

## **Comment on Application BH2017\01990**

### **Marlborough House: repainting of east facing elevation and window frames (retrospective)**

1. The Regency Society objects to the application to paint the front of Marlborough House and urges the Planning Authority to refuse permission. We also urge the Authority to pursue vigorously compliance with the recently issued enforcement notice requiring the new paint to be removed.
2. Marlborough House is grade I listed and is described by Antram and Morrice as Brighton's "finest late C18 house" (Pevsner Guide 2008). Its history over recent years is one of shameful neglect and abuse and its integrity as a heritage asset is now seriously at risk.
3. The application states that the design principles are "based on historical evidence of previous building maintenance of the main facia with contrasting timber"; this evidence is said to be "taken from Historic evidence supplied by the local authority and information from John Sloane (sic) Museum archives". These statements are inadequate without verifiable reference to the sources quoted. They should not therefore be taken into consideration when the planning decision is made.
4. Fifteen years ago the façade was restored using a render carefully designed to mimic John Liardet's 'Portland stone-like' oil cement. This render is protected by the listing, as would be the original render, were it to have survived. To change this unique render would require strong arguments as to why an altered finish is now both needed and appropriate. No such arguments are provided in the application.
5. Liardet's decorated properties are extremely rare in the UK; even Adam's masterpiece Kenwood House in London has lost much of its Liardet's finish in recent years. The painting over of the period render on Marlborough House should therefore be seen as a matter of national significance.
6. In order for listed building consent to be granted a case needs to be made that the loss of this heritage feature is justified by a resulting benefit of greater value. We doubt that such a case could be made. It has clearly not been made in this application which should therefore be refused on the grounds of the loss of a significant and highly visible heritage feature from a grade I listed building.

Roger Hinton  
Chair of the Regency Society  
11/8/17