

APPENDIX 2: CONSERVATION PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & POLICY SCHEDULE

APPENDIX 2A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Need for a Conservation Plan

Built as a seaside pleasure palace by King George IV, Brighton Pavilion is a truly iconic building and its pleasure grounds sought to match its Regency flamboyance through innovative landscape design and horticulture. First designed as a private royal retreat the Royal Pavilion Garden (the Garden) was opened to the public in 1851 and has now become one of Brighton's most loved and used public spaces. Nash's design was partly recreated in the 1990s and the Garden is one of the few surviving Regency style gardens in England.

However, high levels of use, anti-social behaviour and an erosion of character resulted in the Garden being placed on the Heritage at Risk Register in 2017. A Conservation Plan was commissioned by Brighton & Hove City Council to address the issues facing the Garden and with a view of restoring the Garden to its former glory.

Summary of the Royal Pavilion Garden's Heritage Significances

A full Statement of Significance is provided in **Section 3** of this Conservation Plan. This is supported by detailed Tables of Significance for each individual heritage asset in **Appendix 4**. The following is a summary of the key points of the Garden's Statement of Significance.

As a place the Royal Pavilion Garden captures a unique blend of historic, aesthetic and community significances. Its history as a Regency style private royal garden and setting for the exuberant Royal Pavilion is a central aspect of its significance; but so is its over 165 years as an important public park and open space in the heart of Brighton. These two aspects form the primary significances of the site.

In historic terms the Garden is one of the few surviving Regency style gardens in England. Its creation by Nash in the early 19th century marked an important stage in the development of landscape and garden design bringing contemporary aesthetics into the realm of the garden. Sadly, the pioneering and influential nature of the design was not recognised in later phases of the Garden's life and the design was gradually eroded and lost. The partial re-creation of the Nash garden in the 1980s and 1990s sought to address this loss by re-creating elements of the design and implementing a Nash style picturesque landscape. There were however physical limitations to the extent of the works and the analytical works that supported the re-creation were largely limited to documentary analysis.

Consequently, the current garden, or even the garden that was created at the end of the re-creation works process, cannot be considered to be a fully intact and authentic recreation of the Nash design. It is instead a well-informed re-creation that provides a strong sense of the original Nash design and incorporates key aspects of the design. Its historic and evidential value lies in the elements that are known to accurately reflect earlier features and in the clear sense it provides of how a Regency garden was laid out, planted and maintained.

There are four Nash views of the Royal Pavilion that include images of the Garden, represented by aquatints by A.C. Pugin and contained within 'Views of the Royal Pavilion' (**Figure 5**). These are significant as they provide evidence for the layout of the Garden and established principal views of the Royal Pavilion.

A substantial element of its significance also relates to its relationship with the Royal Pavilion and wider estate. As an ensemble they represent an important architectural statement and their royal connections provide them with historic resonance. The Garden unifies and brings the architectural elements together and is a fundamental component of their setting. In particular it provides the main landscape setting for the Royal Pavilion itself. The decline in the quality of the Regency-style landscape is therefore affecting the significance of both the Garden and the Pavilion.

Since 1851 the Garden has served a public purpose, in contrast to its original private design intent, as an accessible public park for the people of Brighton. It has become an important urban green space providing a venue for numerous formal and informal events. It is now well used all year round with over five million people visiting or passing through the Garden each year. Its use is supported by the in-garden café and a regular programme of events. Its openness and ease of access makes it a particularly attractive venue. This communal usage is a fundamental aspect of the Garden's significance and has been for over 165 years.

Headline Risks and Opportunities

Underlying most of the issues and challenges facing the Garden is the inherent tension between its historic significance as a flamboyant Regency garden associated with the Royal estate, and its modern function as an important urban green space in the centre of Brighton.

Historic England placed the Garden on the Heritage at Risk Register for South East England in October 2017 citing the following reasons:

- The Garden had begun to suffer visibly from the high levels of visitor use and recreational development pressure; and
- There has been an erosion of the character caused by a disparate range of fencing, litter bins, signage and lighting units.

The combination of these factors was viewed as weakening the sense of the Garden's rich history for visitors.

Risks and opportunities facing the conservation of the Garden's heritage significances are grouped under the following headings, and explored in **Section 4** of this Conservation Plan:

- Presence on the Heritage at Risk Register
- User pressures
- Condition of the Garden
- Anti-social behaviour
- Trees and ecology
- Long-term climate change risks
- Completeness of restoration works
- External development pressures
- Management costs and resources
- Access, Engagement & Profile
- Interpretation & Research

Key Policies

The primary purpose of this Conservation Plan is to ensure that the significances of the Garden are fully taken into account during day-to-day and strategic decision-making. The policies in **Section 5** are designed to support this purpose, being developed from the analysis of risks and opportunities presented in **Section 4**.

Section 5 is divided into seven sections. Key policies are:

Policy 1: Governance

Policy 2: Strategic Principles

Policy 3: Capital Works Priorities

Policy 4: Management & Operation Priorities

Policy 5: Masterplan & Guidance

Policy 6: Interpretation & Research

Policy 7: Audience Development & Engagement

Governance Policy 1a: If the Royal Pavilion & Museums is to move to an independent Trust, ensure that a Trustee with a horticultural / historic parks background is appointed to the new Trust to provide oversight of the long-term conservation and management of the Royal Pavilion Garden element of the wider Estate.

Governance Policy 1b: If the Royal Pavilion & Museums is to move to an independent Trust, ensure that management structures within the Trust provide clarity on responsibility for the Garden and that appropriate levels of resourcing and revenue funding are maintained to support the Garden.

Governance Policy 1c: If responsibility for management remains with the local authority ensure that the daily management of the Garden remains with the Royal Pavilion and Museums division of B&HCC; and that regular integration meetings are held with other parties operating within the Royal Estate.

Strategic Principle 2a: Ensure all decisions and actions conserve and enhance the significance of the Garden (as defined in the Statement of Significance) and potential conflicts between significances are addressed through reasoned decisions supported, where necessary, by expert opinion and stakeholder engagement.

Strategic Principle 2b: Ensure future management and development decisions maintain the Garden's key role as a free to enter accessible public open space in the heart of Brighton.

Strategic Principle 2c: Maintain an appropriate level of capital and revenue funding/resources to ensure a high standard of management and maintenance of the Garden and explore possible new future funding sources.

Strategic Principle 2d: Ensure future management and development decisions maintain and enhance the distinctive historic character of the Garden and the "Nash Style" approach to horticulture and landscape design.

Strategic Principle 2e: Conserve the significance of the Garden by continuing to provide a high standard of management and maintenance.

Strategic Principle 2f: Promote the Garden's community and recreational values, providing facilities, activities and events which meet local people's and visitor's needs.

Strategic Principle 2g: Conserve, protect and enhance Nash's Views.

Strategic Principle 2h: Ensure a good understanding of the Garden's significance through a systematic approach to managing information and high quality interpretation.

Strategic Principle 2i: Adopt, Implement & Review the Conservation Plan.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3a: Design and implement a boundary for the Garden that enables management of egress and exit in a way that is sympathetic to the Garden and surrounding area.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3b: Improve and enhance the entrances to the Garden.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3c: Enhance the Western Lawn compartment.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3d: Enhance the East/North East Lawn compartments

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3e: Enhance the area of the Garden near to The Corn Exchange and The Dome.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3f: Relocate the public toilets and maintenance sheds.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3g: Rationalise and improve the Garden's furniture and path network.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3h: Enhance the lighting within the Garden.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3i: Improve the streetscape quality on all the lanes entering the Garden.

Capital Works Priorities Policy 3j: Remove or mitigate the features that detract from the Garden's character.

Management & Operational Priorities Policy 4a: Address the issue of the succession of the existing Head Gardener.

Management & Operational Priorities Policy 4b: Update the Management and Maintenance Plan (MMP) following the completion of any capital works or changes to procedures.

Management & Operational Priorities Policy 4c: Provide adequate training to staff and volunteers on managing and maintaining the heritage.

Management & Operational Priorities Policy 4d: Develop an agreed event accommodation and servicing procedure for the Garden.

Management & Operational Priorities Policy 4e: Digitally record the drawings from the restoration/plans for beds – to ensure these are not lost in a fire or other disaster.

Management & Operational Priorities Policy 4f: The Sustainability Policy of the new Trust should include specific elements relevant to the Garden.

Management & Operational Priorities Policy 4g: Develop a tree strategy.

Masterplan & Guidance Policy 5a: All of the capital works projects should be drawn together into an agreed Masterplan/concept design for the Garden.

Masterplan & Guidance Policy 5b: Establish design guidelines for the Garden and use appropriate methods and materials during any improvement/amendment (e.g. any new buildings, infrastructure, furniture and signage) and ongoing maintenance of the Garden.

Masterplan & Guidance Policy 5c: Carry out archaeological research on the Garden (e.g. geophysical surveying).

Interpretation & Research Policy 6a: Develop, implement and review an interpretation strategy for the Garden.

Interpretation & Research Policy 6b: Research, catalogue and conserve material in the archive.

Audience Development & Engagement Policy 7a: Develop, implement and review an Activity Plan.

Audience Development & Engagement Policy 7b: Enhance the programme of events and activities for all users.

Appendix 2B: Policy Schedule

Policies	Progress & next steps	Completion Date
Governance	When RPM moves to an independent Trust it is important to ensure management structures are in place to provide oversight, ensure appropriate levels of resourcing and reporting to the Council	Implementation Phase of RPM Trust
Strategic Principles	A management and decision making framework to guide the day to day management of the Garden to conserve and enhance the garden significances	Spring 2019
Capital work Priorities	A high level masterplan for the Royal Pavilion Estate has already been developed outlining investment priorities. These priorities formed part of the public consultation in. Round 1 HLF funding will support refinement and detailed development of capital programme	Dec 2019 for Round 2 HLF submission
Management & Operational Priorities	A Management & Maintenance Plan has been produced by Chris Blandford Associates to support this Conservation Plan further areas to be developed <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training & development plan for staff and volunteers (Part of HLF Round 1 work) 2. Event accommodation and servicing procedures(Part of HLF Round 1 work) 3. Digital Preservation strategy for Garden archives 4. Update of RPM Sustainability policy to include specific Garden elements 5. Tree Strategy 6. Succession planning 	Items 1, 2 & 3 by HLF Round 2 submission Dec 2019 Items 4, 5 & 6 June 2019
Masterplan & Design Guidance	To be developed to Riba Stage 3 as part of HLF Round 1 work	By HLF Round 2 Submission Dec 2019
Interpretation & Research Strategy	Interpretation Strategy to be developed to Riba Stage 2-3 for HLF Round 1 resubmission Research strategy to be funded via Round 1 in preparation of Round 2	March 2019 By HLF Round 2 Submission Dec 2019
Audience Development & Engagement Strategy	To be developed as part of HLF Round 2 works Access Audit to be undertaken in advance of re submission for HLF Round 1	By HLF Round 2 Submission Dec 2019 March 2019