WHY CELEBRATE CAPABILITY BROWN? RESPONSES AND REACTIONS TO LANCELOT 'CAPABILITY' BROWN, 1930-2016.

Oliver Cox, TORCH| The Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities, Radcliffe Humanities Building, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG

Email: oliver.cox@humanities.ox.ac.uk

Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (1716-83) is the most famous landscape designer in English history. This article charts popular and political responses to Brown from 1930 to the present day. It argues that Brown's tercentenary in 2016 offers an important opportunity to critically analyse the ways in which Brown has become part of the English national psyche. The clues to this rediscovery can be found in the writings of an influential group of inter-war and post-war Modernist architects and planners, who also provide clues as to how Brown's relevance can endure into the twenty-first century.

A remarkable transformation occurred in the scholarly and popular understanding of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown between the middle of the twentieth century and the present day. Brown is no longer just the preserve of scholarly articles interested in attribution and stylistic development, or of an elite landowning class, but has become popular shorthand for landscaping on the largest scale, and – more interestingly, representative of a certain kind of Englishness.

This popularisation has, however, denuded Brown of his potency. His tripartite concoction of trees, grass and water now represent a reassuring vision of Englishness: stable, secure, remote from the challenges of the twenty-first century, and easily-marketable to domestic and international tourists.[i] Yet during the inter-war and post-war years, Brown and his landscapes had power, meaning and influence. This article suggests that in order to ensure Brown's significance into the twenty-first century, we must take inspiration from writers like Christopher Tunnard, Christopher Hussey, Dorothy Stroud and Nicholas Pevsner, who laid the intellectual foundations of Brown's twentieth-century renaissance, and regard him as more than a cosy national hero. Brown, and the eighteenth-century landscape movement, must be instrumentalised to provide – as the 2016 tercentenary celebrations suggest – insightful solutions to contemporary issues of town planning, land-management, infrastructure development, brand identity and entrepreneurship.

In tracing Brown's progress through the nation's popular consciousness during the twentieth century, this article highlights how references to Brown in architectural publications and periodicals, debates in the Palace of Westminster, and within broader popular culture were, up until the mid-1960s, interested in using the eighteenth-century past as a model and guide for solving contemporary issues of land-management, urban expansion and infrastructure development. From the mid-1960s onwards, references to Brown decline at

Westminster, but increase in the popular press as more and more people look to fill their leisure time with visits to heritage attractions.[ii]

The Genius of the Place: Suburban Plots and Urban Planning.

At 9am on Sunday 27 November 1955, Nikolaus Pevsner gave the last in his series of seven lectures on the 'Englishness of English Art'.[iii] Pevsner's Reith Lectures digested two decades of theoretical and intellectual responses to the eighteenth century landscape movement contained within publications like *The Architectural Review* and *Landscape and Garden* and presented them to a wider public.[iv]

Called 'The Genius of the Place', Pevsner's final lecture was a response to the post-war world of ongoing reconstruction, infrastructure development, and the continued freezing of relationships with the Eastern Bloc. To take the aesthetic lead, the English needed to look back, and within. Pevsner asserted:

> Our problems are those of improvements in towns, including the metropolis, and the laying out or, as it is now called, the planning of new towns and new parts of towns. But even with regard to those urgent problems, so much more serious and portentous than those of the country-house and its grounds, the English Picturesque theory – if not its practice – has an extremely important message.[v]

Pevsner identified how, 'there is an English national planning theory in existence which needs only be recognised and developed'.[vi] Finding support from writings by eighteenth-century theorists from Alexander Pope to Uvedale Price and Payne Knight, he told his radio audience that:

> The *genius loci*, if we put it in modern planning terms is the character of the site, and the character of the site is, in a town, not only the geographical but also the historical, social and especially the aesthetic character.[vii]

Pevsner asked his audience to consider the capabilities of the site, and by extension that functionalism – or 'each case on its own merit' – be the guiding principle behind the building of new towns, and the reconstruction of old.[viii] The future then, for Pevsner, lay in the past. 'There is plenty of precedent to make use of in our situation today', he wrote, 'not by copying but by applying the same principles, the same great English principles'.[ix]

Yet, this kind of architecture and town planning required popular support, and Pevsner ended his broadcast with a plea for:

> support against ignorance and shortsightedness, and against the stupid prejudice that such newfangled ideas as would give England modern and worthy town and city centres must be outlandish. It has, I hope, been demonstrated how thoroughly inlandish they are.[x]

This recourse to the eighteenth century was first developed in the interwar period as suburban development, 'spreading as rapidly as oil on water',[xi] menaced landscapes and coherent urban planning. As W.A. Eden observed in *The Architectural Review*, post World War One suburban building, 'covers an area out of all proportion to the people housed, and is completely out of scale with the urban centres to which it is attached'.[xii] One response, as outlined by the magazine's editor Hubert de Cronin Hastings was to publish 'a series of historical studies on certain aspects of English life' to rediscover native landscape traditions that 'may give direction to the present and coherence to our aims for the future, though clothed inevitably in forms that appear to be new and strange'.[xiii]

For contributors to *The Architectural Review*, the eighteenth-century landscape tradition had agency and power; providing a guide for solving 'the problem of how to reconstitute a balance between the claims of town and country':[xiv]

> The proposition that must now be stated is that the problem can only be solved by a general return to the improving tradition of the English landscape – the tradition which was for the time being swamped by the developments of the nineteenth century. Our interpretation of 'the people' has broadened since the last great period of improvement, and therein lies one opportunity of adding to the tradition. We can attempt to do for the whole community what the eighteenth century landowner did for his own enjoyment, and only incidentally for the benefit of his tenants.[xv]

To illustrate this argument, W.A. Eden turned to Capability Brown's landscape at Blenheim Palace, and demonstrated the contrast between development where 'great estates are being broken up and broken into by the speculative builder', and a new approach imbued with eighteenth-century principles where 'the park and the garden are retained and in place of the house a block of flats is built'. This method of adaptive reuse was further advocated by influential architects such as Walter Gropius and Maxwell Fry who argued that, 'preservation by sterilisation is not possible on a wide scale' and that instead 'preservation must become part of an *active* policy of development'.[xvi]

Suburban growth for Romantic Moderns like John Betjeman meant that 'landscape for most of us has shrunk into a back garden'[xvii] and that in order to create innovative responses to interwar challenges, architects, planners and politicians needed to recapture the eighteenth-century's scale and magnificence of vision. Suburban home-owners, like Georgian aristocrats before them, had the opportunity to lay claim to the wider landscape: 'The garden of tomorrow will not be the hedged, personal, half-acre of today, but a unit of the broad green landscape itself, controlled for the benefit of all'.[xviii]

Written by the twenty-eight year old landscape architect, Christopher Tunnard, this idea of 'the garden without limitation' – of ha-has jumped and vistas borrowed – was a spiky reaction against, 'those barren and stereotyped notions of street planting, classic open-air civic centres…which make the present-day

schemes of the so-called "garden city" school of panning such empty and cumbersome achievements'.[xix] Through articles in *The Architectural Review* and his 1938 book *Gardens in the Modern Landscape*, Tunnard used Capability Brown as an attempt to provide 'a manifesto for modernism in landscape'.[xx] Tunnard's approach was emblematic of what Alan Powers has recently labelled 'romantic regeneration', as Tunnard sought to challenge 'the sterilisation of large areas of precious and often productive land' through preservation. Like W.A. Eden, Tunnard used a Brownian landscape, Claremont, to illustrate the alternative:

> Estates such as Claremont…are becoming permanently sterilized as built-over areas…while with rational planning of the whole area, and the concentration of dwellings in certain parts of it, more people might be housed yet and virtually the whole estate might be left open for the benefit of the residents and the public.[xxi]

Tunnard argued that in 'parcelling the landscape into minute private properties' speculative builders seriously threatened community coherence, and outlined how carefully situated tower blocks could house 6000 people, rather than 800 residents in 1938.

'Not Infrequently Branded a Charlatan': Scholarly Research into Capability Brown

However, interest in using Brown's landscapes as stage sets for working out responses to interwar housing and infrastructure challenges did not yet translate into a biography. Writing in Spring 1937, H.S. Reid could lament that, 'for all his industry and his fame no life of him seems yet to have been written',[xxii] that Brown 'is now not infrequently branded a charlatan', and that

> to-day, among the lovers of gardening proper, as distinct from the creation of park scenery, his name is anathema. They recall the devastation that he wrought at Moor Park and Longleat, the destruction all over England of forecourts, terraces, fountains, parterres and clipped hedges.[xxiii]

Against this background of interwar interest – yet superficial understanding of – Capability Brown, Dorothy Stroud's landmark 1950 study takes on further significance. Christopher Hussey's introduction to Stroud's study opened with the now familiar celebration of how:

> the designing of 'natural' landscapes…is an unique English contribution to the arts, and, typically English in its union of beauty with use, an art of which our countryside contributes the principal display.[xxiv]

The significance of Hussey's introduction, however, lay not in the association of Brown with Englishness, but more in the recognition that Brown's style of landscape could be rehabilitated for modern purposes. Hussey praised the 'timeliness of the present work', which had the potential to 'set the focus with the aesthetic trend of his and our own times'.[xxv] Indeed, Hussey suggested that

rather than an ahistorical investigation into an artistic figure, the 'main impulse' behind Stroud's research – which had begun in 1936:[xxvi]

> has undoubtedly been the growing concern with problems of country planning, preservation of scenery, and the relation of buildings to their setting.[xxvii]

Hussey's introduction is rooted in the challenges facing the architectural and landscape design professions in post-war Britain. When held up as an example of landscape management Brown, Hussey argued and Stroud documented

> should put us to shame who, men of little faith, seek an immediate return for such niggardly sums as are expended in public plantations by resorting to flowering crabs and shrubberies.

Building on the growing interest in Brown and the English landscape garden during the 1930s, Hussey saw Brown as more than just a man, and more than just a landscape designer. His works could provide a guide on how to fundamentally recalibrate post-war reconstruction away from short-term solutions towards a 'requisite largeness and length of vision, this responsibility of ours to posterity'.[xxviii] But, like Christopher Tunnard in the 1930s, this vision for landscape and design required the British people to sacrifice their own suburban plots to confirm to the idea of the landscape garden as a common garden, and Hussey feared that even if government departments and local authorities were willing to plant 'along the new arterial roads around housing estates' the 'depredations of undisciplined urchins would soon bring their intentions to nought'.[xxix]

In the search for an appropriate vocabulary for modernist landscape architecture, and a setting suitable for the post-war challenges facing Britain, one answer was to anglicise international modernism by situating its buildings within settings inspired by the eighteenth century landscape movement. Or, as de Wolfe suggested in *The Architectural Review*:

> acknowledgment in our own day of the existence of a perennially English visual philosophy could revolutionise our national contribution to architecture and town-planning by making possible our own regional development of the International style.[xxx]

Models for housing schemes cited in official publications like the *Government Housing Manuals* of 1949 and 1953, emphasised the importance of green space and buildings that worked with the capabilities of the site. The 1949 *Manual*, for example, noted that 'In urban areas the town dweller needs the visual relaxation that can be given by the sight of grass and tress', and that 'Where estates border open country or a park, the layout should allow the country or park to be viewed from within the housing area'.[xxxi]

The Rise and Rise of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown

As well as representing a rare alliance between designers and historians, Dorothy Stroud's study provided the foundations for Brown's ascent to the position of a national hero.[xxxii] Her scholarly excavations started to be reflected in political discourse in the Palace of Westminster. As politicians endlessly debated the challenges of combining beauty with utility in post-war reconstruction and infrastructure schemes, Brown's name was frequently held up as an example of best practice – but with very little detail as to what he actually achieved, or even where he worked.

As the Atlee Cabinet discussed the proposal by Manny Shinwell (Minister for Fuel and Power) for the working of opencast coal in Wentworth Woodhouse park,[xxxiii] Lewis Silkin (Minister for Town and Country Planning) noted in an erroneous, yet revealing statement:

> What really matters in the case of Wentworth Woodhouse is not the Mansion, which, though fine, is not of outstanding merit and anyhow is not materially affected, but the whole environs of gardens and park. These were laid out in the eighteenth century by the famous landscape gardener, Capability Brown, and have been carefully maintained and renewed ever since.

In his attempt to stop the proposed opencast coal mining, Silkin emphasised how the landscape was of 'a quite special value to the 130,000 inhabitants of Rotherham and the surrounding district which is otherwise mostly very bare and grim'.[xxxiv] For Silkin, Wentworth Woodhouse's green and pleasant land was part of both the prescription and cure for an aesthetically oppressed industrial populace.

The importance of amenity and usefulness echoes throughout political pronouncements mentioning Brown between post-war and the final quarter of the twentieth century. In 1955, during the second reading of the 'North Wales Hydro-Electric Power Bill' in the House of Commons, James Ede (MP for South Shields), observed:

> I have this to say about amenities People still believe that the most beautiful parts of this country – and I mean both England and Wales – are the results of what nature did. Most of the beauties of this country in the last 200 years have been created, first, by the efforts of a gentleman known as Mr. Capability Brown. He took places that were quite uninteresting and, by the skilful use of plantations of trees and by the creation of artificial water, gave to those places a distinction and a beauty that today is sometimes ascribed to a power even higher than Mr. Capability Brown.

Rather than just the hero of preservationists, Brown could be mobilised to support the development of hydro-electric power during the 1950s:

> Those of us who can recall some of the schemes for reservoirs in different parts of the country where attention has been paid to preserving, and

> even adding to, the natural advantages of the landscape, know the capabilities there are here.[xxxv]

Brown's achievements were passionately invoked as an inspiration for a new cadre of landscape engineers responding to the requirements of a nation hungry for electricity, noting that: 'the schemes [can] add greatly to the permanent beauty of our beautiful island'.[xxxvi]

Debates from the 1930s continued to be revisited. David Price (MP for Eastleigh) concluded that one of the basic principles that the House needed to adopt came from the past:

> We must control the direction of our industrial development so that we preserve the general line of our landscape. If we go back to our forefathers, we will find two names which will give us a lead on how to do this. One was Sir Christopher Wren and the other a century later, that great landscape artist Capability Brown.[xxxvii]

Supporters of the 'Gowers Report on Houses of Outstanding Historic or Architectural Interest' seized upon these arguments.[xxxviii] Arthur Colegate (MP for Burton) argued that the battle to preserve the country houses and designed landscapes of England should rise above politics because, 'it is in the field of amenities, and no other problem is as important as this'.[xxxix]

In the Palace of Westminster during the second half of the twentieth century, Brown was no political football, but rather a national hero who could be summoned to legitimate or support a variety of opportunities. First mentioned in the Lords in 1949,[xl] and the Commons in 1952,[xli] references to Brown peak in the 1980s, before dropping off into the 1990s and 2000s. What unites all the varied pronouncements is the instant recognition that each speaker expected from their audience on the mention of Brown's name **(Figure 1 – Andy Davey, *The Sun* (27 January 2010)**. No other landscape designer could come close. This recognition was due to the remarkable renaissance experienced by the country house and landscape garden in the second half of the twentieth century. By the second edition of *Brideshead Revisited* (1959), Evelyn Waugh could reflect on how his novel had become, 'a panegyric preached over an empty coffin' as 'it was impossible to foresee, in the spring of 1944, the present cult of the English country house'.[xlii] It was, most importantly, the eighteenth-century country house and landscape that dominated.[xliii]

Yet this movement to the heart of the nation also rid Brown of his potency. He has become a symbol of a reassuring Englishness, the creator of an ideal English landscape that is an escape from the challenges of daily life **(Figures 2 and 3)**. As Stoker Cavendish, 12th Duke of Devonshire observes,

> I don't think visitors care whether the landscape is real or not real – it just is. When you think of all the unlovely parts of life, to come to a place like this for a bit of quiet contemplation and mental refurbishment means a great deal to people.[xliv]

The tercentenary celebrations, co-ordinated by the Landscape Institute and supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund,[xlv] provides us with an opportunity to reinvigorate Brown, to take inspiration from the Modernist architects of the 1930s through to the 1950s, and re-imagine him as something more than just a cosy, cuddly national hero who created the landscapes a certain subset of the British population spend their time in.

A Twenty-First Century Brown?

One way of ensuring Brown's ongoing relevance into the twenty-first century is to jump the ha-ha that bounds Garden History and explore other aspects of his life and work. To do this we need to focus on the man. As increasing numbers of country house visits are driven by an enthusiasm for character-driven historical drama;[xlvi] people like people rather than things.

One connection is particularly apposite. James Dyson, the self-made billionaire entrepreneur, now owns Dodington House in Gloucestershire, with a landscape designed by Brown.[xlvii] Dyson, as a self-made man and entrepreneur provides a different lens through which to analyse Brown's achievements. As Roderick Floud's research is demonstrating, to view Brown as an entrepreneur is to place his achievements in context, and highlight how in spotting a gap in the market Brown was able to create a business with over £718 million worth of contracts (between 1761 and 1783), organise teams of contractors and finance the projects.[xlviii] Brown is starting to provide lessons in entrepreneurship outside of garden history.[xlix]

Most significantly, as the challenges of urban growth continue, Brown can once more be invoked as inspiration for a compelling vision of an ideal nature that can also service the practical and economic needs of its population.[l] For future urban, suburban and rural developments that are visionary, economically viable, and popular perhaps it's time to put the historians back in touch with the architects, town planners and landscape designers.

---

[i] 2016 is the 'Year of the English Garden', with an international marketing campaign co-ordinated by Visit Britain and Visit England: https://www.visitbritain.org/year-english-garden-2016 (accessed, 24 April 2016).

[ii] On the development of the heritage sector, see: Robert Hewison, *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline* (London: Meuthen, 1987); David Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); LauraJane Smith, *Uses of Heritage* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), and Patrick Wright, *On Living In An Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain*, 2nd edn. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009);

[iii] The original lectures are available to download, see: http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p00h9llv (accessed, 24 April 2016). For the position of the Reith Lectures within Pevsner's output, see: Susie Harries, *Nikolaus Pevsner: The Life* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2011), pp. 484-500.
[iv] Pevsner planned a book on English planning, which remained unpublished in his lifetime: Matthew Aitchison (ed.), Nikolaus Pevsner, *Visual Planning and the Picturesque* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2010). See also, John Pendlebury, Erdem Erten, Peter Larkham (eds.), *Alternative Visions of Post-War Reconstruction: Creating the Modern Townscape* (London: Routledge, 2015).
[v] N. Pevsner, *The Englishness of English Art*, 2nd edn (London, 1964), pp. 179-180.
[vi] Ibid.
[vii] Ibid.
[viii] Ibid., p. 183.
[ix] Ibid., p. 186.
[x] Ibid., p. 180.
[xi] E. Prentice Mawson, 'Forward', *Landscape and Garden: A Quarterly Journal devoted to Garden Design and Landscape Architecture*, 1:1 (Spring, 1934), p. 32.
[xii] W.A. Eden, 'The English Tradition in the Countryside', *The Architectural Review*, vol. XXVII, no. 461 (Apr. 1935), p. 151. For details of interwar construction, see: Matthew Hollow, 'Suburban Ideals on England's Interwar Council Estates', *Garden History*, 39:2 (Winter, 2011), pp. 203-217.
[xiii] Hubert de Cronin Hastings, 'The English Tradition', *The Architectural Review*, vol. XXVII, no. 460 (Mar. 1935), p. 86. See also, Anthony Raynsford, 'Urban Contrast and Neo-Toryism: On the Social and Political Symbolism of *The Architectural Review*'s Townscape Campaign', *Planning Perspectives*, 30:1 (20015), pp. 95-128.
[xiv] Eden, 'The English Tradition in the Countryside', *The Architectural Review*, vol. LXXVII, no. 462 (May 1935), p. 193.
[xv] Ibid.
[xvi] Walter Gropius and Maxwell Fry, 'Cry Stop to Havoc, or Preservation by Development', *The Architectural Review*, vol. LXXVII, no. 462 (May 1935), p. 188.
[xvii] John Betjeman, quoted in Alexandra Harris, *Romantic Moderns: English Writers, Artists and the Imagination from Virginia Woolf to John Piper* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2010), p. 222. See also, Karin Hiscock, 'Modernity and "English" Tradition: Betjeman at *The Architectural Review*', *Journal of Design History*, 13:3 (2000), pp. 193-212.
[xviii] Christopher Tunnard, 'The Case for the Common Garden', *The Architectural Review*, vol. LXXXIV, no. 502 (Sept. 1938), p. 109. For the realities of interwar gardening, see: Matthew Hollow, 'Suburban Ideals on England's Interwar Council Estates', *Garden History*, 39:2 (2011), pp. 203-217.
[xix] Ibid.
[xx] Alan Powers, 'Modernism and Romantic Regeneration in the English Landscape, 1920-1940', in Therese O'Malley and Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn (eds.), *Modernism and Landscape Architecture, 1890-1940* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2015), p. 73. See also, David Jacques and Jan Woudstra, *Landscape Modernism Renounced: The Career of Christopher Tunnard (1910-1979)* (London: Routledge, 2009).
[xxi] Tunnard, 'The Case for the Common Garden', p. 116.

[xxii] H.S. Reid, 'Famous Landscape Architects: Capability Brown – I', *Landscape and Garden: A Quarterly Journal Devoted to Garden Design and Landscape Architecture*, vol. IV, no. 1 (Spring, 1937), p. 19.
[xxiii] Idem., 'They Designed our Countryside, Famous Landscape Architects: Capability Brown – II', *Landscape and Garden: A Quarterly Journal Devoted to Garden Design and Landscape Architecture*, vol. IV, no. 2 (Summer, 1937), p. 87.
[xxiv] Christopher Hussey, 'Introduction' in Dorothy Stroud, *Capability Brown* London: Country Life, 15), p. 13. Hussey's interest in a systematic study of Capability Brown probably emerged out of his wide range of architectural and landscape history articles published in *Country Life* during the 1930s, and his pioneering study, *The Picturesque: Studies in a Point of View* (London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1927).
[xxv] Ibid.
[xxvi] Alan Paul, 'Dorothy Stroud: A Tribute', *Garden History*, 29:1 (2001), p. 102. Paul suggests that Stroud was 'fortunate in her timing for an interest in the English landscape garden had been stimulated post-war by Nikolaus Pevsner and Frank Clark' (p. 103).
[xxvii] Hussey, 'Introduction' in Stroud, *Capability Brown*, p. 13.
[xxviii] Ibid., p. 20.
[xxix] Ibid
[xxx] I. de Wolfe, 'Townscape: A Plea for an English Visual Philosophy Founded on the True Rock of Sir Uvedale Price', *The Architectural Review*, 106:636 (1949), p. 355.
[xxxi] Quoted in Harriet Atkinson, *The Festival of Britain: A Land and Its People* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2012), p. 69.
[xxxii] Stroud's study of Brown was so comprehensive that it took over thirty years for the second wave of scholarly research – in addition to the drip feed of *Country Life* articles – to germinate. Most significant amongst this work was Tom Williamson's *Polite Landscapes: Gardens and Society in Eighteenth-Century England* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1995). *Garden History*, 29:1 (2001) is especially useful as a staging post for understanding the range of scholarly interest in the Brownian landscape, with a new focus on the mechanics of Brown's construction including his lakes and use of contractors.
[xxxiii] James Raven, 'Introduction' in James Raven (ed.), *Lost Mansions: Essays on the Destruction of the Country House* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 14; Catherine Bailey, *Black Diamonds: The Rise and Fall of An English Dynasty* (London: Viking, 2007). For the eighteenth-century landscape, see: Michael Charlesworth, Patrick Eyres and George Sheeran, *Wentworth Woodhouse: A Landscape of Georgian Monuments* (Leeds: New Arcadian Press, 2006).
[xxxiv] TNA CAB 129/6/20 (21 January 1946). Some twenty years later, Viscount Ridley wryly observed in the House of Lords that, 'the Coal Board has a chance which nobody since the Almighty, or perhaps Capability Brown, has ever had of completely re-creating new tracts of landscape': HL Deb (18 May 1966), vol. 274 col. 1060.
[xxxv] HC Deb 7 July 1955 vol. 543 cols. 1424-1425.
[xxxvi] Ibid., col. 1426. Ede also returned to Brown's work transforming 'dreary expanses into vistas which are a delight to every human eye' in the Commons Chamber in 1961, see: HC Deb 14 Feb. 1961 vol. 634 col. 1356.

[xxxvii] Ibid. col. 1497
[xxxviii] Ruth Adams, 'The V&A, The Destruction of the Country House and the Creation of "English Heritage"', *Museum & Society*, 11/1 (2013), p. 4.
[xxxix] Ibid. col. 2014.
[xl] HL Deb (22 May 1947), vol. 147 col. 1057
[xli] HC Deb (1 August 1952), vol. 504 col. 2010.
[xlii] Evelyn Waugh, *Brideshead Revisited* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. ix
[xliii] A recent study highlights how 'lost' country houses in Norfolk tended to be in the (by mid-twentieth-century) unfashionable heavy gothic style characteristic of Salvin and J.C. Buckler: Tom Williamson, Ivan Ringwood and Sarah Spooner (eds.), *Lost Country Houses of Norfolk: History, Archaeology and Myth* (Boydell & Brewer, 2015), p. 45.
[xliv] Stoker Cavendish quoted in Mitchell Owens, 'Estate Agent', *Architectural Digest*, 73:5 (2016), p. 124.
[xlv] The Landscape Institute has been awarded £911,100 by HLF to stage the Capability Brown Festival, see: https://www.hlf.org.uk/about-us/media-centre/press-releases/heritage-lottery-fund-grant-capability-brown-festival (accessed, 4 June 2016); http://www.capabilitybrown.org
[xlvi] Oliver J.W. Cox, 'The "Downton Boom": Country Houses, Popular Culture, and Curatorial Culture', *The Public Historian*, 37:2 (2015), pp. 112-119.
[xlvii] For an overview of the property's history, see: Natalie A. Zacek, 'West Indian Echoes: Dodington House, the Codrington Family, and the Caribbean Heritage' in Madge Dresser and Andrew Hann (eds.), *Slavery and the British Country House* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2013), pp. 106-113, 159-161.
[xlviii] Roderick Floud, 'Gardening Entrepreneurs', http://www.gresham.ac.uk/lectures-and-events/gardening-entrepreneurs (accessed, 4 June 2016).
[xlix] Andrew Wild, 'Capability Brown, the Aristocracy, and the Cultivation of the Eighteenth-Century British Landscaping Industry', *Enterprise and Society*, 14:2 (2013), pp. 237-270.
[l] See, for example, URBED's Wolfson Economics Prize winning entry, Uxcester Garden City, http://urbed.coop/sites/default/files/URBED%20Wolfson%20Entry%20low%20res.pdf (accessed, 4 June 2016).