenth century OS map, but the woodlands to the west of the house were developed into a vast pleasure ground from the mid-eighteenth century (Plate 16). The walled gardens to the south and southeast of the house were swept away sometime between the 1792 and 1823 maps (Plates 14 and 17), and a lawn with a natural approach was added, but the gardens and terraces to the rear of the house were maintained.

In comparison to the retained formality of the parks and gardens within Wensleydale, Clints, Marske and Marrick were more naturalistic in design. Buck detailed the walled gardens at Clints and Marske. By 1732 the walled gardens were removed at Marske and a plantation was added near the house, whilst the wider landscape remained dedicated to pasture and deer park. By 1857, the wider landscape had been developed into a naturalistic landscape, with additional woodlands planted to the west of the house. At Clints the walled garden was swept away during 1762-63 when work was being carried out on the house. Unfortunately, the lack of early cartographic evidence for the designed landscape at Marrick means that the character of the earlier landscape is unknown. However by 1792, a naturalistic landscape was developed around the house. These three natural landscapes comprise part of the cluster of landscapes within the Richmond area which were introducing national trends into the Riding, indicating an association with the Dales Fringe rather than regional trends within the Dales.

### *Transitional Lands*

The natural topography to the east of the Dales descends to the low-lying lands of the Vales of Mowbray and York. Within this transitional region the Countryside Commission recognized two narrow Character Areas comprising the Pennine Dales Fringe in the west and the South Magnesian Limestone in the south-east.

### *Pennine Dales Fringe*

The first area that will be covered is the 'Pennine Dales Fringe' which lies immediately to the east of the Dales. This region contains the largest number of landscape parks and gardens within this data set. There are a total of twenty-seven estates held by twenty-three different landowners. For the landowners at Gilmonby, Hauxwell, Swinton and Patrick Brompton, these estates served as their only seat. Like the Vale of Mowbray, a high number of land owners within this region had wider holdings beyond the Dales Fringe. However, unlike the Vale of Mowbray, the majority of the estates within this region are the landowners' primary seat. The primary seat for five of these estates lay outside of the region including Gayles owned by the Duke of Northumberland of Alnwick Castle, Northumberland; Jervaulx and Kilgram Grange owned by the Earl of Ailesby of Tottenham Park, Wiltshire; Spennithorne owned by John C Chaytor of Croft Hall and Gillingwood Hall owned by John Thomas Wharton of Skelton Castle.

The descent of ownership is rather continuous throughout the long eighteenth century. Fourteen of the estates were purchased prior to the eighteenth century, six of which were purchased either during or before the fourteenth century.<sup>5</sup> Six estates -- Aldburgh, Aske, Clifton, Gilmonby, Leyburn and West Layton -- were purchased during the eighteenth century. Although Gayles, Great Crayke Hall, Easby Abbey and Sedbury were purchased during the early-nineteenth century, the families who sold the estates had maintained these properties through lineal descent from the at least the mid-sixteenth century through to their sale in the early-eighteenth century.

Of these twenty country houses with a known date of construction, twelve, or just over half, were built prior to the eighteenth century. Fifteen of them received alterations and additions through to the end of the nineteenth century. Although there is no indication of later alterations at Barningham, Gayles and Hauxwell, this could be simply down to lack

---

<sup>5</sup> Scargill Castle (1174), Hornby Castle (12<sup>th</sup> century), Wycliffe (1286), Thornton Watlass (1367), Thornton Steward (1371), Hauxwell (1464), Sennithorne (1553), Jervaulx (1603), Gillingwood (1609), Siwwnton (1615), Lartington (1639), Temple Grounds (1658) and Barningham (1690)



of information rather than lack of occurrence. Constable Burton, Easby Abbey, Hartforth, Rokeby, Sedbury, Thornton Watlass and Wycliffe were constructed during the eighteenth century and Clifton during the nineteenth.

Barningham Hall, Gayles Hall, Gilmonby Hall, Lartington Hall and Scargill Castle, which lie within the upland region between Richmond and Barnard Castle, were situated at elevations above 200 metres above sea level. The remaining landscapes within this region were generally distributed along the base of, or in close proximity to, a strip of higher ground which runs the length of the western edge of the region reaching elevations between 180 and 245 metres above sea level. The majority of these landscapes followed the route of the Rivers Ure, Swale and Tees, creating a linear pattern of distribution within the western area of the region. Only Kilgram Grange, held by the Marquis of Ailesbury of Tottenham Park, Wiltshire, was located in relatively flat terrain. The remaining estates were situated within undulating and varied topography. Nineteen of these were situated within middle elevations along rising ground, while the landscapes at Aldburgh, Gilmonby, Temple Ground, Hartforth and Wycliffe lay at the base of higher grounds, and Hornby Castle and Lartington Hall were situated on higher elevations within the surrounding landscape.

Analysis of the designed landscapes within this region reveals that ten had walled gardens established within the grounds of the house by the beginning of the eighteenth century. Only the landscapes of Swinton (1706), Constable Burton (by 1707), and Aske (by 1723) were altered in late-geometric style. However, by the mid-eighteenth century, naturalistic designs were incorporated within the park and designed landscapes for all of these country houses except for Kilgram Grange, Scargill Castle, and Gillingwood Hall, which was owned by the Wharton family of Skelton Castle in the Tees Lowland, was destroyed by fire c. 1750, and was never rebuilt (Waterson 1990, 47). Although late-eighteenth century and/or early-nineteenth century naturalistic designs were added to the landscape, in all cases these later improvements were not to the detriment of earlier formal designs.

At Temple Grounds in Richmond, Thornton Steward, Swinton Castle and Aske Hall, the formal designs were maintained while naturalistic elements were added to the wider parkland. At Constable Burton and Hauxwell Hall, naturalistic landscapes were designed whilst incorporating retained formal elements (see Gazetteer). Eight of the naturalistic designs within this region were on a grand scale, including Aske, Clifton Castle, Constable Burton, Hornby Castle, Rokeby Hall, Swinton Park and Temple Grounds. The remaining naturalistic designed landscapes within this region were of a middling size. Four of the landscapes, although naturalistic in design, comprised only small pleasure-grounds around the house. Again with the lack of detailed information, the date of implementation for ten of these naturalistic parks and gardens is not known. However, for the remaining sixteen landscapes, naturalistic designs were carried out at Swinton Park in the 1750s, at Aske, Hornby Castle, Constable Burton, and Temple Grounds during the 1760s, and in the 1770s for Rokeby Park. For the five landscapes which were created during the early part of the nineteenth century, the designs were indicative of contemporary design trends, indicating that all of the naturalistic landscapes designed within this region were well in line with, if not earlier than, the accepted chronology.

#### *South Magnesian Limestone*

The final region to be discussed is the northern tip of the 'South Magnesian Limestone', a geological feature which runs from Bedale, at its most northern point down to the village of Hucknall in Nottingham. This area consists of a narrow ridge between the low lying 'Vale of York' to the east, and the rising topography of the 'Pennine Dales Fringe' to the west. It is cut by dry valleys, river valleys, and gorges. The landscape is very fertile and the area is intensely farmed (Natural England 2009).

There were only five estates within this region, including Snape Castle which was owned by Mark Milbanke of Barningham Hall; Tanfield Hall, which was one of the properties of the Marquis of Ailesbury of Tottenham Park; Thrope Perrow, held by Sir Frederick Acclam Milbanke (Bart), the older brother of Mark Milbanke of Snape Castle mentioned above; Newby Hall, the seat of Lady Mary Vyner; and Norton Conyers. Norton Conyers



is included in this dataset even though the late-nineteenth century owner was not listed in Bateman due to a transition in ownership. The estate was held by the Graham family from 1624, however in 1856 Norton Conyers was sold to Viscount Downe to cover family debts. The estate was bought back in 1881 by Sir Reginald Graham (Jackson-Stops, 1986). All of these estates except for Newby Hall, which was purchased in 1748, were acquired prior to the eighteenth century and were maintained through to the end of the nineteenth century through lineal descent or indirect descent through marriage.

Newby, Norton Conyers and Tanfield were situated along the northern bank of the River Ure. While Newby, Norton Conyers and Snape were located within relatively flat grounds, Thrope Perrow and Tanfield were within varied topography in the north-western reaches of the region. Except for Thrope Perrow, which according to the English Heritage report dates from the early-eighteenth century (GD2077), the other houses within this region were of earlier construction. However, all were altered during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. According to the Countryside Commission, the underlying limestone within this region was very much desired as building material throughout the county, and buildings such as York Minster sourced limestone from this area (2008). Although the other houses were constructed with of stone, Newby Hall, built in the 1690s, was constructed from of brick. The Vyners chose to use brick as a building material, typically seen in the architecture within the Vale of York, rather than the stone structures within this region.

Snape Castle is the only house within this region which did not have an associated designed landscape park and garden developed over the long eighteenth century. By the 1720s, Norton Conyers and Thorpe Perrow had walled gardens, whilst Newby had a late-geometric landscape (Buck 1979, orig. 1720; Knyff and Kip 1984, orig. 1707). Tanfield owned by Thomas Bruce, Earl of Ailsebury, established by 1723, was a serpentine-style landscape with terraces, cascades and walks through the woodlands which lined the banks of the river Ure (Page 1923). This landscape was very similar to the serpentine landscapes at Duncombe Park (1713) and Kirkby Fleetham (1720s), owned by the Aislabies. As Hackfall, another of the Aislabie's estates, was situated on the opposite side

of the river Ure, it is highly possible that this neighbouring estate was greatly influential on the Earl of Ailesbury. By the 1850s, naturalistic landscapes were established within the grounds of Newby, Norton Conyers and Thrope Perrow, all of which replaced the earlier formal gardens. The woodland landscape at Tanfield appears to not to have changed from the landscape represented in the 1792 map (NYCRO MIC 1930/40) through to the First Edition OS map. The serpentine-style landscape was more similar to the landscapes of Duncombe in the Moors and Kirkby Fleetham in the Vale of Mowbray, as opposed to the Brownian-style landscapes established within the relatively flat, low-lying lands at the other three estates.

#### 4.5 CONCLUSION

The preceding sections analyzed the 126 designed landscape parks and gardens within the geographical and topographical context of the North Riding. The general distribution of the designed landscapes on a topographical map of the Riding, revealed that like settlement patterns, none of the designed landscapes were situated amongst the higher elevations of the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales. The general placement of the designed landscapes was along fringe of the upland regions and situated along river routes. Of the seventy-five landowners whose country houses were situated along the rivers, fifty-six utilized the rivers within their designed landscapes. A general distribution of the estates by landed status, revealed that the land magnates and great landowners were situated within the upland regions of the Riding. The majority of the estates of the greater gentry were located along the fringe areas between lowland valleys and upland regions, whilst the majority of the estates situated within the low-land valleys were the primary seats of members of the lesser gentry or were secondary holdings.

The designed landscape parks and gardens with time-depth were analyzed within various distributions of design styles, distributions of the country houses owned by Catholics and Protestants, the country houses owned by members of the London Gentlemen's Clubs of Whites and Brooks as well as the distribution of the commissions of John Carr. Whilst a



general distribution of the landscapes by aesthetic choices did not create a distinct pattern as expected, the distribution of the designed landscapes in order of date created and changes within the design revealed some intriguing patterns.

Firstly this pattern revealed clusters of landscapes around Guisborough in the north-east, Richmond in the north-west and a final group of landscapes within and around the Howardian Hills. Distribution of the landscapes based upon the date of creation of formal designs highlighted that four of the seven country houses illustrated by Knyff and Kip were situated within the vicinity of Guisborough, including Acklam, Ingleby, Guisborough and Kirkleatham. As dates of implementation are currently unknown for these landscapes, it is not certain exactly where they are placed within the chronology of development within the Riding prior to 1707.

A strong pattern occurred revealing evidence of a potential dialogue between the landowners with landscapes situated near and around the Howardian Hills and the landscapes in the regions around Richmond. The first landscapes with known dates of design between 1700 and 1723 were situated within and around the Howardian Hills, including Castle Howard, Duncombe Park, Gilling Castle and Newburgh Priory. From this region the next landscapes to be designed were situated around Richmond during the 1740s when Forcett and Stanwick were developed into serpentine-style landscapes. Whilst the wider parkland at Kirkleatham near Guisborough was redesigned into a naturalistic landscape in 1760, the majority of the landscapes designed during the 1760s were located around Richmond including Aske (1761-62), Clints (1763-63) and Constable Burton (1762-8). Naturalistic designs were added to the south terraces and parkland at Castle Howard in the Howardian Hills in 1770. Also during the 1770s naturalist designs were added to the parks and gardens at Arncliffe and Busby in the Tees Lowlands and Hovingham in the Howardian Hills. The pattern continues to move back and forth across the Riding between the Howardian Hills, the Tees Lowland in areas around Guisborough and over to Richmond, each time new and more contemporary designs were being created as the landscapes were altered over the long-eighteenth century.

Although naturalistic designs were being added to the landscapes in the south-west and within the Moors the strongest pattern occurs between landscapes located near and around the Howardian Hills, near Guisborough and near Richmond. This pattern jumps from one of these regions to the other revealing a distinctive pattern in the progress of the implementation of naturalistic landscapes throughout the Riding. Shortly after a design was created or altered in one region a later more contemporary design would follow in the other. Where the landowners within the vicinity of the Howardian Hills were the first to establish formal gardens the landowners around Richmond were much earlier at establishing naturalistic landscapes starting with Marske in 1732. Although the irregular-style landscape at Sheriff Hutton was created in the 1730s, it was not until the 1760s that the rest of the landowners within the Howardian Hills started to apply naturalistic elements within their design.

All of these landscapes were being established within the accepted chronology, and in some instances, such as Duncombe Park, Castle Howard, Sheriff Hutton and Marske, they were ahead of national trends. While they were applying naturalistic designs to their landscapes, the majority of these landowners were not totally replacing their earlier designs. Some were maintaining formal gardens near the house whilst applying naturalistic designs to the wider landscape, while others were retaining formal features within their naturalistic landscape parks and gardens. Within the Riding the only example where early formal gardens were completely removed in favour of naturalistic designs were within landscapes where the landowners maintained their walled gardens up to the late eighteenth century to early nineteenth century.

The important aspect of this pattern is that it demonstrates that the North Riding landowners were not only aware of what other North Riding landowners were doing within their landscapes, but the occurrence of their designs within the accepted chronology reveals that they were aware of trends which were occurring nationally. In this regard it illuminates a line of communication between the landowners of the North Riding. This communication becomes more evident upon the analysis of the distribution of other narratives such as the distribution of the estates of Catholics versus Protestants.



According to Aveling, the two main centers of Catholicism within the Riding were located around Richmond and the areas and within the Howardian Hills, namely the region around Ryedale (1966). Whereas the majority of the Catholic landowners situated within the Howardian Hills remained Catholic through to the end of the nineteenth century, many of the Catholic families situated around the Richmond area converted to the Protestant faith. It is possible that this shift could be seen as indicative of the progressive stance of the landowners in the Richmond area versus the more conservative traditional stance of the landowners within the Howardian Hills. This would explain why the landowners within the Howardian Hills were much later to adapt the naturalistic designs.

An additional narrative which further clarifies these lines of communication involves the progression of dates of membership to the London Gentlemen's clubs of Whites and Brooks's. As discussed in the previous chapter, admission into the Clubs relies on a member sponsoring a newcomer and the required number of votes to gain acceptance. The first landowner within this group to be accepted into Whites was M. Dundas in 1764 whilst the Howards become members the following year in 1765. When we look at the future members who were promoted by the Dundas gentlemen as opposed to those the Howards, the Howards only promoted other members of the family and Percy Shelley (1847) a close friend of Lord Byron, a distant relation of the family (Burke 1972). Unlike the Howards, the Dundases tended to promote local landowners within the region including Mr Chomley of Brandesby, Mr Yeoman of Wood Lands, Sri Bellingham Graham of Norton Conyers, John Bell Esq. of Thirsk, Mr S Chaloner of Guisborough, Hon Phipps, 3<sup>rd</sup> son of the 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Mulgrave, Marmaduke Wyville Esq of Constable Burton, Harcourt Johnstone Esq. of Hackness, John WR Hildyard Esq. of Harsley and Hutton Bonville and Frederick Milbanke Esq. The general progression of membership, starts near Richmond then moves across to the north-eastern region of the Riding, to later head to the southern regions of the Riding in the 1770s. Again this distribution follows a pattern which shifts back and forth from the owners with landscapes located near Richmond down to the landowners with estates situated near and within the Howardian Hills as discussed above. Whilst the strongest pattern within the implementation of formal and naturalistic landscapes occurred between the landowners around the Howardian Hills and near

Richmond, it is not to say naturalistic landscapes were not designed elsewhere within the Riding during this period.

When the architectural commissions of John Carr were plotted his work within the North Riding revealed that the majority of his commissions were located along the fringe areas to the east and west of the Vales of York and Mowbray and the Tees Lowlands. In regard to the commissions of Carr, his first North Riding client was Timothy Mauleverer of Arnecliffe Hall, who in 1753 had the house redesigned by Carr, at the same time terraces and walled gardens were established around the house (GD2305, Wragg 2000), representing a late implementation of a formal design. This delay can be explained by the family's financial history. During the 1660s James Mauleverer was heavily fined by Charles I for refusing to pay knights fees. It was not until 1752 when Timothy Mauleverer married an heiress and turned the families fortunes around.

After this point Carr worked for the Turners of Kirkleatham, who created a naturalistic landscape within his wider parkland in 1760. Shortly after, he had Carr work on his secondary estate of Clints over near Richmond, where Turner also created a naturalistic landscape. From this point onward the progression of Carr's commissions followed closely the pattern of implementation of naturalistic landscapes, indicating that Carr was a forerunner in introducing national trends to the Riding. Again, although naturalistic landscapes were being created by the landowners of the North Riding, the majority of the landowners were opting to maintain and/or retain formal elements within the naturalistic design.

Within section 4.4, the designed landscape parks and gardens were analyzed within their regional contexts utilizing Natural England's Character Areas, established during their survey of the Riding. A similar process of dividing the Riding based upon topographical and geological features was used by both Marshall and Tuke during contemporary surveys of agriculture and land-use within the Riding (1796 and 1800). Analyzing the landscapes within the nine Character Areas of the Tees Lowlands, Vale of Pickering, Vale of York, Vale of Mowbray, the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills, the Yorkshire



Dales, the Howardian Hills, Dales Fringe and the South Magnesian Limestone allowed a comparison to be made between the type of designs developed in conjunction with regional social contexts and topographical trends.

By utilizing Natural England's Character Areas of the North Riding to analyze the 126 landscape parks and gardens, regional attitudes toward estate and land ownership can be highlighted. Within the North York Moors, Vale of Mowbray, Vale of Pickering and the Yorkshire Dales the majority of the estates were held as secondary estates. The estates within The Dales Fringe, Howardian Hills, South Magnesian Limestone, Tees Lowlands and the Vale of York, on the other hand, served as primary seats.

In the Vale of Pickering, where land was typically held by small landowners (Marshall 1796) not only were the landscapes smaller, but only three of the nine High Hall, Kirkby Misperton and Thornton Hall were primary residences. The others served as secondary estates for North Riding landowners. Except for Ness Hall, all of the landscapes within this region had established gardens and wider parklands regardless of size or scale of the overall design. Within the Vale of Mowbray where fourteen of the twenty-one estates were considered secondary, seven were held by landowners whose primary seats were outside of the riding. Within this region the majority of the landscapes were either walled gardens or small parks associated with secondary estates. However, not all of the secondary estates within this region were small in scale, nine of the landowners developed grand design landscapes, despite the secondary function of the estate. Newton House and Hutton Bonville were known hunting estates whilst Wood End and Baldersby Park, had elements associated with hunting within a grander design.

The Yorkshire Dales represent a very different story. Of the ten estates, six were considered secondary all of which were owned by North Riding landowners only two of which were from outside of the Dales. With the exception of Clints which had a naturalistic-designed landscape established during the 1760s, all of these secondary estates had walled gardens by the mid-nineteenth century. In addition Askrigg and Elm house had very small parklands containing very little to no design. Of the secondary estates, Bear

Park served as a hunting estate to the Lords Bolton whilst Clints served as a stud farm to the neighbouring estate of Marske. Within this group only Bolton, Marske and Marrick Priory contained designed landscape parks and gardens on a grand scale.

Within the Dales Fringe, Howardian Hills, South Magnesian Limestone, Tees Lowlands and Vale of York the majority of the estates were either the primary seat of, or the only estates held by the landowners. Within the Dales Fringe, North York Moors, South Magnesian Limestone and Vale of York there appears to be a correlation between the size of the designed landscape and whether the estate was a primary or secondary holding. As might be expected, all of the houses which were secondary estates had small walled a

gardens, in some cases small parklands. In the Dales fringe, three of the houses in these secondary estates were demolished by the mid-eighteenth century. However within the Tees Lowlands ten out of the twenty-two estates were held as secondary estates, of these, only Halnaby Hall, Worsall Hall and Marske Hall had small gardens. All of the country houses within the Howardian Hills, regardless as to whether they were primary or secondary holdings, had designed landscape parks and gardens. This perhaps reflects a perceived regional pressure, either from within the Howardian Hills or from beyond, to have developed a designed landscape park and garden within the grounds of the house.

Closely analyzing design trends within each region revealed that not all of the landowners within a single topographical region were necessarily relating to each other and/or the topography in the same way. Upon analyzing the styles of landscapes in conjunction with the topography within the region some patterns started to appear, especially within the Tees Lowlands which has rolling landscapes within rising grounds in the west near the Dales Fringe and in the south-east near Guisborough where the elevations start to step up to the moorlands to the south. North-east of Guisborough, the topography is relatively flat as it approaches the sea, however to the south of this there is a small ridge line to the rising elevations around Guisborough. Finally in the south-western region where the Tees Lowlands meet the base of the Cleveland Hills to the south, contains quite sudden and dramatic natural topography. Groupings of designed landscapes were situated within these varying regions. Acklam, Arncliffe, Guisborough and Ingleby, situated within the



eastern half of the lowlands, had similar late-geometric gardens as illustrated by Knyff and Kip in 1707. Whereas the landscapes at Arncliffe and Ingleby, located along the base of the Cleveland Hills, contained stepped terraces and linear ponds, the landscapes at Acklam and Guisborough which were situated within more level grounds had longer and in the case of Guisborough, more intricate water gardens.

In the undulating landscapes of the western region the two neighbouring landscapes of Forcett and Stanwick Park were developed into serpentine-style landscapes during the 1740s (Plate 153). Both utilized the Iron Age fortifications within their design. Additionally the strip of landscapes including Normanby, Ormseby, Wilton and later nineteenth-century landscape of Marton were situated at the base of a small ridgeline. Each landscape was in close proximity to its neighbouring estate. Within the Howardian Hills, the Howards at Castle Howard, the Bellasis at Newburgh and the Fairfaxes at Gilling Castle, had all created simplified geometric landscapes during the first half of the eighteenth century. Each of these families created quite distinctive designs within their landscapes.

In some areas there were regional styles in building materials as defined by Natural England's survey. However, in some cases, such as in the Vale of Mowbray, where according to the survey, brick was the main building material, the majority of the landowners within this region had stone or stone clad houses. These were typically located near the rising lands of the Dales Fringe to the west and the Moors to the east. Although these landowners' houses were situated within the lower elevations of the Vale, they chose to utilize building materials typical of the outlying upland regions. Likewise Sir Edward Blckett constructed Newby Hall out of brick, regardless of being situated within the South Magnesian Limestone, in which the underlying limestone was a quite popular building material, both within and outside the region, indicating a stronger association with the building styles within the Vale of York. Additional issues in regard to the boundaries of the regions as defined by Natural England's survey were raised, in particular with the boundaries between the upland regions of The North York Moors and Howardian Hills and the surrounding lowland regions.

The implication of Natural England is that the land use, settlement patterns and building styles and building materials were influenced by the natural topography and underlying geology distinctive to each region. With this in mind the landowners within each region would have approached the creation of their designed landscapes with these same influences. When we look to regions like the North York Moors, where has several dales and valleys, each quite unique, we start to see variation in the types of landscapes created within the same Character Area. For example the landowners at Mulgrave and Duncombe utilized the 'genius of the place' in order to create a picturesque landscape and serpentine style landscape respectively, although, both of these landscapes being located in the social network defined by Natural England as the 'North York Moors and Cleveland Hills'. Likewise, the analysis of the designed landscapes within the Yorkshire Dales, the formal landscape at Bolton Hall within Wensley Dale was quite different from the naturalistic landscapes designed at Clints, Marske and Marrick Priory all located within Swaledale. This difference indicates that the landowners situated within Swaledale were associated with the naturalistic trends occurring around Richmond rather than a trend based on their situation within the region of the Yorkshire Dales. Additionally, if we look at the landowners near Richmond, who created naturalistic style landscapes discussed above, one would note that the association with Richmond was more strongly represented within the style of designed landscape, than those occurring within the various Character Areas of the Tees Lowlands, Dale Fringe and the Vale of Mowbray which comprise the lands surrounding Richmond.

Even with these variances or maybe even because of them, one can get a better understanding of the motivations behind the design. In light of this it is imperative that historians and archaeologists must analyze them within their topographical context. Analyzing the designed landscapes through a combination of topographical, socio-economical and socio-political contexts increases the resolution through which one can start to understand the motivations behind the design. Although this research did not pinpoint the exact motivations for the retention and/or maintenance of earlier formal designs occurring throughout the designed landscapes of the North Riding, regardless of status, social network or topographical situation, has highlighted alternative narratives through



which researchers can utilize to come to a closer understanding of how the designed landscapes were created and later altered throughout the long-eighteenth century.

## five CONCLUSION

The above research was initiated in response to Williamson's inclusive study of the landscape parks and gardens in Norfolk, which revealed differences in style, patterns of distribution and evolution of design based upon the influences of economics, personal

taste and the social and political identity of each landowner. Through this study Williamson dispelled notions of a teleological evolution of designed landscapes over the eighteenth century. Designed landscapes within the North Riding were chosen in order to further test theories of correlations between delay in implementation of national landscape trends and the landowner's connection to London. The above examined the designed landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding within a multi-contextual narrative, driven by both social constructs and the natural topography distinctive to the Riding.

This multi-contextual narrative included a socio-economic context, which examined the influence of economics on the implementation of designed landscapes, to verify if trends were passed from the wealthier, larger landholders down to the members of the lesser gentry within the North Riding. As landscape design trends were thought to disseminate from London outward throughout the country it was thought that these national trends would not reach remote regions like the North Riding of Yorkshire much later (Girouard 1980, Hoskins 1988, Williamson and Lytleton 1907). The examination of the landscapes within the socio-political context of their landowners allowed an analysis of the landowners' connection with or disconnection from London. This socio-political context was analyzed in conjunction with the implementation of national landscape to test for delay in design trends reaching the Riding. Lastly in order to test regional, social and topographical influences the designed landscapes were placed within in their regional geographical and topographical contexts utilizing the character areas defined by Natural England and the Countryside Commission's surveys of the North Riding.

The 126 designed landscape parks and gardens which were created during the eighteenth century were considered within this multi-contextual analysis. Of these, 36 of the landscapes had time-depth allowing for a deeper analyses to occur within each context. First the landscapes were examined through a socio-economic context in which the owners of each estate was classified by the landed status, based upon the total number of acres held and the total income earned from these. This information was acquired from the late-nineteenth century Local Government Board's survey *Return of Owners of Land* (1873) and



Batemans *Great Landowners* (1883). These levels of landed status comprise land magnates who held over 20,000 acres of land and earned over £20,000 per annum; great landowners who held between 10,000 and 19,999 acres of land and earned between £10,000 and £19,999 per annum; the greater gentry, holding between 3,000 and 9,999 acres of land earning between £3,000 and £9,999 per annum; and lesser gentry with holdings between 1,000 and 2,999 acres and earning £1,000 and £2,999 per annum. This effectively divided the levels of the landed elite and local gentry into smaller groupings, allowing for an analysis to be made with a higher resolution. By doing so highlighted subtle nuances which occurred within the designed landscapes in the North Riding.

With this analysis it was revealed that the estates of the landed magnates and great landowners were maintained through to the mid-nineteenth century through lineal descent or through indirect inheritance through the female line, indicating a stability in ownership. With the exception of the terraces and walled gardens established near the houses at the hunting estates of Danby Castle and Jervaulx Abbey respectively, all of the other landowners within this group developed formal landscape parks and gardens by the 1730s. A Simplified geometric landscape was created at Castle Howard between 1700 and 1730, a serpentine-style landscape at Duncombe Park by 1720 and late-geometric landscapes were established at Aske by 1727, Bolton Hall by 1723 and Newburgh Priory by 1722 which was subsequently altered by 1744 into a simplified geometric landscape. This placed the landowners within this group well within the accepted chronology of landscape design. In some cases these landowners were establishing their designs well before the national chronology. Additionally all of the landowners within this group established deliberate associations with antiquity through the use of castles, abbey ruins or through the adaptation of earlier strongholds or abbeys into eighteenth-century country houses.

Although naturalistic designs were added to these landscapes during the later part of the eighteenth century all of these landowners maintained earlier formal elements through to the mid-nineteenth century. This retention of formal elements throughout the eighteenth century is something that was not accounted for within the accepted chronology of design,

especially within the parks and gardens of well connected families such as the Howards of Castle Howard, the Bellasises of Newburgh Priory, the Dawnays of Danby Castle, the Dundases of Aske Hall, the Duncombes of Duncombe Park, the Brundell-Bruces of *Jervaulx*, the *Orde-Powletts* of Bolton Hall and the Danby-Harcourts of Swinton Park. As these families were well connected politically and socially on a national level *this retention* could be seen as a reflection of the conservative or traditional stances of these landowners.

Within the fourteen designed landscapes of the greater gentry, a different pattern occurred. Like the great landowners and land magnates, the Chaloners of Guisborough, the Huttons of Marske, Smithsons at Stanwick, Fairfaxes of Gilling Castle, the Phipps of Mulgrave Castle as well as the Thompsons, Osbaldestones and the Cayleys at Ebberston Lodge applied naturalistic designs within their wider landscape, whilst maintaining the earlier designs near the house. Only elements of the earlier formal gardens at Beningbrough Hall, Constable Burton, Ingleby Manor and Newby Hall were worked into the later naturalistic landscape parks and gardens. However, unlike the great landowners and landed magnates, within this status level we start to encounter landowners who opted to remove formal gardens in order to create naturalistic landscapes as seen at Hackness, Kiplin, Kirkleatham and at Clints, where the formal gardens near the house were completely removed and a naturalistic design was applied.

Additionally a smaller percentage of the greater gentry, chose to establish associations with antiquity. The Fairfaxes at Gilling maintained the 14<sup>th</sup> century castle as the main house, the Chaloners at Guisborough incorporated the abbey ruins within the garden design and the Phipps at Mulgrave utilized within the castle ruins in the landscape and distant views of Whitby Abbey maintained a close association with antiquity within their designs.

Although the great landowners and land magnates added naturalistic elements to their designed landscapes, there was a higher tendency for the greater gentry to create naturalistic landscape parks in three cases to the detriment of the earlier formal gardens. The greater gentry also associated less with antiquity than the land magnates and great



landowners. However, there still was a preference within this group to retain formal elements within their new naturalistic parks.

With the fourteen landscapes of the lesser gentry with time-depth we see some similarities with both the great landowners and land magnates in continuity of ownership through lineal descent. Unlike the greater gentry, more of the lesser gentry establish an association to antiquity, however, there were some trends which were quite unique within the context of the North Riding. At Aldby Park, Hovingham, Forcett Park and Sheriff Hutton the development of the earlier walled gardens into later formal designs occurred in a similar style and adhered to the accepted chronology, much in the same manner as we have seen so far. Similarly the later redesign of the formal landscapes at Aldby and Sheriff Hutton into naturalistic landscapes and later, nineteenth-century gardens occurred in a similar manner including a retention of earlier formal design elements, whereas the serpentine-style landscape developed at Forcett in 1740 was maintained through to the mid-nineteenth century. At Arnecliffe, the Mauleverers did not create a late-geometric landscape until the 1750s due to individual financial circumstances over the eighteenth century, shortly after, reflects a delay in the implementation of design seen by Williamson in Norfolk. Twenty years later, whilst maintaining the formal gardens near the house, the Mauleverers' added naturalistic designs to the wider landscape, placing their designed landscape well within the national chronology.

For the remaining landscapes Brough (between 1798 and 1836), Busby Hall (c. 1794), Clifton Castle (1805-1810), Croft Hall in (1845), Thornton Steward (Danby) Hall (by 1856) and Thorpe Perrow in 1805 the formal gardens established by the first part of the eighteenth century were maintained through to the late-eighteenth century and in some cases to the mid-nineteenth century when naturalistic landscapes with pleasure grounds were established near these houses. Within this group earlier formal elements were maintained within the later designs at Arnecliffe, Croft/Clervaulx and Thornton Steward (Danby), whilst at Brough, Clifton and Thorpe Perrow, there was a total removal of the formal gardens in order to create naturalistic designs. The late-geometric gardens which were established at Acklam by the time of the 1707 Knyff and Kip illustration were

maintained through to the mid-eighteenth century. Whilst the landscapes at Brandsby and Marrick Priory, which did not appear to have earlier formal gardens established near the house, had naturalistic landscapes with pleasure grounds by the first Edition OS map.

Within the landscape parks and gardens of the lesser gentry for the first time we see a long delay between the establishment of late-seventeenth to early-eighteenth century walled gardens and the development of either later formal landscape parks and gardens, as in Arncliffe or naturalistic landscapes with pleasure grounds. Whilst this delay did not typically occur within the majority of designed landscapes of the North Riding, it is a pattern that follows closely with the chronology of garden design Williamson encountered in Norfolk with the design landscapes of the local gentry (1990). Within the landscapes of the lesser gentry, we start to see a higher number of the landowners choosing to completely remove their earlier formal gardens in favor of a naturalistic design. For the first time we are not necessarily seeing a retention by choice, but rather a retention based upon individual economic factors. However, for the landscapes at Aldby Park, Hovingham, Forcett Park and Sheriff Hutton, they were developed and later altered through out the long-eighteenth century much like the landscapes of the greater gentry, great landowners and the land magnates. Likewise, the lesser gentry maintained formal elements within their later naturalistic landscapes, indicating some connections to this regional trend.

Many historians, from contemporary writers to present day, have described Yorkshire as distant, 'a dark land', 'backwater' and disconnected from London which was the accepted epicenter of trends (Girouard 1988, Hoskins 1988, Williamson and Lytleton 1907). Because of such statements and beliefs, one would have expected the landowners of the North Riding to follow behind landscape trends, especially in the gardens of the gentlemen of lesser landed statuses or members of the local gentry. However, inclusively examining the designed landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding through a mutli-contextual approach has gone some way to dispelling this notion. The analysis of the designed landscapes through the context of the landed status for each landowner, revealed a higher incidence of delay in designs and a tendency to completely replace earlier formal



aesthetics with naturalistic landscapes within the designs of the lesser gentry. However there was a wider trend throughout the Riding, regardless of status, in which formal designs were created well within the accepted chronology, in some instances as in the serpentine-style landscape at Duncombe (1713), the simplified-geometric landscape at Castle Howard (1700-1730) and the irregular-style landscape at Sheriff Hutton (1730s) to name a few were created ahead of the national chronology. Likewise, the landowners of the North Riding were developing naturalistic landscape designs well within the accepted chronology. However an overwhelming number of these landowners, regardless of status and level of peerage were maintaining earlier formal designs or reworked elements of these earlier designs within their naturalistic landscapes.

Analyzing the social and political networks of the landowners, through the individual political careers, marital and social connections, attendance to universities and Inns of London as well as memberships to Gentlemen's Clubs such as Whites and Brooks's; indicated that a majority of the landowners within this group were well connected with society, politics and styles beyond the bounds of the North Riding. In addition, the analysis of the landscapes within the context of the landowners' political and religious stances, firmly established the landowners of the North Riding within a wider national context, dispelling notions that Yorkshire and the Yorkshire landowners were indeed disconnected and behind in the transference of trends. A general analysis of the implementation of landscape designs against the accepted chronology, additionally placed the landowners of the North Riding well within wider national trends. However, the regional trend of maintaining or retaining formal elements throughout the eighteenth century could not be explained through a general analysis of design types in conjunction with a particular social or political stance.

The final analysis placed the designed landscape gardens within their geographical and topographical contexts allowing for regional trends and influences to be examined. Through this analysis, patterns of distribution by landed status were revealed, with the great landowners and land magnates in the upland regions, the greater gentry mainly

within the fringe elevations, whilst the lesser gentry and peripheral or secondary estates comprised the majority of landowners within the lowland regions.

When the designed landscapes were placed within their regional contexts, utilizing the nine character areas defined by Natural England in their landscape character assessment interesting patterns of social connectivity and regional trends were revealed. In the Vale of Pickering, the north-western region of the Vale of Mowbray, the south-eastern regions of the Tees Lowlands regional trends were evident in regard to land-use, enclosure, settlement and small landownership. The historic pattern of landownership in these areas did not facilitate the amalgamation of lands and creation of consolidated estates resulting in an absence of designed landscapes within these regions of the riding

Plotting the types of designed landscapes against the dates of implementation and subsequent alterations highlighted avenues of communication and design evolution between the landowners located in the Howardian Hills and the landowners in the vicinity of Richmond. Whilst the landowners within the Howardian Hills were early to implement formal landscape designs, the landowners within the region of Richmond were early in introducing naturalistic landscapes to the North Riding.

The regions around the Howardian Hills and Richmond were traditionally strongholds of the Catholic faith during the late-sixteenth century. By the end of the seventeenth century many of the Catholic families around the Richmond area had converted to the Protestant faith, whilst the Catholic families centered around the Howardian Hills had not. Because landowners throughout both regions were maintaining formal aesthetics within later naturalistic designs, regardless of Catholic or Protestant beliefs, this analysis based upon religious context did not explain the regional trend of maintained formality. However, the continued traditional faith of the landowners of the Howardian Hills versus the contemporary and 'progressive' beliefs' of the Protestant landowners could explain the slight delay in the implementation of naturalistic designs as traditional versus a more progressive stance.



The history, membership and social aspects of Gentlemen's Clubs such as Whites and Brooks have been documented by the likes of Beresford (1922), Colson (1951), Lejune (1993) and Williamson and Lyttleton (1907). Their research established these social clubs as arenas for the discussion and dissemination of knowledge, as well as trends in Politics and fashion, however, the possibility that these clubs also served as venues for the discussion and dissemination of national landscape design trends had yet to be explored. By plotting the dates of admission to London Gentlemen's Clubs such as Whites and Brooks's, revealed that many of these landowners who were members of both or either club were also the landowners who introduced national landscape trends to the Riding. The pattern of distribution by admission to these clubs followed the distribution of implementation of naturalistic designs within the landscapes throughout the region. This analysis presents the possibility London Clubs, such as Whites and Brooks were indeed venues for the communication and spreading of national design trends through out the Riding, regardless of each landowners regional situation, religious belief or political ideals. Further research into these social clubs, such as Whites and Brooks, as arenas for the distribution of landscape design trends needs to be carried out by not only analyzing landscapes through out a wider national context, but by looking at the networks of other London clubs and social organizations.

In addition, plotting the chronology of Jonathan Carr's commissions throughout the Riding revealed a similar pattern, highlighting his role in the introduction and implementation of national trends to the region, potentially revealing the architect's role in promotion of landscape trends. Like, the Gentlemen's Clubs, further research, looking at the distribution of Carr's national commissions conjoined with any design created or altered within their associated landscapes, needs to be carried out. Similar analysis of the commissions of other eighteenth-century architects could potentially elucidate the role of architects within the process of implementing and spreading national landscape design trends.

By studying the eighteenth century landscape parks and gardens of the North Riding through this multi-contextual approach based upon the socio-economic and socio-political

contexts of the landowners revealed various trends. First, it has placed the landowners firmly within a national context. Secondly, it placed the implementation and subsequent evolution of the designed landscapes of the North Riding well within, and in some instances ahead of, the accepted chronology of landscape design. Third it highlighted that whilst the landowners were creating naturalistic landscapes well within the accepted chronology, there was a strong regional trend of continued formality throughout the Riding.

Utilizing a geographical and topographical analysis of the landscapes highlighted regional trends based upon the varying topography of the Riding: for example, there were clusters of design styles situated throughout the varying topography of the Tees Lowlands. It also highlighted regional anomalies. Within the North York Moors many of the landowners were associating with the peripheral regions of the Vale of Pickering, the Howardian Hills and the Tees Lowlands rather than associating within a wider 'Moorland' social network. Likewise several landowners within the lowlands, such as the Thompsons at Ebberston and the Turners at Kirkleatham, held moorland properties as well. Landowners of ranging status held various properties within several of the Character Areas throughout the Riding, disproving a pattern of regionally determined social systems. The strong pattern of communication and spreading of design trends between the landowners of the Howardian Hills and landowners situated around Richmond questions the idea of isolated regional trends. The landscapes included within these two regions crossed the geographical boundaries of the Tees Lowlands, Dales Fringe and Yorkshire Dales around Richmond and the Vale of York and the North York Moors near the Howardian Hills. This indicates the presence of a stronger social and geographical connection occurring amongst the landowners versus a connection through a smaller topographically defined social network.

Lastly the use of alternative narratives through which to study the designed landscapes of the North Riding elucidated lines of communication across the regions through which national landscape trends spread. As discussed above, Gentlemen's Clubs such as Whites and Brooks served as potential venues for which these communications could occur.



Additionally, these narratives revealed patterns of the implementation and dissemination of national landscape design trends throughout the Riding. Whilst a general exploration of the various narratives highlighted some of the trends within the North Riding, it was not until they were placed within a geographical and topographical context that the patterns became apparent.

Analyzing the designed landscapes through a combination of topographical, socio-economical and socio-political contexts increases the resolution through which one can start to understand the motivations behind the owner's design choices. Although this research did not pin-point the exact motivations for the retention and/or maintenance of earlier formal designs which occurred throughout the region, it has highlighted alternative narratives which can be utilized to come to a closer understanding of eighteenth century designed landscape parks and gardens.

# Bibliography

- Aveling, J. (1970) *Catholic Recusancy in the City of York*. London: Catholic Record Society.
- Aveling, H. (1966) *Northern Catholics Recusants of the North Riding of Yorkshire 1558-1790*. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Bateman, J. ([1883]1971) *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland*. 8<sup>th</sup> Edition. Leicester: Leicester University Press
- Batey, M. (1999) *Alexander Pope: The Poet and the Landscape*. London: Barn Elms
- Beckett, J.V. (1986) *The Aristocracy in England 1660-1914*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Bence-Jones, M. (1992) *The Catholic Families*. London: Constable.
- Bending, S. (1999) 'The True Rust of the Baron's Wars: Gardens, Ruins, and the National Landscape' in Myrone, M a LP (ed.) *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture Practice 1700-1850*, 83-93. Hants, UK: Ashgate Publishing
- Beresford, E. (1922) *Memorials of St James' Street Together with the Annals of Almacks*. London: G. Richards.
- Bermingham, A. (1986) *Landscape and Ideology: The English Tradition 1740-1860*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bossy, J. (1976) *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bowden, M. (1998) 'The Conscious Conservation of Earlier Earthworks in the Design of Parks and Gardens' in Pattison, P. (ed.) *There By Design: Field Archaeology in Parks and Garden*, 23-26. Oxford: British Archaeological Report.
- Brown, D. (2001) 'Lancelot Brown and His Associates', *Journal of Garden History* 29, (1), 2-11.
- Buck, S. ([original c. 1720] 1979) *Samuel Buck's Yorkshire Sketchbook*. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.
- Burke, E. (1757) *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and the Beautiful and Other Pre-Revolutionary Writings*. London: Penguin Books.



- Burke, J. (1972) *Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry Eighteenth*, (3). London: Burke's Peerage Limited.
- Burrows Davies Ltd (2006). *Building Stone Assessment of Boynton Hall*. Bridlington: Private Publication.
- Cambell, C. ([1715-25] 1967,) *Vitruvius Britannicus or The British Architect*. New York: Benjamin Bloom.
- Cannadine, D. (1994) *Aspects of Aristocracy: Grandeur and Decline in Modern Britain*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Clemenson, H.A. (1982) *English Country Houses and Landed Estates*. London: Croom Helm.
- Cliffe, J. T. (1969) *The Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War*. London: University of London Press
- Colson, P. (1951) *Whites 1693-1950*. London: Heinemann Ltd.
- Compton, R. (2004) 'Newby-A Short History' in Lazenby, H., Lister A., Lynch, K. and Hand, M. (eds.) *The Enriched Landscape: Sculpture & Ornamentation*. York: Yorkshire Gardens Trust.
- Cornforth, J. (1967a) 'Brough Hall, Yorkshire I', *Country Life* (October 12), 894-898.
- Cornforth, J. (1967b) 'Brough Hall, Yorkshire-II', *Country Life* (October 19), 948-952.
- Cornforth, J. (1966a) 'Swinton, Yorkshire-I', *Country Life* (April 6), 788-792.
- Cornforth, J. (1966b) 'Swinton, Yorkshire-III', *Country Life* (April 21), 944-948.
- Cosgrove, D. and S. Daniels (eds.) (1988) *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cosgrove, D. (1994) *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Cosgrove, D. (ed.) (1999) *Mappings*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Cramer, A. (2008) *Gilling Castle: The Story of the House and its Families*. Keighley: Ampleforth Abbey.
- Daniels, S. (1993) *Fields of Vision: Landscape Imagery and National Identity in*

*England and the US*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Darby, W. J. (2000) *Landscape and Identity Geographics of Nation and Class in England*. Oxford: Berg.

Dennison, E. (ed.) (2005) *Within the Pale The Story of Sheriff Hutton Park*. Sheriff Hutton: Women's Institute Community Pale Project.

Everett, N (1994) *The Tory View of the Landscape*. London: Yale University Press.

Eyres, P. (1981) *Mr Ailesby's Gardens*. Leeds: New Arcadian Press.

Foster, J. (1874) *Pedigrees of the County Families of Yorkshire North and East Riding*, (2). London: W. Wilfred Head.

Fuller, T. (1662) *The History of the Worthies of England*. London: FGWL and WL

GD 2057 English Heritage Register Report (1999) *Aldby Park*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2058 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Aske Hall*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2059 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Beningbrough Hall*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2061 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Castle Howard*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2062 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Constable Burton*. London: HBMCE

GD 2063 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Duncombe Park*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2064 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Ebberston Lodge*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2065 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Forcett Park*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2066 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Gilling Castle*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2067 English Heritage Register Report (2000) *Mulgrave Castle*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2068 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Newburgh Priory* GD 2068. London: HBMCE.

GD 2069 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Newby Hall*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2074 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Rievaulx Terrace*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2076 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Swinton Castle*. London: HBMCE.

GD 2077 English Heritage Register Report (1998) *Thorpe Perrow*. London: HBMCE.



- GD 2305 English Heritage Register Report (1999) *Arncliffe Hall*. London: HBMCE.
- GD 2948 English Heritage Register Report (2000) *Sheriff Hutton*. London: HBMCE.
- Girouard, M. (1980) *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History*. London: Penguin Books.
- Goodchild, P. (c.1986). *Humphry Repton on the Spot at Mulgrave Castle*. Halifax: Stott.
- Hadfield, M. (1979) *A History of British Gardening*. London; J Murray.
- Hadfield, M. (1960) *Gardening in Britain*. London: Hutchinson
- Harris, J. (1979) *The Artist and the Country House*. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet.
- Hartwell, C. (1998) GD 2066 *Report on Gilling Castle*. London: English Heritage Parks and Gardens Series.
- Hepworth, V. (1995) *Initial Landscape Conservation Study*.
- Hey, D. (2005) *A History of Yorkshire: A County of Broad Acres*. Lancaster: Carnigie Publishing.
- Hoskins, W. G. (1988) *The Making of the English Landscape*. London: Hodders and Stoughton.
- Hunt, J. D. (1971) 'Emblem and Expressionism in the Eighteenth Century', *Eighteenth Century Studies* IV: 297-317.
- Hunt, J. D. (1985) 'Ut pictura poesis, ut pictura hortus, and the picturesque', *Word and Image*, 1 (1): 87-107.
- Hunt, J. D. (1987) *William Kent Landscape Garden*. London: A. Zwemmer Ltd.
- Hunt, J. D. (1986) *Garden and Grove: The Italian Renaissance Garden in the English Imagination: 1600-1750*. London: JM Dent & Sons.
- Hunt, J. D. (1992) *Gardens and the Picturesque: Studies in the History of Landscape*
- Hunt, J. D. and P. Willis, (eds) (1975) *The Genius of Place: The Landscape Garden 1620-1820*. London: Paul Elek.
- Hussey, C. (1967) *English Gardens and Landscapes 1700-1750*. London: Country Life.
- Hussey, C. (1967) *The Picturesque Studies in a Point of View*. London: Cass.
- Jackson-Stops, G. (1991) *An English Arcadia: Designs for Gardens and Garden Buildings in the Care of the National Trust 1600-1990*. London: The National

Trust.

Jacques, D. (1991) *Garden Archaeology and Restoration, Association for Studies in the Conservation of Historic Buildings*, 13-23. Manchester: Association for the Studies in the Conservation of Historic Buildings.

Jacques, D. (1983) *Georgian Gardens: The Reign of Nature*. London: Batsford.

Jebb, M. (2007) *The Lord-Lieutenants and their Deputies*. Chichester, Sussex: Phillimore.

Keevill, G.D. and N. Lindford (1998) 'Landscapes with Gardens: Aerial, Topographical and Geophysical Survey at Hampstead Marshall, Berkshire' in Pattison, P. (ed.) *There by Design: Field Archaeology in Parks and Gardens*, 13-22. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Knyff, L. and Kip, J. edited by Harris J. and Jackson-Stops G. ([1707]1984), *Britannia Illustrata Knyff and Kip*. Bungay, Suffolk: The National Trust.

Kruft, H.W. (1994) *A History of Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present*. Princeton: Architectural Press.

Lambert, D., P. Goodchild, et al. (1995) *Researching a Garden's History: A Guide to Documentary and Published Sources*. York: Landscape Design Trust.

Lejune, A. (1993) *Whites The First 300 Years*. London: A & C Black.

Lewis, S. (1831) *Topographical Dictionary of England*. London: S. Lewis and Co.

Local Government Board (1873) *Return of Owners of Land (2)*. London: HMSO.

Lynam, E. (1944) *British Maps and Map-Makers*. London: William Collins.

Macaulay, R. (1953) *Pleasure of Ruins*. Overwallop: Hampshire, BAS Printers.

Marriott, R. (2008) pers comm on various Yorkshire holdings of the Strickland Family.

Marshall, Mr. (1796) *Rural Economy of Yorkshire Comprising the Management of Landed Estates and the Present Practice of Husbandry in the Agricultural Districts of that County*, (1). London: for G Nicol, G.G. and J. Robinson and J. Debrett

Mingay, G. E. (1994) *Land and Society in England 1750-1980*. London: Longman.

Morris, J.E. (1901) *The North Riding of Yorkshire*. London: Methuen and Co.

Mowl, T. (2000) *Gentlemen and Players: Gardeners of the English Landscape*. Sparkford, UK: J.H. Haynes & Co.

Mowl, T. (2002) *Historic Gardens of Gloucestershire*. Charleston: Tempus Publ.



- Mowl, T. (2003) *Historic Gardens of Dorset*. Stroud, UK: Tempus Publ..
- Mowl, T. (2004) *Historic Gardens of Wiltshire*. Stroud: Tempus Publ.
- Mowl, T. (2005) *Historic Gardens of Cornwall*. Stroud: Tempus Publ.
- Mowl, T. (2006) *Historic Gardens of Worcestershire*. Stroud: Tempus Publ.
- NYCRO ZDV *Fauconberg (Belasyse) of Newburgh Papers*. Held in the North Yorkshire County Archives.
- NYCRO ZBL *Kiplin Hall Archives*. Held in the North Yorkshire Records Office.
- Ormrod, W (ed.) (2000) *The Lord Lieutenants and High Sheriffs of Yorkshire, 1066-2000*. Barnsley: Wharncliffe.
- Page, W (ed.) (1914) *The Victoria History of the Counties of England, Yorkshire North Riding, (1)*. London: Constable and Company.
- Page, W (ed.) (1923) *The Victoria Histories of the Counties of England, Yorkshire North Riding, (2)*. London: Constable and Company.
- Parsons D (1990) *Stone: Quarrying and Building in England AD 43-1525*. Chichester, Sussex: Phillimore and Co Ltd.
- Pevsner, N. (1966) *Yorkshire the North Riding*. London: Penguin Books.
- Phibbs, J. (1983) 'An Approach to the Methodology of Recording Historic Landscapes', *The Journal of the Garden History Society*, 11 (2): 167-175.
- Phibbs, J. 1991. 'The Archaeology of Parks: The Wider Perspective', CBA Research Report 78: *Garden Archaeology*, 118-122.
- Phibbs, J. 1998. 'Recording What Isn't There: Three Difficulties with 18th-Century Landscapes,' in Pattison, P. (ed.) *There By Design: Field Archaeology in Parks and Gardens*, 27-31. Oxford: British Archaeological Report.
- Parsons D (1990) *Stone: Quarrying and Building in England AD 43-1525*. Chichester, Sussex: Phillimore and Co Ltd.
- Piggott, S. (1976) *Ruins in a Landscape: Essays in Antiquarianism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pope, A. (1713) *An Essay on Criticism*. London: W. Lewis.
- Price, U. (1796) *An Essay on the Picturesque as Compared with the Sublime and the*

- Beautiful, and on the Use of Studying Pictures for the Purpose of Improving Real Landscapes.* London: Printed for J Robinson.
- Rackham, C. (2004) 'Pre-Existing Trees and Woods in Country-House Parks', *Landscapes* 5(2): 1-16.
- Repton, H. (1976 original in 1792-1812) *The Red Books of Humphry Repton: including the the Red Books prepared for Antony House, Cornwall; Attingham Park, Shropshire; and Sheringham Hall, Norfolk.* London: Basilisk P.
- Rosenheim, J.M. (1998) *The Emergence of Ruling Order: English Landed Society 1650-1750.* London: Longman.
- Rowan, A. (1968) *Garden Buildings. The RIBA Drawings Series.* Fletham, Middlesex: Hamlyn Press
- Saumarez-Smith, C. (1990) *The Building of Castle Howard.* London: Pimlico.
- Scazzosi, L. (2004) 'Reading and Assessing the Landscape as Cultural and Historical Heritage', *Landscape Research* 29, (4), 333-355.
- Stamp, L. (1946) *The Land of Britain and How it is Used.* London: The British Council.
- Stamper, P. (1996) *Historic Parks and Gardens of Shropshire.* Shropshire: Shropshire Books.
- Steenbergen, C. and W. Reh (1996) *Architecture and Landscape of the Great European Gardens and Landscapes.* Bussum NDL: Thoth.
- Stone, L. and Fawtier-Stone, J.C. (1986) *An Open Elite? England 1540-1880.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stuart, D. (1979) *Georgian Gardens.* London: Robert Hale.
- Switzer S. ([1715] 1982) *Iconographica Rustica or, the Noblemen, Gentlemen and Gardeners Recreation, etc.* New York: Garland.
- Taigel, A. and T. Williamson (1993) *Know the Landscape: Parks and Gardens.* London: BT Batsford.
- Taylor, C. (1983) *The Archaeology of Gardens.* Buckinghamshire: Shire Publishers..
- Thacker, C. (1979) *The History of Gardens.* London: Croom Helm.
- Thirsk, J. (1987) *Agricultural Regions and Agrarian History of England, 1500-1750.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.



- Thirsk, J. (ed.) (1967) *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Tooley, R. V. (1949) *Maps and Map-Makers*. New York: Bonanza Books.
- Tuke, J. (1800) *General View of Agriculture of the North Riding*. London: J Nicol.
- Turner, J. G. 1978. 'Stephen Switzer and the Political Fallacy in Landscape Gardening History', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* XI, 489-496.
- Walpole, H. (1785) *The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening*. London: Garland Publishing.
- Waterson, E. and P. Meadows (1990) *Lost Houses of York and the North Riding*. York: Jill Raines.
- Webster D. (2005) *Kiplin Hall*. North Yorkshire: Kiplin Hall Trust.
- Whellan, T. C. (1857) *History and Topography of the City of York and the North Riding*. Beverley: Green Market Place
- Williams, R. (1983) 'Making Places: Garden-Mastery and English Brown', *Journal of Garden History* 3(4): 382-385.
- Williamson, T. (2004) 'Designed Landscapes: The Regional Dimension' *Landscapes* 2: 16-24.
- Williamson, T. (1998a) '18th-Century Landscapes in Norfolk, England' in P. Pattison *There By Design: Field Archaeology in Parks and Gardens*, 47-55. Oxford: British Archaeological Report.
- Williamson, T. (1992) 'Garden History and Systematic Survey' in Hunt, J.D. (ed.) *Garden History Issues, Approaches, Methods*, 59-78. Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.
- Williamson, T. (1995) *Polite Landscapes: Gardens and Societies in Eighteenth Century England*. Sutton: Sutton Publishing.
- Williamson, T. (2007) 'Politeness and Palladianism: Archaeology and the Country House', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 133-146.
- Williamson, T. (1998b) *The Archaeology of the Landscape Park: Garden Design in Norfolk, England c. 1680-1840*. Oxford: Hadrian Books Ltd.

- Williamson, T. (2002) *The Transformation of Rural England Farming and the Landscape 1700 1870*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Williamson, T. and L. Bellamy (1987) *Property and Landscape: A Social History of Land Ownership and the English Countryside*. London: George Philip.
- Williamson, V. A. and Lyttleton, G.W.S. (eds.) (1907) *Memorials of Brooks's from the Foundation of the Club in 1764 to the Close of the Nineteenth Century*. London: Ballantyne.
- Willis, P. (1977) *Charles Bridgeman and the English Landscape Garden*. London: A. Zwemmer.
- Winter, J. (1999) *Secure from Rash Assault: Sustaining the Victorian Environment*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press
- Wood, G. (1957) *Historic Houses of Yorkshire*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.
- Worsley, W. (2004) 'Hovingham Park and the Worsleys', paper given at Hovingham Hall, Yorkshire Archaeological Society 17 July, 2004.
- Wragg, B. (2000) *The Life and Works of John Carr*. York: Oblong
- Young, A. ([1770] 1967) *A Six Months' Tour Through the North of England*, 4 (2). New York: A.M. Kelley Publ.



## ON LINE SOURCES

Hinson, C. (n.d.) 'GENUKI UK and Ireland Genealogy' <http://www.genuki.org.uk>. Page consulted 2006-2009.

Jacques, D (n.d.) 'UK Database of Historic Parks and Gardens' <http://www.york.ac.uk/depts/arch/landscapes/ukpg/database/>. Page consulted 2005

Kershaw, A. (2005) 'Wensleydale Past and Present' <http://www.thedaales.org.uk>  
Page consulted 2008-2009.

Lundy, (2006). 'The Peerage' <http://thepeerage.com>. Page consulted 2006-2009.

Natural England (2009) 'York and Humber National Character Areas' <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/landscape/englands/character/areas/yorkshumber.aspx>. Page consulted 2009.

Oxford University Press (2006) 'The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography' <http://www.oxforddnb.com>. Page consulted 2006-2009.

University of Edinburgh 'Historic Digimap Edina' <http://digimap.edina.ac.uk/historic/HistoricMap?useJS=true>. Page consulted 2004-2009.

Rokeby Park (2007-2009) 'Rokeby Park Home Page' <http://www.rokebypark.com/> Page consulted April 2009.

Dawnay Estates (2000) 'The Dawnay Estates Website' <http://www.dawnay.co.uk/Estates/History.aspx> . Page consulted 12 August 2009.

## MAPS CONSULTED

*A Plan of the Gardens of Thomas Worsley at Hovingham Hall (1700). Held In Private Collection.*

Campbell, C. (1715). 'Ground Plan of Castle Howard', in *Vitruvius Britannicus I*. London.

Fowler, R. (1727). *Estate Map of Henderskelfe*. Held in Private Collection.

Greenwood, C. & J. (1834). *Map of the North Riding of the County of York*.

Jeffreys (1771). *Map of Yorkshire*

NYCRO M31 (n.d.) *A plan of Alterations intended at Sutton on the Forest in the County of York, belonging to the Rev Mr Henry Goodricke.*

NYCRO M (MIC 1982/301-305). (1819) *A Plan of Hutton Bonville.*

NYCRO ZAZ M2 (MIC 2001/9). Gainford, F(1732). *A survey of the Lordship of Marske.*

NYCRO ZAZ M2 (MIC2001/34) (n.d). *Plan of the Estate Aldborough*

NYCRO ZAZ M3 (MIC2001/14) Richardson, R (1757). *A plan of Clints*

NYCRO ZAZ M17 (MIC2001/99). Monkhouse, W (1840) *Marske, Clints and Skelton.*

NYCRO ZCI (MIC 2066/109-121) *Plan of the Parish of Scruton.*

NYCRO ZEW M20 (MIC 1599/100). Hornby, J. (1806). *Plan of Township of Rievaulx.*

NYCRO ZBO (MIC 2002/101). Surveyor Unknown. (1723). *Map of Manors of Wensley and Preston.*

NYCRO ZBO M2/1 (MIC 2002/167). Surveyor Unknown. (n.d. mid 18<sup>th</sup> century). *A map of his Grace the Duke of Bolton's Seat.*

NYCRO ZBO M2/2 (MIC 2002/177). Surveyor Unknown. (n.d. mid 18<sup>th</sup> century). *A map of his Grace the Duke of Bolton's Seat.*

NYCRO ZDA DAR88 Surveyor Unknown (1746). *Map of Aldby Park.*

NYCRO ZDA: DAR MP14. attributed to Knowlton (n.d.) *Aldby Park.*

NYCRO ZDS M1/1 (MIC 1738/374). Foster, A. (1750). *A Correct Plan of the North Boundary of Danby Upon the Forest.*



- NYCRO ZDS (MIC 1738/50). Surveyor Unknown. (1751). *A Correct Plan of the Forest Dale and Lordship of Danby.*
- NYCRO ZDS M1/5 (MIC 1738/68-93). Bewlyay R. & W. Collingwood. (1753). *Map of Lands within the Manor of Danby.*
- NYCRO ZDV (MIC 1504/145-157). Mayson, F. (1665). *Newburgh Priory.*
- NYCRO ZDV VI2 (MIC 1504/145-157). Palmer, W & W. Jones. *An Accurate Survey of Newburgh.*
- NYCRO ZDV VI 4 (MIC 1504/166-173). Jones, W. (1722). *Survey of Newburgh Priory.*
- NYCRO ZDV VI6 (MIC 1504/390-405). Jones W. (1727). *A Mapp of the Sovearl Lordships of Newborough.*
- NYCRO ZDV VI 17 (MIC 1504/183-194). Haynes, J. (1744). *Survey of Newburgh Priory.*
- NYCRO ZEW M6 (MIC 1599/73). Sneaton, D. (1792). *A map of the Lordship of Helmsley.*
- NYCRO ZEW M20 (MIC 1599/100). Hornby, J. (1806). *Plan of Township of Rievaulx.*
- NYCRO ZEW M35 (MIC 1599/208). Tukes & Ayre (1820). *A Plan of the Township of Helmsley etc. the Property of Charles Duncombe esq.*
- NYCRO ZF 9/5 (MIC 1504/13). Outram, J (1774) '*Plan and Survey*' of the estate Hackness
- NYCRO ZF 9/8 (MIC 1504/64-64) Tuke, J (1804). *A map of the estates of Sir Richard Bemde Johnstone.*
- NYCRO ZFM (MIC 1436/238). Seagrave (1773). *A Rough Map of the Manor of Guisborough... the Estate of William Chaloner.*
- NYCRO ZFM (MIC 2656). Surveyor Unknown (1854). *Plan of the Hall and Gardens situate at Guisborough...*
- NYCRO ZJX 10/1/4 (j & f). William Senior. (1627). *The Surueye of Jaruaux Abbaie.*
- NYCRO ZJX (MIC 1930/144-148). Surveyor Unknown. (n.d. 1790s) *Rough Map of Witton Jervaulx and Kilgram.*
- NYCRO ZJX (MIC 1930/126-129). Surveyor Unknown. (n.d. 1793). *Map II of Witton, Jervaulx and Kilgram.*

NYCRO ZJX (MIC 1930/218-219). Surveyor Unknown. (1804). *Modern Sketch of 'Lands nor Jervaulx Park in 1804'*.

NYCRO ZJX (MIC 1930/239-43). Surveyor Unknown. (1807). *Plan of Jervaulx Abbey with the intended alterations.*

NYCRO ZJX (MIC 1931/232-38). Surveyor Unknown. (n.d. 1840?). *Rough plan of Part of Jervaulx.*

NYCRO ZJX (MIC 1931/305). Surveyor Unknown. (1886). *Plan of the Jervaulx Abbey Estate.*

NYCRO ZK 9503 MIC 2047/86. Peirson, G (1840). *Plans of estate at Kirkleatham the property of Henry Vansittart esq.*

NYCRO ZMI 43 (MIC 1496/233-34) (n.d.). *Plan of the estate Gilling*

NYCRO ZMI 43 (MIC 1930/489). (n.d. [mid 17<sup>th</sup> century]) *A plan of part of the Lordship of Ebberston*

NYCRO ZNK M 1/1 (MIC 2120/68). Colebeck, J. (n.d. c 1727-1758). *Map of the Lordship of Ask.*

NYCRO ZNK M1/3 (MIC 2120/79). Jackson, G. (1761). *Plan of the Lordship of Ask.*

NYCRO ZNK M ¼ (MIC 2708/132). Jackson, G. (1763). *Plan of the Grounds of Ask Hall.*

NYCRO ZRL 12/2/1 (MIC 2015/357) Appleby, Ambrose (1727) *Exact Survey of lordship of Brough.*

NYCRO ZRL 12/2/2 (MIC 2015/362) T. Bradley and Son (1836) *Property of William Lawson collected from various surveys*

NYCRO ZS (MIC 2018/225-227). Surveyor Unknown. (1793). *Mr Danby's Map.*

NYCRO ZS (MIC 2018/228-234). Procter, H. (1765). *A Map of Swinton Park.*

NYCRO ZS (MIC 2018/255-265). Chambers, B. (1770). *A Plan of the Manor of Swinton.*

NYCRO ZS (MIC 2023/73-75). Surveyor Unknown. (1820). *Swinton with Wathermarske. A plan of the Gardens, Deer park and Pleasure Grounds of Wm Danby.*



**NYCRO ZS (MIC 2023/105-116). *Swinton with Wathermarske. A Plan of Swinton Park.***

**NYCRO ZQF (MIC 1982/306) Map of Askrigg**

***Ordinance Survey 6 inch to 1 mile: First Edition published 1852.***

***Ordinance Survey 6 inch to 1 mile: First Edition published 1853.***

***Ordinance Survey 6 inch to 1 mile: First Edition published 1854.***

***Ordinance Survey 6 inch to 1 mile: First Edition published 1855.***

***Ordinance Survey 6 inch to 1 mile: First Edition published 1856.***

***Ordinance Survey 6 inch to 1 mile: First Edition published 1857.***

***Plan of Alterations designed for Newby (1803). Held in Private Collection.***

***Plan of Hovingham Hall (1824). Held in Private Collection.***

***Survey of Henderskelfe (n.d.). Held in Private Collection.***

***Survey of Henderskelfe (1770). Held in Private Collection.***

***Survey of the Lordship of Newby belonging to Sir Edward Blackett...(1682). Held in Private Collection.***

***White (1766) A plan of Alterations designed for Newby the seat of William Wedell Esq. Held in Private Collection***