fine example of the early-18th-century Palladian movement in architecture is to be found at Fox Hall in the village of Charlton in West Sussex. The magnificently austere, classical, redbrick building must have appeared quite different from most buildings in Charlton village at the time of its creation, and still stands out from the more usual flint and timber-framed cottages. It remains a striking — and delightful — anomaly that such a novel, Italianate fashion in architecture should have been introduced into the centre of a small hamlet in the rural depths of West Sussex. This vision of sophisticated modernity was entirely due to the enlightened patronage of Charles, 2nd Duke of Richmond (1701–50) and to his passion for fox-hunting.

Uncertainty has for many years surrounded the history of Fox Hall in relation to an earlier building of the same name. This was the banqueting house or Dome, which no longer stands; it was the meeting place or Great Room of the Charlton Hunt, while the surviving Fox Hall, now owned by the Landmark Trust, was the 2nd Duke of Richmond’s hunting-lodge. This paper seeks to establish the full history and exact purpose of these two buildings, the location of the former and the architect of the latter, and their relationship to each other, within the context of the patronage of Charles, 2nd Duke of Richmond.
gripped by the chase, the youngest natural son of the King, Charles Lennox, 1st Duke of Richmond (1672–1723), rented and subsequently (in 1697) bought the neighbouring small estate at Goodwood, to use as a hunting-lodge.

**RICHARD BOYLE, 3RD EARL OF BURLINGTON (1694–1753)**

From 1717 one of the Duke’s many important hunting visitors was Richard Boyle, 3rd Earl of Burlington. The young earl had inherited great estates at the age of ten, and by April 1715, when he turned 21, had already made one European tour. He was to become the greatest scholar-patron of architecture of the first half of the 18th century in England. In 1719 he set off on his third Grand Tour of Europe, his second visit to Italy. In the Veneto, particularly at Vicenza, he became overwhelmed by the magnificent classical palazzi and elegant country farmhouses of the Renaissance architect Andrea Palladio (1508–1586), who had in turn been inspired by ancient Roman architecture.

**THE PALLADIAN MOVEMENT**

Interest in Palladio had first been promoted in England by Inigo Jones (1573–1652) in the early 17th century, and was given a new impetus by two major publications in 1715. The first volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus* came out that year, in which the architect Colen Campbell (1676–1729) published engravings of recent classical buildings by celebrated architects, posing the works of Inigo Jones as an English challenge to those of the French and Italians. In subsequent volumes Campbell added his own designs to take the style closer to Palladio. A first instalment of Giacomo Leoni’s edition of Palladio’s *I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura* was also published in that year, the first translation of the full work into English.

Burlington became absorbed by the style, both as conveyed by Jones and in the original. In 1717 he built from his own first design, a garden building called a ‘Bagnio’ or ‘Casina’ at Chiswick, in the grounds of his Jacobean house. Two years later he asked Campbell, by then architect to the Prince of Wales, to remodel his London town house in Piccadilly. In 1720/1 Burlington bought Inigo Jones’s own classical designs, as well as the original drawings of Palladio, and subsequently made his own drawings for houses and features for his friends. From c. 1720 Colen Campbell designed Mereworth Castle in Kent, the first and closest version of Palladio’s domed Villa Capra or Rotunda at Vicenza; later, from c. 1725, Burlington built Chiswick House, another memorable version of the Villa, subsequently linking it with a special building to his existing home. The Palladian style became increasingly popular. This was surprising considering that the buildings looked austere from the outside and with their shady classical porticoes, arched halls and marble floors were unsuitable for the English climate.

**ARISTOCRATIC PATRONAGE**

In 1719, the Duke of Richmond’s son, the Earl of March (Fig. 1), who also hunted with the Charlton, similarly set off on a Grand Tour, on which he likewise discovered a great love for Italian art and architecture. He commissioned the Italian Baroque architect Alessandro Galilei (1691–1737) to design a house for him, as well as buying paintings by
Italian artists. On his return from the Grand Tour to Goodwood in 1722, the Earl of March would have come into contact again with Lord Burlington, who at about that time designed the banqueting hall for the Hunt, probably in that very year. This was known variously as the Great Room, the Dome and as (the first) Fox Hall. It was paid for by subscribers who included the Dukes of Grafton, Bolton, Devonshire and Newcastle. The 1st Duke of Richmond was presumably a patron: the only extant list of subscribers is that recorded after the 1738 annual meeting of the Hunt, but it only included original subscribers who were still alive.

Among the other subscribers to the Great Room were men who were to become celebrated patrons of architecture at a time of extensive country house building. Charles Howard, 3rd Earl of Carlisle (1669–1738), for whom Vanbrugh had recently built Castle Howard, was one. Thomas Coke, subsequently Lord Lovell and Earl of Leicester (1697–1759) and famous for his patronage of Lord Burlington and William Kent at Holkham Hall, Norfolk, was also a supporter. Eminent Sussex landowners who went on to do great works to their own houses also subscribed: the Hon. Henry Pelham (1695–1754) used a Palladian designer for Stanmer Park, near Brighton, between 1722–7, and in the 1740s Sir William Gage Bt. (1695–1744) transformed his family home at Firle Place, Lewes, including the introduction of two Palladian interiors. Extended families were involved with the Charlton Hunt: Henry Pelham’s elder brother, Thomas Pelham-Holles (1693–1768), 1st Duke of Newcastle, lived at Claremont in Surrey and became a close friend of the 2nd Duke. Thomas was married to Henrietta, daughter of Francis, 2nd Earl of Godolphin (1678–1766) (another subscriber) and his wife Henrietta Churchill, daughter of the 1st Duke and Duchess of Marlborough (and from 1722 Duchess of Marlborough in her own right). The Duchess of Newcastle’s grandmother was therefore the powerful and irascible Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, who was still completing Blenheim, of which Vanbrugh was also the architect, at the time. Several subscribers were therefore close to current architectural projects.

THE GREAT ROOM

The building is described, as being by Lord Burlington, by the anonymous writer of a poem dedicated to the 2nd Duke, The Historical Account of the Rise, and Progress, of the Charlton Congress (a later manuscript copy of which is in the Adsdean book). The Duke wrote in the flyleaf that this was ‘Brought to me by a porter in the beginning of February 1737/8’. It is a wearisome 31 pages long, rambling and pseudo-heroic, in badly scanning iambic pentameter, with infrequent rhymes: it is doubtful if the Duke would ever have read it all. However, it is useful for the small amount of information that it reveals. Clearly the Hunt already had some kind of rather unimportant meeting place: ‘Til now, in homely manner they had Liv’d,/a small Dark Cell.’ Both the 2nd Duke of Grafton and Lord Burlington wanted to create something much better:

...then Boyle, by instinct all divine began
is this an edifice for such a band?
I'll have the honour to erect a room
Shall cost Diana's train but such a sum;
They all agreed, and quickly paid it down,
And now there stands a sacred Dome, confessed
The finest in the Country, most admired.

It is due to this poem that the Great Room is often nowadays referred to as the Dome, giving a constant reminder of its appearance. It was used for social gatherings, as described in the notes in the Adsdean book: ‘Harry Budd remembers when Fox Hall was first built, and the first Duke and Duchess of Richmond with Lord March, Lady Anne Lenox (sic) (afterwards Countess of Albemarle) and Miss Macartney coming to Charlton, and having Assemblies there, which were kept up for two or three years of the second Duke’s time.’

The editor of Defoe’s The Tour through the Whole island of Great Britain, 2nd edition (1738), also attributed the meeting place to the great scholar-architect Lord Burlington in his: ‘Here also is a large Room which was design’d by the right Hon the Earl of Burlington, where the Gentlemen Fox-Hunters dine every Day together, during their stay at the village.’ Mention is next found in the Duke’s hunting diary, for 24 January 1740, when it is first called Fox Hall: ‘Nimm dugg out a bitch fox, which wee turn’d out of the Window at Fox-Hall.’ This suggests a single-storey building: they would not tip a fox out of a first-floor window, not least because they would prefer to preserve the animal for the chase. It is likely that the widely applauded building (‘The Finest in the country, most admired’) looked like a Pantheon, with its
single storey and dome, (Fig. 2) possibly a much smaller version of Colen Campbell’s contemporary Mereworth Castle in Kent (c. 1720–5).

**THE 2ND DUKE OF RICHMOND AND THE PALLadian STYLE**

The Great Room was completed at about the time that the Earl of March succeeded his father, to become 2nd Duke of Richmond in 1723, though there is no suggestion that the young man could have been involved in the commission. However, subsequently he showed his own interest in the Palladian movement with the commissioning of a funerary monument to his recently deceased mother, Anne Brudenell, Duchess of Richmond (1669–1722) at her family home at Deene Park, Northamptonshire. This was by G.B. Guelfi (fl. 1715–34), an Italian sculptor whom Lord Burlington had brought to England. At Goodwood the Duke had a whole dining-room scheme created of paintings of architectural capricci in the classical manner, entitled ‘Tombs of the British Worthies’ (1723–30). At this critical time in his life, the new Duke would have met further proponents of the fashionable Palladian style at the court of George, Prince of Wales. He asked Colen Campbell to design him an entirely new house at Goodwood, of which only a kitchen seems to have been built. Some drawings for the house were also made for Campbell by Roger Morris (1695–1749). Later the Duke also commissioned Lord Burlington to draw plans for his new London home at Richmond House, on the banks of the Thames at Whitehall. The final version of the house had some amendments. Next he asked him to draw plans for Chichester Council House, for which he had to issue a reminder. Burlington eventually produced a front elevation, but the scheme seems to have been adapted and completed by his pupil Roger Morris. The Council House with its superb Council Chamber on the first floor is another fascinating example of the combination of the 2nd Duke of Richmond’s patronage and the new Palladian movement.

**THE STABLES FOR THE HUNTING-Lodge**

Hunting was a passion for the young Duke, just as it had been for his father and for many noblemen. The first building records for the 2nd Duke in the village of Charlton are for materials for a stable: a first payment to Thomas Micklam for bricks is dated July 1728. As the Duke went abroad in September 1728, he must have had to continue with any building plans by correspondence. Payments to Micklam for the stable continued through 1729, including one for timber. For work undertaken on the stable at Charlton in the first part of 1729 Robert Sedgewick, the Duke’s new agent, paid William Elmes, bricklayer. The work was all for the existing stable building, to the east of the lodge (which had not yet been built).
is not clear how the Duke was able to build there apparently before buying the land, the purchase of which was under discussion throughout 1729. A letter of 15 May 1729 from M. Labbé, the Duke’s financial administrator, to the Duke in Paris says that one Mr Isaacson had been told to visit to discuss ‘la ferme du Charlon’ (sic). In a letter of 4 June 1729 the Duke replied that he would accept the offer (it is not known what it was) from Mr Isaacson. An early map of 1710 suggested that the farm occupied part of the centre of the village, whereas a map hitherto dated c. 1767 (Map 2) shows that the farm comprised the numbered fields lying round the edge of the village.

MASTER OF FOXHOUNDS

While the Duke was abroad the 3rd Duke of Bolton resigned as Master of the Hunt at the entreaty of his new actress mistress, Lavinia Fenton. She had apparently only agreed to leave the stage on the condition that he also would make a sacrifice. In 1729 Charles Bennet, 2nd Earl of Tankerville, grandson of Lord Grey and the new heir to Uppark, began to use his hounds at Charlton. The Duke returned to England that October and helped him lead the Hunt for the season. In March 1730 a grandly worded ‘Treaty’ formally creating the Duke and the Earl of Tankerville joint Masters of the Hunt was drawn up. Lord Tankerville was only Master for a short time, after which the Duke was assisted by John West, 7th Baron de la Warr (later 1st Earl): they corresponded regularly about the care, breeding and health of the hounds.

At this date hunts started very early in the morning: the Masters would have needed to start each hunting day in Charlton. The Duke now had a practical excuse for an architectural capriccio: a hunting-lodge was required. Hunting-boxes and stables had already been recently erected in the village by the Dukes of Grafton, St Albans and Devonshire (who had a double-fronted one next to the inn with Lord Harcourt on the other side), the Earl of Halifax and Lord de la Warr. The finances to buy further estates had been provided in the 2nd Duke’s marriage settlement of 1719, under which
his father-in-law Earl Cadogan had agreed to buy him land to the value of £60,000. This payment was now called in; indeed following the Earl’s death in 1726, some of his chattels had had to be sold to pay for the settlement. On 2 September 1730 the manors of Singleton and Charlton, including a farm in each village as well as the forests, were finally purchased by the Duke of Richmond from Richard Lumley, 2nd Earl of Scarbrough (c. 1688–1740), whose seat was some five miles to the west at Stansted Park. The Charlton farm was acquired as a copyhold: it continued to be let to John Budd at £47 p.a. John Budd was a strong hunt supporter, even writing a ribald poem: ‘Of foxhunting I will sing.’

THE HUNTING-Lodge

Throughout 1730 and 1731 William Elmes continued to be paid for work at Charlton, now apparently on the house. To fund the building, in 1730 the Duke also asked Labbé, his steward, for 40 or 50 pounds for ‘the workmen at Charlton’. On 15 August 1730 he wrote from Greenwich sending him £150 from some winnings at Tunbridge Wells to pay for the ‘Bricks, and timber I have taken upp, for my building at Charleton;...’ Four days later he implied that the bricks at Charlton had not been expensive. In February 1731 William Vallantine the surveyor was paid £13 for work at Charlton. For his work done on 20 July 1732 Thomas Tremaine billed the Duke £1.4s.6d for some decorative work for the interior, ‘to Gilding the three frames at Charlton’.

An earlier document from the Adsdean both summarized: ‘The house at Charlton, walls finished and covered in at Michaelmas 1730; the inside of it was finished by Michaelmas 1731 and it was furnished and the Duke and Duchess of Richmond lay in it November 22nd 1732’ (Figs 3 & 4). On 31 March 1731 both house and stables were insured: ‘a Brick or Stone and Tiled house situate at Charleton...’ for £1,000, and ‘the Stone or Brick and tiled Stables with rooms a Granary and Lofts over them belonging to the Said House not exceeding five hundred pounds’. The proud new hunting-lodge is shown as the Duke’s House on a map, inscribed A Plan of Goodwood Park and Warren with the Adjacent Manors of Charlton and Singleton belonging to His Grace the Duke of Richmond &c...Surveyed in February and March 1731 by Thomas Bucknall (Map 1). The anonymous poet stated that the Duke had the finest house:

A warm but small Apartment, each one has,
The Duke’s alone appears magnificent,
Conspicuous, it stands, above the rest
And uniform, & nearest to the Dome.

In 1734 part of the copyhold of the farm was surrendered by the Budd family to the Duke. The next year a neighbouring cottage was given up so that the Duke could ‘make a beautiful Green before his hunting seat at Charlton’. A map from a volume hitherto dated c. 1767 (Map 3) indeed shows that a handsome avenue ran away from the

Fig. 4. The 2nd Duke and Duchess of Richmond, c. 1727. (Attrib. Jonathan Richardson. Trustees of the Goodwood Collection.) The Duke is wearing the collar and chain of his newly acquired Order of the Garter.
lodge to the West, within the Duke’s ‘nursery’: it would give a view from the main chamber to the setting sun. It was probably also used as a grander entrance drive to the hunting-lodge, cutting the corner off the route from Goodwood.

By an agreement of 1766, Edward Budd, John’s son, surrendered further land to the 3rd Duke but reserved ‘one messuage (called Fox Hall) one Barn one Gateroom One Garden & One Orchard’. This ties up with Map 3, with the key on folio 13 exactly describing the above areas, and as Budd’s ‘copyhold of inheritance.’

THE LOCATION OF THE GREAT ROOM

The mention of Fox Hall raises the question of where exactly the Great Room or Dome was situated. An early map already mentioned is that of 1710 by Edward Grantham, giving an ‘explanation’ of ‘the farm held by John Budd’, presumably on a lease from the Earl of Scarbrough. This is the farm that was later acquired by the Duke and the map is a crude drawing of the fields only. The Budd homestead is mentioned in the schedule but is not shown in what survives of that map.

In chronological order the maps illustrated are: Map 1, Thomas Bucknall’s large, unbound map of 1731[1732], showing the village not very clearly and in small scale, but with many small buildings included. This is the only view from the period at which the Great Room was definitely standing. There are then three, numbered in the order in which they are presented, from a large book of estate maps by Yeakell and Gardner hitherto dated as c. 1767, namely Map 2, defining the broader area of Charlton farm that belonged to the Duke; Map 3, a clear and large-scale representation of the village; and Map 4, a small-scale view of both Charlton and Singleton. Then Map 5, is from A Terrier of the Manors of Singleton and Charlton in the Parish of Singleton and County of Sussex Belonging to His Grace the Duke of Richmond, a small (octavo) red book of maps by Yeakell and Gardner, dated by Francis Steer in the WSRO Goodwood catalogue as post-1785 but probably 1780–5. Map 6 is a large, clear, close-up map of the village from a medium (quarto) size book of maps dated c. 1791. From the same volume another map is mentioned, but not illustrated because of its poor quality: it is small-scale, not sophisticated, again used more for the fields around. The best village maps are therefore numbers 3 and 6. All are illustrated as details, to focus on the village.

From the reference to the ‘messuage called Fox Hall’, it has usually been assumed that the banqueting house, which from 1740 was also known as Fox Hall, was on Budd’s rented land. The area to the immediate north/north-east of the lodge is identified as his in the schedule to Map 2. The field adjacent to this and other buildings is named Fox-Hall Field in the same schedule. A long house running roughly north-south, an adjacent barn and stable to the east, a gatehouse to the south, an orchard and a garden, appear clearly on four of the maps (2,3,4,5), and on the earliest one (1) without the gatehouse: these are all as briefly mentioned in the 1766 description quoted above, as retained by Edward Budd. The ‘messuage’ probably referred to Budd’s own house. A later document describes the surrender in 1791 of the same site, after Edward’s death, to the 3rd Duke by Richard Budd: ‘a messuage known as Foxhall, two stables formerly a barn, orchard and garden being parcel of a yardland formerly Glover’s in the manor of Charleston’. (The mention of the Glover family, the other main farmers, who owned property to the west of the village, is not telling). An early, but not contemporary, newspaper report in the Chichester Observer of March 1888, suggested that the Dome was in this area. It said of the ‘notable and convenient building’, that ‘it is now pulled down and three cottages built with materials on its site.’ This report was largely derived from an article in Sussex Archaeological Collections 15, 1863, by T. J. Bennett who in turn drew mostly upon the Adsdean book; but neither gave any indication of the precise location of the Dome.

However, these ‘three cottages’, still standing and now combined into one, are believed to be of 17th-century date. This is confirmed by the present owner, Patrick Jefferson, and by a tour of the building. This is clearly at least the southern part of the Budd farmstead, or possibly even the whole of it. The tithe map of 1846 shows the building was divided into three, and it was still subdivided in this way in living memory, but it is now converted back into what would originally have been a single cottage, on a plan that was traditional in the 17th century, whereby the front door opened onto the side of the chimney breast. The present owner believes that the extension at the rear, covered with
Map 1 [WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E4992] A Plan of Goodwood Park and Warren with the Adjacent Manors of Charlton and Singleton belonging to His Grace the Duke of Richmond &c. Surveyed in February and March 1731 by Thomas Bucknall. The date of the map is therefore 1732. The new hunting-lodge and stable are at ‘Z’. The Dome is over the lane, slightly to the north, looking a little larger than the lodge, but probably in fact the same size, as the lodge is rather blurred by the ‘Z’ and wrongly shortened to a square. The sizes are anyway not accurate as the scale is small. This would suggest that the two could indeed both have been built according to the golden section. The Dome is in the area adjacent to that delineated as ‘Q’: there is a fine boundary line. Arguably the site therefore has no accredited ownership.
the three-roof section, is 18th-century, enabling the division into three. Earlier timber-framed buildings were often chopped into smaller units in this way: the extension may even date from the early 19th century. The Observer’s idea of the ‘three cottages’ as a new building seems to have been an error.

Richard Pailthorpe, an authority on the history of the village, pursued this proposal, but also highlighted some discrepancies. He concluded, in an unpublished paper, c. 1990, that the Dome, also often called a ‘Roome’, might have been just that, a modest room attached to the Budd farmstead on the southern part of the site. However, maps do not show any kind of separate ‘roome’ there, so that even the rear extension cannot be on the site of the Dome. Lord Burlington’s structure was surely too large to have been attached to an old-fashioned farmstead. The northern section of the building is also impossible, as the new hunting-lodge would not then have been ‘nearest to the Dome.’ Moreover, that area, now a field, has a spring which rises regularly, a factor of which builders in early times were all too aware. The problem, which continues to excite curiosity and speculation, was investigated for the Landmark Trust by Charlotte Haslam, who equally refuted the argument for the Dome being where the surviving cottage, or farmstead, stands.

The next question is whether a small building shown on the northern boundary could be the actual Dome. It could not, largely because it does not appear on Bucknall’s map of 1732 (Map 1). The small building does appear clearly to the north in three places in the Yeakell and Gardner maps (Maps 2, 3, and 4). In Map 5, from the Yeakell and Gardner terrier, c. 1780–5, it does not appear, nor in the larger scale Map 6, c. 1791. It is probable that a building considered relatively insignificant is suggested, namely the surviving gatehouse, especially if it had been built just after the lodge, and indeed to serve it, and had therefore had not
been built at the time of the 1732 map. Its present format includes an extension, so it was originally very small indeed. Oddly, it is on land rented by Budd, but the Duke was the landowner, and there was no space on his land for a gatehouse at this point. He knew Budd well and would undoubtedly have been granted the corner area when he wanted it. This little structure is nicely built, but its purpose was very much secondary to the hunting-lodge. The boundary proposal is therefore rejected as the location of the Dome.

The history of the naming is important. The 1710 map does not mention a Fox Hall Field in its schedule. Presumably the Great Room or Dome was called Fox Hall first, before the field, given that it was a hall. The field then took its identification from it, at some time after c. 1740, becoming Fox Hall Field, and that name subsequently became attached to the Budds’ adjacent farmstead, barn, ‘gateroom’, garden and orchard by the time of the Yeakell and Gardner maps. Thus it is likely that the Dome was not inside the boundary of the Budds’ land at all.

Another proposal, also listed by Haslam, derives from the article by T. J. Bennett in Sussex Archaeological Collections, 1863, which states: ‘To add to the importance of the Hunt, the Earl of Burlington, the Vitruvius of his day, designed them a banqueting-room, where these votaries of Diana feasted after the fatigues of the chase, and talked over the feats of the day. This building was popularly known by the name of Foxhall, from the gilt frame of a fox surmounting a tall flagstaff, erected in front of it to show the ‘southerly wind’ so dear to fox-hunters. This had been a gift from Henrietta, Duchess of Bolton, the third wife of the 2nd Duke and stepmother to his successor, probably given this after the Duke’s death in 1722, partly as a memorial to him, and while she was visiting Charlton regularly, largely to support her young son, Lord Nassau Powlett who hunted there; she died in 1730. As the Chichester Observer of March 1888 says, again following Bennett’s article, ‘...a flag-staff was planted before Foxhall and on the top a gilt fox, fashioned as a weathercock, swinging round with the wind.’ Henrietta used to watch it through the window.

A remnant of a flagstaff survived outside The Fox Inn in the 19th century, creating some speculation that this was therefore the site of the Dome.

However, there must have been two separate flagstaffs, one with Henrietta’s weathercock, possibly a solid gilt fox, and one with a flag of a fox. The Duke of Richmond decided in November 1730 that ‘We want a proper flag for this place...I would have it a fox, red in a green field with the union in the corner and about the size of one of the yacht’s ensigns.’ The drawing arrived within a week but he disliked it: ‘The enclosed sketch is most sadly drawn...The fox ought to be as big again and take up all the middle part of the flag...The fox’s tail must also be straight out...the fox must be yellow and not red as I said’. It may be this commission that corresponds with the anonymous poet’s subsequent description of a flagstaff in the centre of the village, not necessarily near to the Dome but to the Duke of St Albans’ hunting-lodge, the location of which is also unknown:

...the Albian Duke, the next best Pallace owns
Just in the centre of the village, where
in sacred sport, white palisado’d round
appears a Mast Erect, of monstrous height..
in which a golden running Fox is seen...

Although the Observer said that the flagstaff was there, with the ‘gilt fox’ still on it, in 1888, the flag would not have survived, and the gilt fox had probably been moved to it from the other flagstaff when the Dome was taken down. In trying to establish the site of the Great Room or Dome, the flagstaff in the centre of the village has thus been something of a red herring.

The Chichester Observer further reported of the history of the first Fox Hall that: ‘The Earl of Burlington had arranged the details of his design with considerable foresight, and it soon appeared that Foxhall was not only admirably adapted as a banqueting-room, but, under stress of circumstances, it could be used as a saloon, concert room, drawing-room, assembly room and ballroom. In fact it proved to be an extraordinary convenient place of wondrous adaptability, and her Grace of Bolton often dined there with the other guests...’ It also says that she breakfasted there, making it sound a charmingly adaptable and sociable place to be. It is not known whether this report is drawn partly from spoken tradition, or if there was any other source more concrete than the article by T. J. Bennett of 1863, on which it appears
Map 3 [WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E100 f. 11]. Map of the Village of Charlton, from a volume attributed to Yeakell and Gardner, now redated c. 1777-85. The hunting-lodge is at ‘L1’, the stable at ‘L2’, the avenue and nursery both at ‘L4’. The Dome, derelict or half demolished, is again a grey square. Edward Budd’s farmstead is at ‘K’, with outbuildings, and the Fox Inn at ‘D1’, near to the Duke of St. Albans’ and the Lord Harcourt’s hunting-boxes at ‘C2’.
to embroider. Bennett’s own source is uncertain. The legend was probably an oral one; whatever the case, the intimation of a substantial room seems to have been strong.

Another central village area that could possibly have accommodated both Dome and weathercock is on the site with buildings labelled at ‘CY’ in Map 1 and 67 in Map 2 and at ‘H’ in Map 3. The area belonged to the Duke of Richmond. Could ‘H’, on the corner, have been the Dome? Apparently not: in Map 3 the buildings, all still standing, are identified in the schedule as ‘Barns, Reek yard etc.’ All were still there in c. 1791. There is no evidence for this as a site. Neither has there ever been any suggestion of its being at H1 on Map 3, although the house shown is adjacent to the field; it is, however too far from the lodge.

An alternative site is the most remote, down the lane from the Duke’s House in the other direction, away from the village to the south (slightly south-west). This had a small building on it in 1732, denoted in pink (Map 1), which by the time of all the Yeakell and Gardner maps (2,3,4, hitherto dated c. 1767, and 5, post 1785) was a greyish rectangle with rounded corners, sometimes with concentric wiggly lines inside. The surrounding area of woodland always belonged to the Duke, denoted as his ‘nursery’. However, this area is generally deemed to have been a pond.

A possible location for the Dome, also favoured by Haslam, is just to the north-west of the hunting-lodge, at right angles over the lane, where a building is clearly shown on the 1732 map (Map 1), even looking slightly larger than the lodge. There is no indication of its ownership in the key, which might be appropriate for a building that was jointly owned by the local hunting community. It also appears on all the larger Yeakell and Gardner maps (Maps 2, 3 & 4). The building appears to sit at the back of a little yard, open to the lane, with a fence on each side (Fig. 2). It looks most substantial in the earliest map (Map 1), as one would expect because 1732 was when the Dome was at the peak of its usage. It is small and grey on the plan in the main village.
map (Map 2), whereas the building to the north of the lodge is pink: this further suggests that the suggested building was by then not a substantial building, but like barns and stables was defined in grey. It may at the time have been half demolished or semi-derelict. The building does not appear again in Map 5 (1780–5), nor in Map 6 (c. 1791), tying in with the legend that it was destroyed.

**THE POLITICAL CONTEXT**

There is a possible further ramification to the building of the Dome, making it likely that it was on the edge of the village. Richard Pailthorpe wondered if the first ‘small Dark Cell’ there was deliberately in a secret, obscure place, in order to double as a Masonic Lodge. Freemasonry was very new at the time, and in 1695 the 1st Duke was Grand Master of what was mainly a London-based organisation; in 1696 he was recorded as being Master of a Lodge in Chichester. However, this meant that they already had some kind of a meeting place.

If the original retreat was a secret one, it is more likely that it was for Jacobite meetings. Lord Burlington is now believed to have begun his continental tours in 1714 in order to keep up connections with James Francis Edward Stuart, the Stuart Pretender to the English throne, after the death of Queen Anne on 1 August 1714. The 1st Duke of Richmond always sailed with the wind in his politics, but as the son of Charles II, the nephew of James II, and the first cousin of Queens Mary and Anne (who until late in her reign did not favour a Hanoverian succession) was probably an on-off Jacobite. At the age of 17 he had sworn loyalty to his uncle in Paris on 1 January 1689, during the Glorious Revolution. Despite becoming an aide-de-camp to William III, he was suspected of being a Jacobite in 1696. He visited France in the suspicious years of both 1713 (July) and 1714 (August), ostensibly to visit his mother, Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth at her country home in Aubigny. There is no record of his having travelled there in previous summers, and she also...
Map 6 [WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E56 f. 13]. From Singleton, Charlton and East Dean Manor Book c. 1791. A large, clear map of the village, very similar to Map 3. Unlike Map 3, the site of the Dome is now completely clear.
had a home in Paris, which could have been useful to him. The 1st Duke may well have favoured the use of a site not far from Goodwood for Jacobite meetings. There may also have been a Masonic connection, given the Duke’s own position: there were also some links between Freemasons and Jacobites. It has recently been suggested that Burlington subsequently included some Masonic motifs in the decoration at Chiswick.  

Whether or not secret meetings occasionally still took place in Charlton by 1722, the Great Room could have been built on this same site. As a new hunt building at a time when Jacobitism was still strong, it could have disguised a second function in the same way that architecture had been a cover for Lord Burlington’s political aims on his first foreign tours, before he became genuinely interested in it. The Earl was extraordinarily secretive: Jacobites were so by definition, treachery being punishable by death. The location would also have had an emotional appeal, relating to the legend that Charles II had hidden in Charlton Forest on his escape through Sussex in 1651. Burlington may have been visited there by messengers from across the Channel, arriving at Chichester or Itchenor to come to Charlton under the semblance of being workmen. Although the landowner of the adjacent farm, the Earl of Scarbrough, was a loyal Whig and an Army officer, fighting against the Jacobites in 1715 and serving as Master of the Horse, he had leased the property and was never there. He was not a subscriber to the Great Room; although he later supported the Hunt articles, there is little record of him in the area.

There is no firm evidence for this added dimension to Burlington’s new structure, and certainly not of any Jacobite link thereafter. The 2nd Duke (Fig. 4) who succeeded in 1723, was no Jacobite, and his friend Thomas Pelham-Holles had been created Duke of Newcastle in 1715 especially for his support of the Crown against the Jacobites. Indeed, at the time of the 1745 rebellion, along with many members of the Charlton Hunt, the Duke of Richmond fought for George II against the Young Pretender. Nevertheless, the fact that there is no record of Lord Burlington returning to Charlton after c. 1722, and that he was tardy in fulfilling requests from the Duke of Richmond for other designs in the area, may indicate that Burlington’s interest in Charlton died as the cause of the Old Pretender faded.

**THE ENSEMBLE**

If the Dome was on this site, the Duke’s lodge faced it across the lane, but slightly offset. Gentlemen arriving to dine would arrive from their lodges and lodgings in the centre of the village and later some of them might approach from the Duke’s avenue. From the village, they would see the windowless north side of the lodge to their left, but they could admire the sophistication of its feigned windows, which suggest that windows were built and bricked in (Fig. 5): in fact they were never open windows. This was an architectural way of articulating the northern façade. From the avenue the gentlemen hunters would see the handsome window of the lodge with its creamy mannered stone quoins (Fig. 6). It is interesting to speculate on whether the lodge imitated the Dome: possibly the three-light window on its southern side picked up on a *serliana* on the Dome (Fig. 2), the window from which a fox could have been put out.

As well as the original subscribers, other important men of taste became members of the Charlton Hunt and would have seen the ensemble. On Sunday 29 January 1738, 20 gentlemen hunters met for their annual dinner at the Bedford Hill Tavern in London. According to the minutes, at this meeting the Duke of Richmond, the master and proprietor of the Hunt, ‘proposed to form the Members of this Hunt into a regular society...’. 65 By these ‘articles’ the Hunt became a more formalized...
with his attendant groom in the Charlton livery in blue with gold cord and tassels to their caps’.66 It is not known where they met: they may have assembled by the Duke’s flagstaff in the centre of the village, near to the Inn, or maybe in Fox Hall Field, near to the two fine new buildings.

The Hunt had become so fashionable that it was necessary to begin to exclude new arrivals. Those who had subscribed to the original Great Room were in favour for life: new members had to be proposed by one of the Society, ‘his name affixed up in the Great Room at Charlton’, and balloted. Thus, for example, Evelyn Pierrepont, 2nd Duke of Kingston (1711–73), was elected on November 1738, and Francis Seymour-Conway, then Baron Conway, later 1st Earl and finally 1st Marquess of Hertford (1718–94), was elected by ballot in December 1739. Neither had any particular connection with Sussex. Between 1675 and 1750 Hunt membership included 17 dukes, 4 marquesses and 36 earls, as well as a bevy of lesser peers and senior military officers. It is likely that the charming architectural ensemble contributed to the attraction of Charlton, creating a peak in the years 1735–50.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE GREAT ROOM

The taking down of the Dome is only loosely established from documentary evidence. It was still standing in 1751 when Dr Richard Pococke passed through Charlton and noted ‘several lodges of a Society of Hunters with a large room in which they dine’.67 However, it is not mentioned in the 1769 edition of A New Display of the Beauties of England, and in the second edition of 1773 the Duke’s House is mistakenly attributed to Lord Burlington, suggesting that the Dome may already have disappeared, or was at least in an unimpressive state.68 The last huntsman of the Charlton, Tom Grant (b. 1754), described in an 1827 interview how he had come to Charlton in c. 1777 ‘to whip in to Mr Budd’ and: ‘the hunt had a club or lodge, as they call it, and many a good bout I have known there’.69 This has always been taken to refer to the Dome. The Dome had certainly been destroyed by 1863, when T. J. Bennett wrote that ‘Fox Hall was pulled down; the residences of the various noblemen in the village have disappeared (the Duke of Richmond’s lodging only remaining)’.

Club. Charles Spencer, 5th Earl of Sunderland and 3rd Duke of Marlborough (1706–58) was, although absent, a subscriber to the new articles. Marlborough’s interest may have derived from that of his aunt, Henrietta Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough. As Earl of Sunderland, Spencer was the heir to Althorp, the huge family seat in Bedfordshire, but on inheriting the dukedom at the death of his aunt in 1733, he had to abandon that family home in favour of the grandiose Blenheim. Stephen Fox, later created Earl of Ilchester, also subscribed to the new articles: he was a family friend of the Richmonds, who through his heiress wife inherited the Strangways house at Melbury in Dorset. Many marriages occurred between families linked by the Charlton: Fox’s younger brother Henry subsequently eloped with the Duke’s eldest daughter, Lady Caroline Lennox. Under the 2nd Duke the Hunt became so popular that, according to a Goodwood retainer writing a century later: ‘Every morning a hundred horses were led out, each
Mark Antony Lower said: ‘A banqueting room called Fox-Hall, for the accommodation of sportsmen, no longer exists.’ It has already been noted that the Chichester Observer of March 1888 also described its demise.71

The 2nd Duke died in 1750. The Hunt Club had been his creation and the members were all his close friends. With his death, the life went out of hunting at Charlton, with hunting-boxes deserted and the hounds dispersed. His son, Charles, 3rd Duke of Richmond, who was only 15 when he inherited, went off on the Grand Tour. He rebuilt a pack of hounds for the 1757 season, and was proud enough of it to be painted by George Stubbs together with other Hunt members in their dark blue livery and gold braid in 1759 (Fig. 11). However, the Charlton Hunt was never again as fashionable as it had been in the days of his father and grandfather. The new hounds were always kept at Goodwood, kennels being built for them in 1787.72 The Charlton Hunt became known as the Duke of Richmond’s Hounds. It would seem that the Dome disappeared owing to lack of use at some stage between 1751 and the year in which Map 5 was made, and that these maps indeed mark the cleared site. The village of Charlton had gone out of fashion, and it is not known if the 3rd Duke even used the hunting-lodge.

This means either that Tom Grant was not referring to the Dome or that Maps 2,3 and 4 must be given a slightly later date. This is perfectly possible. The volume is only dated from one map of 1767, which may anyway be a stray.73 From Map 2, the maps must be post-1766, as Edward Budd is mentioned in the schedule as a landholder. The latest date that Yeakell and Gardner, to whom these maps have been attributed since their original cataloguing in 1790, should have worked in this capacity for the Duke is probably 1782, in which year the 3rd Duke, as Master of the Ordnance, took Yeakell to the Ordnance with him. However Map 5, which is inscribed T. Yeakell sculpt. is said in the catalogue to be post-1785: this may be incorrect, probably relating to another item in the volume. Gardner followed Yeakell to the Ordnance in 1784. In 1787 Yeakell died and Gardner died in 1800. If Tom Grant was referring to the Dome, and if he was correct in the date that he came to Charlton, this narrows the date of its destruction to between 1777 and 1787, and more probably to before c. 1785.

Oral tradition, quoted by Haslam, suggested that ‘a Venetian window’ from the original Fox Hall was located in Midhurst.74 This has never been properly investigated. There are two serliane adorning the first floor of the Georgian Clock House in North Street, which dates from c. 1770–90. However, these windows are not of the quality associated with Lord Burlington: they are smaller and later than that on the lodge and there is no evidence of Lord Burlington ever having used this type of window in a pair. The ‘tradition’ may be unreliable, but it could just possibly relate to local knowledge that the lodge had a serliana.

This would anyway seem to be very likely: Lord Burlington had already used a serliana on the first floor of his little Casina in the garden at Chiswick, dating from 1717. At the Charlton Great Room, the big window would have looked onto the lane, and from it a fox could easily have been put out (Fig. 2). The window on the hunting-lodge would then have been created in response to it, only eight years later (Fig. 3). Indeed, two of the three lights of the lodge windows appear always to have been bricked in, never active but purely decorative. This was not unusual in Georgian buildings, whose rooms were often only lit from one side only. As the Dome was built before the Duke created his avenue, its long side would have been onto the lane with the big window at the centre. This arrangement suggests an exciting early Chiswick-type building by Lord Burlington. Measurements taken of the lodge show it to have been built on a ground plan proportioned according to the golden section. The Dome was probably about the same size as the lodge. The drawing by Paul Draper follows the same mathematical arrangement, with the north façade working out exactly as a square up to the cornice.

The evidence for this structure also illuminates the process of Lord Burlington’s architectural career. It has often puzzled the author that Campbell built a Rotunda-type villa (at Mereworth, from c. 1720) so much earlier than Burlington from whom, as a wealthy patron and an impatient, proselytising Palladian, one might expect an essay in Vicentine architecture a little sooner. That the Earl made an attempt at a similar type on a small scale at Charlton at about the same time as Campbell’s larger commission, a few years before his own masterpiece at Chiswick, makes much more sense of his development. At Chiswick he went on to use the three-light window to theatrical effect on three of the façades.
It is not so surprising that the 3rd Duke would pull the Great Room down. By the 1770s the English Palladian style had gone through a mellowing and merging process, by which second generation houses were big blocks with porticoes, not nearly as radical in their proportions and arrangements as Chiswick and Mereworth. The 3rd Duke was certainly no great lover of severe Palladian architecture, preferring the latest styles, first buying rococo furniture in Paris and then neo-classical items, as well as commissioning elegant, light neo-classical designs. He even gave two chairs by William Kent to Chichester City Council by 1785, which suggests that he held no torch for the Burlington-Kent partnership that had been so fashionable half a century earlier. It is even possible that some structural disaster had affected the building: perhaps the dome itself had fallen in. The true history of the Dome has been hindered by the 3rd Duke’s lack of interest in it, and by 19th-century misinformation, or misinterpretation of that information.

THE ARCHITECT OF THE HUNTING-Lodge

Who was the designer of the neighbouring Duke’s House, standing so tall, severe and sophisticated among the rustic neighbouring cottages, and facing the Dome? In an undated letter, c. 1734–5, the Duke asked Burlington for a design for his ‘Casino’: the Duke begged ‘Don’t forget my Casino and pray remember to keep the opening to the buffet in the dining-room as wide as possible. The dining-room Kitchen and Cellar being the apartments I have always most at heart’. This had always been taken to refer to his hunting-lodge and was one of the documentary reasons for its earlier attribution to Burlington. Indeed, Ian Nairn gave it to Burlington in Pevsner’s Sussex, published in 1965. However, it is essential to appreciate that the Duke’s House was a hunting-lodge and not a banqueting house. As Charlotte Haslam showed, the inventory reveals that the Duke only kept utensils for breakfast at the lodge,
namely a coffee pot, a pair of candlesticks, six teaspoons, a strainer, and a cream jug. Cutlery for dining (a knife, a fork, a spoon and a silver tumbler) was kept at the then Fox Hall, the Dome or Great Room, where the Duke would walk the short distance across the lane to join his companions after the day’s hunting. The recess in the upper room of the hunting-lodge is now generally agreed to be designed for a bed, not a dining area (Fig. 7). It had an adjacent powder closet. Moreover the Chatsworth archivist now dates the Burlington letter to 1734/5, after the completion of the lodge. For all these reasons the letter to Burlington cannot refer to it.

The 1738 poem moreover describes Burlington as author of the Dome but not of the ‘magnificent’, ‘conspicuous’ lodge. There is certainly no evidence that Burlington had any hand in the hunting-lodge. Haslam believed the Council House, the Duke’s House and Carné’s Seat all to be by Roger Morris. Classicizing improvements in the Long Hall and bedchambers above at Goodwood House billed in March 1730 were surveyed by Morris, making it all the more likely that he was at this time commissioned to design a hunting-lodge for the Duke.

Drawings discovered by the author at Sotheby’s in 1997, now in a private collection, support the stylistic theory for the hand of Morris. Sir Howard Colvin confirmed the authorship of the drawings, and agreed the date could be about 1729/30. Most of the drawings in the group are of palazzi and villas in Italy: Colvin’s Dictionary indeed shows that Morris was abroad between June 1732 and November 1732, for at least some of which time he was sketching buildings in Italy. Three drawings bear similarities to the Duke’s House, one of which may have been a preliminary design (Fig. 8). These were presumably made before he set off on his travels.

The simple geometric proportions of the two-storey façade in the drawing are clearly the same as those of each end of the hunting-lodge. In the courtyard the windows are completely plain, as in the side ones in the Morris drawing. However, on the lane a single pedimented window sits down onto a string course, above a rusticated lower window that is very similar to the design for the door (Fig. 6). The fact that the main façade, with its stone quoins on the corners, fronts the lane suggests that it relates to the Dome across the lane at right angles. Internally a chimneypiece, removed to Goodwood House by 1888 (according to the Observer), is possibly the marble one now in the Pavilion Bedroom at Goodwood (Fig. 9). It is very similar to those by Morris in the Long Hall of the house (Fig. 10), again providing evidence of his hand at Fox Hall. In the side scrolls of both, a bell-shaped acanthus runs upwards on a twisted stem. Again, there is some similarity between these scrolls and the detail in the brackets supporting the pedimented window of the hunting-lodge. The overmantel at Fox Hall has magnificent drops of harebells at the sides, and runs of flowing ornament which lift the plain geometric arrangement, as they do on the chimneypiece. The stunning combination of severe and free-flowing ornament at Fox Hall is characteristic of Morris, as shown in the Council Chamber at Chichester. The ornate entablatures over the doors include serpent scale decoration in the frieze, while there are exuberant Baroque scrolls in corner sections (Fig. 7).
THE ‘CASINO’ LETTER AND CARNÉ’S SEAT

The ‘Casino’ of the letter is more likely to be an early reference to plans for the hillside pavilion at Goodwood. Built near to the rustic cottage lived in by Louise de Kéroualle’s old retainer, M. de Carné, it was christened Carné’s Seat. Christopher Hussey suggested that from a stylistic analysis it could be by Lord Burlington, assisted by William Kent or even Giacomo Leoni. Attention was drawn to Kent’s favourite sphinxes on the parapet, so similar to those in Piccadilly on the Devonshire House gates to Green Park. Although it is interesting to think that the Duke wanted Burlington to build it, for a generation now this pavilion has been agreed to be by Roger Morris, an attribution first made on stylistic grounds by Ian Nairn, but for which he did not otherwise give evidence. Nowhere was the attribution explained. A firm source for the attribution is a drawing (probably not seen by Nairn) of the floor, undated but endorsed 18 Aug 1744, and agreed to be by Morris. The loggia is inscribed 1743. The attribution is reinforced by a note discovered by Richard Hewlings in Andrew Relfe’s letter-book which shows that Morris was despatching stone to Goodwood in 1742.

In recent generations sight has been lost of the essential banqueting function of the pavilion: the room was stripped out in the early 19th century. In 1747 Vertue described the main chamber at Carné’s Seat as being for dining: ‘His Grace the Duke of Richmond since, has there erected a beautiful building of stone, fronted with an Arcade rooms and other agreeable conveniencies, for to entertain company. and over it a most beautiful room for a dining room - finely adorned with stuccos, carvings, marbles etc. in the finest and most elegant taste’. This function would seem more appropriate to the type of building usually called a ‘casino’, or little house, than to that of a hunting-lodge.

By relating the ‘Casino’ letter to Carné’s Seat, the attribution of the hunting-lodge is given yet another tilt away from Burlington. The final hand
at Carné’s Seat is also shown to have been Morris’s. Owing to Campbell’s death, Burlington’s other preoccupations and the considerable extent of the Duke’s architectural projects, it appears to have been Roger Morris who did the most building for the 2nd Duke of Richmond in Sussex. A further major wing added to Goodwood House by Matthew Brettingham in the late 1740s shows that the Duke stayed with the Palladian style right to his end.88

**CONCLUSION**

However, it was the Earl of Burlington who first introduced the Palladian style to the Dukes of Richmond, with his radical, classical, domed structure for the Hunt. The additional element of a history of Jacobite meetings on the site, whether in the new building or not, is an intriguing possibility. It was in proximity to this novel ‘Roome’, that the present Fox Hall was created, adding further glamour and high society to this little corner of Charlton with its occupancy by the 2nd Duke (and sometimes the Duchess) of Richmond. Although *The Chichester Observer* of 1888, written over 100 years after the destruction of the Dome, had inaccuracies, one section describing the walk through the village rings delightfully true:

...A place called Foxhall, consisting of a room and offices, was erected for the votaries of Diana, as a place of resort during the long winter evenings. And here they came not in ...carriages only, but on foot, stalking up the village in the dark from close-packed cottages and inconvenient Inns.

From 1730 until his death in 1750 they also looked up to the 2nd Duke of Richmond’s hunting-lodge. On a wider level, it is fascinating to think that some of the great architectural luminaries of the early 18th century either subscribed to the Dome, or at least visited this magnificent classical ensemble, which as a pair was only fashionable for barely 20 years.
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NOTES
Most manuscripts are West Sussex Record Office (WSRO), Goodwood Mss.

1 Fox Hall is owned by the Landmark Trust, which is an independent conservation charity that rescues and restores architecturally interesting and historic buildings at risk, giving them a renewed life by letting them for self-catering holidays.

2 The paper is watermarked Golding and Snelgrove 1809. The book contains a copy of an early poem about the Hunt, the two pages of notes, and a record of ‘the remarkable Chace’, an especially long hunt on 26 January 1739. It must have been written by an anonymous but diligent Hunt enthusiast and historian who knew Harry Budd. It belongs to Mr T. Wilmot of Pimlico.

3 From Henrietta’s son, Charles Dorrien, the items came into the possession of the Dorrien-Smith family, from which Mr T. Wilmot is descended.

4 Architectural debate continues as to whether Inigo Jones was ahead of his time, with a break at the Civil War, the rather domestic looking Restoration House then deriving from Italian–Dutch sources; or whether Inigo started off a movement that gathered pace slowly, culminating in the early 18th century — see Giles Worsley, Classical Architecture in Britain: The Heroic Age (Yale University Press, 1995): he believes that the movement was continuous from the early 17th century.

5 This is the first full publication, of all four books, but Lady Wilbraham at Weston Park, Salop., owned a small brown leather copy of Palladio’s writings in English as early as the 1660s. However, it was not a complete version of the Quattro Libri.


7 It was called the Great Room in the new Hunt Articles of 29 January 1738, the Dome by the anonymous poet (see below) and Fox Hall popularly from c. 1740.

8 In contrast to other articles on this subject the dates included here have been modernised: double dates formerly used for the first three months of the year, such as 24 March 1745/6 are rendered as 1746.

9 Simon Rees, The Charlton Hunt (Chichester: Phillimore, 1998), 18–19, has used the 1738 hunt list to work out subscribers to the Dome: a list of absent members included 12 original subscribers, so they are certain. Others, who he believes probably subscribed, are listed under his Appendix 2, Members of the Charlton Hunt, 226–34, where the date of membership of each individual is given. See also the Earl of March, Records of the Old Charlton Hunt (London: Elkin Matthews, 1910).

10 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 151; much of it is published in Rees, (1998).


12 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 152.

13 There is one rather horrifying story in Rees (1998), 103, of a fox being kept for two days before being turned out for the hounds.

14 In 1998 Goodwood was the underbidder in an attempt to buy back the central Allegorical Monument to George I, with its marvellous architectural detail by the Imperiali brothers. Another of the paintings, Allegorical Monument to John Somers, with ruins painted by Canaletto, is on display in the British Galleries at the Victoria and Albert Museum, on loan by an anonymous owner.

15 Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), CA3 1–13, 1724.

16 WSRO (miscellaneous boxes), an amateur drawing, not part of Campbell’s new design.

17 Formerly RIBA CA4, 1–7, now WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 2227: four plans and three elevations.

18 The drawings are in WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 2226.

19 Chatsworth Mss. 201:1, 22 June 1730 2nd Duke to Ld Burlington. (The request, at Mss 201:0 29 June 1730, is quoted by Connor: ‘I am very sensible how troublesome I must be to your Lordship about these plans, and am really quite ashamed of it but I must once more beg of you to send the plan for the Town house as soon as possible for the Subscription is full and... I dare not go (to Chichester) without a plan.’) On 19 August he wrote from Goodwood to Labbé: WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 102, f113, ‘pray tell Richard that I expect a paquet from my Lord Burlington at Whitehall, if it is put up like a letter or paquet, he must send it me by the first post, but if it be rolled up, he must have a box made for it & send it down by the first carrier’. Connor, p. 188, shows that the Chichester building was complete in August 1732. Another letter, WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 110, f 62, from Burlington to the Duke simply saying that he will wait
on him in Town (ie. London) as soon as possible is, unfortunately, undated.


21 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 117.

22 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 117, f. 104. At one stage these stables were even been investigated to see if they could actually be the Dome, but the interior is completely rustic. They are clearly identified in the insurance list: see note 35.

23 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 102, f. 137: a letter from M. Labbé, the Duke's financial administrator, at Whitehall to the Duke in Paris, 15 May 1729: ‘Monsieur Brudenell me dit hier qu'il avoir écrit a Mr Isaacson de se rendre ici pour conferer avec vous sur la fame du Charlon’.

24 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 102, f. 100, 2nd Duke to Labbé, 4 June 1729, ‘Je crois j'accepterai l'offre de Monsieur Isaacson qu'il fera la collection pour moi’. It sounds as if he was perhaps borrowing more money to buy the farm.

25 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E4986, map of 1710 showing the extent of the farm; The Charlton farm, bought as a copyhold; Map 2, E100 f. 25–6 (1767).

26 Although Ford, Lord Grey of Warke, was the 1st Earl of Tankerville, the title became extinct at his death without male heir in 1701. It was re-created for his son-in-law, Charles Bennet, 2nd Baron Ossulston, who as a Whig was given the title on the accession of George I in 1714. At his death in 1722 his son, also Charles Bennet, thus became the 2nd Earl of Tankerville.


28 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 98.


30 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 117, f. 104.

31 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E56, f. 95.

32 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E100. The dating is post-1766 accurately, and he ignored the change of year at the end of March.

33 This was suggested in conversation by Richard Pailthorpe.

34 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E3569.

35 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E37661.

36 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E3569.

37 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E4992.

38 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E4986.

39 I am grateful to Patrick Jefferson for this information.

40 This area still belongs to the Goodwood estate. When building works were carried out here in the early 1990s, brick footings were seen, which does at least suggest a building there, perhaps beside the pond. Richard Pailthorpe was told this by the late Mr Jefferies, who lived in Charlton. For a time the author favoured this site, as it could well have given its name to Fox Hall Field, and especially to East Fox Hall Field beyond, but although it is not initially clear, it has to be accepted that the grey area depicts a pond.

41 This document, dating between 1731 and 1749, amusingly recorded weights of members of the Hunt (the 2nd Duke weighed 15 stone).

42 Guildhall Library, Ms. 11936, Sun Insurance Office Policy Register, Vol. 33.

43 The date of this map is therefore 1732 in modern style.


45 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E56, f.95.

46 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E3789, 3790.

47 WSRO, Singleton Tithe Map, TD/W110; a good example of this arrangement can be seen at Pendean, in the nearby Weald and Downland Museum.


49 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E56, f.95.

50 WSRO, Goodwood Ms. E3789, 3790.

51 This is cogently argued by Jane Clark in Toby Barnard & Jane Clark (eds), Lord Burlington: Architecture, Art and Life (London: Hambledon Press, 1995), as well as mentioned in chapters by Richard Hewlings and
Eveline Cruickshanks. The evidence is regarded as inconclusive by Howard Colvin, who saw him as a Whig, in his introduction to the book, but in his *Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600–1840*, 3rd ed. (Yale University Press, 1995), he concedes the possibility in his excerpt about Burlington, p. 147: ‘Even if most of his foreign itineraries were to be explained in terms of clandestine contact with exiled Jacobites rather than of planned architectural tourism...’ J. Watson, The Melton Mowbray of its day, *Country Life* 13 October 1988.


Illustrated in Rees (1998), 3. The document is WSR, Goodwood Ms. 2003, A List of Goodwood Foxhounds, 1721–1750, p. 79: the original is at Goodwood House, Small Library, with microfilm at WSR.

John Kent, Records and Reminiscences of Goodwood and the Dukes of Richmond (London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co., 1896), 216. His source was the poem, which stated: ‘A hundred speedy coursers now are seen’. See also Watson (1988).

J. J. Cartwright (ed.), *The Travels through England of Dr Richard Pococke*, 2 (London: Camden Society, 1889). Pococke also observed ‘the cover’d place in which they sometime used to dine’, presumably the ‘small Dark Cell’ of the anonymous poem, which was replaced by the Dome.

R. Goadby, *A New Display of the Beauties of England: or, A Description of the Most Elegant or Magnificent Public Edifices, Royal Palaces, Noblemen’s and Gentlemen’s Seats, and other Curiosities, Natural or Artificial, in Different Parts of the Kingdom* (London, 1769; 2nd ed. 1773, 1774).


T. J. Bennett, Charlton and the Charlton hunt, 74–82.


Chatsworth Ms. 201.5, undated letter c. 1734 or 5. The first part is about chimney pieces, presumably for Richmond House.

WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 99, 14.

Visits to Goodwood, 1997 (Hewlings) and 1998 (Colvin), also called a ‘bed-recess’ in Ian Nairn & Nikolaus Pevsner, *Sussex* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965). Connor (1979) believed the letter to relate to the lodge, but while describing the possibilities of its use for a buffet conceded that this type of alcove was normally designed for a bed.

Haslam (1994). The author does not agree with John Eyre’s suggestion, quoted by her, that the ‘Casino’ letter is entirely about Richmond House. The first part of the letter is almost definitely about Richmond House: but the ‘casino’ reference is a change of subject, to the banqueting house projected for Goodwood. The dating of Haslam and Eyre’s work is a little confusing: Haslam first wrote notes in c. 1984, after the lodge was acquired by the Landmark Trust. John Eyre then commented on them in 1993: A chronology of the history of two buildings at Charlton related to the Charlton Hunt, West Sussex History, *Journal of the West Sussex Archives Society* 51 (April 1993), 25–30. Haslam then revamped hers afterwards, in 1994, in which she commented on his views. It was therefore a useful dialogue.

WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 121 f.107: John Hughes bill 6 March 30, examined by Roger Morris. The work was therefore paid for in March 1730. It probably commenced soon after the Duke’s return from his second European tour in late 1729, possibly straight after Christmas.


It has clearly been moved round the house. It was, incongruously, placed in the Ante Room to the Supper Room in the 1980s. It was moved at the author’s suggestion to the Pavilion Bedroom in 1999, and was married up with a similarly Palladian (but possibly Edwardian) overmantel.


Connor, 1979, on p. 190 and in note 47, traces the attribution to Vertue, p.143: but the Vertue attribution to Morris is on p. 144 and refers to the Council House, Chichester.

WSRO, Goodwood Ms. 137, undated but endorsed 18 Aug 1744

British Library, Additional Ms. 27587, Andrew Relfe’s letter book.
