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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 16th May 1754 William, 5th Earl of Dumfries appended his signature to the building contract for a new house at Leifnorris by ‘John, Robert and James Adam in Comp’y Architects in Edinburgh’.1 In so doing, he brought to an end some years of rehearsal and deliberation, and set in motion a commission that marks a key moment in the history of British Architecture and Design.

Dumfries House is an exceptionally fine mansion built in 1754-60 for William Crichton-Dalrymple, 5th Earl of Dumfries and designed by the celebrated architects John, Robert and James Adam.2 The most important additional phase of works to the building was undertaken by prominent Scottish architect Robert Weir Schultz in the late 1890s and this was undertaken for the 3rd Marquess of Bute, one of the most important architectural patrons in British history. It is set within an extensive and complex designed landscape and has many associated and important estate buildings within the study area boundaries, including several listed buildings.

Dumfries House is a Category A listed building and there are eleven other listed buildings and structures located within the study area, of which a large proportion comprises an area identified in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes. There are numerous other structures and landscape features within the study area of a high level of historic interest. The heritage value of these structures has been examined in further detail as part of this conservation plan.

The collection within Dumfries House is exceptional and includes furniture bought specifically for the house made by Thomas Chippendale from his ‘Director’ period, and the contemporary Edinburgh furniture makers William Mathie, Alexander Peter and Francis Brodie. This Scottish group has no comparison anywhere in the world.3

The sale of Dumfries House and collection was completed on 28th November 2007, purchased from John Bute by a consortium led by HRH The Prince of Wales, Duke of Rothesay. The consortium included: The Prince’s Charities Foundation; Historic Scotland; The Art Fund; The National Heritage Memorial Fund; SAVE Britain’s Heritage; The Monument Trust; The Dunard Fund; and The Siegmund Warburg Voluntary Settlement.

An independent trust, The Great Steward’s of Scotland’s Dumfries House Trust, was established to manage the presentation and maintenance of the house, its collection and grounds.

The building and landscape is to be preserved for the nation as not only a place of immense heritage value, but to provide a centre for education, appreciation and enjoyment of art, architecture and the countryside.4

This document is a conservation plan for Dumfries House, its policies and its collection. It contains a detailed assessment of the history and significance of the house, landscape and associated buildings, and a discussion of some of the conservation issues arising from the condition of the buildings and landscape and the proposals associated with opening the building and grounds to the public. The conservation plan has brought in several specialist reports which have been appended to the report and referred to throughout the document. These include

1 DU/ 5/ 29/ 9
2 Andrew McLean, Christie’s Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 – Dumfries House: A History
3 www.princeofwales.gov.uk Press Release 26th June 2007
Collections Conservation Management Plan, Textiles Report, Furniture Assessment for the collection. For the house and policies, a detailed Condition Assessment and Recommendations have also been appended.

The primary aim of this conservation plan for Dumfries House is to provide a document that assists in the long term management of this important site, to aid in the ongoing decision making processes for the site overall and for its individual components. The intention of the plan is to support a management agreement between the Great Steward of Scotland’s Dumfries House Trust, Historic Scotland and the National Heritage Monument Fund.

It is possible that some opinions or conclusions will change as more information becomes available following completion of the conservation plan and further research is undertaken in specialist areas. It would be expected that any additional information would be used to update the conservation plan as necessary.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Objectives

This conservation plan has been commissioned by the Great Steward of Scotland’s Dumfries House Trust that was established as an independent trust in 2007 following the purchase of the house and estate for the benefit of the nation. Simpson & Brown have been engaged by Oliver Chapman Architects to undertake this component of the work.

The aim of this report is to inform the future conservation, repair, use and management of Dumfries House, the designed landscape and estate buildings. It will inform future proposals for conservation and repair work to the buildings, as well as alterations that are required to facilitate their ongoing and improved use where required. The intention of the plan is to support a management agreement between the Great Steward of Scotland’s Dumfries House Trust, Historic Scotland and the National Heritage Monument Fund.

This conservation plan has been prepared as an appraisal of the heritage value of the Dumfries House, its setting and collection, and provides an examination of key conservation-related issues and guidelines regarding the site.

The conservation plan assesses and sets out in summary what is important about the house, the collection and the estate and the information gathered is then considered in an assessment of cultural significance, for the site as a whole and for its various parts, to be summarised in this report by a summary statement of significance. Gazetteers for the house and landscape provide more detailed information on an element-by-element basis.

The purpose of establishing the importance of the site is to identify and assess the attributes which make a place of value to our society. Once the heritage significance of the building, associated buildings, collections, the landscape and their context is understood, informed policy decisions can be made which will enable that significance to be retained, revealed, enhanced or, at least, impaired as little as possible in any future decisions for the site. A clear understanding of the nature and degree of the significance of the building and other elements of the site will not only suggest constraints on future action, but it will introduce flexibility by identifying the areas which can be adapted or developed with greater freedom, that is, identify opportunities within the site.

From all of this information, it will then be possible to establish a set of policies, or guidelines that will inform the future conservation, repair, management and use of the buildings, the collections and the designed landscape according to best conservation practice.

2.2 Study Area

The study area boundary chosen for Dumfries House and Landscape generally follows the boundary designated by the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes entry for Dumfries House. However, it includes an additional area of land to the south which is outwith the designated designed landscape area, but is of interest for its historical association with the Dumfries House Estate, as a key part of the developed landscape as a whole and providing a fuller context for the house.
itself. It also includes a small additional area of land to the west, which contains features from the historic designed landscape.

The study area is shown in Figure 2. It comprises an area of approximately 700 hectares. Dumfries House and landscape is bounded by the village of Auchinleck, the railway line and Barony Road (B7036) to the north. Holmhead and Cumnock are to the east of the study area. Agricultural farms surround the south and east sides, with the disused railway line running through the southern portion of the site. The A70 runs through the centre of the site from east to west and the A76 cuts through the east part of the study area through the designed landscape.

Figure 2 Study area boundary (blue), listed buildings and designed landscape area (yellow). Numbers refer to table in Section 2.3 - Designations. Historic Scotland, modified by Simpson & Brown.
### 2.3 Designations

Dumfries House is a Category A listed building. There are other listed structures within the estate study area, as identified in the table below.

There are many listed building located within the Dumfries House and Landscape study area and they have been identified as follows. They are shown on Figure 2 with map identification numbers corresponding with the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>HB No.</th>
<th>Building or Site</th>
<th>LISTING DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14413</td>
<td>Dumfries House</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>The Temple, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14416</td>
<td>Dovecote, Dumfries House</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14414</td>
<td>Avenue Bridge, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14419</td>
<td>Icehouse, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Nov 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14415</td>
<td>Sundial, Dumfries House</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14421</td>
<td>Westgates, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14420</td>
<td>Coach Buildings, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Nov 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14423</td>
<td>Terringzean Castle, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14422</td>
<td>Stockiehill, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category C(S)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14418</td>
<td>Waterloo Bridge, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Nov 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14417</td>
<td>Lady’s Bridge, Dumfries House Policies</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Nov 1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large part of the study area is identified within Historic Scotland’s Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes (Volume 2, published 1987), as the Dumfries House site (Site No. 029). It has an area of 535 hectares and is shown shaded in yellow on Figure 2.

The Inventory evaluated the policies as follows:

- **Historical**: Outstanding
- **Architectural**: Outstanding
- **Scenic**: Outstanding
- **Work of Art**: High
- **Nature Conservation**: High
- **Horticultural**: Little
There is one known Tree Preservation Order (TPO) located within the study area. This TPO is located at Knockroon, Auchinleck, and it applies to six mature oak trees just west of the B7038.

In addition to this TPO, there are considerable areas of trees within the study area which are designated by Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) as Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland.

![Map of Dumfries House policies (includes study area) with woodland designations](image)

Figure 3 Map of Dumfries House policies (includes study area) with woodland designations. SNH

### 2.4 Structure of the Report


Reference is also made to the British Standard BS 7913 - Guide to the principles of the conservation of historic buildings (1998) and the detailed guidelines prepared by the
The Conservation Plan provides a more detailed report on Dumfries House and its landscape than that provided by the Conservation Statement completed by Simpson & Brown in November 2007.

2.5 Limitations & Issues

2.5.1 Research

It is recognised that despite extensive primary research for this project, that it is highly likely that more information for the house and estate will become available in the future, particularly at the Mount Stuart Archives. It is accepted that further research in the future will add to the historical development contained within this conservation plan, and it should be updated accordingly.

2.5.2 Reports

At the time of completion of this report, the Business Plan and Habitat Survey, which are currently being undertaken, were not available for review.

2.5.3 Physical Investigation & Access

Survey work of some structures within the estate landscape: the Walled Garden, Pennyland camp and Temple, was obstructed by vegetation. The Temple interior was obscured by rubble, debris and soil accumulation, which affected the recording of the building. The Lady’s Well area was also obscured by undergrowth and a buildup of topsoil over the remains and associated carved stones.

Access to some buildings was not possible during site visits, such as some areas of Dumfries House Mains, where doors could not be unlocked. These spaces were therefore not fully surveyed at the time of completing this report.

2.5.4 Collections

There were some issues that arose during the examination of collections care within the house and subsequent provision of recommendations for the collections. One of the main issues was that conservation treatment and other collections actions (such as the deep clean prior to opening), were taking place while the approach to such actions was still being developed and written up as part of the plan.

The nature of the current management and use situation, with room settings no longer in original configurations, but also not finalised in a new setting, and various uses not quite formalised (e.g. to use or not use beds/bedrooms) created difficulties in fully assessing the vulnerability of items, as different uses and management approaches will be quite different.

There were also difficulties during the completion of the collections care component of the conservation plan, in working with the two management tiers at Dumfries House. It was difficult to obtain accurate information from the team within the...
house, as at the time of writing this report, many issues within the house were yet to be resolved. The Curator for Dumfries House had also only just begun in post during the completion of this report.

Consequently, more of a 'risk assessment' approach has been taken for collections care, where a standard, benchmark or other framework within which to assess the situation would normally be applied.

2.6 Project Team

The study team for the conservation plan comprised:

- James Simpson – Simpson & Brown
- John Sanders – Simpson & Brown
- Tom Addyman – Addyman Archaeology (a division of Simpson & Brown)
- Christopher Dingwall – Landscape Historian
- Wilma Bouwmeester – Collections Care Advisor
- Sophie Younger – Textiles Conservator
- Jennifer Austin – Simpson & Brown
- Cath MCFarlane – Simpson & Brown
- Tanja Romankiewicz – Simpson & Brown
- Sam Purves – Simpson & Brown
- William Kay – Historian
- David Jones – Furniture Consultant, University of St Andrew’s
- Kristina Taylor – Landscape Historian
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2.8 Abbreviations

The following abbreviations have been used throughout this report.

BL  British Library
M SA  Mount Stuart Archives
N LS  National Library of Scotland
NM RS  National Monuments Record of Scotland
NAS  National Archives of Scotland
S&B  Simpson & Brown
SNH  Scottish Natural Heritage
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HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF
DUMFRIES HOUSE
& LANDSCAPE
Image: 1895 photograph of Dumfries House and front garden. M SA
Figure 4 Ground floor historical development plan of Dumfries House. Simpson & Brown. Not to Scale.
Figure 5  Principal floor historical development plan of Dumfries House. Simpson & Brown. Not to Scale.
Figure 6  Chamber floor historical development plan of Dumfries House.  Simpson & Brown.  Not to Scale
Figure 7 Attic floor historical development plan of Dumfries House. Simpson & Brown. Not to Scale.
3.0 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Before Dumfries House: Leifnorris, Waterside, Terringzean

3.1.1 Introduction

What was to become the Dumfries House estate was in the early 17th century and before, a number of separate estates and baronies, in the hands of different families. The names of some of these have survived, giving the landscape a historical depth not immediately obvious from the present buildings and plantations.

Two earlier estates with associated landscape which were subsumed within Dumfries House were Leifnorris and Waterside, however the earliest known building within the policies is Terringzean Castle. The earliest surviving built feature in the landscape so far discovered is the Eastern Ha-ha, which runs north from Stockiehill, and may be associated with either Leifnorris or Terringzean. The oldest known surviving tree is a magnificent sycamore, associated with Waterside (see below).

3.1.2 Eastern Ha-ha

This feature bears no particular relation to the design of the mid 18th century landscape associated with Dumfries House. Its masonry is of more massive construction than the Western Ha-ha, (which appears to be of a later date, although it may be an early 18th century feature, associated with Leifnorris), suggesting it is of 16th or 17th century date. A structure like this would have been used as a boundary to a deer park, although it is not possible to associate it definitely with any of the surrounding known baronies. A number of enclosures are shown on Blaeu’s mid 17th century map, which is based on Pont’s map of c1590. The stumps of substantial trees remain along the top of the ha-ha, and it is clear that a ditch originally ran alongside the wall. The 18th century estate plans show a narrow plantation of trees to the west of the ha-ha, but by this date it was not in use as a boundary to the policies.

Figure 8 Wall of Eastern Ha-ha 2008. S&B
Figure 9 Looking north along Eastern Ha-ha 2008. S&B
3.1.3 Terringzean

Numerous spellings of this building are known (pronounced ‘tring-en’). It was bought by the Crichton family in 1696, but before this the barony had several owners, with the earliest recorded being a branch of the Crawfords of Leifnorris in the 15th century. The surviving masonry indicates a 14th century construction date. Nothing is known of any policies which may have been associated with the castle.

Terringzean was built in an excellent defensive position on the banks of the Lugar. This elevated position later made the ruins of the castle an important landscape feature in the mid 18th century designed landscape centring on Dumfries House.

It is not known when the castle fell into ruin. It is not shown on Blaeu’s map of 1654 nor on Robert Gordon’s map of 1635, and it may have been ruinous even by the late 16th century. Roy’s Survey of 1747-55 is the first to show Terringzean, but with no detail.

Smith’s 1756 estate plan, however, shows a substantial building on the site, and describes it as ‘Toure of Taringzan’. Home’s less detailed survey has a small circle marked ‘castle’.

Armstrong’s map of 1774 shows ‘ruins’ on the site.

One sketch of the building survives from 1863, and its footprint appears on OS maps from the mid 19th century (figures 13-16). It was excavated by the antiquarian 3rd Marquess of Bute in the mid 1880s.

‘The walls uncovered then showed that the building had at one time been fairly extensive. Within the ancient courtyard, walls of more recent erection were found, confirming the tradition current in the district that this keep of troubled times had in later days been used merely as a place of security for cattle.’

No drawings of this excavation are known to survive, and the only other assessment of the ruins, by the antiquarians and architects MacGibbon & Ross, found the only noteworthy feature to be that the castle resembled Mugdock in Stirlingshire.

---

5 H Steven’s ‘Old Cumnock’ of 1899 outlines the owners: After the Crawfords, it was by 1467 granted to the Earl of Arran by the king. In 1497 it was granted to John Ramsay, Lord Terringzean and a favourite of James III. In 1534 William Ramsay of Balmain had it, and in 1546 it was given to Hugh Campbell, Earl of Loudon, the family still having it in 1644, but in 1664 it was sold to James Reid, merchant burgess of Edinburgh. In 1691 it was owned by Sir George Campbell of Cessnock, but soon afterwards by James Carmichael of Boniton, from whom it was bought by the Crichtons.

6 H Steven ‘Old Cumnock’ 1899
3.1.4 Leifnorris

The castle of Leifnorris was owned by the Crauford family, in whose possession it is recorded in 1440. 15th and 16th century Ayrshire was unsettled, and the historical mentions of the Craufords suggest the castle was probably fortified. In 1510 William Crauford is recorded as having taken Loch Doon Castle from the Kennedys, and two years later he was arrested for the murder of the Laird of Corsingtoune at the Kirk of Cumnock. No description of the castle is known before 1635, when it was sold to the
1st Earl of Dumfries with its ‘Tower, fortresse, mansion place, orchardes, yardes and pertynances’.

Blaeu’s map of the area, drawn in the 1650s, but based on Pont’s survey of c1590, shows the Castle of Lefno (Leifnorris), together with Mid Watersid and Watersid Hoom, Pennyland, Pennyfadyoc, Hapland and Grumgroiglin (Grimgrew).

![Figure 17 Detail of Blaeu’s Map 1654. NLS](image)

Blaeu’s map also shows plantations and enclosures in the vicinity of Leifnorris, but all to the north of the Lugar. The two nearest enclosures are marked ‘Sneds’, ‘Rogentoil’ and ‘Blakstoun’. Blackston and Rogerton survives as the names of farms to the east of Auchinleck village, shown on the 1st Edition OS map, and ‘Sneds’ features on the 1756 estate plan as ‘Snaidsholm’, a field name. No bridge is marked across the Lugar which might link the Castle of Lesno to the enclosures, however the gap shown on the river probably indicates a ford. The plantation to the north west of Leifnorris is associated with the estate of Waterside.

![Figure 18 Manuscript map of Ayrshire, Robert Gordon 1635. NLS](image)

Robert Gordon’s manuscript map of 1635 shows ‘Lesno’, but is not detailed enough to give any useful information.

Although it was the principal country residence of the Earls of Dumfries between 1635 and the completion of Dumfries House in c1761, almost nothing is known of Leifnorris. No detailed description is known to survive, and the only known images are those on historic maps and estate plans. There are fragmentary references to it:
one undated bill from the mason Andrew Morton is for flooring a ground floor room 16 feet by 18 feet, and for 12 new steps for a staircase 4 ½ feet wide. A small quantity of furniture from the old house was transferred to the new, and its dainty dimensions suggest (as would be expected in a Scots tower house) that Leifnorris had small doorways, a narrow staircase and modestly sized rooms. Smith’s remarkably detailed estate plan of 1756 is our best guide to how the ‘old house’ may have looked, and to the layout of its policies, although by this date it is clear that the designed landscape had been altered to suit the new house, then in progress. The design and materials of the Doocot and the Lady’s Well, as well as the bolection moulded fireplace (all discussed below) suggest that Leifnorris was a building of some architectural quality.

A fireplace surround in one of the buildings of Dumfries House Mains has a very elaborate bolection moulding, and is probably of late 17th century date. Near to it is a re-used window which is of similar date. It is possible that both of these pieces may have come originally from Leifnorris.

Leifnorris was certainly surrounded by the typical outbuildings of a tower house, which can be seen on Smith’s estate plan (figure 24). In 1762 the ‘Old Kitchen, Coach House, Larder’ were taken down, together with the ‘Old House’7 itself.

The bill for this demolition also refers to repairs made to ‘Pigeon Houses’. Another doocot is known to have existed to the west of Waterside (shown on the 1772 estate plan) so the plural reference may be to that one.

The Doocot attached to Leifnorris survives, dated 1671, and the early 18th century structure known as the Lady’s Well, and shown on the 1756 plan, is know to have survived until 1944 (figure 21).

The 1756 plan is remarkably detailed, with the Lady’s Well canopy shown (in both plan and partial elevation, figure 21) as having four entrances, and the Doocot a doorway, and string course. The building with the pointed roof just south of the house was probably a pavilion of some sort.

---

7 There is a bill for ‘white-washing the old house’ dating somewhat mysteriously from 1766. It does not seem likely that the ‘old house’ in this bill is in fact Leifnorris, however further research may clarify this point. In any case it is clear that Leifnorris was demolished before 1772.
The elevation of the house itself is probably fairly schematic. It shows what may be a U-shaped building, with a three storey, three bay tower to the west, a single bay, lower block in the centre, and a three storey, two bay tower to the east.

The house is surmounted by five chimneys. Roy’s mid 18th century map shows a U-shaped footprint (figure 26).
Excavations of the Leifnorris House site were made by the 3rd Marquess of Bute in 1897, but no other archaeological work has been carried out on the site. The 1897 excavation ‘exposed a portion of the old walls as well as some capital causeway work made of water worn stones.’\(^8\) A drawing of this, which shows the foundations in relation to the Coach House, survives in the Mount Stuart Archive (figure 25). An overlay of the 1857 1st Edition OS map which places this sketch in relation to the Coach House is shown at figure 27.

Interestingly, the excavation sketch suggests an L or U shaped building, but with the open side of the building orientated north, rather than south as suggested on Roy and the 1756 estate plan.

\(^8\) J Warrick, History of Old Cumnock 1899
3.1.5 **Approach to Leifnorris**

Prior to the building of the Adam Bridge in 1760, there was no formal approach to Leifnorris from the north, only a ford, which can be seen on both the Smith and the Home estate plans, and which was in use during the construction of the new house. It seems reasonable to assume that the straight approach from the south which leads from the Ayr-Cumnock Road past Dumfries House Mains was approximately the route taken to reach Leifnorris. The only other reference so far found is to ‘the avenue on the west side of the burn’.

The clearest surviving feature of the Leifnorris landscape is the Doocot, which is shown on the 1756 estate plan as in alignment with the house, the Lady’s Well and the pavilion (figure 28). The ‘old garden’ behind the house is shown divided into six main areas, with three diagonal plantings. The garden was retained until at least 1772, when it is also marked ‘old garden’ although by this date the formal arrangement had been replaced by trees, possibly forming an orchard, and by the Washing House in the south east corner.

![Figure 28 Smith’s estate plan 1756. MSA](image)

![Figure 29 Home’s estate plan 1772. MSA](image)

Roy’s Survey of 1747-55 is not always an entirely reliable source, but it is the earliest record of the policies prior to the construction of the new house. It is clear that a number of features shown on the later 18th century plans were in place, suggesting either that the 5th Earl had been as interested in implementing the design of his policies as in his house, or that plans for the policies had been in train for a period before the 1750s. It is also possible that the layout shown on Roy’s map is partly unrelated to the house built by the 5th Earl. It may incorporate features associated

---

9 A letter from his factor to Lord Dumfries dated 1746, Leifnorris (MSA). The factor also complains of the moles.
with a landscape planned by the 5th Earl's parents, relating to Leifnorris rather than the new house.

The principal east-west alignment from the Pennyfadzeoch Ds to Terringzean is shown on Roy (figure 30), but the north-south alignment is not indicated. No road is shown to Leifnorris, but as noted above the house is not accurately sited on this map. The area to the east of the new house contains allées and vistas, but these seem almost random, aligned neither with Leifnorris, nor with the new house, and it may be that the depiction is schematic. Some features are clearly accurate however: the Ayr-Cumnock road, Stair and Dettingen Mounts, the Western and Eastern Ha-ha, Homeston Park and the western boundary of Polcalk Wood.

With so little evidence it is not possible to do more than suggest the likelihood of an early 18th century formal designed landscape. It is clear however that the allées and vistas shown on the mid 18th century maps by Roy and Smith could have been designed at a considerably earlier date than the house, and may have been influenced by William Adam’s designs for the 2nd Lord Stair, whose son had married the heiress to Leifnorris, becoming the 4th Earl of Dumfries (see below).

![Figure 30](image-url) Roy’s survey 1747-55 with blue line imposed to show alignment; Pennyfadzeoch Ds coloured red. BL, S&B edits

### 3.1.6 Waterside

The earliest documentary reference to Waterside is the 1612 charter confirming its by George Douglas of Pennyland, to William Reid, merchant burgess of Edinburgh. The lands of Pennyland, containing a ‘fortalice’ or tower house were halved by the sale. Pennyland was to the east of Waterside, and later came within the Dumfries House policies.
Waterside was sold some time after 1640 to Sir John Cochrane of Ochiltree, who gifted it to John, his second son, a notable Covenanter. It is not clear when Waterside was acquired by the Dumfries estate, but it must have been acquired by Crichton family by the time of building Dumfries House.

The tower house of Waterside and its walled garden is shown on Roy’s mid 18th century map, together with ‘Yonner Waterside’ across the Lugar to the south.

![Figure 31 Waterside, Roy’s Military Survey c1750s. BL](image)

Smith’s estate plan of 1756 shows Waterside determinedly labeled ‘Garden’ with the same shape of walled enclosure as is shown on Roy.

A short avenue of trees leads in from the road to the north east corner, and what is presumably the tower house is to the north west of the enclosure (in a different position to Roy’s map). It is not clear why the house is not shown in elevation. It is possible that it was ruinous, or it may be a whim of the surveyor – Terringzean for example had been shown in elevation (see above), although it may have been a ruin by this date. Two small buildings may have been lodges or pavilions within the Waterside policies. Just north of the walled enclosure is ‘Swine Park’.

![Figure 32 Walled Garden at Waterside, shown on Smith's Estate Plan 1756. M SA](image)

Waterside was demolished in the spring of 1763. A bill was presented from John Thomson quarrier ‘for taking off the Roof and throwing doun the Old House at Wattersyde and carrying out the buildable stones’. Another bill was for ‘throwing doun the low brick wall at Waterside’ and ‘to throwing doun the old vault and other stone walls at Waterside’, done in March 1763. The brick wall probably indicates a kitchen garden for growing fruit trees.
One feature of Waterside which was allowed to remain was a sycamore tree (figure 33). Warrick’s ‘History of Cumnock’ of 1899 states:

‘Mention must be made of the magnificent specimen of the maple or sycamore in the garden of the Marquis of Bute. It is said to be at least 300 years old; and certainly its widespread umbrageous head, and its thick stem, which measures 14 feet 10 inches in circumference three feet above the ground, make it easy to believe that it has stood the blasts of even three centuries, and is by far the oldest living thing in the parish of Old Cumnock.’

The tree is marked ‘large tree’ on a plan of the Walled Garden from 1818 (see below).

A dot marked on the Roy map may indicate this tree (figure 31).

3.1.7 Crichton Family - 17th Century

The Crichtons were an old family with a family seat at Sanquhar Castle in Dumfriesshire. The 9th Lord Crichton of Sanquhar had befriended James VI and I, and was created Viscount Ayr in 1622. The Crichtons now expanded their estate, buying up land around Cumnock between 1629 and 1635.

Viscount Ayr (William Crichton) was created 1st Earl of Dumfries, in 1633. The family fortunes continued to flourish, with more land being added to the estate, which now centred around the house or castle of Leifnorris.

Leifnorris estate and house was purchased by the 1st Earl of Dumfries in 1635 and the estate comprised a ‘tower, fortress, mansion place, orchards, yards and pertynences’. The tower was known as the Ward of Lochnorris and was known to have been in the ownership of the Craufords of Leifnorris in 1440. The mansion place refers to Leifnorris House, the family home, and this was located northwest of the present Dumfries House near the stables and was in use by the 1630s when the estate was purchased by the Crichton family.

In 1639 the Earl sold Sanquhar Castle to Sir William Douglas, 1st Duke of Queensberry. The 1st Earl of Dumfries died in 1643, and his son the 2nd Earl survived the Civil Wars to become a Privy Councillor to Charles II.

The 3rd Earl of Dumfries died unmarried in 1694, when the estate was inherited by his sister Penelope, Countess in her own right. She married Colonel William Dalrymple, the second son of the Earl of Stair in 1698. It is with this couple that the family’s first formal connections with architecture are known. The Stair family were architectural patrons, notably of William Adam, the most important architect in Scotland in the early 18th century, and a landscape designer. Lord Stair had employed Adam at his house at Newhailes, where there was an extensive designed

---

landscape. William Adam also worked for the 2nd Earl of Stair at Castle Kennedy. His other known landscapes include Arniston, Midlothian; Duff House, Banffshire; Mavisbank, Midlothian; and Taymouth, Perthshire. No documentary evidence links William Adam to the family at Leifnorris, but it is probable that at least the influence of Lord Stair would have extended to some modernisations of the landscape.

The family estate continued to expand - Terringzean was bought in 1694, and Shankston after 1700.


3.2.1 Introduction

William Crichton-Dalrymple (c1710-1768) succeeded as 5th Earl of Dumfries on the death of his mother Countess Penelope on 6th March 1742.

His father, the Honourable Col. William Dalrymple died 3rd December 1744. Like his father, the 5th Earl had pursued a military career, having served as a Captain in Lord Cadogan’s (formerly Lord Stairs) Dragoons in Flanders and Germany 1742-3; and was an aide-de-camp to his uncle, Lord Stair, Commander in Chief at the Battle of Dettingen on 27th June 1743.

He was gazetted Captain Lieutenant in the 3rd (later Scots) Guards 18th July 1744, and was subsequently promoted to Captain and Lieut. Colonel on 1st May 1745. He resigned his commission in 1747, and it is likely that he formulated the project of building a new house on his Ayrshire estate.

3.2.2 Early Proposals for Dumfries House - c1748-1753

Leifnorris had been in the family for 120 years before the 5th Earl of Dumfries decided to replace it, and its lack of a strong family connection as the ancient seat meant that rather than retain the ‘old house’ as Lord Auchinleck had done when building his new mansion, where the principal view from the four windows of the new library was of the former house, Leifnorris was to be demolished. Instead, the ruins of Terringzean were used as a view-closer to the eastern axis of the designed landscape. Terringzean was also more conveniently sited for this purpose.

No doubt on campaign and at home Lord Dumfries had sought the counsel of his uncle Lord Stair (1673-1747), an early and important patron of the architect William Adam whom he had employed since the early 1720s on building and garden projects.
on his estates at Newliston in West Lothian and at Castle Kennedy in Galloway. Stair had an uncommon attachment for his architect (he left him £100 in his will), and had long encouraged Adam's presentation at London. This was eventually effected in 1727 when Lord Stair had apparently secured a patent of a baronetcy for Adam, which, however, failed to gain assent before the death of the King, George I. Stair may also have been instrumental in launching Adam’s projected publication of his own and other Scottish architectural designs (published posthumously in 1812 as Vitruvius Scoticus), in which Adam’s only exercise in strict Neo-Palladianism is represented by an unrealised (and probably vanity) design for Newliston House.

However, there were wider connections to William Adam, who had designed for several members of the Dalrymple family: these included Stair's lawyer brother George Dalrymple at Dalmahoy, Midlothian, in 1725; for Lady Elizabeth Crichton-Dalrymple and her husband John McDowall of Freugh, at Balgreggan, Wigtownshire, c.1725-30.

Additionally, there were business connections to Adam's close-knit in-laws, the Robertsons, that can be traced back to correspondence of 1703 between Adam's future father-in-law, the entrepreneur and early industrialist William Robertson of Gladney and Sir David Dalrymple of Hailes (d.1721). Several members of the two subsequent generations of Robertsons make an appearance in connections with Dumfries House; but for the moment it is sufficient to draw attention to a pre-existing relationship through Gladney's son, Henry ('Harry') Robertson (b.1692), who acted as factor and coal overseer to Lord Dumfries's father Colonel William Dalrymple of Glenmure, on his Clackmannan estate (and occasionally at Leifnorris), then to Lord Dumfries himself until the 1760s, where he performed a valuable role in managing the industrial economy, and therefore the disposable income of both estates.

At the time of Lord Dumfries's retirement from the army, in selecting a proven native architect in Scotland there was effectively only one obvious contender – William Adam. Tradition has it that Adam was indeed engaged but there is no documentary reference to his name in the Mount Stuart Archive. However, the survival of a discarded design for the new house is evidence of his influence if not his actual presence.

This undated drawing is captioned ‘South front of LEIFNORRIS HOUSE towards the Court. ONE OF THE SEATS of the Right Honble the EARL OF DUMFRIES’, and is consistent with William Adam's late architectural manner. It may be compared
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12 NAS GD18/ John Clerk of Eldin: Manuscript sketch biography of Robert Adam, 1790s.
13 Plates 32-36
14 NLS MS 13251 Janet Rochead (wife of Sir David Dalrymple) to William Robertson of Gladney 18th June 1703 regarding litigation over the coal at Urquhart, near Dunfermline, leased by Robertson from Grisel Kynninmond since the 1690s. At marriage, Hugh Dalrymple, son of the above took the estate of Melgund and the name of Kynninmond.
15 See for example Robertson’s report of 22nd July 1745 regarding a coal seam at Leifnorris, DU\5\, 8, 1. On 13th July 1746, Archibald Campbell of Stonefield endorsed the appointment of William Adam as ‘Intendant General’ for the building on Inveraray’ [Adam had actually been appointed in 1745] adding ‘There is one John Douglas at Edinr. Next in character to Mr Adams, he had built several house but never so great a design as this’. Stonefield MSS, NAS GD14/99. See also Ian G Lindsay & Mary Cosh Inveraray and the Dukes of Argyll (Edinburgh, 1973).
16 DUP/2 A distinctive back-loop on the ‘t’ of ‘Feet’ in the legend ‘Extends 230 Feet’, points to John Adam’s hand. The watermark: a crowned shield-like cartouche containing a fleur-de-lyss over a cipher composed of a 4 over an entwined WR, is often encountered in William Adam’s drawings. The later Contract drawings are on paper of a slightly different mark.
with known schemes of the 1740s depicted in Vitruvius Scoticus such as Buchanan House, Stirlingshire (1741) for the Duke of Montrose, and more cogently with the complete survival of the presentation drawings for Torrance House, Lanarkshire (1740) for ‘Col. James Stewart’.  

Whether this scheme for Leifnorris represents a design by William Adam or not, attribution on the basis of a single finished drawing is fraught with pitfalls. It is known that Adam’s Clerk, Alexander Whyte (whose formal hand is very much like his employer’s) was also his draughtsman; and that increasingly in the 1740s John Adam was also working up and annotating the Practice drawings. This is demonstrated in some of the Torrance designs where John’s distinctive handwriting is in evidence. The non-cursive title to the Leifnorris design is problematic as a diagnostic tool as it is indistinguishable in drawings known to be by William Adam and those known to be by John before and after his father’s death in 1748.  

Whether this scheme was by William or John Adam, the latter only is mentioned in the surviving correspondence. On 19th November 1748 (five months after the death of William Adam following illness from late 1747), Lord Dumfries’s agent in Edinburgh, Andrew Hunter, Writer to the Signet, was able to report ‘M r Adam I see now in town and will wait of your Lop whenever you desire’. There is no further record however, until 4th June 1750 when Lord Dumfries (apparently then at Leifnorris) noted in his personal account book ‘given M r Adam and his servant £22.1.0’.  

---

18 Vitruvius Scoticus: Buchanan: Plates 135, 136; Torrance: Plates 139, 140. Also ‘Plans for a House at Torrence made out by old M r Adams Architect for Colonel Stuart of Torrence Anno 1740’, NLS MS 8222.1-12.

19 See, for example, NAS RHP 6150 ‘General plan of... Buchanan’ 1745; British Museum: King’s Topographical Collection, 49.72 ‘An Exact plan of Edinburgh Castle. 1746’ by William Adam; and those drawings by John Adam for works at Inveraray post published in Lindsay and Cosh, op.cit. (who however, do not distinguish John Adam’s hand in several pre-1748 examples).
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might represent a site visit, as three days later Hunter wrote ‘I hope Mr Adam has given your Lordship full satisfaction. Is the House to go on or not?’.

The reply must have been equivocal, as on 27th June 1750, Hunter states ‘Your Lordship seems undetermined yet as to the House at least until the Earl of Hopetoun and Mr Adams be of one mind. I wish the Earl of Dumfries had equal estates and then we should soon have a good House.’

Exactly a month later, on 27th July 1750, Hunter cautioned ‘I understand My Lord Hopetoun had finished his observations upon the plan and that Mr Adam is to send your Lordship the estimates soon. I agree with your Lordship that you need a House, but would not have your Lordship go into an expense that would shorten your living comfortably. Clearly there were financial constraints to contend with. To his chagrin, on retirement Lord Dumfries had failed to attract a pension from the Crown for his military service, and had to rely therefore on the product of his Clackmannan and Ayrshire estates.

Lord Hopetoun’s appearance at this juncture is significant, but not surprising. He was universally accepted (rather like Sir John Clerk of Penicuik) as an authority and arbiter in architectural and building matters, and as a social equal, could be relied upon to give impartial advice. Further, if Lord Dumfries was nervous either of architectural matters or of John Adam’s capability, he could take solace (as did several others) from the fact that since 1748 John Adam had enjoyed Hopetoun’s confidence as successor to William Adam in completing the transformation of Hopetoun House into an immense palace – work that had been continuing in fitful phases for fifty years, and which had occupied William Adam since 1721.

Under Hopetoun’s supervision John and Robert Adam seem to have drawn up several proposals for Lord Dumfries. Writing to the latter on 12th April 1751, Lord Hopetoun reported:

Hopt = house 12 April 1751

My Lord

Messrs Adam have at different times show’n me various Drawings for the Principall Front of your intended House, & they carry one with them that I do not think is nothing inferior to the first, tho’ that’s having received the Sanction of Lord Burlington’s Approbation puts it above Exception. As to the Garden Front after several attempts to get free of the Beau Window we found it impossible without altering the whole Disposition, that is in effect making a new Plan which we thought would not be agreeable to your Lordship & might have occasioned greater inconveniences.

I have also seen their Estimate of the Expence, which I could not pretend to examine particularly, that being a long & laborious work, but doubt not your Lordship will find exact, as they assure me they have taken all Pains to make it so.

If your Lordship determines to go on with your Plan I most heartily wish it may prove to your satisfaction. I beg my most humble Compliments to your Lady & am with great Respect

My Lord

Your Lordship’s most obedient
& most humble servant Hopetoun

21 DU\5\19\8
22 DU\5\19\9
23 DU\5\29\1
This letter is highly significant in several respects. Perhaps most arresting is the revelation that Lord Burlington had examined and endorsed an Adam design for Lord Dumfries's new house. But how are we to interpret this? Is the 'first' design that is represented by the elevation drawing of a four-storey balustraded façade for the entrance front considered above? (see figure 35) If so, however technically correct in its architectural grammar, its fussy detailing hardly accords with the tenets of chaste Neo-Palladianism championed and practiced by Burlington and his circle in England.

A second point of interest is revealed in Hopetoun's letter by mention of a 'Beau Window' on the garden front which seems to have been an early and firm inclusion in the Adam proposals. Intriguingly, an undated sketch plan in the Mount Stuart Archives shows just a feature. This drawing, bearing the caption ‘Plan of Dumfries House – Ground flat’ is in an unidentifiable hand, is not a formal presentation item, as it consists of a sheet made up of six smaller pieces of paper spot-gummed together, and drawn in ink hatching lines, very much in the manner John Adam adopted in working plans at Inveraray at the same period.

This drawing may be a hybrid design incorporating elements of the four-storey house represented in the early elevation, but with a new plan for the external entry stair, and for the pavilions and offices which are expanded into a form virtually identical to that ultimately carried forward. That the sketch plan is actually a very carefully worked out and detailed proposal is suggested by careful articulation of levels with steps at the junction of the corridor and the passage into the quadrant links – a feature unique to this proposal.

The ground plan of the body of the house also reveals the early establishment of a layout essentially similar to that executed, but with the distinctive ‘Beau’ placed in the middle of an advanced centre on the north which is one bay wider each side than
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24 DHP/7 The unusually formed capital D is very like the style of Andrew Hunter’s clerk, John McHaffie, who wrote out the Contract of 1754.
that on the south or entrance front. The perceived planning difficulties of dispensing with this ‘Beau’, implied by Lord Hopetoun, may relate to the arrangement of the paired family apartments in the storey above, which because of the increased depth of the advanced wall, would have obliged the subsidiary closets, etc. there to adjoin the intervening central parlour in order to avoid uneven window reveals in the larger two-bay family rooms, which consequently would be pushed into the outer bays of the north front.

**The First Estimate - 1751**

The two early Adam drawings for Lord Dumfries’s house, may constitute the basis of the estimate mentioned in Lord Hopetoun’s letter of 1751, as such a document bearing the same date, and in the hand of John Adam, survives.25 Headed ‘Estimate of a House for the Right Honble the Earl of Dumfries propo’sd to be built at Leifnorris’, it runs to eleven pages, specifying and costing in meticulous detail the stonework, wright work, Slater work, lead work, window sashing, plater work and hardware of the proposed building. The estimate is divided into three main sections dealing in turn with the body of the house; the pavilions and offices; and the ‘Great Drain’ round the building.

Its contents seem to agree closely with the two drawings mentioned previously, with very minor variation. It is explicit that the estimate is for a house of four main storeys – ‘Ground...Principal...Lodging...Attick’, with sky-lighted garrets in the roof. Further, the architectural detail itemised is consistent with the elevation drawings of the south front. In this, the wall plane was to be treated as broached ashlar as a foil to the ‘plain polished free stone in the Base, betings & strings of both Fronts & ends; in all the Rustick corners; in all the Solls, Lintles & Blocks... Pediments of the windows... Great Cornish and Pediments... Ballustrades’ and other moulded elements.

The degree of richness intended is revealed in further entries of the estimate. Pediments on the two main fronts are described, each costing £21: ‘My Lord’s coat of Arms in the pediment of the South Front, impaled with My Lady’s And the Angles to be filled up with Foliage’, and ‘a Compartment round a window in the pediment of the North front, & Foliage in the Angles’. Another entry specifies ‘204 Stone Balusters for the top of the House, & Beau on the back front’ at 5 shillings each (a quantity whish suggests the ends were also to be balustraded) combined with ‘19 vases for the top of the House’ at £3 each. A further remarkable feature is ‘a Festoon & scrolled Key to the paladian window of the North Front’.

That the term ‘paladian window’ has a rather specific meaning here is implied by the quite distinct use of the term ‘Venetian Windows’ later in the same document.26 Strictly speaking, the Palladian arrangement comprises an arched opening – usually flanked by narrower (sometimes blind) openings, housed within a larger, shallow recessed relieving arch, the panels of the openings often with engaged balustrades. This device was introduced to British architecture in General Wade’s house (1723-4) by Lord Burlington, and soon after applied by him to great effect at his own house of
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25 DU S 29, 2
26 The laxness in the application of the term ‘Palladian’ at even an early date is attested to by the painter James Waitt, whose bill of 1761 for work at Dumfries House refers to painting two ‘Venetian’ windows and two ‘paladian’ windows. The latter obviously refers to the tripartite Roman lunette or thermal windows lighting the stairs in the end sof the house: DU S 34, 20 ‘The Right Honble The Earl of Dumfries & Stair D[ebito]r to Jas Waitt painter in Ayr’ 1761.
Perhaps this helps explain why the first Adam design (if this is the same) managed to secure Burlington’s approval, for otherwise in architectural matters he was an uncompromising dogmatist. Significantly, on a visit to England in the early part of 1748, John Adam had recorded details of Neo-Palladian architecture, including notes on chimneypieces and other decorative devices, and importantly in the present context, a measured drawing of a Palladian window at Lord Granville’s house in London. The combination with a scrolled key and festoon is unusually elaborate. A possible source is Isaac Ware’s Designs of Inigo Jones (1731), where Plate 35 shows the same elements in a design for the dining room of Houghton by William Kent.

Figure 37 Plate 35, dining room details for Houghton by William Kent. Designs of Inigo Jones, 1731

It would be fascinating to know precisely how the Adam combination of pediment, balustrade, vases, Palladian window and ‘Beau’ on the garden front of Lord Dumfries’s new house was to have been articulated. Had it been adopted, the Palladian window would have made its first appearance in Scottish architecture: a distinction that finally went to Robert Adam’s Register House, Edinburgh, of 1769.

Internally, the estimate provides accommodation on the principal storey of: dining room, drawing room, pillared hall, and a parlour which were to contain ‘Rich Stucco Ornaments in the Ceilings of the Dining room and Drawing room, And in the Coves, Ceilings & side walls of the Hall & Parlour’. That is, exactly as eventually adopted three years later.

28 John Adam’s sketchbooks RIBA Library, L 12, 1 & 2 (cited in John Fleming, Robert Adam and his Circle, 82)
The layout is quite different in one respect however. In specifying timber linings and plaster to the walls, the estimate refers more than once to a ‘Gallery’ on the lodging storey. This, it seems, was to occupy the whole open area between the advanced three bays of the centrepiece, north and south, with the remaining corners of the body of the house on this level containing ‘4 Bed Chambers, & 4 Dressing rooms... & 4 Closets’.

That the Gallery is not simply to be identified with the ‘Corridore’ mentioned elsewhere, is made clear from the distinction made between the ‘Gallery &... Stair Lobbies of the Lodgeing Story’ connecting with it. Inclusion of a dedicated gallery is a statement of status, and recalls the even more extravagant version at William Adam’s Duff House, where it is placed off-centre.29

Both stairs at the ends of the corridor were specified to be ‘hanging stairs’ of polished stone from top to bottom, with mahogany handrails and balusters (although this was not exactly as carried out, no doubt due to the expense).

In the 1751 estimate for Dumfries House, the offices depart substantially from those shown on the early elevation. The sketch plan shows that the pavilions were now to be expanded by one bay (allowing two flue-bearing cross-walls), while the screen walls and low buildings comprising the back courts (not depicted at all in the early elevation) extended the composition laterally. The implied elevation intends three concave niches or blind occuli in the screen walls to the south, while the ‘Toofalls’ on the north side (housing domestic facilities such as brewing and baking) are screened on the north elevation by a slightly advanced middle section and court walls articulated with blind niches, and, as the estimate reveals ‘Venetian Windows’, pediments and four vases, suggesting an arrangement of two sets of paired towers rather like that eventually adopted, but with detailing like pared down versions of William Adam’s ‘Kennel’ of Chatelherault for the Duke of Hamilton.30

However, the literal evidence of the plan does not show recessed walling at the middle to give articulation to the supposed towers wither side, and while raised margins are carefully depicted on the ends of the court walls, the estimate makes reference to the ‘Rustick Coins’ [quoins] of the pavilions: a feature not shown on this plan. Evidently, there is some cross-over of ideas in the surviving material, but the impression is that the basic plan and essential compositional details of the final scheme were already inherent at quite an early design stage and certainly by 1751.

Specific supplementary clauses at the end of the estimate addresses responsibility regarding the client’s provision of essential materials, and of additional carved joinery and chimneypieces in marble. Thus, the breakdown of costs in 1751 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate of the Body of the House</td>
<td>£6851.14.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto of the Offices</td>
<td>£2174.19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto of the Drains</td>
<td>£155.16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£9182.10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proved to be too expensive for Lord Dumfries, and it is clear that discussions took place as to what trimmings could be made.

29 Vitruvius Scoticus, plates 146-8
30 Vitruvius Scoticus, plate 160
The Second Estimate - c1753

Although the chronology is not precisely known, a new estimate was produced which set a new stamp on the complexion of the house. This document is again in the hand of John Adam, and details items for building, joisting, roofing, and sashing the carcass of the house, colonnades, pavilions, offices and making the drains only: all joinery and carpentry (including one stair and flooring), plastering, fittings and finishes being omitted. In this estimate, only one of the paired stairs is carried above principal level in stone.

This scheme possibly relates in its essentials to four exquisitely executed presentation drawings, which may be those referred to by Lord Dumfries on 9th March 1753, ‘M r Adam has at last finished the plans and estimates for the new house, but I have not seen them yet and of consequence have taken no resolution about them.’

These comprise plans of the ground and principal storeys and two elevations showing the entrance and garden facades, one inscribed ‘SOUTH FRONT of a NEW DESIGN for LEIFNORRIS One of the SEATS of the RIGHT HON ble THE EARL OF DUMFRIES’. It seems appropriate that this revisionist approach should be accompanied by a radically different drawing style, and may signify a more active role in matters for their author, who as the annotation at the foot of both elevations reveal is Robert Adam.

It is clear from both the estimate and the drawings that the main saving in costs was to be achieved by lowering the house a level by sacrificing one storey. Further savings were achieved by dispensing with much of the expensive stonework associated with the earlier scheme’s balustrades, vases, rusticated quoins, pedimented windows, and other carved and moulded work.

In the new scheme the elevation of the ground storey shows a ‘Rustick basement’ of polished freestone, with a simple scale and plat outer stair with balustraded ends occupying the full width of the centre three bays (probably following on the success of the Hopetoun model recently designed by John Adam). The principal storey is still distinguished by its height and windows with uniformly treated windows with architraves, frieze and cornices; while the Chamber storey windows are now sill-less square openings with lugged architraves. At the wall head, a fully articulated Great Entablature continues round the whole house, exposing the roof and pediments free of balustrades and vases.

This exercise in simplification was much more in tune with contemporary second-generation English Neo-Palladian tastes, but ironically the new design emphasises the debt owed to the much earlier Scottish prototypes of Bruce’s Harden and William Adam’s Belhaven, in plan, scale and rhythm, if not detail.

31 The drawings are referenced DHP. 4; 1-4
32 The ‘Second’ estimate refers to ‘the Architraves, Freezes, Cornishes & pediments of the Windows’. Presumably this does not signify retention of the early scheme’s pedimented windows for the principal front, but refers broadly to the pediments over the central garden front window and the entrance door.
Figure 38: Ground floor, c.1753 (top) and Principal floor, c.1753 (bottom). Presumed Robert Adam DHP/40/4. MSA. Not to scale.
Figure 39. *SOUTH FRONT of a NEW DESIGN for LEIFNORRIS One of the SEATS of the RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DUMFRIES*, C1753 (top) and North elevation, C1753 (bottom). Robert Adam, DHP 4/4-4, MSA
This comparison is made more immediate by the revelation in the estimate that the new design incorporated four ‘Intersolls’ or mezzanines, a leitmotif of Bruce that occurs at Harden in a similar situation. The later Contract drawings of 1754 locate these rooms in the ends of the house over the attic storey dressing rooms and closets: the debt owed to Bruce’s generation reinforced by the mezzanines being lighted by windows in the pulvinated frieze of the Great Architrave.  

The plan of the Principal storey is now revealed in Robert Adam’s drawings, and shows the layout as described in the first estimate of 1751, the wide transverse ‘Corridore’ (readily accommodated in the relatively deep body of the house) mentioned in the estimate, now shown to centre on the stairs and running uninterrupted from end to end. One curiosity is the asymmetry in the arrangement of the family apartments flanking the hall.

On close inspection, the plans of the ground and principal floors which would appear to belong with the elevations, show minor conflicts in detailing. The ground plan of the body of the house is still essentially that of the early sketch with the ‘Beau’ removed, and the advanced centrepiece of the north trimmed back to correspond in width with the three-bay breaking of the entrance front. Internally, the previously implied planning repercussions seem to be accommodated without difficulty: the wine cellars are now a matched pair; while the Housekeeper’s room in enlarged and partitioned differently, with a store off it. The half-landings of the internal stairs lit by paired windows in the ends are now shown as being triangular.

Both house and pavilions now communicate via the colonnades without changes in level. However, the elevation shows open (or blind?) quadrant arcades, balustraded, but without ball finals. The pavilions remain as formerly, as does the general disposition of the back courts and toofalls, but in this set of drawings there are conflicts in the detailing of plans and elevations. To the north the blind niches of the former ground plan of the offices are replaced in the new plan with a grouping of raised margins which suggests an intermediate phases with Venetian windows (as mentioned in the 1751 estimate) containing blind side lights in the towers at lower level. In the elevations the offices are shown as executed: on the north suavely chaste pairs of pedimented sham towers of apparently two storeys but whose linking walls disguise the lean-to roofs of the ‘Toofalls’ behind. The screens at either of the south elevation contain a bell and a clock and have blind arched openings surmounted by open pediments capped with single urns.

The ‘Second’ estimate for the basic construction work is summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate of the Body of the House</td>
<td>£3814.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto of the Offices</td>
<td>£1639.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto of the Drains</td>
<td>£155.16.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of the Estimates</td>
<td>£5609.1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 The Earl of Mar’s design of 1723 for House of Dun RHP 13288, 3, for example, shows mezzanines lit by windows in a frieze.
The Third Estimate - c1753-1754

This undated estimate may have had the purpose of allowing Lord Dumfries the option of fitting the new house in stages as finances allowed, while residing at the old. His neighbour, Alexander Boswell, Lord Auchinleck was later to adopt such a tactic, building his mansion 'so slowly and prudently, that he hardly felt the expense'.

The document (again by John Adam) is inscribed ‘Estimate of a House for the Right Honble The Earl of Dumfries shewing what Articles are performable by My Lord & what by John and Robert Adam’. It reproduces verbatim the contents of the ‘Second’ Estimate, with separate details of contract costs associated with fitting out with all joinery (including flooring), plasterwork and hardware to be met by the client. This method may have been intended to inform a decision by Lord Dumfries as to whether savings could be made by employing separate trades himself. The fitting out costs amounted to £2025.9.10 for the body of the house and £336.19.10 for the offices. When combined with the Adams’ prices for construction resulted in the following totals:

- Estimate of the Body of the House: £5839.9.10
- Ditto of the Offices: £1976.2.6
- Ditto of the Drains: £155.16.10
- Total: £7971.9.2

Compared with the scheme for building the four storey house of 1751 appraised at £9181.10.9, the new design represented an overall saving of £1211.1.7.

3.2.3 Construction of Dumfries House - 1754-1761

The Fourth Estimate, Contract Drawings and Contract - 1754

The ‘Fourth’ Estimate, dated 24th April 1754 was signed by John, Robert and James Adam and by Lord Dumfries, signifying its endorsement relative to the finalised scheme. The specification is essentially the same as the ‘Third’ Estimate with an additional item of £8.2.0, making a revised total of £7979.11.2.

The Adams were to be contractors for all the work, with the same clause common to all previous estimates, that:

'It is understood that My Lord is to dig the Foundations; Furnish all Materials for the Masons & Plaisterers work, & Lyme for the Sclaters work, And to lay them down on the Spot; To perform all the Carriages of every kind; Furnish Scaffolding, Cooms, Mortar Mares, Troughs &ca.; Sower the whole Lyme; and pay the trades peoples Travelling days'.

Despite the later date of this Estimate, the decision must have been taken in 1753 to proceed, as a memorandum of 8th August 1753 showed that Lord Dumfries was already making preparations for works to be carried out the following season as following:

1. Digging out of the Great Drain
2. Quarries worked at Templand, Pennyland and the ‘Quarry outside the Parks’.

34 A Allardyce, Scotland and Scotsmen in the Eighteenth Century (1888), I, 165-6
3. A new road was to be constructed from the Templand quarry to the High Road, and another up the bank on the south side of the Shaw Wood.

4. A Drawkiln was to be built on the face of this bank.

5. Extra horses, oxen and carts to be bought or hired for hauling.

6. Workmen to be housed in the Nest, and at Pennyland; and a flying bridge to be fixed for crossing the Lugar Water.

7. Timber for Scaffolding, cooms, carts, etc., of birch and ash to be supplied largely from the estate.

8. A shed or lodge for the masons to work in to be put up opposite the east end of the west pavilion, 20 or 30 feet from its front and facing east.

A new and complete set of final presentation drawings on six sheets was settled upon and adopted as the template for the scheme as specified in the ‘Fourth’ Estimate and the Contract itself. These, all signed by both client and architects (at or after the date of the Contract) comprise:

1. Title Elevation, inscribed ‘South Front of Leifnorris House, one of the Seats of the Right Honourable the Earl of Dumfries’.

2. Elevation of the ‘North Front’.

3. Elevation of ‘One of the Ends’.


5. Plan of the ‘Principal Floor’.


These elevations and plans (probably by Robert Adam) vary a little from the previous undated ‘New Design’. On the south front, the quadrant colonnades are now closed, but fenestrated, and the balustrades over them now have ball finials. The height of the attic floor windows is increased slightly from square in the previous design, to a diagonal of the square tall.

The plans and elevation reveal that the previous constant of paired windows lighting the stairs at either end are now articulated quite differently. At ground level there is a single rectangular window, then in ascending order; a Roman Thermal window, a Venetian window, and window in the frieze of the pediment of the advanced ends. The flanking frieze windows serve the mezzanines.

For the first time, the exact placement of the ‘Great Drain’ and its outlet direction is shown. At principal floor level the family apartments are now symmetrically arranged.

The lodging and attic storeys are combined on one floor as a consequence of the decision to delete a storey from the earliest scheme. The pressure on accommodation is evident by the substitution of four minor bedrooms and closets in place of the formerly intended Gallery. And, the layout and access of the mezzanine and garrets is now apparent.

---

[35] Contract drawings: DHP/1, 1-6
Figure 40 South elevation, 1754 contract drawing, Robert Adam, M SA
Figure 41: North elevation, 1754 contract drawing, Robert Adam, MSA
Figure 42  Elevation of one of the ends of the house, contract drawing 1754. Robert Adam, M SA

Figure 43  Contract signature on all drawings in the 1754 contract set, signed by John, Robert and James Adam. M SA
Figure 44  Ground floor plan, 1754 contract drawing. Robert Adam, MSA
Figure 45 Principal floor plan, 1754 contract drawing, Robert Adam, M.S.A.
Figure 46  Chamber floor plan, contract drawing 1754. Robert Adam, MSA

Figure 47  Attic floor plan showing intersolls/ mezzanine rooms and garret spaces within the original roof, contract drawing 1754. Robert Adam, MSA
On 11th December 1753 Andrew Hunter wrote from Edinburgh informing the Earl: ‘Mr Whitefoord [of Ballochmyle] told me the other day that he had the night before a visit from Mr John Adam who left with him the Scroll of a draught of the Contract for your House which he was to look over and send to me’. By 9th February 1754 Hunter and Whitefoord has perfected this to accommodate some amendments by Lord Dumfries, and on the 20th of the same month, Whitefoord was about to send out a copy of the Contract to Lord Dumfries by courier, being ‘too bulkie’ for the post. A final copy of the Contract was written out by Hunter’s clerk, John McHaffie and signed by John, Robert and James Adam (witnessed by Andrew Hunter and Alan Whitefoord of Ballochmyle) at Edinburgh on the 24th April 1754; and by Lord Dumfries at Leifnorris (witnessed by Andrew Hunter and the Earl’s servant Joseph Wilson) on 16th May 1754.

Lord Dumfries’s gardener Robert Neilson was appointed overseer of the work, while the Adams’ foreman of the masons was John Mitchell. Neilson’s accounts of disbursements on behalf of Lord Dumfries provide valuable evidence of the day to day carrying on of those aspects of the work that were the responsibility of the Earl. These commenced in 1753, when payments to named local labourers at typical rates of 6d per day begin to appear in connection with digging out the trench for the Great Drain and foundations. No comparable information exists relative to the Adams’ workforce, who were engaged from an established pool of operatives, and from whose labour a substantial part of the profits derived.

By April 1754 the Adams were acting as agents to Lord Dumfries for the supply of four-wheeled carriages for transporting heavy lifting gear from Edinburgh in preparation for building.

**The Great Drain**

On the 8th August 1753 the ‘Requirements of the Great Drain’ were set out in a memorial relating to the carrying on the works of Leifnorris House.

The memorial suggested that work would not be carried out in this season, but preparation for the next season would be required. It indicated that the great drain needed lots of stone, lime and sand. Common building stone was suggested as suitable for the side walls of the drain, but flat edged stone must be got for the arch, the tops and the flagging of the bottom.

The drain was specified to be 3½ feet wide in the clear with the side walls 18 inches thick. The trench to be dug was to be 6½ feet deep at the west end of the west pavilion below the surface of the ground. It was to slope down 7 feet perpendicular to the east end of the east pavilion and from that into the Ditch at the sunk fence, to slope 5 feet perpendicular more. The earth was to be thrown on the south side until the space over the drain was filled up.

---

36 DU/5/37/24 The scroll contract, DU/5/29, 7 is dated 1754.
37 DU/5/37/27 Andrew Hunter to Lord Dumfries, 9th February 1754. Lord Dumfries proposed amendments are in DU/5/29/8.
38 DU/5/37/28, Andrew Hunter to Lord Dumfries 20th February 1754.
39 The contract is referenced DU/5/29/9
41 DU/5/71/109 & 114
42 DU/5/29/6, MSA,
The quarries to be most depended upon included Templand for the outsides of the two fronts and two ends, and the red stone at the corner of the ‘clump of firs’ on the Pennyland side for the insides of these outer walls. Templand stone was also to be used and for all the inner walls. The quarry at the outside of the Parks was also mentioned as a possibility to serve only for employing the carriages when the river was high and workers were unable to cross to the Pennyland side.

Stone dimensions specified:

- 66 feet running of Base 1’3” thick and at least 1’ broad on the bed.
- 190 feet running of the base 1’ 6” thick and same breadth on the bed.
- 140 pieces of Rustick 2’ long, 1’ thick and from 10-12” broad on the bed
- 30 pieces of Rustick 2’ 9” inches long and same breadth
- 600 pieces Rustick 2’ long, 1’ 3” inches thick and same breadth
- 60 pieces 2’ 9” long, 1’ 3” thick and same breadth
- 200 pieces Rustick 1’ 9” long, same thickness and breadth
- 300 feet running of Bell, 1’ thick, 1’ 6” broad at bed
- 30 stones for steps from 5 to 6 feet long, 15” broad, 7” thick
- 20 stones for newaal steps and plats from 5½ to 8 feet long, 2½’ broad at one end and 1’ broad at the other and 7” thick

All of these were to come from the Templand Quarry. The following was to come from the quarry at the back of the Parks.

- 400 pieces of ashlars for rebates and corners to doors and chimneys within the ground floor from 15-20” long, 1’ high and 9-12” broad on the head.
- 30 stone for lintels to doors from 4’ 3” to 5’ 6” long, about 14” broad and 7-8” thick.

A new road to the Templand Quarry was formed to avoid flooding of the existing road when the river was high.

Workers were to stay at the Nest and Pennyland House and a rope and pulley system was suggested to make the river ‘always passable’ for those staying at Pennyland house when the river flooded.43

A large quantity of scaffolding timber was required for the work to the Great Drain and to save money, it was suggested that the timber came from the Earl’s woods. Fir trees were suggested to be well suited for vaulting framing and for the inside arches of windows and doors, as well as for lath. Birch trees from Shaw Wood were suggested as the larger girth trees might be suitable for trusses. The ash trees were recommended that they be spared until fully grown.

During the works, an account suggested that even wooden packing cases were to be broken up and used for lath for many rooms within the house, particularly in the service areas.44

43 The only recorded fatality during construction of the house was that of William Nasmith, mason, aged 40, who died in a fall from Dumfries House on the 3rd November 1756. Sanderson, M Robert Adam in Ayrshire - Ayrshire Monographs No. 11 Ayrshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, April 1993, p7
A masons shed was also recommended to be built immediately south of the east end of the west pavilion, facing east, with the end of it to be about 20 or 30 foot distant from the front of the pavilion.

The Foundation Stone

The foundation stone was laid on 18th July 1754 with great ceremony. The sponsors were Katherine, Duchess of Gordon (sister of Lady Dumfries), General Bland, and the Hon. James Wemyss. Proceedings were reported in the Scots Magazine (coincidentally on the same day that John Adam’s hijacked scheme for the Edinburgh Exchange was commenced):

They write from Leifnorris in the shire of Air, that on the 18th July, The Earl of Dumfries laid the first stone of a magnificent house to be erected by his Lordship, called Dumfries house, in presence of many persons of distinction of both sexes, who were invited to witness the solemnity.

Robert Adam, who had been in attendance, left for Edinburgh soon after. On 27th July, Andrew Hunter reported to Lord Dumfries ‘Mr Robert Adam called here on Monday last and informed me of the Company your Lop had and the proceedings at Laying the foundation of Dumfries House, and at the same time showed me a writing containing a different account of it which he said he had shown to M r Whitefoord and desired that I might get it published in the Courant’. This duly appeared in a more ebullient style than the prosaic earlier report:

Many persons of distinction... were transported to the field where the new House is to be built, through a crowd of people who had lined the road. Tents were pitched for the Reception of the company, who witnessed the foundations stone’s being carried from the principal tent & laid attended by a band of music. The King, the Royal Family, The Lord Chancellor & many other loyal healths were drunk. Handsome presents were made to the work men, who join’d the people in loud acclamations at every health, & on sincere wishes for success to the work & prosperity to that noble family. In the evening the trees were illuminated with lamps, and the whole ceremony concluded with a Ball.

This Watteau-esque idyll might be overstated, as in the same letter Hunter observes ‘all this summer has been rainy and Cold’.

Having conveyed the manuscript of this happy event, Robert Adam acquainted Hunter that £1,500 was now due as the first instalment as specified in the contract. Hunter scoured round for sums of interest due on various bonds of Lord Dumfries, and negotiated advances with the British Linen Company, and went ‘directly from that office to Mr Adams and paid him £1,500 and got his receipt... I wish I had also a receipt for the last M oity and could put in the Newspapers that Dumfries House was finished’.

Within a few days Robert was back at Dumfries House whence he wrote to his mother: ‘I thought to have wrote you by Tuesday’s post from this Place, but really was so occupied with Drinking and seeing nothing, that it was not in my power to fulfil my intentions. We arrived here on Sundays afternoon, where we found no Strangers But all the family in good Health and Top humour Since that time Alexr Godron My Lady’s Brother return’d from Bargeny where he had been with M r Charteris & M r Wemyss, who return’d

44 MSA, DU 5/29/14. Mr Mitchell & Mr Thomson’s account how the timber was applied about Dumfries House.
last week to Newmilns, He has been here ever since, & is a fine Boy, so that we are always merry and Laughing'.

At this point Adam alludes to his impending Grand Tour:

‘I have given M y Lord [Dumfries] an account of my Travels who is not fond of C[harles] H[ope]; as he thinks him a vast Scrub & says he imagines I must stay a while after him [in Italy] in order to make my acquaintances. I often gave hints about Letters of Recommendation But find that He does not Chuse to give any where Hope is to be the introducer; & I suppose thinks them needless on that account & you know one cannot insist for that one their own behalf...

Robert reveals to his mother that he had invited Lord and Lady Dumfries to the Adam household in the Cowgate, and was teased for going abroad after extending the invitation, but that they had ‘a great desire to be acquainted’ with her. The next day Robert was to set out for Inveraray where he and John had appointed to settle accounts with the Duke of Argyll for superintending the building work there since 1745. While there, Robert received the anticipated call from Lord Hopetoun’s brother, Charles Hope, to join him on the Continent on the first stage of their Grand Tour.

Thus Robert Adam bows out of the building of Dumfries House, which had been, according to his relation and biographer John Clerk of Eldin, ‘more particularly superintended as a fried of the Earl’. Whatever the level of responsibility in the design stages, so lucidly conveyed in the presentation drawings, it was under the direction of the practical and accomplished John Adam that the house was so beautifully constructed.

Completion of each stage of the building programme as determined in the Contract was recorded formally in certificates issued jointly by Robert Neilson as Overseer, and John Mitchell as Foreman of the Masons. Corresponding payments were then authorised through Andrew Hunter in Edinburgh for the Adams, who in turn issues receipts for the instalments. Most of these survive and may be tabulated thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instalment to Architects</th>
<th>When Due</th>
<th>Actual Date</th>
<th>Payment Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Instalment £1500</td>
<td>Foundation laid</td>
<td>18th July 1754</td>
<td>26 July 1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Instalment £1000</td>
<td>Ground storey vaults made</td>
<td>4th August 1755</td>
<td>28th August 1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Instalment £800</td>
<td>Joisting over principal storey</td>
<td>9th June 1756</td>
<td>24th June 1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Instalment £800</td>
<td>Entablature &amp; Garret joists laid</td>
<td>18th December 1756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Instalment £800</td>
<td>Timber &amp; lead of roof complete</td>
<td>15th August 1757</td>
<td>18th August 1757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 NAS GD\18\4744  Clerk of Penicuik MSS
46 No bargain had been made with William Adam in 1745, so the £300 received for the entire period was not derided by either John or Robert.
47 NAS GD18\4892, ‘Mr Clerk’s life of R.A.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instalment</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>East pavilion &amp; colonnade roofed</td>
<td>8th November 1757</td>
<td>16th December 1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>West pavilion &amp; colonnade roofed</td>
<td>12th August 1758</td>
<td>29th August 1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Toofalls roofed; Back court walls done</td>
<td>3rd February 1759</td>
<td>2nd June 1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Wright, plaster &amp; smith work complete</td>
<td>1759/ 1760</td>
<td>[discharged 1764]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£7979.11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the house was essentially complete by the end of 1759, full payment was not made to John Adam for some years, but which time a small balance due had become embedded in accounts for additional building works on the estate. Similarly, John Bonnar, painter, submitted accounts to Lord Dumfries in December 1759, 48 and July 1760 49 but he was not paid for the painterwork carried out on the house until October 1761.

It would appear that finishing touches to the house in late 1759 and early 1760 were creating difficulties relating to setting up home. In the spring of 1760 Lord Dumfries returned from London, and in a letter to Lord Loudon on 12th April exclaimed ‘I have been most extremely busie since I cam home hastning finishing the House that it might be ready to receive the company in time. The wrights, plasterers, and painters have been rather dilatory otherwise, and Mr Adam was never more wanted here than at this present, which I beg your Lordship will be so good as to tell him if you shall chance to meet him’.

There was also some dissatisfaction with some aspects of the interior. Writing from Dumfries House on 18th May 1760, implying that the family were already in residence in advance of the house-warming scheduled for the 4th June, Lord Dumfries Complained to Andrew Hunter ‘Mr Adam has used me shamefully, as to the stairs, locks, and backs of grates that were all broke down or cracked before we came into the house which will I’m afraid never give me real satisfaction and cannot be agreeable to the strangers and others that are soon to see it which considering the furniture is monstrous...’ 50

There are some salient points to consider in terms of the Adams’ responsibility for the interiors. A set of room sections, probably by Robert Adam, survive and although not signed either by architect or client, are critical to the execution of the interiors relative to the Contract and Estimate of 1754. Of primary interest are the drawings for the Drawing room and Dining room which detail the frieze and cornices of the walls, wall panels, joinery, chimneypieces and over-mantles. These are rather conservative interiors and may owe their inspiration to elements culled from published sources. Again, the vocabulary of Ware’s Designs of Inigo Jones may be detected. In the Drawing room the repeating pattern in the frieze of masks and garlands seems to quote from a detail of plate 1 from this source which depicts a chimneypiece at Chiswick. The Robert Adam chimneypiece is perhaps derived from plates 2, 32, 36 and the overmantel based on that in plate 34, with the scrolled pediment made triangular. The large wall panels are specifically made to house

48 MSA, DU5/ 34/ 15
49 MSA, DU5/ 34/ 19
50 DU\ 5\ / 33\ / 11
tapestries owned by Lord Dumfries via Lord Stair to whom they were originally gifted by Louis XIV.

The Adam drawing for the Dining room is even more elaborate with pedimented doorcases with stucco festoons over them. Again the chimneypiece and overmantel may be derived from Ware plates 3 and 35; and 27 and 37 respectively, while the large panel on the east wall has something of the character of Ware, plate 50.

Figure 48 Room sections of the Drawing Room (P2) (left) and original Dining Room (P13) (right), 1754. Adam Brothers. M SA

Figure 49 Room sections of the Parlour (P8) (left) and the Family Bedchamber (P7) (right), 1754. Adam Brothers. M SA
Figure 50  Room sections of My Lord’s Dressing Room (P9)(left) and a Bedchamber on the Chamber floor (originally referred to as the Attick Storey) (right), 1754. Adam Brothers. M SA

Figure 51  Plates 2 (left) and 36 (right). The Design of Inigo Jones, 1731.
Figure 52  Plates 27 (left) and 34 (right). The Design of Inigo Jones, 1731.

Figure 53  Plates 37 (left) and 3 (right). The Design of Inigo Jones, 1731.
Although these drawings faithfully informed the architectural framework of the interiors, in execution some of the detail was altered. The chimney pieces for these two rooms were ultimately supplied to different designs by George Mercer of London in 1757.\textsuperscript{51} As for the plasterwork, that too was executed differently. In this respect the drawings of the two public rooms are significant for what they do not show – the ceilings, which as carried out are on of the crowning glories and most original features of the interiors. It is not know whether Robert’s absence during the building phase led to departures from his interior schemes, or whether the stuccoist

\textsuperscript{51} DU/ 5/ 34/ 6-7 Missive and bill relative to marble items supplied by George Mercer.
himself assumed responsibility for the designs of the ceilings. In William Adam’s time, for example, the stuccoist Joseph Enzer seems to have chosen the decorative detail of his work within a broader prescribed architectural context.\textsuperscript{52}

The ceiling of the Drawing Room is an astonishing tour-de-force of Rococo plasterwork, consisting of very fluid tendrils of partly abstracted, partly botanically accurate renditions of foliage and flowers in which the thistle predominates in reference to Lord Dumfries’s tenure as a Knight of the Thistle. The ceiling of the Dining Room is more geometric in character with repeated low relief octagons interposed with foliate bosses and a central ceiling rose.\textsuperscript{53}

The author of these works and of the other Rococo plasterwork in the coves and walls of the Hall and Parlour is not recorded. Sir John Stirling Maxwell thought that Thomas Clayton was responsible on the basis of his recorded work at Pollock House and St Andrews Church, Glasgow of similar date, but the Dumfries House work seems rather different from his characteristic style. Another possibility is John Dawson, a London-trained Scot who was enticed back to his native land by John and Robert Adam specifically to work for them at Hopetoun from 1750 as a carver and stuccoist.\textsuperscript{54} Certainly some of the work in the coves at Hopetoun is similar to the work in the Hall and Parlour of Dumfries House. One other contender is Philip Robertson (b.1722), a first cousin of the Adam brothers and former apprentice to Joseph Enzer.\textsuperscript{55} Robertson had worked on many Adam projects from 1736 and at the time of the building of Dumfries House was employed by them at Buchanan, and Inveraray. Further, he was responsible for the plasterwork at Auchincruive in the mid 1760s, under John and Robert Adam, where Lord Dumfries’s local master mason Adam Smith was superintendant.\textsuperscript{56}

The Adam/Robertson/Crichton-Dalrymple connection at Dumfries House is further reinforced by the presence of the ‘King’s Smith’ David Robertson (brother of Philip), who supplied most of the new grates, fenders and other fireplace furniture to Lord Dumfries in 1760.\textsuperscript{57} If any further proof of such ties is needed, William Boyd Robertson (son of Henry Robertson, Lord Dumfries’s factor at Clackmannan), became factor to Lord Dumfries for exactly the duration of the building phases of the house 1754-61.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{52} At Yester in 1743 some of Enzer’s choice of work did not meet with Adam’s approval. ‘Poor Joseph Enzer died last week; Among the last things he did was altering a Trophy he done over the pediment of the chimney piece in the Garden Parlour. I complaint’d of it to him and indeed he has put a much better in its place, a vase with some mosaic work. He has filled up the pannal of that Chimney where your Lop intended a picture, in Basso Relevo which is very neatly execute, & I dare say Your Lop will be as well satisfied with it as with any picture that could have been put there.’ NLS, MS 14551, f.93, William Adam to the Marques of Tweeddale, 5th July 1743.

\textsuperscript{53} The often supposed similarity of the Dining Room to the plate of the ceiling of the Temple of the Sun in Robert Wood’s Ruins of Palmyra (1753) does not stand up to scrutiny.


\textsuperscript{55} Robertson appears in Enzer’s day book as apprentice to him at Yester in 1736.

\textsuperscript{56} Edinburgh University Library, Oswald of Auchincruive MSS, Dk.130, ff.73,80, 104. 1766-7.

\textsuperscript{57} DU/5/34/5 Account. Earl of Dumfries to David Robertson for £114.18.8, 19th and 24th June 1761. Mainly for Dumfries House, but including minor items to the Earls Edinburgh House from 1756. Robertson also discounts coal from his uncle Henry Robertson, as factor to the Earl at Clackmannan. David Robertson (1716-1730 was apprenticed to George Old Locksmith, Edinburgh 1734; At the time of his death he resided at the head of the Cowgate and designated ‘King’s Smith’, a position that reflects lucrative government contracts with the Board of Ordnance.

\textsuperscript{58} See DU/5/61-64: Accounts of charge and discharge between William Crichton-Dalrymple, 9th Earl of Dumfries and William Boyd Robertson, his factor.
**18th Century Configuration of the House**

When completed, the original house comprised Ground floor, Principal floor, Chamber floor and Attic level. The symmetrical house comprised a main body of house with east and west wings.

![Figure 56](image) Inset showing elevation of Dumfries House and Mains, John Home's Survey 1772. MSA

**Ground Floor**

At Ground floor level, the west wing contained: Woman house (with 2 beds) and closet; laundry; stair to upper bedrooms; and within the service court - Coall Yard; Ash Yard; Back Court; Place for feeding of fowls; Scullery for the Milk House; Milk House and Back Court with lavatories. The main body of the house contained: a place for empty bottles (beneath the front stair); Small beer Cellar; full length corridor; Nursery (with beds and closets); Butler’s Room (with bed); Pantry; Porter’s Lodge (with bed); 2 no. wine cellars; Service stairs at either side of the house; Housekeeper’s Room (with bed and closet); My Lady’s Woman’s Room (with bed and closet); Store room; Second Table Room (presumably the senior staff dining room); My Lord’s Vally’s Room (with bed and closet); and Latter Meat(?) Room (presumably the junior/lower staff room). The east wing of the house at this level comprised: the Kitchen; Scullery; Larder; Cook’s room; Cook’s Pantry; Bake House and oven; Brew House; Gyle House; Ash Yard; Coal Yard; Back Court and smaller Back Court with lavatories. Curved corridors (shown as ‘Collonades’) linked both the east and west wings to the main body of the house and central corridor at ground floor level only.
Figure 57  Ground floor detail of the main part of the house from the contract drawings, 1754. M SA
Figure 58  Ground floor detail of the west wing from the contract drawings, 1754. M SA

Figure 59  Ground floor detail of the east wing from the contract drawings, 1754. M SA
Principal Floor

The Principal floor level of the house as built comprised the following according to the signed contract drawings of 1754 in the west wing: Above the Laundry and Woman’s Room was a series of 4 no. bedrooms, each with closets around a central stair; a platform is indicated off the upper floor passage and roofs are shown over the Milk House etc and the curved corridor linking to the main house. The main body of the house has on its principal level, a Main Entrance Hall off the main stair; flanked by a Drawing Room to the west and Dining Room to the east; Central corridor; north Parlour; Parlour flanked by a suite of rooms containing My Lady’s Bed Chamber, closet and dressing room to the west, and a separate suite of rooms containing My Lord’s Dressing Room, closet and Charter Room to the east. The central corridor has staircases at both the east and west ends. The east wing at Principal floor level is symmetrical to the west wing, also containing 4 no. bedrooms with closets.

Figure 60  Principal floor detail of the main part of the house from the contract drawings, 1754. M SA
**Figure 61** Principal floor detail of the west wing of the house from the contract drawings, 1754. M SA

**Figure 62** Principal floor detail of the east wing of the house from the contract drawings, 1754. M SA
Chamber Floor

At Chamber floor, known as the Lodgeing, or Attick Story on the Contract drawings of 1754, this level comprised at each corner: 4 no. suites of rooms containing Bedroom, Closet and Dressing Room. The central space off the corridor comprised 2 no. large bedrooms; 2 no. small bedrooms, closets off all and 2 no. Servant’s rooms. There is a main corridor with the stairs continuing up at either end. See figure 46 for floor plan of this level.

Attic Level

Above the Chamber level was the original attic level, identified on the 1754 Contract drawings as the plan of the Intersolls, or Garrets. The mezzanine rooms off the landing between Chamber and Attic levels on both east and west sides of the building are shown as Bedrooms with closets. The rest of this level is shown as large garret spaces that would have been used for storage. See figure 47 for floor plan of this level.

The Place of Dumfries House in Scottish Architecture

When William Adam died in 1748, the early Georgian phase of Scottish architecture came to an end. William’s output towards the end of his life was considerably reduced by comparison with that of the 1730s and much of his energy was spent on construction, mining, civil engineering and other business enterprises. His contracts for the building of Inveraray Castle, designed by Roger Morris, and Fort George, by
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59 Personal Comments James Simpson
Colonel Skinner, were his largest undertakings by far. The cost of Fort George in the 18th century has been compared with that of Trident at the end of the 20th century!

John Adam was 27, Robert 21 and James just 17, when their father died, and for the first few years, John was very much in charge. John Adam was, by general consent, a capable builder and a businessman, but not a particularly able architect: his designs had a slightly awkward austerity and none of the ‘brio’ of his father’s work. It is hard to imagine John producing a Duff, a Chatelherault or a Mavisbank.

From a fairly early stage, however, Robert began to outshine his older and younger brothers, both in architecture and socially. In the completion of Hopetoun, it was Robert who had the assurance to depart from his father’s designs and who seems to have gained the confidence of the family and it was through Lord Hopetoun that the brothers obtained the commission to design Dumfries House.

Dumfries House, much more than the contemporary work at Hopetoun, is the outstanding work of the period in Scotland. The architecture has an ‘Augustan’ quality: handsome, well proportioned and beautifully built; plain, but by no means austere. It is still a Palladian house with wings and, though comparable with some of James Paine’s contemporary work, its symmetrical planning is rare in Scottish architecture. Only Sir James Clerk’s Penicuik House was comparable in quality and stature and, by the 1760s, the format was distinctly old-fashioned. The interiors, by contrast, were far from staid: up to the minute in the age of lightness, chinoiserie and asymmetrical rococo and were, in this, the perfect setting for what has been called ‘the reference collection’ of the work of Chippendale and his Scottish contemporaries.

It was, however, Robert Adam himself who ensured that this ‘Augustan’ phase of mid 18th century Scottish architecture was short-lived. Much of the work on Dumfries House was completed after 1754, when he departed on his grand tour with the young Charles Hope. When Robert returned in 1758, it was with the clear intention of completely overturning the architectural taste of the age. Palladianism and the rococo rapidly became history and the neoclassicism of ‘Bob the Roman’ was soon all the rage. The 1750s stand out, therefore, as a short-lived, but key period in the history of Georgian architecture: Dumfries House is the key work of the ‘mid-Georgian’ decade.

Dumfries House Furniture Collection

Dumfries House contains Scotland’s most important and extensive collection of 18th century rococo furniture. Most of this remains in situ, as it was executed, and as such presents an unrivalled opportunity for detailed study of luxury carvers’ work from Edinburgh’s top firms. The collection is also the outstanding monument to Thomas Chippendale the Elder’s rococo phase, represented by fully documented pieces for which accounts survive from 1759, 1763 and 1766.60

The Chippendale Furniture

Scotland was the ‘proving ground’ for Thomas Chippendale’s early rococo furniture and Dumfries House was the key work. Because it was the first major commission of his ‘Director’ period, it was an experiment and his patron, the 5th Earl of Dumfries, was certainly aware of this. Correspondence shows the 5th Earl to have been excited by his purchases from Chippendale, picking up on the infectious enthusiasm that the
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60 Bills and correspondence, MSA
designer had for his own ideas. Because of the important Scottish connection in Chippendale’s business, just over 25% of the subscribers to The Gentleman and Cabinet Maker’s Director were from Scotland. The early presence of such a relatively large number of copies of this document throughout the country had a lasting influence that can be seen even today. A visitor is as likely to find Chippendale-derived furniture in a croft or crofting museum as in a country house. However, Dumfries House was the first manifestation of these Director designs and this is why it is so culturally important for Scotland.

The commission is very well documented in Christopher Gilbert’s The Life and Work of Thomas Chippendale, but the following is a summary list of the significant pieces that date to the period of the 5th Earl of Dumfries.

**Best Bed**

Important because it conforms exactly to the design in the 3rd edition of the Director (1762) which records that the model had ‘been made for the Earls of Dumfries and Morton’. It was therefore a prototype for the printed pattern book design. The model made for the Earl of Morton is untraced, leaving the Dumfries bed as the only one in existence.

---

*Figure 64* The Chippendale Best Bed. Christie’s

*Figure 65* One of the two Chippendale Drawing Room girandoles. Christie’s

---

Drawing Room Seat Furniture

The fourteen elbow chairs and two settees, originally supplied for the White Drawing Room but now spread between this room and the Pink and North Drawing Rooms, capture the spirit of Thomas Chippendale’s early rococo phase perhaps more than any other items except the original Drawing Room girandoles. They are matched by a pair of plain mahogany card tables that are unique in Chippendale’s repertoire.

Drawing Room Girandoles

Iconic pieces of Chippendale design that are correspondent with plate LXXVIII in the Director and are fully documented.

Black and Gold Lacquered Clothes Press

This pre-dates the lacquered furniture at Nostell Priory, Yorkshire, by twelve years. It was constructed using real oriental lacquer and is lined with Chippendale’s signature marbled paper, on trays that have been recently re-united with the piece.

Boulle Commode

A commode decorated with inlaid brass and tortoiseshell in the manner of A C Boulle. Most unusual in Chippendale’s repertoire and therefore of special importance.

Best Bedroom Overmantel

The carving that frames this English carpet tile panel is of particular quality and makes it an especially good study piece for understanding Chippendale’s workshop techniques.

**Figure 66** Chippendale black and gold lacquered clothes press. Christies

**Figure 67** The Chippendale rosewood bookcase. Christies
Rosewood Bookcase

The most flamboyant piece in the house. In Padouk, but described by Chippendale as rosewood.

The Scottish Furniture

The Scottish furniture in the house is the major reference collection of its kind. No other museum or country house can match its content and quality. There are pieces from the workshops of Francis Brodie, Alexander Peter, William Mathie, James MacDowall and other, as yet unidentified, Edinburgh wrights. If chimney furniture is included, then this also, is the best collection of work by Scottish fashionable furniture makers, including David Robertson and John Richardson.

Francis Brodie

The Lady’s Closet by Brodie, made of Padouk wood with brass-inlaid cabinet and drawers, is the most significant piece in this cabinet maker’s known repertoire. The eagle table, corner cupboard and overmantel glasses are representative of his fashionable range (as were illustrated on his printed billhead).

Alexander Peter

Peter supplied most of the seat furniture, beds and tables to the house. His seat furniture is important because it represents experimental variation on the theme of
Thomas Chippendale’s first edition Director designs. The beds are the only identified examples of carved and gilded work from Peter’s shop. The bed cornice and matching curtain pelmets in Lady Bute’s downstairs bedroom are the finest examples of his craftsmanship in this medium. They pick up on a small design detail in plate XXVII of Thomas Chippendale’s Director.

The sideboard table in the Dining Room is the earliest documented piece of Scottish furniture to follow a Director pattern. Of the quantity of other tables by Peter, most significant are the bedroom tables, a distinctively Scottish sort that was designed to be a space saving item used when receiving guests in the bedroom, a custom that lingered on in Scottish country houses when it had disappeared elsewhere. The type was made from less expensive timber for smaller houses, but survival has been low in this domestic context, hence the importance of the examples at Dumfries House.

William Mathie

The Dining Room (now Pink Drawing Room) contains what is the most iconic piece of Scottish rococo carving in existence; Mathie’s frame for a painting by Jacopo Bassano. This light frame, attached to the wall, is delightfully natural, with plenty of Scottish fresh air between its scrolls and floral trails. It was invoiced by Mathie in 1760 at £12.

Elsewhere in the house he supplied a sequence of full-height looking glasses, some of which are carved with thistles and the badge of the Order of the Thistle. This reflects the 5th Earl of Dumfries’s receipt of the Order in 1752, an honour he received for his service to King George II in the War of the Austrian Succession, particularly his part in the Battle of Dettingen, 1743. By deliberately commissioning Mathie to carve the thistle motif in this manner, the Earl was emulating his friend Sir Robert Walpole, 1st Earl of Orford, who had done the same thing – but using the English Order of the Garter at his house, Houghton Hall, in Norfolk. There are several parallels between the two houses that would repay further research.

Other Furnishings

Supporting the major players, as at every authentic country house, there is a cast of lesser-known and anonymous figures. James MacDowall provided a quantity of plain brown furniture in the decade following completion of the new mansion. Amongst this group are items in Scottish cabinet timbers such as Laburnum Alpinum, which are of national importance. There is a substantial run of case furniture, mainly bureaux and chests of drawers, by an unidentified Scottish cabinet maker. They can be verified as Scottish by their characteristic construction details, such as drawer format and the appearance of strengthening muntins (or munters).

A quantity of curtains and soft furnishings was supplied by the Edinburgh upholsterers Young and Trotter in 1759. Some of these survive and are significant because they are products of Edinburgh’s leading 18th century upholstery company.

An important suite of gilt Drawing Room seat furniture by Whytock and Reid in the Louis XVI style (eight items) exists in the house. This is significant because it is a fine example of a phase of this Edinburgh company’s output that is not represented in museum collections.
Dumfries House Landscape

1756 Estate Plan surveyed by John Smith

Drawn at a point when the building of the new house had begun, but while the old house of Leithnorris remained, this plan may include features which were proposed - in particular it shows a completed new house, although the building was not to be finished for another seven years - and it certainly includes features not shown on the Home survey of 14 years later.

This plan shows that the central conceit of the original design was a broad straight ride, shown in green on the plan, running north-south, with the new house at the centre. The ride narrows slightly at the house, giving it a slight ‘waist’ at this point. To the south the ride terminated at the top of Blackwood Hill, flanked on either side by the two roundels Stair and Blann Mount. At the north end two half roundels flank a wall. From the house the southern end of the ride terminated naturally with the crest of the hill. At the north end no view-closer is shown, but mid-way between the half roundels was to be the site of the Temple. Roughly half-way between the site of the Temple and the house was the Lugar Water.

In addition to the new house, Smith’s plan shows Leithnorris, its walled garden and associated buildings, the Mains and Pennyland. The 17th century doocot is shown, and possibly the Nest, a cottage where some of the workforce were housed. The Avenue Bridge, Stables, Coach House, and Laundry, for which John Adam’s 1760 estimates exist, are not shown. The Temple is not shown.

No road reaches the new house in this plan, and instead the entrance from the main road between Ayr and Cumnock passes the Mains and proceeds straight to Leifnorris. Just to the east of the Mains, however, and within the broad ride, the main road is flanked to north and south by large semi-circular clearings. At Dalkeith Palace a similar feature allowed the visitor to leave the public road, and enter the park through elegant gates. No gates are shown on the Smith plan, and it may be that at this stage of construction the feature was there merely to allow passers by (and the Earl himself) to leave the traffic and gaze down at the building site. On the ground, interestingly, this point in the road is rather low, and would not now offer a particularly good view of the house. It is possible that the road was at this date higher than now.
Figure 70 ‘A Plan of the Inclosures, Plantations and Policy Pertaining unto and possessed by The Right Honourable The Earle of Dumfries’, John Smith 1756. MSA
Design Context of the Mid-18th Century Policies

The policies around the new house were relatively modest in scale, in keeping with both the house and the Earl’s budget, although not, if his agent Hunter is to be believed, in accordance with his vaunting ambition\(^\text{62}\). Contemporary landscapes, as laid out by, for instance the Earl of Hopetoun (who is known to have advised the Earl on his architectural scheme) could be on an extensive scale (figure 71-72). Within Ayrshire, the designed landscapes at Eglington and Fullarton also dwarf the policies at Dumfries House.

\[\text{Figure 71  Roy’s Survey, detail Arniston estate, designed by William Adam, 1750s. BL}\]
\[\text{Figure 72  Roy’s Survey, detail Hopetoun estate 1750s. BL}\]

The majority of the policies around Dumfries House were laid out with profitable plantations of timber, with only a small area to the east of the house given to ornamental allées around a Bowling Green, an essential feature for a fashionable estate. This area, and the radial vistas of the roundels, were the only parts of the policies which would have needed to be managed primarily for aesthetic effect. While at other richer, estates there were complicated wilderness planting, ‘cabinets’ of ornamental plants, and artificial water features, at Dumfries House very little work was done to ornament the policies which was not also profitable.

\[\text{Figure 73  Smith plan, detail of Mount Blann, part of Stair Mount, 1756. MSA}\]
\[\text{Figure 74  Smith plan, detail of ‘Mount Dittingen’, 1756. MSA}\]

\(^{62}\) Hunter wrote to the Earl in 1750 ‘I wish that the Earl of Hopetoun and Dumfries had equal estates and then we should have a good house’
Roundels

The 1756 plan indicates vistas extending from the roundels, with views of various features, natural and artificial, most of which can be deciphered and identified from the plan, and some of which can still be readily seen on the ground. 63

From the lists it is clear that the mounts were conceived as both points from which to view, and features within the views. Dettingen Mount is sited close to the public road approaching the house from the east; Stair and Bland Mounts are on the skyline when looking out from the principal front of the house. The natural topography of central Ayrshire, with its many low hills, lent itself to the formation of hill-top dumps or roundels, as is apparent at Loudoun Castle to the north and at Sundrum Castle/ Auchincruive to the west. The view eastward from Auchincruive remains characterised by these dumps, 250 years later.

Mounts outwith the Dumfries House policies can be seen from them. This remains the case, with Treeshill Mount to the north of the Barony Road, and well within the land owned by the Auchleck estate, a feature on the skyline as seen from Blackwood Hill. 64

Progressing clockwise from the north, from Stairs Mount the viewer should have been able to see: ‘Shawwood, Achenleck, Terringzan, Templetoun Glen Stairsmounty Mase [not identified], Mikles Changue [Meikle Changue], Nypes [not identified], M oordyke, Knockdon hills, Achenwayhill, Arran hills, Loch... hills, Dumfries house, Machline hill’.

From Blann Mount the views were of (again starting from the north): ‘Waterside & Machline, Dumfries house & Pennyfadzeoch, Achenleck & ... , Stairs mount, Garalan mount, Garlaf & Corsgillock, The hill planting, Mount Allan, Ochiltree Glen.’

From Mount Allan the views were of: ‘Dumfries house, Stockiehill, Banns & Stairs mount, ... Raw planting, Ackenwayhill, Ochiltree Glen, M auchline hill Waterside.’

Dettingen Mount was not on a hill top, and may have been sited so as to be seen very clearly from the approach road from Cumnock, but it still managed some vistas: ‘Achenleck & Terringzan, Blacklia [not identified], Cumnock, Achengibben & Collochill, Blackaig & Shi... [two vistas to the south cannot be deciphered], Stairs Mount, Mount Allan, Arran hills G... C... Stockihill, Pennyland’.

The 5th Earl had been a soldier, and the names of the three principal mounts: Stair65, Blann and Dettingen have clear military connotations. They seem to have been intended as a memorial to the Battle of Dettingen of 174366 and to a friendship between fellow soldiers. At Dettingen, the 5th Earl served as aide-de-camp to his uncle the Earl of Stair67, who was in nominal overall command of the victorious
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63 Restoration of the estate plans should render the remaining text readable.
64 Further research is being carried out on the wider context of the Ayrshire designed landscape of this period by Christopher Dingwall and Peter McGowan. This will assist in establishing a history of the development of a landscape feature which appears to have been particularly fashionable in 18th century Ayrshire.
65 Dettingen Mount can be dated to after 1743; it is possible that Stair Mount had been planted earlier, and it would have had a visual relationship with Leifnorris. Further research might clarify this, and might also provide an explanation for Mount Allan.
66 Dettingen, a battle within the War of the Austrian Succession, between the Pragmatic Army (British, Austrian, Hanoverian armies) and the French, is noted as the last in which a British monarch was present on the battlefield. The French were defeated.
67 It was suggested in the 19th century that Dettingen Mount had been planted in halves to suggest two opposing armies. The 18th century maps show with radial vista: the division into two halves came later.
army. Bland or Blann Mount was probably named after General Humphrey Bland (1686-1763), commander of the King’s Own Dragoons at the battle, where his horse was shot from under him. General Bland had been one of the sponsors of the ceremony to lay the foundation stone of the new house in 1754, and his wife was described as sister-in-law to the Earl of Stair.

A drawing by Robert Adam of 1754 for ‘a Rusticated Temple design for Mount Stair at Lefnorris’ suggests that at least one very decorative building was considered (figure 75). It was presumably rejected on grounds of cost, but the idea of a Temple was not lost. In John Adam’s ‘Gateway, Porter’s Lodge, Temple etc’ of 1760 (see below) the building was to be at least nominally functional, with the Temple flanking a Gateway, and paired with a humble Porters Lodge.

Robert Adam’s temple was ‘design for Mount Stair at Lefnorris’, perhaps for the gap between Bland Mount and Stair Mount, or perhaps for the centre of the Mount – the building includes a viewing platform reached by a small pencheck stair. Either way it would have formed a striking object in the view from the principal front of the house.

Figure 75 Scheme for a Rusticated Temple at Lefnorris, Robert Adam 1754. NMRS

3.2.4 Ongoing Works - 1761-1768

Dumfries House

By the end of 1760, Lord Dumfries was in considerable debt. Several of the key craftsmen responsible for furnishing and decorating were awaiting payment of their accounts. In March 1761 a list of sums owing to creditors was drawn up, the total amounting to £13,974.8.10.

68 It is not clear whether the Earl of Stair referred to was the 5th Earl of Dumfries or his uncle.
69 DU/5/47/86 ‘Various Artificers Accounts… to be paid in May 1761’ including Alexander Peter, wright; John Bonnar, painter; David Robertson, smith; Messrs Young & Trotter upholsterers.
70 DU/5/37/51 Debts of Lord Dumfries, 30th March 1761.
Despite this, even before the house was occupied John Adam had supplied estimated for additional works as summarised below:

Amount of the Estimates for the Rt Honble
The Earl of Dumfries 11 Feby 1760
Vizt

The Stables & Coach houses South of the Barn £679.8.10
The Bridge £430.16.2
The gateway, Porter’s Lodge & ca £279.17.7 ½
The bringing in the Water £107.12.6
£2,177.2.11 ½

Most of these works were executed 1760-2, although the Stables and Coach House and Washing House were constructed in a more modest form, and are still extant. The water supply to the Dumfries House and Washing House were engineered and carried out by the Edinburgh plumber Robert Selby 1760-61, and in addition to lead pipes included installation of a ‘forcing engine’ to raise the water into the house. The original design for the estate bridge over the Lugar Water by John Adam survives. This was constructed in a form with additional balusters and four obelisks. The Gateway and Porter’s Lodge was also built as a gothic eyecatcher and is now ruinous.

In addition to these works John Adam was asked to perform a number of small jobs at day rates such as walling at the Mains and putting up obelisks, and supplying book presses for Dumfries House. Tinkering with office buildings was undertaken; the sham towers made into two-storey roofed structures, and making small structures behind the clock and bell towers.

When Adam submitted an account of interest outstanding on all these sums (including that on a balance of £100 outstanding for building Dumfries House) in 1763 Lord Dumfries was piqued. Correspondence was entered into and finally in 1764 legal action was precipitated by a financial crisis owing to the failure of Adam’s banker Adam Fairholme.

An interim payment of £990.4.1 was receipted by John and James Adam in November 1763 and a final discharge by Adam for receipt of £885.0.4 was issued on Christmas Eve 1764.

An account was noted from John Adam Architect for additional wright work done in and about Dumfries House in the years 1760 and 1761 that was not included in the former accounts.

In the handwriting of Alexander White, clerk of the Adam brothers, the following additional works were identified:

- 4 yards 3 feet of Doors on the garrets of the pavilions and Bell House
- 3 yards 3 feet of flush panelled doors on clock house
- 5 yards 7 feet of roofing and sarking on the bell house and clock house
- 11 yards 2 feet of slating on clock house and bell house
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71 DU/5/30/7-8 Accounts of Robert Selby, endorsed by John Adam and Robert Neilson
72 DHP/23
73 See DU/5/30 for the papers concerning Adam’s additional work at Dumfries House and estate; and the disputed accounts.
74 MSA, DU/5/30/13
- 46 yards of joisting in the 3 towers and clock house
- 46 yards of course flooring on ditto
- 13 yards 2 feet slit deal lyning round the clock house and ceiling thereof
- 6 yards 1 foot in the stair in the west tower
- 33 yards lath and plaister partitions in ditto
- 81 feet superf of whole deall packing boxes for my Lords glasses sent to Edinburgh
- 142 ½ days of a wright putting up pictures and glasses, scribing to the frames of the marble tables in the Dinning Room and Drawing Room, putting up blinds in the windows with the upholsterers. Lath and levelling the Garrets of both pavilions. Levelling standarling and lathing my Lord’s garret and making the Cupiloes of the clock and bell houses
- 1750 double flooring nails. 980 single floorings and 15160 lath nails
- 1289 feet of sawing old packing boxes for lath
- 33 ¼ inch dealls for levelling and standarls in my Lord’s Garret.
- 11 ¾ inch cleats for battens pavings and washing boards
- 219 yards 2 feet of stone wall plaister in my Lord’s Garret and 2 pavilion garrets
- 13 pair of cross failer (?) hinges for ditto garret doors, bell house and ice house doors
- 2 pair of edge hinges for clock house doors
- 2 pair of 3 inch hinges for garret doors
- 3 stock locks for clock house, bell house and ice house doors
- 1 ditto for the stair foot leading up to my Lord’s gallery in Cumnock Kirk
- 1 iron rimmed lock with brass handles for clock house
- 73 stone 9 ½ lb of sheet lead on the 4 towers ridges and Cupiloes of clock house and for my Lord’s Isle in Cumnock Church
- 11 stone of iron for marble chimneys
- 14 lb of iron for the obelisks
- 18 stone of iron for my Lord’s use to 11th February 1760
- 20 stone 7 lb ditto for ditto since that time
- 35 days of a wright flooring and joisting and filling up the brewhouse
- 34 1 ¼ inch dealls for the floor
- 7 1 ¼ inch ditto for the Raill and bench
- 4 inch 10 foots for ditto
- 1 2 ½ inch Gottr deall for ditto. Sawing 399 feet superficial in squaring the joists being my Lord’s timber and cutting a lath cleat off them which was used in the lower storey
- 16 single Garron nails, 36 doubles and 620 double floorings
- 201 days of a wright taking down old lyning and filign it up for Surbase Lyning in the house keepers room, my Lady’s woman’s room, nursery and Lyning above the chimneys and moulding round them, taking up old floors for sarking to the Coach House which was afterwards used by Mr Neilson for
other purposes, making a cupboard in the 2nd table room, making 3 presses in the House Keepers Store room, making a cistern and frame in the Pantry, putting up shelves and fitting up the milk house, making a frame and leaves for a cover on the mouth of the great drain etc.

- 1 3 inch deal for surbase mouldings on top of old lining
- 3 ½ of 2 ½ inch deals for table stoups in the milk house and frame for the cover of the great drain
- 1 1 ½ inch 14 foot deal for the cistern in the Pantry
- 24 ½ of 1 ¼ inch 12 foot deals for tables and shelves in the Milk House and for the leaves of the cover on the great drain etc
- 300 double double nails, 510 double floorings, 350 single, 160 doors, 260 1 ½ inch springs, 2 ½ dozen of 1 ½ inch screws, 8 iron rings for lifting up the cover on the drain, and pitch and tarr for laying it over and the cover on the hatch of the Gyle House.
- 2 pair of hinges for the Cupboard in 2nd Table Room and hatch of the Gyle House and 6 ½ lb of Glew.
- 8 brass fastners for the running sashes not to let them shut up on the outside and a spring for the 2nd table room door to keep it from breaking the glass panes
- 1 iron lock with brass handles for my Lord’s Garret
- 2 days of awright putting on the above
- To cash paid by John Thomson wright to the Cumnock Carrier for carriage of nails, glass, iron work and other necessaries from the beginning of the work till the end of the different articles in the books.
- To Cash paid for 15 tonns of stucco from Ireland with charges buying and shipping it.
- Total accounts - £132:8:11 ¾

In addition to accounts from the Adams, there were further accounts from John Bonnar, painter in October 1761 to Lord Dumfries,75 and from James Waitt, painter in December 1761 for painting and cleaning windows etc.76

A memorial concerning the use of timber in building Dumfries House from 1762,77 was consistent with earlier records showing that home grown fir and birch would be used for scaffolding and the like, the exception to the original plans being the importation of about 200 dales of Norway wood for scaffolding. The Norway wood, with others was used partly for lathing in the pavilions and ‘collonades’. The timber was also recycled for scaffolding for the other buildings and quarries.

According to accounts, a considerable amount of mason work was employed in 1762 on various parts of the estate. Included in this was a reference to the taking down of the ‘Old Kitchen’, presumably work undertaken in the New House, which another reference mentions at about the same time. It is not clear what this work entailed.
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75 MSA, DU/5/34/18
76 MSA, DU/5/34/20
77 MSA, DU/5/29/13
Lord Dumfries died at Dumfries House in 1768. By this date John Adam was slipping out of architectural practice, but Robert made one brief last appearance with an unrealised design for an entrance gateway in 1784 (see below).

**Landscape**

**Estate Buildings 1760s**

In February 1760 John Adam produced designs and detailed estimates and specifications for a Coach House, Stables, Washing House, a Bridge and a Gateway with Porters Lodge and Temple. The first three had been completed by September 1761, when the painter James Waitt submitted his account. The mid 18th century Cistern building on Blackwood Hill was probably also designed by John Adam but no records of its construction are known to survive, other than an estimate for ‘bringing the Water to Dumfries House’. Two Obelisks in front of the house were also specified. Another estate building constructed at this time was the Icehouse. A wright’s bill includes ‘Cutting the Ice house door & fixing the Arch’d part of it’, but nothing further is known of its construction.

![Figure 76](image1) **Figure 76** View of Coach House and Stables, late 19th century. M SA

![Figure 77](image2) **Figure 77** Washing House, south section, 2008. S&B

The Coach House, Stables and Washing House are elegant but modest estate buildings, with little ornamentation. Although the Avenue Bridge was clearly functional it was designed for aesthetic effect, and its steep rise would have afforded the visitor a striking view of the house.

![Figure 78](image3) **Figure 78** Undated view of the Avenue Bridge. M SA
Two bridges at Inveraray Castle, almost contemporary with the Avenue Bridge, bear clear similarities to it. The semi elliptical arches are unusual in bridges of this date. John Adam also employed the shape at the Garden Bridge at Inveraray (1759-61). The steep rise to gain a view at the apex is similar to the Garron Bridge at Inveraray, and the same effect was achieved by Robert Mylne at the Aray Bridge in 1775, which replaced an earlier Gothic Bridge by John Adam. William Adam had used four obelisks on his 1733 Tay Bridge at Aberfeldy.

Figure 79  Bridges at Inveraray: Garran Bridge, designed by Roger Morris, built by John Adam 1748; Garden Bridge, designed by John Adam, 1759.

An earlier drawing dated 1754 for a Bridge shows a small increase in ornamentation had been allowed by the time of its construction in the 1760s.

As built, the Bridge included four obelisks (shown sketched in pencil onto the 1754 drawing), and a longer stretch of balustrade.

Figure 80  Design of a Bridge for the Right Hon The Earl of Dumfries, attributed to John Adam, 1754. N M R S
The original specification for the Temple survives (see Appendix VI) but not the original drawings. A reconstruction drawing of the south elevation shows the design of the Temple in its original exterior configuration (figure 82).

It would have been harder to justify the cost of the construction of the Temple Gateway on purely practical grounds. It was described in Adam’s specification of 1760 as a ‘Gateway, Porter’s Lodge, a Temple & walls adjoining, being an Entrance propos’s for the Right Hon The Earl of Dumfries’s Park at Leifnorris’, and it is clear that the Earl intended a grand approach from the north. Unfortunately, the northern boundary of

---

The Temple was surveyed in 1910, and drawings survive in the MSA. The Gateway was taken down in the 1960s, and the stones numbered. A drawing showing the numbered stones is also in the MSA. For more details on the condition of the building see Appendix I.
his estate at this point stopped at the Temple, rather short of the Barony Road, the magnificent route between Auchinleck and its Auchinleck village, from which any approach to Dumfries House would have to branch off. The Gateway was duly built (the precise date of construction is unknown but it was in existence by 1768, when it featured in an inventory of garden tools kept in the estate buildings, including the ‘Temple’), but later correspondence between the widowed Countess and Lord Auchinleck indicates that its original purpose was not to be realised.

The Countess wrote in August 1773:

‘My Lord,

As your Lordship was so polite as to grant a request of mine to have a road (through some fields you have lately enclosed) from the Gateway built by the late Lord Dumfries to the turnpike road between Kilmarnock and Cumnock – the season being now advanced it is necessary to have it ascertained so as your promise was given to me I beg you will name what day I shall attend upon your Lordship to see it lin’d & I will bring one or two of my Lord’s servants to do it.

With Lord Dumfries & Lady Penelope’s comp’s to your Lords Lady Auchinleck and Miss Boswell.

I am your Lordships most humble servant.

The reply from Lord Auchinleck was unequivocal:

‘I have thought maturely upon that road, and as when the late Earl of Dumfreis was alive, I made out my inclosures on the plan they now are and inclosed a Road for his Lords use which he was well pleased with and have at immoderate charge made a road for my own use to the Church of Auchinleck which indeed gives me great satisfaction and to an old fellow like me is a mistress. Your Lady’s and My Lord Dumfries I hope will excuse me when I say that after long deliberation I cannot submitt to have my Plan altered. But this much I am willing to agree to, that there shall be a road to communicate from the Gateway to the Earls present road if so be the Earl chooses it and fences it properly…”

Armstrong’s map of 1775 does show a road leading north from the Gateway, and this may be along the route desired by the Earl, but the ‘road to communicate from the Gateway to the Earls present road’, offered by Lord Auchinleck (which was perhaps on an undesired route), was never made. By 1815 even the road leading to the Temple had gone, leaving it merely a decorative feature after all.

Water Cistern

An undated ‘Plan shewing the Manner in which the Water is conducted into Dumfries House’ is probably from the 1840s. It includes the only known sketch of the 18th century Water Cistern on Blackwood Hill, together with a further Water Cistern further to the south. The designer of the cisterns and the water system is unknown, but it is likely to have been John Adam. The cistern on Blackwood Hill is on the main north south axis of Stair and Bland Mount, Dumfries House, and the Temple. It was designed in a Gothic style, so that it relates to the style of the Temple. The cistern to the south, out of view of the house, is about as plain as it could be. There is a comparable system of water cisterns at Culzean by John’s brother Robert Adam.

---

79 It is not clear why there was such a long gap between the design of the building and this attempt to realise its original purpose – perhaps earlier negotiations had failed.
although these are slightly later, from the 1780s. As at Dumfries House, the degree of ornamentation depends on their visibility.

Figure 85 Detail of Cistern on Blackwood Hill from ‘Plan shewing the Manner in which the Water is conducted into Dumfries House’ undated, c1840. MSA

Within the Walled Garden a Hot House had been slated and glazed by 1763, and the walls themselves were repaired and rebuilt in 1766, together with a Factor’s House. This house may be the surviving plain two storey building to the north of the present Walled Garden, although it was later extended and altered.

There is no record of the construction or design of the model farm buildings at Dumfries House Mains (later known as Causeyhead), but an archaeological assessment carried out for this report have dated the majority of the buildings to the mid 18th century.

Perhaps the humblest building within the policies was The Nest, a thatched cottage beside the Nest Burn which housed some of the workforce involved in building the house. It survived until the mid 20th century but thereafter fell into ruin and was demolished. Its appearance is known from 19th century views (figures 87-88).

Figure 87 View of The Nest, Charles Blatherwick, c1860-90. MSA

Figure 88 The Nest, late 19th century. MSA
A small plan of part of the policies shows the area to the north of the house, with features given names which relate to the Dukes of Northumberland, and are not known from other sources. ‘A Plan of Piercy Wood and Bridge with Northumberland Mount, being part of the Policy and Ridings in the Earl of Dumfries’s Stairs Park Dumfries House’ is undated, but can be assigned to between 1760 and 1766. There are known social links between the two noble families of Percy and Crichton80, but it has not been possible to investigate how this might have affected the policies. The viewpoint referred to in the plan, to the east of the Walled Garden, does not feature in the Smith or Home plans.

The key was as follows, explanations in brackets:

Explanation
A The road leading from the Park and over the Bridge to Dumfries House [marked south and north of Avenue Bridge, road goes east and west immediately north of bridge, reaching Walled Gdn and doubling back towards Pennylands]
B Piercy Bridge [Avenue Bridge]
C Piercy Wood [Waterside Wood]
D Northumberland Mount [beside Walled Garden to east, aligned with wide avenue of trees to east]
E A bank of Flowering Shrubs and Evergreens, over which the finest prospect of the Lawns Plantations River Bridge and House are got [east of Walled Garden, in vicinity of present Gardener’s House]
F Parallel Walls for Fruit Trees [Walled Garden]
G Ridings thro Piercy Wood & [throughout]’

80 The first Duchess of Northumberland visited Dumfries House in 1760 ‘with Lord Dumfries to see his Paraphernalia. After Dinner we spent the Evening in very agreeable conversation, Ld Dumfries very drunk, talk’d of being frisky and rummish.’ Michael Davis, ‘The Castles and Mansions of Ayrshire’ 1991
3.3 27th July 1768 - 7th April 1803: Patrick McDouall-Crichton, 6th Earl of Dumfries (b.1726-d.1803)

3.3.1 Alterations to Dumfries House

When Lord Dumfries died on 27th July 1768, he did not have an heir and the estate passed to his nephew, Colonel Patrick McDouall of Freuch. During the period of his ownership the estate was managed by John Kennedy, Lord Dumfries's factor (who was also a friend of Robert Burns).

In 1771, the 6th Earl of Dumfries married Margaret, the daughter of Ronald Crauford of Restalrig and they had two daughters. Elizabeth Penelope Crichton was born in Dumfries House in 1772. She married John Stuart, Viscount Mountstuart and eldest son of the 1st Marquess of Bute, uniting the two families.

Their marriage produced a son, John Stuart, but tragically, both Lord Mountstuart and Lady Elizabeth died young, in 1794 and 1797 respectively.

It does not appear that the 6th Earl did much within the house for some years after inheriting in 1768, as the first recorded works date from the early 1780s. Within the estate however, the Earl and Countess were active agricultural improvers, commissioning two estate plans in 1772, and carrying out numerous schemes of drainage, enclosure, and industry.

1782-1783 - Bathroom Works

During the time of his occupation, the 6th Earl made relatively minor, but significant changes to the house, including the construction of a bath house and water closet.

Lord Dumfries paid for a patent apparatus and other furnishings for a water closet from Joseph Bramah in 1782. It is possible that this water closet was originally installed in the closet beneath the west stair at Principal floor level, which is currently used for storage and an electrical distribution box.

Joseph Bramah (b.1748-d.1814) was an inventor and locksmith by trade and became well known for his contribution to hydraulic engineering. He invented the improved water closet, which originated from an existing model of water closet having a tendency to freeze in winter. He designed a water closet in which the usual slide valve was replaced by a hinged flap that sealed the bottom of the bowl. He obtained a patent for his design in 1778 and began manufacturing water closets. The design was a success and production continued well into the 19th century.

Lord Dumfries ordered the improved water closet for Dumfries House only four years after it was patented, and it would then have represented the height of technology.

---

DU/6/44/7 MSA, payment receipt 14th December 1782.
Throughout 1782 and 1783, purchases were made for the fitting out of the new bath house, which according to early plans was to be constructed in the Back Court of the West wing, attached to the Laundry with an access door through the west wall of the Laundry. Purchases included ‘Tyles and terras’ (‘84 dozen of their best white tyles’) for a bath from Alex White; copper boiler for the hot bath from Thomas McIlraith; furnace door for a boiler for a bath from Messrs Bogle & Scott; lead pipes and sheet and leading, limestone and sand from William Mckinlay.

Figure 91  c1782 plan (top) and section (bottom) for a ‘...new addition intended for a hott bath or cold bath’ constructed in the west wing off the west wall of the Laundry in the Back Court of the West Wing. MSA

---

DU/ 6/ 44/ 8 MSA, 9th May 1782
DU/ 6/ 44/ 36 MSA, undated.
DU/ 6/ 44/ 9 MSA, 14th December 1782.
DU/ 6/ 44/ 10 MSA, November 1782
DU/ 6/ 44/ 37 MSA, 5th March 1783
The bath house was completed in 1783 by Robert Buchan, including finishing the inside of the bath and setting up the copper boiler. The bath house was fairly typical of its kind. The ground floor location was dictated by the weight of the water involved in such a large bath, and perhaps partly by the need for better water pressure. The dimensions of the bath and its depth were fairly typical, as were the shape and the steps down into it. It was intended for the bather to walk into the bath and then suddenly dip their head under (hence our expression 'going for a dip' - the sudden shock was meant to 'tighten the fibres').

It appears from the cross-section that the water came from a cistern, which stood in the small room opposite the bathroom. The interesting thing about this is the furnace in the adjoining small room. It seems from this that it was intended to make it a hot or cold bath. As there is no furnace marked in the laundry, it may be that the furnace was to serve both the bath and the laundry.

It was quite common for a bathroom to be adjacent to service rooms during this period. This was probably dictated by the convenience of having the room close to sources of coal, hot water and dry linen. Pipes were also very prone to leak at this time, therefore water piped into other parts of the house could cause damage.

Although bath houses were adjacent to kitchens or laundries, they were usually served by a private stair to a bedroom and dressing room above. Sometimes, they had a dressing room by them so that the bather could at least rest (an important part of the post-bathing ritual) and dress before returning to the main part of the house through the service areas.

Inconvenient arrangements of the location of the bath house in the service areas were not uncommon. However, Dumfries House is rare in that the bather was forced to go through another room to get to the bath. As the bathroom was a later insertion, there was probably little option in this case. Generally, direct or adjacent private access was provided to avoid contact with service areas - this was not the case at Dumfries House.

In October 1784, a year after it was completed, John McClure was employed to plaster the bath house, as well as the water closet and a dressing room. At this time he also undertook repair work to plaster in the dairy, bakehouse, servants hall, passages and washing house.

### Decorative Works

Decorative works were undertaken within the house in 1782, 1784 and 1786 by James Waitt, painter from Ayr, including repairs to stucco work in the Parlour, Dining Room and Hall. Waitt also completed painterwork on the large Chippendale pier glasses during the redecoration of the Parlour.

Waitt was employed for 17 days in January of 1784 for cleaning, mending and whitening the Dining Room ceiling; cleaning, puttying and mending the broken

---

87 DU/6/44/83 MSA, 2nd July 1783.
88 Personal Comments. For this and following discussion on the 1782 bath house. Elizabeth Graham
90 DU/6/45/128 MSA, 8th October 1784.
ornaments of said room; and cleaning and varnishing the pictures therein. It was mentioned in this correspondence that whitening was also brought to the house for the Lobby (presumably the Entrance Hall) and Dining room.

Wait was employed to carry out further work in March of the same year to clean, mend and whiten the Lobby ceiling and walls.

3.3.2 Landscape & Estate Buildings

In 1772 (a year after the 6th Earl’s marriage), two estate plans were commissioned, one from John Home, who carried out an ‘accurate survey’, and the second a ‘Plan for the Improvement of Ground Adjacent to Dumfries House’, by an unknown landscape designer. The Home plan shows the entire Ayrshire estate at this time, stretching far to the south, with the policies coloured green to distinguish them from mere agricultural land. By contrast the improvement plan shows a smaller area around the house, and all of it is parkland or policies.

1772 Home Estate Plan

It is particularly useful to be able to compare the 1756 Smith plan, some of which may have been aspirational, with this ‘accurate survey’ of 14 years later. Some changes are the result of construction and demolition: Leifnorris had gone by this stage, although the ‘old garden’ remained; the Bridge, Coach House, Stables and Washing House were shown, as was the Temple. Within the Walled Garden the Hot House had been built, and the Pennyfadzeoch Ds are clearly marked, surrounded by a ploughed field.

Figure 92 Detail of the Home survey showing policies around Dumfries House, 1756. MSA

91 DU/ 6/ 45/ 52 MSA, 13th January 1784.
92 DU/ 6/ 45/ 79 MSA, 20th March 1784.
Figure 93  A Plan of all the Lands in the Parish of Old Cumnock and County of Air Belonging to the Right Honourable the Earl of Dumfries comprehending the Policie and Planting about Dumfries House from an Accurate Survey taken in September 1772 by John Home Surveyor M SA
There had been significant development of the approaches. From the north a new road had joined the entrance from the Mains, possible now that the Bridge had been built, and the old house demolished. Another approach met this from the east, ending at the boundary of the land owned by Lord Auchinleck. The hoped-for grand entrance from the north through John Adam’s ‘Gateway, Porter’s Lodge and Temple’ also ran into the boundary of Lord Auchinleck’s lands, and the Temple itself, rather than being at the north end of the great vista shown on Smith’s estate plan, was shown rather diffidently sitting slightly to the right of the tree-lined road which leads to it. All of this north and north-eastern boundary of the policies is shown as bordered by a row of trees. The Ayr-Cumnock road was also tree-lined, and the circular viewing or entrance point shown on Smith’s plan had gone. Both Smith and Home show a ford crossing the Lugar due north of the house.

Mount Allan, a separate roundel on the Smith plan, had been subsumed into a plantation as Mount Allan Park.

Home’s plan includes an inset showing the front elevation of the house, with the Mains to the left, emphasising the importance of this model farm-building within the context of the agricultural improvements to the estate overall. Although decorative and pleasing, the formal landscapes laid out in this period were also profitable – the plantations which framed the vistas were crop to be sold as they matured.

As this plan covers a greater area than Smith’s, it is easier to see the four principal axes of the design.

The designed landscape relates to the topography of the site – ie a roughly east west valley through which the Lugar flows, with gently sloping hills to north and south. This results in a roughly cruciform landscape, with two major alignments or sightlines from the house at the centre – one east-west, with the main line running from Terringzean in the east, through the formal area east of the house around the Bowling Green, and west from the house across the Western Ha-ha (the 18th century allee is no longer clear), through the Pennyfadzeoch Ds and off to the west, eventually lining up with the Mains Mount. The other major sightline runs north-south, from Stair and Bland Mount on the brow of Blackwood Hill in the south, north through the house, and on to the Temple. Clews Mount and Treeshill Mount, on the tops of hills to the north east are not in perfect alignment on a plan, however from the brow of Blackwood Hill they are on the skyline and appear to line up with the house and site of the Temple.

Of these four major axial views of the 18th century landscape design the only one currently open to view on the ground is the link between the house and Blackwood Hill to the south. The other three have been lost to later plantings, although a number of the original trees may survive93.

---

93 Only the view to the east from the house across to Terringzean has been compromised to a serious degree on the ground, by the construction of the A76 in 1991. Even in this case, passing traffic will not permanently interrupt the sightline between the house and the focal point of the ruined castle.
Agricultural Improvements

Agricultural improvements became a national obsession among the Scots nobility and gentry of the late 18th century. The twin methods of drainage and enclosure transformed both the appearance of the country, and the profits and living standards of the owners and tenants. Ayrshire was no exception in the general trend, and two contemporary descriptions of the process survive.

Andrew Wright, an East Lothian farmer, reported on the ‘Present State of Husbandry’ in 1778-84:

‘Dumfries House was built by the late Earl [ie the 5th], who at the same time, inclosed and planted much. In particular, 35 acres, not far from the house, were planted with oaks, which are now beautiful and grow luxuriously. This has encouraged the present Earl to continue the plantations in belts round his enclosures, and clumps on every height, which embellish the country at present, and in time will be very profitable. The land which the Earl has in his own hand extends to 1200 acres, including pleasure ground.

‘Lady Dumfries is the best assistant that ever blessed a man who delights in improvements. She is the very soul of husbandry and manufactures in that part of the country. She zealously patronises the woollen manufacture at Cumnock, and the linen manufacture all around, giving premiums to promote each. In that view her Ladyship has excellent crops of flax on her Lord’s farm, so extensive, as more than once to have gained premiums given by the trustees for manufactures.

94 Both are reproduced in D McClure ‘Ayrshire in the Age of Improvement’ 2002
More particularly with respect to agriculture, it is amazing what skill her Ladyship has acquired in a few years, which she puts in execution, by relieving her Lord almost wholly of the trouble of attendance. She is a substitute that leaves nothing undone. A field of ground, frequently under water by the over-flowing of the Lugar, was rendered no better than a bog. Much draining was necessary, and parallel drains were opened; the distance more or less, according to the degree of wetness, and all were filled with brushwood. The ground being made now very dry, a part proper for turnip was dunged in the rows, well hoed, and a very good crop raised. The rest was fallowed for corn, straight ridges made 10 feet broad, and 50 bolls shell lime given to each acre. One half was sown with wheat: I saw the crop which was uncommonly good. The barley on the remaining part was good. The whole was sown with grass-seeds, never again to be opened.  

'The last thing that I have to observe is that the water of Lugar is a troublesome neighbour, by laying waste many fine spots on its banks. The Earl, by a laborious work, has widened its bed, raised banks with an easy slope, and sowed natural grass to bring a sward on the bank, that may preserve it from being pitted by the water in a flood.'

No estate records from this period are known to survive. Secondary sources have been consulted, but the existence of the two estate plans of 1772 and the third of 1815 are extremely helpful in explaining the alterations carried out in this 50 year period.

One improved farm shown on the 1772 Home plan was Knockroon (figures 95-96). Here, an avenue was laid out from the Auchinleck-Cumnock road, with a set of four farm buildings, one of which survives.

**Figure 95** Knockroon, Home 1772. MSA  
**Figure 96** Knockroon, farm building, 2008. S&B

1772 ‘Plan for the Improvement of Ground Adjacent to Dumfries House’

Although this plan is physically very large, it covers a smaller area than either the Smith or the Home plans. As suggested by the title, the areas to be improved are limited, extending only as far south and north as the Ayr-Cumnock Road and the Temple respectively, and as far east and west as the Eastern or Stockiehill Ha-ha and to a little beyond the Walled Garden.

---

95 The surveyor is not known, but he might possibly be identified by comparison with other contemporary plans on stylistic grounds. Several designers were working in this style in the 1770s: James Robertson (fl.1750-1780), Robert Robinson (fl.1762-1777), James Abercrombie (fl.1768-193), William Blackadder as well as Thomas White [Senior] (fl.1770-1803) for whom this would be an unusually early piece of work.
This plan proposed a new entrance approach from the east, leaving the Ayr-Cumnock road at the angle where it turned south east (at Stockiehill). No new approach from the west is suggested, but it is notable that the effect of the new eastern proposal is to introduce a more curved, semi-circular shape, allowing the visitor to glimpse Dumfries House from various points through the clumps of trees, as he gradually drew nearer. The approaches shown on the next available plan of 1815 (see below) show that this basic proposal was followed up, although the plan chosen involved much longer drives, and the addition of a secondary drive from the west.

Figure 97 Plan for the Improvement of Ground Adjacent to Dumfries House, 1772. MSA

Another striking difference between the proposal and the actual landscape shown on Home, is the virtual concealment of the estate offices - thick belts of trees enclose the Mains and the Stable and Coach House, leaving the house to be seen in isolation from menial buildings, across a wide and treeless lawn.

The allées of the formal area to the east of the house around the Bowling Green were to be replaced by informal clumps and scattered single trees, although there was a faint echo of the formal layout in the six groupings around the open space of the Bowling Green, three of which are shown densely planted, and the alternate three more sparsely planted.

As it was commissioned before correspondence with Lord Auchinleck sealed the Temple’s fate as being not after all a gateway, the plan shows a road extending north through the Temple. It is clear that in the 5th Earl’s schemes the Temple had been designed to be seen from the house, but this plan suggests it be concealed in views
from the south by thickly planted trees. When approaching from the north the masonry would have been strikingly off-set by the plantation. The approach road from the north is lined with what are probably low hedges, which would not have concealed the building.

No supporting contemporary documentary evidence survives to indicate how this plan was received by Lord Dumfries.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 98** Plan for the Improvement of Ground Adjacent to Dumfries House, detail of Temple, 1772. MSA

**Proposed Gateway 1784**

Two drawings by Robert Adam for a Gateway for the Earl of Dumfries, dated 1784, may shed light on the date of the additional approaches. The approaches to the house shown on Home’s survey of 1772 were:

a) Mains: from the south, leaving the Ayr-Cumnock Road at the Mains (probably the original Leifnorris approach)

b) Pennyland: at the north boundary at Pennyland the road continues outwith the boundary for a short way and presumably joined the Barony Road. It reached the house to the south either via the Avenue Bridge, or via the ford over the Lugar.

c) Auchinleck: at the east boundary in East Pennyland Park the road again continues beyond the estate boundary, and presumably on to Auchinleck village.

At the Mains there was insufficient space to construct a gateway like this, and it would have obscured the model farm; at the Pennyland boundary point the Temple was adjacent and a further elaborate gateway would have been both redundant and a reminder of the failure to secure the Temple’s original purpose. At the Auchinleck entrance there was more reason to construct a show gateway.

The gatelodge which was built at Auchinleck however was single, one half of the design of paired gatelodges at Stockiehill and the West Gates. The fact that Robert Adam was proposing paired lodges may be simply be for aesthetic reasons. It could
however be interpreted that by this date the 6th Earl had begun to consider, or had indeed laid out, the later, picturesque arrangement of approaches from Stockiehill and at the West Gates, both of which were to gain smart paired lodges and gates. It is possible that by the time of the 6th Earl’s death in 1803 he had added the two new, fashionably picturesque approaches.

The gap in the evidence between 1784 and 1815 means the gate lodges at Stockiehill, West Gates and at Auchinleck cannot be dated precisely: that at Auchinleck was certainly there in 1815, and the others are identical, although they do not appear in the evidence until 1821. Stylistically, the likely date of construction is around 1810-15.

Just as Robert Adam’s design for a Temple had been considerably larger and more elaborate than the Temple eventually built, so the proposed gateways were perhaps beyond the 6th Earl’s budget.

**Figure 99** Proposed Gateway for Lord Dumfries, Robert Adam, 1784. Soane Museum

**Figure 100** Another Design for a Gateway for Lord Dumfries, Robert Adam, 1784. Soane Museum
3.4 7th April 1803 – 18th March 1848: John Crichton-Stuart, 7th Earl of Dumfries & 2nd Marquess of Bute (1814) (b.1793-d.1848)

3.4.1 Minor Works to Dumfries House

John Stuart inherited the estate and became the 7th Earl of Dumfries on the death of his grandfather in 1803. To reflect his new title and family ancestry, he adopted the name of Crichton-Stuart in 1805.

During the 7th Earl’s infancy, Dumfries House was occupied and cared for by the late Lord Dumfries’ brother, John McDouall, who endeavoured to maintain the house and estate in good order. When McDouall died in 1803, only months after moving into the house, the house remained occupied only by skeleton staff to maintain the house. It was decided that the house would remain vacant but maintained, in the interests of Lord Dumfries and for the well being of the furniture.

From 1803-1814 the Dumfries House estate was run by trustees, including the 1st Marquess of Bute (grandfather of the future Earl), until the 6th Earl of Dumfries came of age. Lord Dumfries became the 2nd Marquess of Bute on the death of his paternal grandfather in 1814, however he rarely lived at Dumfries House, preferring his other estates, including Mount Stuart, Cardiff Castle and Luton Hoo. Like his grandfather, the Marquess was a keen agricultural reformer, carrying on the process of drainage and enclosure begun in the late 18th century.

Despite his preference for the other properties, some alterations were made during his ownership. Between 1817 and 1826, the house was re-plumbed and water closets were installed. The house was redecorated and additional furniture and carpets were purchased.

Both the Bute and Dumfries Estates were placed under the direct management of the Bute Estate factor Colonel Archibald Moore in 1816.

In May 1818, works were planned for the installation of new cross partitions and doors in the main corridor of the Principal floor between the Entrance Hall and both staircases. A drawing of the proposed doors shows the ‘...manner of finishing the green baise doors in new cross partitions of Dumfries House.’ The drawing shows an elevation and plan with dotted lines on the elevation showing the frame of a door head light which was to be put in and covered with lath and plaster. It was the intention that the door head lights would be opened up at a later stage if the corridor was found to be too dark. The new cornice was to match that in the corridor and the doors themselves were to be 2” thick double doors, flush on the sides next to the corridor and panelled on the sides next to the staircases.

96 Andrew McLean, Christie’s Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 - Dumfries House: A History
97 Andrew McLean, Christie’s Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 - Dumfries House: A History
98 The original Luton Hoo was commenced in 1767 by Robert Adam but later transformed by Robert Smirke c1830.
99 Andrew McLean, Christie’s Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 - Dumfries House: A History
100 Andrew McLean, Christie’s Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 - Dumfries House: A History
101 Andrew McLean, Christie’s Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 - Dumfries House: A History
102 DHP/9 Mount Stuart Archives
Figure 101  Drawing showing new door in new cross partitions in the Principal floor corridor, 28th May 1818. MSA
In March 1820, some repairs to windows of Dumfries House were carried out (along with repairs to the Temple). A crate of glass was provided by Neilson, plumber of Glasgow, of which 2/3 of the crate was to be for the house.

1821 lead repairs were carried out at Dumfries house in conjunction with works for the Gatehouses.

Lord Dumfries, John Crichton-Stuart died in 1848, but prior to this, he had become a prominent figure at the time of the Industrial Revolution, and had built the first Bute Dock at Cardiff in 1839. He had initiated the extensive growth of the City of Cardiff and its industry.

3.4.2 Landscape & Estate Buildings

The 1st Marquess of Bute had an international career as a diplomat, but carried out various alterations to the designed landscape of Mount Stuart, all in the picturesque taste\(^1\). They included alterations to the principal approach. In the absence of any documentary evidence it is not possible to say whether the new approaches to Dumfries House had been created by the 6th Earl in the third quarter of the 18th century, or were introduced under the guidance of the Trustees between 1803 and 1814. It is clear that the Trustees did invest in acquiring new lands around the estate (see below).

![Figure 102 Gates at Auchinleck Lodge, 1990. Bob Heath](image1)

![Figure 103 Detail of gates at West Gates 2008. S&B](image2)

The 7th Earl of Dumfries inherited the Bute fortune, including the main family seat at Mount Stuart, Bute and vast estates in Wales. The Marquess was able to use some of the profits of his Ayrshire estates to develop Cardiff docks, thereby making the family fortune one of the largest in Britain.

---

\(^1\) He wrote, for instance, to his factor in 1805 requesting that he ‘take away the formal staid appearance’ of a walk within the policies at Mount Stuart.
1815 Crawford Estate Plan

An estate plan was drawn up in or just before 1815\(^2\), showing the additions to the estate made during the Earl’s minority. While not as detailed as the previous surveys, this plan shows both how the basic layouts of many of the plantations remained, and how the formality of the 1750s had been replaced by softer, scattered trees, in the same tone as the proposed improvements of 1772, although with significant differences. This plan is not perhaps a wholly reliable guide to the policies – the lack of detail extends to not including the Coach House or Stables at all, and the Temple is a mere dot. The Pennyfadzeoch Ds, which exist today as fairly substantial walled plantations, are indicated by a single tree.

The most significant alteration had been to the approaches. A mid 18\(^{th}\) century visitor would have left the Ayr-Cumnock road at a right angle and passed the model farm buildings at the Mains, travelling along the straight approach which had once led to Leifnorris, and reaching Dumfries House by a direct route. Now the visitor reached the house via a roughly semi-circular approach road with two entrances, to the east and west of the Mains, and after a gently curving drive through the woods arrived in front of the house. The lodges at Stockiehill and the Westgates are not shown on this plan, but it is possible that they had been built by this date.

The Lady Bridge over the Nest Burn is likely to have been built to carry the approach from Stockiehill. Although the ornamental cascade just upstream from the bridge may date from the mid 18\(^{th}\) century\(^3\), the bridge itself was clearly built to be wide enough to carry carriages.

The estate ownership had been extended by this stage, and rather than stop before reaching the Auchinleck-Cumnock road, the north east approach now announced itself with a ‘Gate’ and a building which was presumably a gate lodge. This approach proceeded along the old straight avenue, before meandering gently through the plantation north of the Lugar and joining the Bridge.

Notwithstanding the new approaches, the principal bones of the formal mid 18\(^{th}\) century design remained. The shapes of the plantations to the south of the house, and the straight lines of the Western Ha-ha, the Polcalk Wood, and other boundaries were unchanged from the lines shown on Home’s 1772 plan (see above). The roundels of Stair, Bland, Dettingen and Crosshill Mount are all present. The lawns north and south of the house however, rather than being the empty lawns suggested on the 1772 Plan of Improvement are shown with scattered trees, apparently arbitrarily placed, with the exception of a row of trees about half-way up Blackwood Hill.

\(^2\) The plan is marked as ‘copied by Wm Crawford Jnr 1815’ but as it refers to lands acquired during Lord Dumfries’s minority, which ended in 1814, it is unlikely to have been a copy of a much earlier plan

\(^3\) A grey square is shown on Smith’s 1756 plan in approximately the same location, and the Burn had been canalized to this point. The smaller scale of Home’s 1772 plan gives no detail on the area. Further research may reveal more about this feature.
Bowling Green Area - First Half of the 19th Century

The lack of detail in the Crawford plan is particularly apparent in the depiction of the formal areas around the Bowling Green, and one significant change may have been the removal of planting immediately to the east of the house. An undated plan of the Lugar and the Ayr-Cumnock road gives a little more detail of the layout of the ground around the house (figures 105-106), but again this plan fails to show the Stables and Coach House, so is clearly not an accurate survey.

The 1857 OS map shows that the Bowling Green had not been removed in this period, and on that map there are trees immediately to the east of the house. The best that can be said about the formal area to the east of the house (which was the principal site of the axial vistas, allées and alignments of the mid 18th century plan) is that by the middle of the 19th century the principal east-west allee remained, crossing the Bowling Green.

Undated Early 19th Century Plan of the Road and Water of Lugar c1819-37

This plan can be dated with certainty to between 1815, when the 2nd Marquess became the owner of the estate, and 1837, when the line of the Ayr-Cumnock road was altered. It is notable that the line of the approach from the West gates shown on this map differs from that shown on the Crawford 1815 map (above). This is probably a result of works to the Polcalk Burn to create the Mill Dam, necessitating a more circuitous route and a crossing of the Burn further to the north. The route shown on this map is the same as appears on the 1857 OS map (below). It is not
known when the Mill Dam was created, however a bill of 1819 refers to a ‘Tar Barrel got while tarring the Sawmill’. There is no evidence of a sawmill in the estate on a site other than the present one, so it may be possible to date this plan to after 1819.

It is just possible to discern the Westgates and their curved entrance.

Figure 105 Plan of the Road and Water of Lugar between Cumnock and Ochiltree through part of the lands of the Marquis of Bute, undated c1819-37. MSA

Figure 106 Plan of the Road and Water of Lugar between Cumnock and Ochiltree through part of the lands of the Marquis of Bute, undated c1819-37 (detail). M SA

Works to Policies 1818-1850

A reasonable number of documents survive relating to works on the estate in the 1820s and in the 1840s. They give a picture of the round of repairs, alterations and improvements to be expected on a well-managed estate – there were repairs to the
windows of the Temple, and the Hothouse (coinciding with window repairs at the house itself); a new stable and milkyard was built at Pennyfadzeoch; the Cistern was painted, and there were grants to the tenants ‘for repairing their houses and fences’. Young trees were ordered in quantities, both for the Nursery, and for the plantations. 5,000 Thorns were taken from Kilmarnock in 1818; in the following year 12,000 Larch and 8,000 Scots Firs ‘for planting in the Plantations’, together with 4,000 Dwarf Box for planting in the Nursery; in April 1820 the estate paid for 8,000 Thorns 4 years old, 10,000 Larches, and 15,000 Scots Firs; and in 1821 11,000 Scots Firs 3 years old, 2,000 Larches, and 5,000 Dwarf Boxes.

No accounts remain for the 1830s, but the accounts from the 1840s continue to show expenditure on re-stocking or stocking the plantations and on decorative additions to the policies. In April 1842 Mr Sampson of Kilmarnock sent 50,000 Thorn trees 4 years old, 18,000 Larch, 6,000 Spruce, 1,800 Ash, 12,000 Elm, 800 Plane, 1,500 Oak, 1,000 Silver Fir, and 500 evergreen Privets. The next year Thomas Imrie & Sons of Ayr sent 18,000 Larch, 6,000 Spruce, 1,000 Silver Fir, 1,800 Ash, 1,200 Elm, 1,500 oak and 800 Planes; while Mr Sampson provided 5,000 Larch and 2,000 Spruce. Mr Sampson also supplied more decorative vegetation. His bill for December 1843 includes 50 Black Italian Poplars; 12 Rhododendrons ‘named varieties’; 50 Lombardy Poplars.

The Waterloo Bridge is a single span stone bridge across the Polcalk Burn just as it meets the Lugar. The bridge does not appear on any map until the 1st Edition of 1857, but was presumably constructed in the years immediately following 1815.

**Agricultural Improvements**

New farm buildings were built, including the two elegant farmhouses of Pennyfadzeoch and Orchardton, both of which form set-pieces in the landscape. Pennyfadzeoch is ‘back-to-front’, presumably so that its principal front can be seen from within the policies. By the time of the New Statistical Account of 1837, most of the parish was enclosed by hedgerows.

The 2nd Marquess required his tenants to drain a proportion of their farms each year, and he provided free tiles to line the new drains from a tilework he had built for the purpose.

**Estate Buildings**

The Gate Lodges at Stockiehill and at the West Gates were in place by 1821, although it is possible that the entrance drives had been created before 1803. The Auchinleck Gate is shown on the Crawford plan of 1815, and although they are not shown, it seems likely that the Stockiehill and West Gates were also in place by this date. The lodges at Stockiehill were repaired in 1821.
The Temple was altered in 1818, when the two previously discrete rooms of the Temple itself (the west room) and the Porter’s Lodge (the east room) were broken through to join their respective wings. A hearth was also inserted to the Porter’s Lodge.

An 1818 plan of the Walled Garden (figure 109) shows the garden divided into three areas. To the west was a square garden with four beds around an oval rose border, bordered to the east by a yew hedge. To the east, the remaining 2/3rds of the area was divided into a north and a southern half by a 12 foot wall.

![Figure 109 Plan of the Walled Garden 1818. M SA](image)

The roughly triangular shaped area to the south east was marked ‘Melon Ground’ and has a ‘melon pitt’.

Outwith the garden to the west were forest trees and an orchard and north, immediately outwith the walls, beyond this a gravel walk, and beyond that ‘Shrubry’ to the north in parallel rows. North of the north wall a beech hedge concealing ‘a place for manure and peas sticks’.

Two entries – one at north east corner, and one about half-way along the east wall, lower one marked ‘gates to admit carts with dung’

The angled wall at the south eastern corner, formerly the main entrance, is shown as unbroken wall, but there is a small pedestrian entrance on the south wall, so that the lime walk beside the Lugar would presumably have to be followed a little bit longer, but would still allow the visitor to reach the garden. One path is marked ‘to the water’ but appears to end in wall.

The line of the river has perhaps been idealised in this plan, or it may have been altered. In any case, by the next survey of 1857 the southern boundary of the garden is the same angled line as had been shown on the 18th century plans.

A storm in October 1819 blew down the south wall of the Walled Garden, which had to be rebuilt, and the Hot house was also repaired.
The gardens and plantations were highly productive, with fruit and vegetables sent to ‘the Family’ while at Edinburgh, and even at Mount Stuart, which at this date had its own new walled garden.

In 1837 the Ayr-Cumnock road was ‘improved’ by being moved south. The alteration was commissioned by the 2nd Marquess, possibly in part as an act of charity, since the labour used was that of weavers left unemployed by a trade slump. The amount of labour used was also possibly artificially high, with this section of the road bounded by a low wall of dressed stone, with numerous bays, which may have been unnecessary elaboration. The realignment of public roads to a position further from the house was a fairly common practice at this period, both with the intention of gaining privacy, and to facilitate the creation of the longer, irregular approaches then fashionable.

With the alteration of the public road to a more southerly alignment, as marked in pencil on Crawford’s estate plan of 1815, the Stockiehill Lodges became redundant as the entrance from the south east. A new and much longer carriage drive or approach was created, leading through the parkland and policies from the western outskirts of Cumnock. Marked on the OS map of 1857 as ‘The Avenue’, this sinuous and scenic drive led through the Harperbank Plantation, across Terringzean Holm and up the bank through Shaw Wood to join the line of the old drive from Stockiehill at the Lady’s Bridge. This approach is notable for its use of Terringzean as a landscape feature, with the status of the focal point of the eastern policies, just as it had been in the 1756 scheme. Terringzean’s 18th century role was as a view-closer to a long vista. The 19th century approach gave it a more Romantic appeal, with the road emerging from dense woodland by the side of the steep banks of the Lugar, and sweeping round to reveal the ruins ahead, set against a hilly background. In spite of its name ‘The Avenue’ was tree-lined for only part of its length, where it passed through Harperbank Plantation and Shaw Wood.

The title of the 1840 ‘Plan of the Entrance to the New Approach to Dumfries House and the Lands Adjoining’ (figure 110) suggests that the longer route through the policies from Cumnock was made very shortly after or at the same time as the alteration to the main road.

![Figure 110 Plan of the Entrance to the New Approach to Dumfries House and the Lands Adjoining, Adam French 1840 M SA](image1)

![Figure 111 View of Terringzean by Moonlight Charles Blatherwick undated, c1860-1895 M SA](image2)
3.5 18th March 1848 – 9th October 1900: John Patrick Crichton-Stuart, 3rd Marquess of Bute (b.1847-d.1900)

Figure 112  1857 detail of Dumfries House. Not to scale. Ordnance Survey

3.5.1 1860s Alterations

Dumfries House

John Patrick Crichton-Stuart inherited the estate in 1848 as an infant. He carried out works to the house, particularly following his coming of age in 1868 and he began a substantial package of works in the 1890s. The 3rd Marquess spent considerable time at Dumfries House during his childhood and he referred to Dumfries House as his ‘homeliest’ of homes, with particular reference being made to Falkland Palace as his most luxurious.

Recognised as the most important architectural patron in Victorian Britain. He remodelled Castel Coch; Cardiff Castle; and undertook the construction of the new Mount Stuart house following a fire, among many other projects. The 3rd Marquess was well known for ongoing works to all of his houses and many projects remained unfinished upon his death on the 9th October 1900.

Works suggested in 1867 by a letter to Charles G Shaw from Frederick Pitman regarding items of expenditure, included the building of a bathroom, some improvements to the Kitchen and the introduction of gas to the House and offices. It also suggests the proposed construction of the Turkish Bath.

William Railton, long-term architect to Lord Bute in Kilmarnock, completed a coloured sketch of the Entrance Hall with the assistance of a decorator to determine how the Hall could be effectively painted. He completed this along with a plan for the Bath. Unfortunately, neither of these drawings appear to have survived, which

---

4 Andrew McLean, Christie's Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 – Dumfries House: A History
5 Comment recorded by Rt Revd Sir David Hunter Blair, John Patrick, Third Marquess of Bute, K.T.: A Memoir, 1921
6 18th June 1867, Dumfries House. Letter referred to in RCAHMS entry.
7 6th May 1867, Bute Papers, Dumfries House A 1573 MSA
is likely to have shown the colouring in of the plasterwork embellishments of the Entrance Hall (and possible changes to the embellishments), more in line with the taste of the 3rd Marquess and probably what is in existence today, but still more subdued than decoration seen at many of his other residences.

Correspondence from Railton to Shaw also reported progress of the mason and joiner: work was completed in the pantry and the kitchen range; as well as various other works, including an ornamental tile floor (possibly the tessellated tile floor in the Silver Safe?); lamps for the passage outside the doors of the wings; plumber work; and a bathroom platform. 8

It was agreed to go ahead with the Turkish Bath, new kitchen range and gas supply in a letter dated 10th July 1867. 9 An 1895 plan showing the existing layout of the house indicates that this work was successfully completed.

The 3rd Marquess of Bute celebrated his coming of age party at Mount Stuart in September 1868.

Landscape & Estate Buildings

The 3rd Marquess retained a particular fondness for Dumfries House and its estate, and his additions and alterations were in a sensitive but practical spirit, respecting the architecture and designed landscape which he inherited, but modernising and improving efficiency where necessary. As at his main seat at Mount Stuart, his approach to the designed landscape was to preserve and partially restore the earlier formal and picturesque designs, but also to add. His legacy at Mount Stuart includes a pinetum, a collection of rare foreign and native conifers planted in a formal lattice arrangement, and a Rock Garden designed with the landscape gardener Thomas Mawson, which was an attempt to unite the new house with the historic landscape. At Dumfries House the additions were less dramatic, as the original aesthetic harmony of house and policies had not been disturbed by new architecture.

By 1848 the designed landscape was a combination of early-mid 18th century formality co-existing with later 18th and early 19th century picturesque alterations - straight bones as it were, clothed in softer drapes. The 3rd Marquess's alterations harmonised with both aesthetics: the laying out of a new formal garden, to the west of the Western Ha-ha, was a response, and a counterbalance to the 18th century formal area immediately east of the house. The planting of his favourite conifers, particularly the stand of Wellingtonias behind the Coach House and Stables, added a highly visible backdrop to the neat Georgian buildings, and a 19th century counterbalance to the obelisks on the Avenue Bridge (figure 113).

Other alterations were in keeping with his own era: the replacement of the gravel in front of the house with a small formal garden and statues was fashionable, and the addition of a gate lodge at the Cumnock entrance gave scope for typically Victorian decorative ironwork and a recognisably contemporary lodge building, although its shape and scale was related to the existing gate lodges.

---

8 5th September 1867 – 11 October 1867, Bute Papers, Dumfries House. A1574 MSA
9 10th July 1867, Bute Papers, Dumfries House. A1573, MSA
Again as at Mount Stuart the Marquess continued the work of his forebears in improving the efficiency of the estate, updating the estate buildings where necessary, and adding new buildings, including the Gardener’s House, extensions to the Mains, the Kennels and Mountallian.

The 3rd Marquess’s other great contribution to the designed landscape was the archaeological investigation of both the site of Leifnorris and of Terringzean Castle, neither of which had received any previous attention.

1857 OS map

The 1st Edition OS map of 1857 is the first detailed description of the landscape since the 1772 Home estate plan, and it fills in some of the information missing in from the less detailed early 19th century surveys described above. Although alterations had been made later in the 18th century and in the early 19th century, they were largely in the character of additions, and the general layout of the 1772 landscape could still be discerned without much effort. Since the 3rd Marquess was only ten years old at the time of the map it can be considered a fair indication of the state of the policies as he inherited them, with the next OS map, of 1896, the first to show works carried out under his direction.

The pattern of approaches, the boundaries of plantations and the number and position of estate buildings had remained remarkably unchanged. The formal area east of the house around the Bowling Green had lost its diagonal allées and vistas, but the central axial alignment remained, and Terringzean Castle was obscured from
views along this only by a small plantation to its immediate west. The c1837 approach from Cumnock, marked here as ‘The Avenue’ would probably have afforded a glimpse along the Bowling Green axis to the house, from a point just east of the Ds.

Figure 114 Detail of OS 1st Edition 1857. NLS

To the west however, although a row of large broadleaved trees are marked, presumably the 18th century trees originals, the open allée had become obscured.

A plan was commissioned in 1858 for a new Gardener’s House from the local architect William Railton, Kilmarnock, although it may not have been built until 1869, when drawings were made of its decorative bargeboards.

In 1867 the Glasgow and South West Railway Company began construction of the Ayr-Cumnock Branch, which was to include a private station for Dumfries House. The Station Building and two Station Cottages are first shown on a plan of the site dated 1896, but may have been constructed at the same time as the railway.

The line taken by the railway had no adverse impact on the mid 18th century designed landscape, and the siting of the private station took advantage of the straight edge of the Polcalk Wood plantation to create an imposing ‘Station Avenue’, without disrupting the existing design. The avenue was created by planting a row of the Marquess’s favourite conifers.

Figure 115 View south down Station Avenue, Polcalk Wood to left, 2008. S&B

An undated late 19th or early 20th century photograph of Dumfries House Station shows the viaduct, gas lamps, and attendants (figure 117).
No significant alterations to the planting can be dated to the 1860s, although an examination of the highly detailed Garden Books may reveal more about this decade. An enclosed garden is shown on the 1st Edition map to the north of the Mains, and possibly the foundation walls of a hothouse. This hothouse had been built by 1868, when two garden gates were also added to the ‘Burn Garden’. This garden is now a small walled area, bounded by the Polcalk Burn to the west and by estate roads to the east and north, with a footbridge over the burn. The OS maps show woodland paths winding around the small plantation, and a further footbridge enabling the stroller to return to the eastern side of the burn near to the Mains.
3.5.2 1870s Alterations

Dumfries House

The 3rd Marquess undertook some redecoration work, including colouring works to the original Adam decoration in the Entrance Hall completed by June 1877 by Messrs C Campbell & Smith.\(^{10}\) This was no doubt in response to the sketches begun by Railton in previous years. Gilding of the ceiling and wall niche in the North Drawing Room (Parlour) was introduced by the 3rd Marquess of Bute during the 1870s\(^{11}\) and probably carried out by Campbell & Smith at the same time as other painterwork.\(^{12}\)

The Campbell & Smith account details the following work undertaken at Dumfries House in 1877:

**Dining Room (current North Parlour)**
- Walls: filling up woodwork, painting (5 coats) and preparing for enamelling and enamelling – Gilding mouldings of panels and cornice – Decorating niche etc etc.
- Ceiling: Preparing, filling up and painting (4 oils and flatting). Preparing and gilding raised ornaments – Colouring foliage naturally to complete.

**Entrance Hall Walls**
- Walls: Filling up woodwork, painting (5 coats) and preparing for and enamelling.

**Entrance Hall Ceiling & Cove**
- Preparing and filling up and painting (4 coats & flat) to receive decoration.
- Filling up and preparing cove and decorating portion of same – emblazoning arms – gilding and colouring fascia as instructed by His Lordship

Total Fee: £419:8:10

\(^{10}\) 14th June 1877 Account of works by Messrs C Campbell & Smith, MSA
\(^{11}\) Country Life August 16, 2007. p62
\(^{12}\) Campbell & Smith worked on Cardiff Castle and the Burgess Chapel at Mount Stuart and reference was made in the accounts to work at Mount Stuart in June 1877, before the devastating fire at Mount Stuart in December 1877.
Note: The above account included labour and materials for a preliminary experiment under His Lordship’s directions.

It is not clear when the work was completed, but a reference was also found that suggested that the stone jambs in the Library were to be finished to imitate marble and this could have been carried out at about the same time, especially following completion of the Turkish Bath arrangement in the west wing.

Figure 120 Dumfries House front elevation, c1895 before Robert Weir Schultz alterations. MSA

Figure 121 Dumfries House front elevation, c1895 before Robert Weir Schultz alterations. MSA

\(^{13}\) Bute Papers, undated(?) A1542. No. 202
Landscape & Estate Buildings

An undated 19th century plan of the ‘Domains (Part of)’ of between 1876 (the date of the Kennels building) and the 2nd Edition of 1896, has a pencil sketch of an oval shaped garden just to the west of the house (figures 123-124), indicating the 3rd Marquess was considering a site for a new garden. Nothing is known to have come of this scheme, although some coniferous trees were later planted in the area.

There were small alterations including the addition of a porch to the Garden Offices along the north wall of the Walled Garden in 1873 (figure 125).
Sunken Garden

By the second half of the 19th century fashionable practice for the immediate setting of a country house – plain in the 18th century – had become rather more elaborate. At Mount Stuart the 3rd Marquess added a Rock Garden to the area immediately in front of his new house. At Dumfries House he created a sunken garden in front of the house. Its original 18th century form had been a simple gravel square with grass plats to either side (figure 126).

14 A detailed report on this area has been prepared by Peter McGowan and Christopher Dingwall. A full copy of this is attached as Appendix IX.
The 3rd Marquess had the central area dug out with four circular stone-edged borders added around the edges, and a statue on a plinth at the centre. Two matching statues on plinths were set in small beds in the centre of the two flanking plats. This 1878 garden is shown in a photograph taken by Weir Schultz before his alterations of the mid 1890s (figure 127).

![Image](image1.png)

**Figure 127** Detail of front elevation of house, showing Sunken Garden, Robert Weir Schultz, c1894 MSA

### 3.5.3 1890s Alterations by Robert Weir Schultz

**Dumfries House**

New bathrooms were added in 1894 and, following Lord Bute’s conversion to Catholicism in 1868, a new chapel was needed (a feature common to all of Lord Bute’s properties), as well as space for a library.

![Image](image2.png)

**Figure 128** 1896 detail of Dumfries House - prior to the Weir Schultz works. Ordnance Survey

The prominent arts and crafts architect Robert Weir Schultz was employed by Lord Bute following his first visit to the house in 1892. He prepared designs for the house in 1894 for the remodelling, extension and expansion of the original wings to allow for a Chapel in the east wing and a Turkish Bath and plunge pool in the west wing (the Billiard Room today) on ground level. A plan dated to 1895 by Robert Weir Schultz shows the existing layout of the house in 1895, with drains, water and gas pipes in place. Above this, was to be a top-lit tapestry room for the 18th century tapestry collection.

The main body of the house was to remain largely intact, with the exception of new doorways to the Dining Room and Drawing Room to allow access to the new arched...
corridors linking the house to the Chapel and Tapestry Room. On the exterior, two domed turrets were built above the connecting wings on the south elevation.

Figure 129  Dumfries House front elevation, c1897 before Robert Weir Schultz alterations, but showing what appears to be a mock-up of the west wing stair tower in place (detail below). MSA

Figure 130  Dumfries House front elevation, c1897. M SA

Figure 131  Dumfries House front elevation, c1897, before Robert Weir Schultz extensions. M SA
**West Wing**

Work began to alterations on the west wing in 1897.\(^{16}\)

Prior to this, a survey of the existing building, dated January 1894, with pencil marking indicating early design ideas for the alterations, was made by Robert Weir Schultz.

Shultz’s account for the work to the west wing indicated that the work was difficult in execution, and included ‘ornamented finishings’ of the interior; plaster modelling; wood panelling; and carving.

**Ground Floor**

The ground floor west wing retained the general layout of the 1754 southeast rooms and stair, with the original Woman House becoming the ‘Low Wing Room’ (became Schoolroom by 1895); the Laundry had become the Billiard Room (became Library on 1895 plan); central stair had been retained, but opening altered. By this time, the west wing had been extended to the west from the original 1754 design, with the demolition of the late 19\(^{th}\) century bath house off the Laundry and the addition of a new Bath Room (shown as ‘Shampooing Room’ in 1895); Plunge Bath; Turkish Bath; furnace with boiler; and clock room – all on the south side of the central passage, which now ran the full length of the west wing.

On the north side of the passage in 1894, it is clear that the original 1754 layout had been modified substantially by this time. The original ash yard had become the Coal Yard and ashpit; the ‘place for feeding of fowls’ had been transformed into lavatories; and the Scullery for the Milk House and the Milk House had been changed into a Brushing Room and Small Kitchen. The small Back Court on the curve of the original Collonade was altered to fit one lavatory and a Small Scullery (the Little Scullery in 1895). Little physical change from 1894 in 1895 plan (only small change to the ashpit in the coal yard and two new openings through Small Scullery and lavatory walls). There were some room name changes as noted.

![Figure 132](image)

**Figure 132** January 1894 plan of west wing, Ground floor level. Robert Wéir Schultz, MSA

The 1897 alterations drawings indicate that along the south wall of the wing, from 1895 to 1899, the Schoolroom remained the same in the southeast corner, with the exception of change in access from the north wall (now blocked) to access from the foot of the stair on the west wall. The 1895 Library (still connected to the Schoolroom) became the Smoking Room, and the Plunge Bath, Bathroom and Turkish Bath remained intact, with Furnace Room and Clock Room to the south. North of the south corridor, the only remaining part of the original wing was the structure of the new Bedroom (part of the former Brushing Room and Lavatories). Essentially, the north side of the south corridor was completely remodelled and extended in 1897, and new bathroom, w.c. and urinal proposed for the west end of the corridor. Two bedrooms were created along the north side of the south corridor, as well as a Strong Room and Stationery Store.

The new alterations included a new Brushing Room and Coal Store in the location of the 1895 Little Scullery and lavatory. A new corridor was created to the north to form the Bachelor’s Entrance from the west end of the wing and north of the corridor was the new Book Room, flanked to the west by a lavatory, stair to the upper level suite of rooms and Housemaid’s closet beneath the stair. The Book Room was flanked to the east by the Butler’s Bedroom, Store for Plate Chests and new rear entrance and lobby.
Principal Floor

The west wing at Principal floor level comprised the Menservant's bedrooms – four in total off a top landing from the central stair below and closet to the south of the stair. The 1894 layout of this level differs substantially from the 1754 design, which showed each bedroom with a closet and all but two exterior windows in use (12 in total, 2 no. blind). The 1894 plan shows four blind windows out of the original twelve and the original closet partitions appear to have been removed to open up each bedroom. By this time, all of the ground floor spaces of the west wing have been roofed.

Figure 134  January 1894 plan of west wing, Principal floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

Plans of 1897 for the west wing Principal floor level show that the 1894 Menservant’s bedrooms had been altered for a new suite of bedrooms in the Bachelor wing. Layout remained the same as in 1894 on the west side, with the exception of the opening up of the northwest blind window due to the loss of the north window. The partitions of the east side bedrooms had been removed and a new partition inserted to create a single, large bedroom off the upper corridor and a lavatory at the east end of the new corridor, which related to the existing northeast window.

The main addition to the west wing was that of the large, wood panelled, carved and sky lit Tapestry Room at the centre of the wing. It had 18 no. individual round skylights installed. The Tapestry Room was approached from the main part of the house (Drawing Room) via a vaulted corridor which branched off to the south to meet the new suite of Bedrooms. The Tapestry Room is considered to be the best surviving example of the Weir Schultz work at Dumfries House.\(^\text{17}\) The wood used for the room was cedar, to deter moths and was produced in the famed Bute Cardiff workshops. Although begun much earlier, the Tapestry Room wasn’t completed until about 1908.\(^\text{18}\)

\(^\text{17}\) Andrew McLean, Christie's Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 - Dumfries House: A History
\(^\text{18}\) Andrew McLean, Christie's Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 - Dumfries House: A History
The Tapestry Room was designed to display four panels of Gobelins tapestry which had been presented to John, the Earl of Stair by Louis XIV when he was Ambassador in Paris (later sold to his nephew, Lord Dumfries).\textsuperscript{19}

On the west side of the Tapestry Room was a private suite of rooms comprising Bedroom, Dressing Room, w.c. and private stair down to the Bachelor’s Entrance corridor. There was a cistern room over the Dressing room at this time.

\textbf{Figure 135}  May 1897 plan of west wing, Principal floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA

\textsuperscript{19} Stamp, G Robert Weir Schultz - Architect - and his work for the Marquesses of Bute - an Essay 1981, p34
Chamber Floor (Attic of West Wing)

Chamber floor level of the west wing (attic of the west wing) in 1894 is shown to contain Menservant’s Bedrooms, like the level below, but with boxbeds (2 no. in each of the rooms either side of the central stair) along the south wall and windows only along the north wall. Access to roofspace is also shown.

This level is not shown on the 1754 contract set of drawings, presumably indicating that this was a later addition.

The Chamber level plan of the west wing (Attic of West wing) shows the removal of the box beds from the 1894 Menservants Bedrooms. A skylight was installed over the stair and skylights put in both bedrooms to compensate for the loss of the north windows from the extensions. A new cistern was positioned in the roofspace area in the east bedroom and the access door on the east wall was changed at this time.
Figure 137  January 1894 plan of Chamber floor level (attics of wings) and roof of west wing (left) and east wing (right). Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

Figure 138  May 1897 plan of west wing, Chamber floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA
Main Body of House

Ground Floor

The Ground floor level of the main part of Dumfries House had physically changed little from the original 1754 configuration, however the use of several of the spaces had changed by 1894.

Off the south side of the central corridor, the space originally for empty bottles beneath the front stair was now a Beer Cellar, with additional ventilation opening slapped through the north wall. The Small Beer Cellar became the Lamp Room and by the following year in 1895, the Lamp Room had been subdivided to comprise Lamp Room and Hot Water Furnace Room. To the west of the Lamp Room, where the 1754 Nursery and 2 no. closets were located, was now the Still Room and the closets had become a Store Room and Pantry for the Still Room. To the east of the Lamp Room, the Butler’s Room has become the Silver Room (with access from corridor changed to access from the Butler’s Pantry only by 1895) and the Pantry and Porter’s Lodge of 1754 had become by 1894 the Butler’s Pantry, with the central wall slapped through, and opened up completely by 1895.

Off the north side of the central corridor, the pair of wine cellars from 1754 do not appear to have been altered, but renamed the Stock Wine Cellar (west) and the Day Wine Cellar (east). By 1895, the Stock Wine Cellar (west) had been subdivided to create a smaller Decanting Cellar (east part) and Housekeeper’s Store (west part). The two service stairs at either side of the building have been little altered, with the addition of a lavatory beneath the east stair (had become the Boy’s Pantry by 1895) and a Housemaid’s Closet below the west stair. Along the north wall of the house, the 1754 My Lady’s Woman’s Room in the northwest corner had been altered and by 1894 had become the Housekeeper’s Bedroom and a Store Room (by 1895, the Store Room partition had been removed and the room became that of the Lady’s Maid). The Housekeeper’s Room retained this use to 1895 with the 1754 Store Room off the east side of this rooms becoming the Linen Store. The 1754 Second Table Room became the Steward’s Room by 1894 and panelling and cupboards were fitted to this room. There was a doorway slapped through on the west wall to the Linen Room. Further along to the east, the Latter Meat Room had become the Servant’s Hall, with the boxbeds on the south wall removed and fitted cupboards installed in their place. My Lord’s Vally’s Room and closet in the northeast corner had been opened up by 1894 for the Footman’s Pantry with sink and by 1895, it had been re-subdivided to form the Boy’s Room in the north part (accessed from the Servant’s Hall through new opening) and Valet’s Room in the south part.
Figure 139 January 1894 plan of main body of the house, Ground floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

Principal Floor

The Principal floor level of the main part of the house in 1894 was generally unaltered in configuration from the 1754 original plan. The Entrance Hall was flanked by the Tapestried Drawing Room (original Drawing Room) to the west and the Morning Drawing Room (original Dining Room) to the east. The central corridor remained the same with the exception of the previous installation of partitions with doors separating off both the east and west stairs from the Entrance Hall. Lavatories had been installed beneath each of the stairs by 1894. In 1894, the North Parlour had become the Dining Room, flanked by two suites of rooms: Lady Bute’s Bedroom, Dressing Room and lavatory (former closet) to the west and Lord Bute’s Dressing Room, Bathroom (with w.c. – former closet) and Strong Room (original Charter Room) to the east.
In 1895, Schultz was supervising the continued painting of the Entrance Hall, and in 1898, he was also in discussion with the 3rd Marquess over an inscription to be put over the door in the Dining Room. A full-size drawing of the inscription is still located in the Mount Stuart Archives.

Figure 140  January 1894 plan of main body of the house, Principal floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

Figure 141  Inscription proposed by Robert Weir Schultz for the doorway to Dining Room (split into two parts above). MSA

Chamber Floor

The Chamber floor level appears to have changed little from its original 1754 configuration by 1894. In 1894, the chamber level comprised a suite of rooms (Bedroom, Dressing Room and separate room) in each of the four corners of the floor. The central corridor remains unaltered.

To the north of the corridor at centre remains a large Bedroom, small bedroom and two closets. Changes from the 1754 scheme are the addition of a lavatory in the servant’s bedroom and the introduction of a press cupboard on the south side of the small bedroom, with access to the closet originally off this space now changed to access from the corridor vestibule, with a new opening made by this time. Similarly, there remains a large Bedroom and small Bedroom on the south side of the corridor at centre, with closets off each and with only one change of the addition of a lavatory in the former servant’s bedroom. The southwest bedrooms suite is being used as a Nursery in 1894.

Figure 142  January 1894 plan of main body of the house, Chamber floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

Attic Level

In 1894, the Attic level (shown as Intersolls and Garrets on the 1754 contract) had undergone little alteration. The main ‘Garret’ space across the centre of the building was being used as a store room, with skylights built in for the lavatories below on the Chamber level. The northeast, southeast and southwest ‘garrets’ were also being used as storerooms and the northwest ‘garret’ was at this time being used as a Workroom by Lady Bute, with a partition installed along the north wall providing access to the rooftspace beyond, presumably used as storage. There were small
skylights marked in each of the storerooms and workroom. The mezzanine, or intersoll, rooms remained intact and in use at this time as Bedrooms with Dressing Rooms. There was also a stair to the flat lead roof leading up from the west stair upper landing.

In 1897, Robert Weir Schultz submitted an account to Lord Dumfries for ‘arranging painting of new chapel in roof of old house, designing new altar of same, making working drawings, instructing tradesmen.’. This refers to the temporary chapel that was built at the top of the west stair within the Attic space, which was to serve Lord Bute until the permanent chapel in the east wing was operational. The ‘temporary’ chapel is still shown on existing plans of March 1905.

Figure 143 January 1894 plan of main body of the house, Attic floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA

East Wing

Work on the alterations to the east wing began in 1899. 23

Ground Floor

The East Wing ground floor completed the service facilities for the house. It had undergone some changes, but still retained a large part of its 1754 configuration and use. The Kitchen was still located in the southwest corner of the wing, with a Bread Larder now in the location of the 1754 Scullery and the Cook’s Baking Room and Cook’s Pantry still in their original uses. The large Larder had become the Meat Larder by 1894, with access from the corridor and through to the stair to the upper levels maintained. Along the north wall of the wing, the Back Court with lavatories on the curve of the former Colonnade had been converted into a Scullery; the Bakehouse and Oven was still insitu; the original BrewHouse had been converted to a Joiners Store; the access corridor originally between Bakehouse and BrewHouse converted into a store room; the Gyle House was altered to become the Brew House; and a lavatory was inserted into the original Ash Yard area. The Coal Yard was retained, with the insertion of a Belfry room by 1894 and the south end of the Back Court was converted from open space to Empties Shed.

A heating boiler was put in the basement area below the new Chapel and central heating with radiators installed according to plans dated September 1899.

An essential feature for all of the 3rd Marquess of Bute’s properties was the installation of a private chapel. Robert Weir Schultz was brought in by the 3rd Marquess to create a new chapel within the east wing of the house. Although the extensions at this time were substantial and clearly new, the exterior presentation of the alterations was in keeping with and respectful of the 18th century architecture of the original house by the Adam brothers. The only clearly new part of the design from the exterior is the domed cupolas for the circular stairs either side of the main block on the south façade.

The Chapel was to be entered at Ground floor level and sketch designs sections dated 8th March 1898 show that there was extensive planning of the layout and decoration of the Chapel characteristic of the 3rd Marquess.

Figure 145  January 1894 plan of the east wing, Ground floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA

Figure 146  8th March 1898 sketches for the Chapel. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA
Figure 147  April 1899 plan of the east wing, Ground floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

The ground floor of the Chapel was to contain along the north wall, Sacristy, Sanctuary and Chapel of the Dead, with a separate Lady Chapel on the east side. The Chapel was to be entered off a vestibule to the west with an access stair to the Principal floor which also gave access to the passage to the upper private pew.

The Chapel was clearly the main addition to the east wing and saw the removal of part of the original wing. At Ground floor level, plans dated April 1899 show that the colonnade was converted to a passage that linked the new rear entrance Hall with the main east-west corridor of the wing that was extended out into the Back Court. The Kitchen was retained with modification to the access door from the corridor. The Bread Larder was effectively removed and a store put in under the stair the Bread Larder space was opened up to become part of the new Scullery. The new Scullery was created with the removal of the partitions forming the Meat Larder, Cook’s Baking Room and Cook’s Pantry. In the Scullery, new vegetable rack, dish sinks and vegetable gas cooker were installed. A window was put in the place of the former access to the stair and this area was to be used for pots & pans. The area next to the foot of the stair was turned into a cupboard at this time. The original window into the Back Court from the Meat Larder was changed to a doorway at this time for access into the extended corridor. Further along the south side of the wing, the Covered Shed (Empties Shed in 1894) and Coal Shed were retained, with a new slapping between the Coal Shed and Covered Shed and the removal of the door to the belfry tower.

On the north side of the Corridor, the 1894 Scullery, Bakehouse, Oven and Joiners Store had been completely removed for the new Chapel complex. A group of three new larders was inserted at the southeast corner of the Chapel (Boiler Room and w.c. today). The 1894 Brew House was converted to the Cook’s Room with a wood block floor and the Ash Yard and lavatory were altered to become the Housemaid’s Room, also with a woodblock floor. A new w.c. was inserted into the east end of the new Corridor, adjacent to the Housemaid’s Room.
Principal Floor

At Principal floor level of the east wing in 1894 there were bedrooms for Maidservants. Almost symmetrical in layout to the west wing Principal floor level, but with additional partitions for what were presumably closets to the bedrooms.

The 1899 alterations at this level saw the retention of the stair and outer walls of this level. Substantial modifications were made to convert this level for accommodation. The 1894 Maidservant’s Bedrooms had all of its partitions removed and the north east blind window was opened up. The west bedrooms were converted to a single space with one fireplace (existing). The east bedrooms were partitioned off to create a corridor to the north and room to the south, with the closet south of the stair becoming a Wardrobe. A wc was inserted at the end of this new corridor. North of the original west wing at this level was a new Housekeeper’s Bedroom and Servant’s Bathroom over the new group of Larders at Ground floor level. The Chapel had a passage to the private pew mezzanine (on south wall of Chapel); stair between Chapel and Private Pew passages and the vaulted corridor leading to the main part of the house.

Figure 148  January 1894 plan of the east wing, Principal floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA
Chamber Level (Attic of East Wing)

The east wing Attic level (at Chamber level) is symmetrical to the west wing, with bedrooms for Womenservants, including boxbeds. The only exception to the layout is the addition of a lavatory on the upper stair landing, which is not shown on the west wing layout. See figure 150.

By 1899, the lavatory was to be removed and made into a cupboard. With the removal of the north windows due to the new additions, skylights were installed over both rooms. Boxbeds were removed and the bedrooms left as open rooms with access maintained to roofspace. The former west window became a press cupboard, the centre window was blocked and the east window was concerted to a door into the new Cold Water Supply tank room.
Figure 150  April 1899 plan of the east wing, Chamber floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA

Figure 151  West wing under construction in 1897. M SA

Figure 152  West wing under construction in 1897 - detail. M SA
The 1890s alterations were structurally complete by the time of the death of the 3rd Marquess at Dumfries House on 9th October 1900. However, much of the internal decoration was completed by the 4th Marquess of Bute. 24

Figure 153  Dumfries House following completion of east wing, late 1900-early 1901, as the building shows the hatchment for the 3rd Marquess on the front elevation, following his death on the 9th October 1900. MSA

Landscape Alterations by Robert Weir Schultz

The Bute family had taken on the lease of St John’s Lodge, Regents Park, and in addition to architectural work within the house, in 1892 RWS had replanned the gardens. These were formal, with a rectangular lawn, a circular rose garden with classical piers, loggias and niches (figures 154-155).

At Dumfries House he also designed a new garden in a formal, early 18th century manner.

Figure 154  View of St John’s Lodge garden 1890s Gavin Stamp
Figure 155  View of St John’s Lodge garden 1890s Gavin Stamp

New Chiswick and Proposed Casino

It is not clear when the name ‘New Chiswick’ was selected. Weir Schultz presented a bill in 1897 for the design of an orangery and Portico ‘at New Chiswick’, and the name appears on the 1896 OS map, but Schultz’s earlier plans were for ‘planting around the Casino’. No other drawings of this building are known.

The plan for a new garden to the west of Homeston Wood, to be called ‘New Chiswick’ is an example of the 3rd Marquess’s historicist, but also highly personal approach to his properties. The design echoes the garden at Chiswick House, evoking the shade of Lord Burlington, who had advised the 5th Earl of Dumfries on his new house in the 18th century; and the 3rd Marquess and his family had lived for a time at Chiswick House. The site chosen was an empty field, so that no earlier layout or planting was disturbed, and the design fitted around the principal east-west axis of the mid 18th century plan. It could be seen as a counterbalance to the formal area around the Bowling Green to the east of the house, which had been maintained by the 3rd Marquess. The east boundary of New Chiswick was to be the Eastern Ha-ha, which was broken through with a pair of gates. Two other entry points have been made, but these are not shown on any of the plans for New Chiswick.

![Figure 156 Opening in the Western Ha-ha 2008](image)

![Figure 157 Opening in the Western Ha-ha 2008](image)

The principals of the early 18th century landscape at Chiswick on the Thames followed the ‘natural style’ of the ‘Villas of the Ancients’, thought in that period to be a mixture of regular and rural gardening, adjacent to a strong central axis feature which connected the villa and the landscape. Winding paths were thought to be a characteristic of Pliny’s classical gardens, leading to a fashion for wildernesses. The hippodrome shape was another essential feature (figure 158).

The plans indicate a great deal of work in progress – the first scheme includes an overlay with an alternative arrangement of fountains for the south east corner; there are pencil sketches in the margins of the third scheme. A further, possibly fourth, scheme was sketched onto a plan of the grounds dated January 1893. The second scheme has been lost.
Figure 158 Detail of John Rocques survey of Chiswick, published 1736.

Figure 159 Plan of Proposed Planting on the site of the Casino Robert Weir Schultz April 1892 M SA
The motifs and the basic layout of the original Chiswick are followed in Schultz’s first scheme: the goose-foot allées, winding wilderness paths, the hippodrome shaped lawns and entrance path, and in place of the villa a substantial ‘Casino’.

Traditionally this would have been an outdoor dining pavilion, but nothing is know its proposed use here. The dimensions of the Casino – 80 feet square with a portico and three external staircases, together with an elongated Annexe – indicate it was to have been a fairly substantial garden building.

The Third Scheme departs from the Chiswick design by removing two allées from the goose-foot. Two more pavilions are shown, and an arbour at the end of the remaining allée. The grey areas on the plan indicate planting, with a round rose garden in the north west corner.

An amphitheatre had been added to the south of the central hippodrome and the fountains in the south east area had gone.
What is probably a fourth scheme for the layout was sketched onto a plan of part of the policies dated January 1893. This reverts to the goose-foot of the original Chiswick.

The extent to which the known plans for New Chiswick were realised is unclear; it seems certain the Casino itself was not fully constructed. Schultz’s Third Scheme has been overlaid with the 1909 OS map for comparison (figure 165). The most obviously missing element is the Casino building itself, which may only have reached the stage of foundations or low walls by the time of the 3rd Marquess’s death. By 1896 a slope had been built against the Western Ha-ha to allow access to the west, and on the 1909 OS this lines up with a vista of cleared trees in the Homeston Wood which continued east to the house.
An aerial photograph from 1946 shows some marks in the ground on the site of the Casino, but also two parallel lines which correspond with neither the Schultz plans nor the 1909 map. The nursery of 1909 had been removed by this date.
Alterations to Sunken Garden

Schultz carried out alterations to the Sunken Garden in the mid-late 1890s, extending the central section to a square shape by surrounding the original sunken feature with additional grassed areas (figure 167).

All known photographs from this period shows the beds surrounded by wire fences against the rabbits (figure 168).

Figure 167  Detail of plan of the garden, Weir Schultz April 1896 M SA

Proposed Chinese Bridge

‘Lord Bute’s Walk’ is marked on the OS map of 1896, a sinuous path covering a reasonable distance around the eastern half of the policies. The path crossed the River Lugar, and Weir Schultz designed a particularly decorative bridge, probably for this walk (figure 169). There is no indication the bridge was ever built.

Figure 169  Proposed Chinese Bridge over the Lugar, Robert Weir Schultz, pre-1900 M SA
Additional Buildings and Structures within the Policies

The approach road from Cumnock added shortly after 1837 had had no gate lodge of its own, unlike the other approaches. The 3rd Marquess commissioned an elegant, Italianate gate lodge, together with walls, railings, gatepiers and gates. There is no documentary evidence of the involvement of Weir Schultz, but given the style of the building and the involvement of the architect at the house it seems likely to be by him. The building appears on the OS map of 1896, but its construction date is not known.

The planting of fast-growing conifers changed the appearance of the policies, as can be seen in several late 19th century views. The area to the east of the Walled Garden had continued in its historic role as a nursery for the rest of the policies, and a phalanx of small conifers can be seen growing there in a late 19th century view (figure 172), which also shows the new Gardener's House, and a number of substantial deciduous trees within the Walled Garden. The majority of the conifers at Dumfries House are Wellingtonias, which were first introduced to Scotland from the United States in 1853.

Although it had been a highly visible feature in the 18th century landscape, by the late 19th century the Lady's Well had been partially obscured by conifers (figure 173).

Figure 170 Lodge at Cumnock 2008. S&B

Figure 171 Gates at Cumnock Lodge 2008. S&B
Figure 172  View of the Nursery, with Gardener’s House and Walled Garden, undated late 19th century  M SA

Figure 173  Lady’s Well, undated, late 19th century  M SA

Figure 174  Doocot, undated late 19th century  M SA

Figure 175  House from north, undated late 19th century  M SA
A proposal to divert part of the Lugar is dated 1900, and was perhaps not carried out due to the death of the 3rd Marquess. A thick belt of planting along the Lugar (first shown on the 1896 OS as ‘Home Plantation’) had separated the main river from views from the house, creating a secluded riverside area. The open ground to the north of the house was vulnerable to flooding from the river, and the proposal was perhaps a combination of practical flood prevention measures with a desire to bring the sound of water closer to the house – a modification in the picturesque taste.

The Marquess’s friend Hunter Blair had diverted the Water of Girvan where it passed through his park at Blairquhan (figure 176), which may have inspired this proposal.

![Figure 176 Proposed diversion of Lugar Water 1900 M SA](image)

![Figure 177 Diversion of river at Blairquhan](image)
The 3rd Marquess of Bute died at Dumfries House in 1900. His friend Hunter Blair described how his body was taken by train from the estate to the coast, and then by boat to Bute, where it was laid to rest in the mausoleum at the Shore Chapel at Mount Stuart.

A memorial to the 3rd Marquess was erected in the policies, close to Lord Bute’s Walk, and apparently identical to one raised at Mount Stuart, which has not survived.

The plinth is inscribed ‘Thy Wounds are my Merits’ and an inscription reads ‘HOEC SACROSANCTA IMAGO JUSSU JOANNIS MARCHIONIS III BOTHAE ERECTA EST PROPE LOCUM UBI IPSE ANIMAM DEO REDDIDIT DIE IX OCTOBRA MDCCCC 25’

---

25 This sacred statue was erected according to the wishes of John 3rd Marquess of Bute, near to the place where his spirit returned to God on the 9th October 1900.
3.6 9th October 1900 - 16th May 1947: John Crichton-Stuart, 4th Marquess of Bute (b.1881-d.1947)

3.6.1 1900-1909: Alterations by Robert Weir Schultz

Dumfries House

After the death of the 3rd Marquess, his son, the 4th Marquess of Bute continued the works programme at Dumfries House.

Structural work on the Chapel was completed by 1905, when it was commented on by Rt Revd Sir David Hunter Blair. In 1906, Schultz prepared a scheme for the marble lining of the Chapel. By 1908 it was clear that work to the Chapel had been delayed and it does not appear to have ever been completed. 1

Figure 179  Sketch of marble finishes for the Chapel, c1905 (left) and completed design perspective for the Chapel, c1905 (right). Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

1Stamp, G  Robert Weir Schultz - Architect - and his work for the Marquesses of Bute - an Essay 1981, p.34
In 1905, a survey of the building showed a number of changes since the 1897 programme of works. The Schoolroom in the southeast corner was now the Business Room with access through to the Smoking Room blocked and what appears to have been a doorway in the south elevation inserted in place of the central window on the elevation. Stair had been replaced and the access from the foot of the original stair through to the Smoking Room was also blocked by 1905. The west wall of the Smoking Room, which originally led on to the Turkish Bath had been completely opened up and the Turkish Bath, Plunge Bath and Bathroom had been transformed into a large Billiard Room. The new door to the Smoking Room was inserted in the north wall into the south corridor. The Smoking Room was to have a new marble fireplace with old Dutch tiles, and the Smoking Room/ Billiard Room was to have new walnut bookcases, paneling and doors, billiard table, heating and lighting.2

The south corridor remained unchanged since 1897 with the exception of alterations to a w.c. at the west end and the relocation of the partition and door within the south corridor itself.

The 1897 Strong Room and Stationery Store remain intact by 1905, however the other rooms off the north side of the south corridor had been altered to form three menservants bedrooms with a bathroom at the west end. It appears that it was about 1905 that the underground passageway between the south and north corridors was constructed, stepping down from the behind the Strong Room and coming up next to the Brushing Room. The Brushing Room and Coal Store remain in place, with a minor alteration (brick wall and glazing above) to the Coal Store to incorporate the stair to the basement passage.

**Figure 181** March 1905 plan of the West Wing, Ground floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

**Figure 182** c1908 photograph of the Billiard Room, view east. M SA
In 1905, the Book Room has been converted to the Gun Room, however the remainder of the layout along the north wall of the wing remained as it was constructed in 1897.

A new bathroom was proposed by Robert Weir Schultz in the Store for Plate Chests for the side entrance in the west wing 23rd February 1906, which involved a new door slapping through the south wall to the corridor and the blocking up of the existing doors on the east wall which originally served the Store for Plate Chests.

Principal Floor

There was very little change to the Principal floor level of the West Wing by 1905. The only noticeable change was the replacement of the south stair and the subsequent blocking up of the access to a closet (now removed) and the construction of a new, panelled stair up to the Valet’s Bedrooms.
Figure 185  March 1905 plan of West Wing, Principal floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA

Figure 186  c1908 photograph of Tapestry Room, view south. M SA
Figure 187  c1908 photograph of the Tapestry Room, view north. M SA

Figure 188  c1908 photographs of the Tapestry Room Corridor (left) and the West Wing Corridor (right). M SA
Chamber Floor (Attic of West Wing)

The rooms within the attic of the West Wing became the Valet’s Bedrooms by 1905. The skylights were still in place and the only noticeable change was the replacement of the stair.

Figure 189  March 1905 plan of West Wing, Chamber floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

Figure 190  March 1905 plan of the ground floor of the main body of the house. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA
Main Body of House

Ground Floor

According to the March 1905 plans, there does not appear to have been any alterations to the layout shown on the 1895 drawings.

Principal Floor

Between 1894 and 1905, a number of changes occurred on the Principal floor level. The Tapestried Drawing Room in the southwest corner had become the White Drawing Room and access was provided as part of the late 1890s work through to the new corridor in the west wing. This splayed access doorway appears to have used the location of a blind(?) opening recess (combined with exterior blind window - possibly a device to retain symmetry in the room?) on the west wall of the White Drawing Room.

The Hall remains unaltered and the Morning Drawing Room of 1894 became the Dining Room by 1905, with the 1894 Dining Room returning to its original 18th century use as a Parlour.

There was no change to Lord Bute's suite of rooms in the northeast corner, however Lady Bute's lavatory room was converted to a Bathroom by 1905.
Figure 192  c1908 photograph of the Entrance Hall, view north. M SA

Figure 193  c1908 photograph of the reinstated Dining Room, view west. M SA
Figure 194  c1908 photograph of the White Drawing Room, view west. M SA

Figure 195  c1908 photograph of the reinstated Parlour, view south. M SA
Chamber Floor

The general 1754 layout of the Chamber floor level has been retained, with the corner suites of rooms and this level remains in use as the accommodation floor. The main alterations on this level by 1905 is the upgrading of plumbing.

This included the insertion of wcs into the closets of each corner bedroom suite (all identified as being in use as Bedrooms again by 1905). The central north Bedroom suite has had its wc and closet knocked through and made into a Bathroom with wc. The Closet is identified as being the Housemaid’s Closet at this time. The central south Bedroom suite has lost its closet and wc by this time, the space being opened up into the bedroom with what appears to be a pillared ‘screen’ to the newly created alcove.

Skylights are shown over the central part of the Corridor.

Attic Floor

By 1905, the Attic level of the house had undergone some changes physically and in use. The large central store room had been subdivided; a large central light well had been put in for the skylights over the Corridor; as well as a skylight over the bathroom for the central northern bedroom suite; and a large cistern. The temporary Chapel was in place within the west stair upper landing and the remaining corner store rooms had not been altered, with the exception of the northwest corner room becoming a store room once again from being Lady Bute’s Workroom in 1894.

On the mezzanine levels either side of the building, the dressing room partitions had been removed by this time from each room. The east rooms are shown as Bedrooms and the west rooms are shown in 1905 as the Lady’s Maid’s Room (north) and Lady’s Maid’s Bedroom (south).

Figure 196 March 1905 plan of the Chamber floor level. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA
Figure 197  c1908 photograph of the Chamber floor corridor. M SA

Figure 198  March 1905 plan of the Attic level. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA
East Wing

Ground Floor

A further round of changes had been made by 1905 since the 1899 additions to the east wing. Structurally complete by 1905, it has been presumed that the elaborate design for the finishing of the Chapel was never fully completed. That said, the layout as proposed in 1899 appears to have been fully carried out for the Chapel, passageway and rear entrance hall.

Changes by 1905 include the conversion of the group of three larders at the southeast corner of the Chapel into the Maids Sitting Room, with Maids wc and basin. The Proposed Cooks Room and Housemaid’s Room on the 1899 plan in the northeast corner of the end of the wing had been knocked through to form three new larders – the Cook’s Larder, Raw Meat Larder and Games Larder (running west to east). The wc at the east end of the 1899 corridor extension had been removed to allow access into the new Games Larder.

The Kitchen, Scullery, rear yard, shed and coal store remained unaltered since 1899.

Principal Floor

There appears to have been no change to the layout proposed in 1899 at this level. The only difference in drawings is that the two rooms on the south side of the level either side of the stair have been named as Maid Servant’s Bedrooms.

Chamber Floor (Attic of East Wing)

The attic of the east wing had not been altered between 1899 and 1905, but the rooms were identified in 1905 as Maid Servant’s Bedrooms.

In 1909, the entire house was wired for electricity. An Electricity Generator Station was proposed in February 1909 by James E Sayers & Caldwell, Consulting Engineers and electricians of Glasgow. It is not clear where this generator station was to be located.

---
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Figure 199  March 1905 plan of the East Wing Ground floor. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA

Figure 200  March 1905 plan of the west wing Principal floor. Robert Weir Schultz, MSA
There were developments in the landscape between the 2nd Edition OS of 1896 and the 1909 OS, however in the absence of documentary evidence, what is shown on the 1909 OS map cannot be dated to the period after 1900 with any certainty and it may largely be a reflection of works carried out by the 3rd Marquess.

The 1909 OS map shows the area to the east of the house had gained allées. This had been the most elaborate area of planting in the mid 18th century, and the new allées are clearly a part of the programme of restoration which the 3rd and 4th Marquesses
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Figure 201  March 1905 plan of the west wing Chamber floor. Robert Weir Schultz, M SA

Figure 202  Early 20th century postcard of Dumfries House, following completion of works. M SA
carried out at several properties. Both the Smith and Home plans would have been available to guide the reinstatement, together with a number of the original trees, several of which remain today. The 1772 estate plan by Home has been overlaid with the 1909 OS map (see figure 205) for comparison. The combination of straight allées with sinuous paths is an approach that the 3rd Marquess would have been familiar with at his main seat at Mount Stuart, where the geometric design laid out by the 3rd Earl of Bute in the 1720s had been overlaid by a winding approach. The visitor at both seats had the benefit of long views down the formal vistas, but seen intermittently from the fashionably irregular paths and approach roads.

The Bowling Green itself had been planted over by 1909, perhaps surprisingly, as this interrupted the principal vista. Most of the trees appear to be conifers, however, so this may have been a decision by the 3rd Marquess. The curved flower beds at the back of the house had been made rectangular. The area to the south of the house retained its parkland qualities, with scattered and grouped trees.

Figure 203  Detail of area around Bowling Green OS 1896. NLS
At some point in the early 20th century, the 18th century Icehouse was partially taken down, and a meat larder added over the earlier structure. It continued to be referred to as ‘Icehouse’ on OS maps. The shape and size of the meat larder may be related to
the similar round Game Larder at Mount Stuart, built also in the early 20th century to provide additional storage space for the 4th Marquess's shooting parties.

After 1909, the Coach House was altered to provide more accommodation on the first floor, with dormer windows surrounded by carefully tooled masonry, matching the original. This is almost certainly the work of Robert Weir Schultz.

![Figure 206](undated late 19th century view of Coach House)  ![Figure 207](Coach House 2008 S&B)

### 3.6.2 1913-1915: Alterations by Allen Stevenson

1913 plans at Ayrshire Archives show alterations proposed to the Attic level.\(^4\) The central section of the Attic layout with the 2 lightwells is intact, however the rest of the Attic has been altered substantially, including new roof lights. Only the main structural walls and mezzanine rooms remain unaltered.

A plan of March 1913 of the existing layout of the Attic level shows a chapel at the head of the west staircase (as seen in the March 1905 plan, see figure 198), with servants rooms only in the mezzanines. A part from use as a private chapel, the Attic appears to have only been used for storage up until this time. This plan indicates the location of the 3rd Marquess of Bute’s chapel prior to the design of the much larger proposed chapel in the east wing of the house, and suggests that this ‘temporary’ chapel was in use for a much longer period than originally intended.

A new steel roof, and therefore substantial alteration to the Attic level, was proposed in April 1913 and roof construction drawings were developed through to December 1913.

Drawings show the proposed roof construction to comprise:

- 14 x 2½ Wood kerb bolted to concrete beam for fixing leadwork.
- 16 x 5¼ concrete beam
- 1½ inch thick ‘breeze’ concrete for fixing slates
- 16” x 8” slates all to be nailed with a single nail at top and two nails at bottom as in old roof.
- 3” concrete slab

\(^4\)Allen Stevenson Drawings, 14 Cathcart Street, Ayr – Darley Hey Collection, Ayrshire Archives. Information courtesy of Simon Green, RCAHMS
By August 1913, a plan indicated the new layout for the Attic with a Servant’s Bathroom.

In July 1914, James Boyd and Sons Plumbers adapted the heating system with a new mains supply and by December of that same year, drawings existed for the Chamber floor that showed the proposed fireproof floor.

The drawings for the fireproof floor show a temporary truss along the south wall of the Chamber floor landing across the archway; existing wooden beams to be retained; and proposed steel beams. The Chamber floor corridor and Entrance Hall had steel beams and reinforced concrete floors inserted c1915, following adoption of the 1914 drawings.

By February 1915, detail drawings had been prepared showing the new cornice for the whole corridor on the Principal floor level between both the east and west staircases, which appears to have been carried out.

3.6.3 1928-1938: Alterations by Arthur Forman Balfour Paul

Chapel & New Dining Room

The Chapel was continued following the death of the 3rd Marquess, however it presumably remained unfinished when it was removed during the 1930s period of works to Dumfries House. Some of the fabric from the Chapel survive in the house today, including a Palladian window in the new, 1930s, Dining Room.

Upon his father’s death, the 4th Marquess continued works, but with alterations to the original designs. Architect Arthur Forman Balfour Paul, who had previously worked for Lord Bute on Charlotte Square in Edinburgh during the 1920s, was employed to carry out the new work.

Balfour Paul proposed the remodelling of east wing at Dumfries House between 1928-1931, and there was a proposal to let Dumfries House in 1929.

The biggest change proposed at this time were to the Chapel wing, which was horizontally subdivided with the addition of a new floor for a Dining Room above and a book store below. The 4th Marquess desired for the Dining Room to be closer to the Kitchen.5

The new Dining Room was floored with 7/8” thick Austrian oak laid on battens, and a Robert Adam fireplace was installed (originally brought from Luton Park, then used at Mount Stuart, before coming to Dumfries House).

The installation of the New Dining Room saw the removal of the existing pillars at Principal floor level and the Chapel side galleries. A new service stair was installed against the west wall of the wing in the position of the former passageway to the private pew. The c1935 plan of the New Dining Room suggests that it was constructed with a larger southwest Service Room (with lift) than is there at present, Sideboard Recess and store, and that the whole of the south end of the Dining Room was in fact much further forward and symmetrical along the east wall about the fireplace. The stair to the galleries and private pew in the northwest corner was removed and became the Secretary’s Room. The new northeast corner room was identified as a Spare Room.

The original Dining Room became an additional Drawing Room once the New Dining Room was completed.

Below the new Dining Room, a new library was created. The Weir Schultz Lady Chapel area was retained and remodelled as the house chapel, giving the room the name of the Chapel Library.

Figure 208  c1935 proposals for alterations to the Principal floor level to create the New Dining Room in the east wing. M SA
Other Works to Dumfries House

Earl of Dumfries and family moved back to Dumfries House in 1933, which prompted the extensive works programme within the house. Apart from the major changes to the Chapel Wing, the 4th Marquess instigated other works, including new bathrooms and the purchasing of new furniture and fittings (including fireplace grates). Plumbing and electrics for the house were overhauled during the 1930s.

Works carried out during this period include:

- In August 1933, Lord Bute requested a new bathroom be installed in the west wing\(^6\), but due to space and height issues, this was not carried out.

- In September 1933, \(^7\) there was an issue over a single, awkward step at the south end of the Tapestry Room Corridor leading to the Business Room end of the of the house and that this was a trip hazard. The Factor suggested levelling by creating an incline along the corridor to meet the step 6” over 26’ and this work was carried out shortly afterwards in a way that the change is almost imperceptible.

- Also in September 1933, \(^8\) a small iron enamel bath was installed in the wash place/ lavatory at the northwest corner of the west wing. It was to be a 5’4” bath with chromium fittings and taps to be on the window end of the room. The front end was to be covered with wooden panels and painted white. Frosted glass was to be put in the window.

\(^6\) Mount Stuart Archives, DE/ Factor's Correspondence with Lord Bute - Mr Hendrie 1933-1938
\(^7\) Mount Stuart Archives, DE/ Factor's Correspondence with Lord Bute - Mr Hendrie 1933-1938
\(^8\) Mount Stuart Archives, DE/ Factor's Correspondence with Lord Bute - Mr Hendrie 1933-1938
• September 1934 plans by Rowand Anderson & Paul & Partners show a new heating chamber in place of the covered shed, (former Empties Shed) in the rear yard of the east wing, attached to the east wall of the Scullery.

• Teak flooring was selected for bathroom floors in June 1935.

• New marble top in ‘Blanc Cair’ selected for washbasin in northwest corner bathroom of west wing in July 1935.

• October 1935, Mr. Hendrie purchases two antique grates.

• In October 1935, the telephone line was installed at Dumfries House ‘Cumnock 3’.

• By the 1st March 1936, Lord Bute is clearly getting impatient with getting the work to the house complete and asks for Balfour to be hurried up. Balfour Paul was on site on the 17th March and had arranged at this time for the tradesman to finish the contract. These final works included the erection of a partition at the service stair; covering of radiators; altering skirting in the chapel; changing of the glass in the New Dining Room ceiling oval.

• March 1936 saw the dispatch of the new Dining Table through Gander and White to Dumfries House.

• Installation of a new lift at the northwest corner of the Kitchen in May 1936. The intention was that food would be collected by the Kitchen door by the footman and brought to the lift direct from the kitchen. The footman would receive same at the top of the stair. Waste from the New Dining Room would

Figure 210  May 1936 setch of changes for new lift from Kitchen to New Dining Room Service Area. M r Hendrie, M SA

9 Mount Stuart Archives, DE/ Factor’s Correspondence with Lord Bute – Mr Hendrie 1933-1938
10 DE/ 1935-1936 Mount Stuart Archives, October 1935
11 Mount Stuart Archives, DE/ Factor’s Correspondence with Lord Bute – Mr Hendrie 1933-1938
12 Mount Stuart Archives, DE/ Factor’s Correspondence with Lord Bute – Mr Hendrie 1933-1938
13 DE/ 1935-1936 Mount Stuart Archives, 23rd March 1936.
14 Mount Stuart Archives, DE/ Factor’s Correspondence with Lord Bute – Mr Hendrie 1933-1938
be collected by the chef and taken directly into the Kitchen – the oddman would take dirty dishes from lift on the Passage side and not need to enter the kitchen.

In June 1936, painterwork by J B Bennett & Sons Ltd was undertaken, as was work to the Chapel (former Lady Chapel) and Chapel Library (Book Store), All woodwork in the Chapel was to be painted white. Step and altar in the Chapel were also to be brought forward a little for new radiator. Back stair from Kitchen to New Dining Room, Turret Stair and Chapel Library also painted. All to be painted white.

July 1936, bookcases stained and varnished mahogany, radiator covers to be painted white.

Dimensions were provided to order a new Turkey carpet for the New Dining Room in 1936.  

Dumfries House Furniture Collection

Of the remaining furniture by English makers within the house, the most distinctive item is the early 19th century nine pedestal Dining Table by Gillow of Lancaster. It was acquired in 1936 for the new Dining Room at Dumfries House. The 4th Marquess of Bute purchased the table from the collection of the major Gillow patrons, the Earls of Eglinton, another Ayrshire landowning dynasty. The table is significant because of its size, its provenance, and the fact that it corresponds exactly with a design supplied by Gillows to the 12th Earl of Eglinton around 1800.

Landscape & Estate Buildings

The inter-war years were times of great change for British landowners. Numerous estates were sold and country houses demolished. Dumfries House remained cushioned by the great Bute fortune, and was one of the few estates in Ayrshire to survive the period almost unscathed.

Subsidence caused by mining operations affected parts of the policies.

3.6.4 1939-1945: Second World War

Dumfries House

J McSparren & McCormick wrote to Mr Hendrie, Factor of Dumfries House, in August of 1941 on behalf of the Archdiocese of Glasgow to ask whether Dumfries House could be let for the duration of the war for the use as an Approved School for Boys. This would have required the storage of furniture and the application was refused by Lord Bute. An additional complication would have been that by 1941, Dumfries House was being used to store furniture that had been moved by Lord Bute from his London and Edinburgh properties.

In February 1942, it was suggested that the Military Authorities would like two or three rooms in the house for offices.

---

Colonel Galbraith wrote a letter to Lord Bute on 14th July 1942, requisitioning the east and west wings. The requisitioned rooms were to accommodate 15 officers including the Brigadier General.

In August 1942, Lord Bute agreed to give the Military Authorities some accommodation in the East and West Wings of Dumfries House, and the Stables, Garages, and Laundry.

Accommodation was to include the East Wing (excluding the Library); West Wing (excluding the Billiard and Tapestry Rooms); Main House - Servants’ Hall and Store; bedroom, adjoining room and bathroom at the east end of the first floor; the 4 mezzanine rooms at east and west ends; Attic rooms; Coach House and six rooms over; Stable loft over; Laundry and three rooms over.

Matting was to be placed over the Dining Room floor for protection and in September 1942, a catalogue was made of both the Chapel Library and the Billiard Room Library, as well as a complete inventory and valuation of the furniture and china etc.

In December 1942, Brigade Headquarters requested six additional bedrooms and two dressing rooms at Dumfries House and there was discussion about using Lady Bute’s suite of rooms. Lord Bute refused the request unless the military was to requisition the entire house and take full responsibility for its contents.

No troops were permitted to use the Chapel in the east wing, by order of Lord Bute. However, there were a number of exceptions to the rule when individual requests were made, such as in June 1942, when the priest attached to the Irish Fusiliers requested use of the Chapel to say Mass for himself on Sundays; in July 1942, a Captain Stevens also requested the use of the Chapel; and in April 1943, Father McManus, a Canadian Catholic Padre called to ask to use the chapel at Dumfries House occasionally, and he would only take his Batman with him. By June 1943, however, correspondence indicates that Lord Bute was not allowing use of the Chapel in case it ‘infringed on arrangements with the military authorities.’

In August 1944, a letter was received stating that Dumfries House would be derequisitioned on the 1st September. Hendrie expected at this time that the West Wing would again be requisitioned by the Ministry of Fuel and Power for offices.

Landscape & Estate Buildings

During the Second World War parts of the Dumfries House estate were also requisitioned, and a military camp was built south of the Temple. Damage was caused within the policies, the most serious being the destruction of the Lady’s Well, although the Avenue Bridge was also damaged.

Pennyland Camp

The most significant alteration to the policies in the 20th century was the construction of the Pennyland Camp (figure 211). Although later used as a Prisoner of War Camp, Pennyland was constructed as a British Army training camp, and did not receive prisoners until about 1943. The camp was built to the north of the house.

Further research is required into the history of the camp. The information below comes largely from Dan Lowe’s ‘History of Auchinleck’ 1991.
with the Temple at its northwest corner, the small cottage of Pennyland at its northeast corner, and it extended over the line of the 18th century approach from Auchenleck. Although not shown on OS maps, aerial photographs taken by the RAF in 1946 give a clear indication of the appearance of the camp.

Auchinleck was also requisitioned, and used to house Free French, Canadian and Polish Commandos. The degree to which Auchinleck was damaged by their occupation is not known, but correspondence from the factor at Dumfries House indicates that the uncontrolled behaviour of the occupants of the Pennyland Camp was of grave concern. The Free French wandered from the grounds of Auchinleck – they were responsible for the destruction the 18th century Lady’s Well, which was blown up in 1944.

The camp at Pennyland covered about 12 acres, with Nissen huts to house around 750 soldiers who were there for up to 6 months for pre-deployment training. The

**Figure 211** Aerial photograph Pennyland Camp 1946 RAF, with conjectural assessment of use NMRS, S&B edits
nearby Airds Moss was used for manoeuvres. In 1943 the camp was converted to a Prisoner of War centre.
Dumfries House was de-requisitioned on 1st September 1944.

![Figure 212 Drawing for reconstruction of Lady's Well, November 1944 Stevenson & Ferguson Architects](image)

3.6.5 1945-1947: Post Derequisition
In April 1945, the plasterwork throughout the house had been repaired, with the exception of a small part in the West Wing, which had been damaged by a leak from the flat roof. Plumbers had been instructed to repair this and other damage. On the
Marchioness of Bute’s instructions, Messrs. J B Bennett & Sons Ltd. Were instructed to paint the Dining Room, small room off Dining Room and staircase from Kitchen to Dining Room at a cost of £175:18:6.

Instructions were also given in April 1945 to repair the central heating plant which the Military Authorities had converted to burn coke.

In April 1945, Mr Hendrie was informed that cloth had been used throughout the house to hide cracks in the panelling and that to remove it all and renew the panels would be too big a project at the present. It was suggested that while the painting of the Business Room was being done they might take the opportunity to complete the few panels in that room. Mr Hendrie stated that there were at least 14 panels in the Business Room which had split, or where joints had opened. To complete the work properly, the panels would need to be taken out and pieced together.

Painting of the de-requisitioned Nursery wing (above the Business Room, west wing) was also planned at this time and repainted in white was suggested. The bulk of the post-requisition works were to do with repainting and repair. In February 1946, Lady Bute asked for the staircases; chamber corridor; and 4 middle bedrooms to be painted white. She also suggested the Blue and the Green rooms be painted white at the same time. A quote received the following month from Messrs J B Bennett & Sons for the painterwork quoted for 2 staircases; 8 bedrooms, 5 bathrooms, 4 dressing rooms, Housemaids’ Pantry, Dress Cupboard, and Gallery (Chamber Floor Corridor).

In March 1946, Hendrie was also enquiring about tiles for the fireplaces in Dumfries House that might be obtained from Mount Stuart. It is not clear what tiles, nor for which fireplaces at Dumfries House these were concerning.

J B Bennett & Sons did not start painterwork on the house until September on 1946.

The ceilings were completed in an off-white according to Hendrie in November 1946 and there was question over the shade for the walls – presumably white was not the final choice? It was suggested that the bedrooms, bathrooms and dressing rooms be painted a shade lighter than that on the walls of the Old Dining Room in 1946, but it is not clear what this colour was, as the sample originally enclosed with the letter has been lost.

By 13th December 1946, the painting of the north bedrooms had been completed, with the Gallery and staircases to be completed in the following week, following then by the south bedrooms.

In January 1947, it was expected that the painterwork would be completed by the end of the month.

Following Lord Dumfries’s death on 16th May 1947 his son, John Crichton-Stuart, now the 5th Marquess of Bute, moved the family to Mount Stuart and it became the principal family residence.
3.7 16th May 1947 - 14th August 1956: John Crichton-Stuart, 5th Marquess of Bute (b.1907-d.1956)

3.7.1 Dumfries House

As the 5th Marquess of Bute had made Mount Stuart the principal family residence, little work was undertaken at Dumfries House during his ownership of the estate. The house was looked after presumably by a caretaker and skeleton staff in the absence of the family under the supervision of Mr Hendrie, Factor of the estate.

It would have been expected that some changes of use would have occurred during this period and this is reflected in a letter written by Mr Hendrie with regard to an attempted burglary at Dumfries House in June 1947. He stated that the thief didn’t get beyond the Servant’s Hall (which he refers to as the old kitchen), which was, in 1947, being used as a sitting room.

Upon the death of John Crichton-Stuart, 5th Marquess of Bute on the 14th August 1956, the Dowager Marchioness of Bute returned to live at Dumfries House until she passed away in 1993. She was the last member of the family to permanently reside at Dumfries House. 17

3.7.2 Landscape & Estate Buildings

In 1947 Pennyland Camp was again converted, this time to a Polish Repatriation Centre. Some Poles who died at the camp were buried in the new Auchinleck cemetery. The camp was officially abandoned in 1948, but not demolished, and squatters moved in, their numbers rising to 120 families by 1951, with a population of 380 (122 men, 115 women, 143 children). The Camp at this stage was run by a committee who organised the camp and the recreation hut. A Sunday School run jointly by the Peden and Barony churches, had a roll of 36.

In 1949 there was a lengthy correspondence between the War Office, the Dumfries House Estate Office, and the Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments over the proposed restoration of the Lady’s Well, detailed drawings for which had been prepared at or just before its destruction. An offer of compensation from the War Office proved inadequate, and the Inspectorate was unwilling to sanction a restoration, stating, ‘As far as we are concerned a rebuilding would be archaeologically useless.’ The stones from the canopy were left where they had fallen.

During the 1950s, as Britain began to recover from the war and new council housing was built, the residents were gradually rehoused and the camp demolished. Although the 1959 OS map shows only that the concrete block access roads and the turning area to the south west remained (figure 215), an aerial photograph from the same year shows more substantial remains, at least to foundation level. The Temple had been used as accommodation during the War – by this date it was marked ‘ruins’.

Several mature trees on the site can be seen among the huts in the 1946 aerial photographs of the site. A comparison between the 1909 and 1959 OS maps shows a number had been lost, although the basic pattern of planting remained. The western side of the avenue leading south from Pennyland had gone, together with several of the parkland trees to the south of the Auchinleck Avenue.

17 Andrew McLean, Christie’s Catalogue, Dumfries House, Volume 1 – Dumfries House: A History
Figure 213  Site of Pennyland Camp 1909 OS Map. NLS

Figure 214  Site of Pennyland Camp 1959 OS Map. NLS

Figure 215  Detail of aerial photograph of Pennyland Camp February 1959. NMRS
A target used for practice by troops stationed at the Camp remains (figure 216). It was placed on the south side of the Lugar, on the edge of Shaw Wood and to the west of the Crucifix.

It was formerly accessed by a wire and rope bridge across the Lugar. The bridge was lost in the post-War period, but the concrete footings remain.

![Figure 216 Second World War target 2008.](image)

3.8 14th August 1956 - 22nd July 1993: John Crichton-Stuart, 6th Marquess of Bute (b.1933-d.1993)

3.8.1 1960s-1970s: Alterations

Dumfries House

Little work was done to the house until the 1960s, when substantial repair works were carried out.

Architects Watson Salmond & Gray were responsible for two major schemes of work in 1966. The first programme of works in August 1966 was comprised a complete overhaul of the roof with new lead flats on the main block and the wings. Chimneys were repaired and relined where found necessary. A new rooflight was installed over the Dining Room and possibly a new laylight. Plans at this time include a survey linking every fireplace to a chimney pot.

A second stage of works in November 1966 included the fitting of a new oil-fired heating system, including a new chimney in the present boiler room and new heaters in the window recesses of the Hall and White Drawing Room. These are wall-mounted radiators.

Works during 1966 also included a variety of minor works, such as the installation of cabinets in the Crystal Corridor to house the Waterford Crystal.

In August 1967, new lead work was carried out to all roofs and pointing of chimneys etc.

February 1968 saw Watson Salmond and Gray responsible for the installation of a new oval metal laylight in the east wing Dining Room, replacing a timber laylight.

In March 1969, the ‘apse’, or north window end of the Dining Room was remodelled with a new coffered ceiling and walls were framed out with a new frieze and existing

---

18 Watson Salmond & Gray Collection, Ref: No. 550, Box A, Mitchell Library. Courtesy of Simon Green, RCAHMS.

19 Watson Salmond & Gray Collection, Ref: No. 550, Box A, Mitchell Library
skirting refixed in new position. A proposal for cabinets on the walls below the coffered ceiling was not carried out.

Figure 217  Proposed lanterns for front entrance stair, November 1967. Watson, Salmond & Gray, MSA

Figure 218  Detail of proposals for Dining Room, showing new coffered ceiling at window, 1968. Watson, Salmond & Gray, MSA
They also completed a drawing of an electrified chandelier in the Dining Room, which is currently located in the North Parlour. New external lanterns were also designed and fitted to the front entrance stair.

Various alterations were proposed that were not carried out during these periods of work, and included the moving of the south wall of the Dining Room to create a serving room.

The firm AJ Russell Janfield were employed in 1969 to review the central heating supply for the house, no doubt in association with Watson Salmond & Gray. A detailed heating review was made and a number of changes to the heating system made as previously mentioned.

The heating plan has the advantage of showing the current uses of some of the spaces within the house. One obvious change in the West Wing in the 20th century is the conversion of the Business Room into the Day Nursery and hence the bedrooms above into the Nursery (West) Wing. The Nursery rooms on the Principal floor level comprised two nursery bedrooms on the west side of the stair and Lord David’s Room on the east side above the Day Nursery.

An oil tank was installed into the former Games Larder of 1905 in the northeast corner of the east wing and a new boiler was inserted into the 1905 Maid’s Sitting Room – the wc and washbasin remain in place off the Boiler Room.

Figure 219 June 1969 plan of the Ground floor level showing the Day Nursery, Smoking and Billiard Rooms. AJ Russell Janfield, M SA
Figure 220  June 1969 plan of the Principal floor level Nursery above the Day Nursery and Smoking Room. AJ Russell Janfield, M SA

Figure 221  June 1969 plan of the Ground floor level east wing, showing new boiler room and oil tank location. AJ Russell Janfield, M SA
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The policies were generally well maintained during the time of the Dowager Marchioness.

A feature of the management which was remarkable both for the labour involved and perhaps for the unusual visual juxtaposition of the by-products of heavy industry with the enjoyment of aristocratic leisure, was the careful spreading and raking of reddish spoil from the nearby coalmines over all the footpaths in the policies²⁰. No photograph of the red paths during this period is known to have survived, but in some places the remains of the spoil can still be seen (figure 223).

A Sewage Works for the town of Cumnock was constructed beside the Lugar between the end of the Second World War and 1959 (figure 224). It was concealed from the policies by mature trees and rising ground along the banks of the river.

By the 1960s the 19th century Peach House in the Burn Garden had fallen into disrepair and was taken down. Footbridges within the policies were repaired or replaced during this period. Concrete footbridges were put in over the burn in the Waterside Wood and over the Nest Burn close to the Memorial Crucifix, both replacing previous and presumably wooden examples. The wooden footbridge over the Polcalk Burn, linking the Burn Garden to the woodlands walks, was replaced.

²⁰Information from Billy Shields
Figure 223  Photograph of remains of red paths in the Burn Garden beside footings of Peach House 2008. S&B

Figure 224  Aerial photograph showing Sewage Works east of Lugar 1959. NMRS
Within the Walled Garden the 18th century Hot House had also fallen into disrepair. The garden itself was no longer used to provide fruit and vegetables for the family, but was let to a market gardener and run as a commercial operation.

The Nursery to the east of the Walled Gardens, in use as such since the mid 18th century, continued to be planted in rotation with young trees.

Glasgow and South West Railway
Following the Beeching reforms of the 1960s, the Ayr–Cumnock branch of the railway line was closed, and the station buildings became redundant. Both Station Cottages were sold to private owners, but the Station building itself failed to find a buyer, and was demolished. The viaduct was gradually buried under soil and became obscured by the growth of self-seeded saplings.
Pennyland Camp

The Pennyland Camp site remained clear until the mid 1970s (figure 228) but was afterwards planted with commercial forestry. Large agricultural sheds were built on the concrete footings left by some demolished huts in the southern part of the camp, and the concrete road parallel to the eastern avenue was also built over.

Avenue Bridge

Repairs to the Avenue Bridge were carried out in 1972 by Robert H Cuthbertson & Associates (figures 230-231), including strengthening, repointing and refacing damaged stonework. New ball finials were added to the existing plinths. Detailed drawings for this work are kept in the MSA.
3.8.2 1980s-1990s: Condition Survey & Repair Works

Dumfries House

In 1989, the architect Bob Heath, then of 23 Barony Street, Edinburgh (now based in Haddington), was commissioned to undertake a condition survey for the house and the Adam Bridge. Restoration works had been carried out in the late 1960s (probably referring to the previous works), and the felt-based roof above the Billiard Room was in need of replacement. The flat roof of the Billiard Room was made of concrete.

The steps in front of the house were in poor condition and in need of repair. However, the original stone quarry had been exhausted and matching stonework would need to be brought in. There was also damage to the plaster ceiling noted in the Chinese Room (the North Parlour); the New Dining Room; The White Drawing Room; and the Pink Drawing Room. Damage in the latter two appeared to have been relatively minor.

The first repair works were undertaken in 1991, and concentrated on the plaster ceilings repair and redecoration of the interior. The plasterwork was repaired by Len Grandison of Peebles, and the painterwork was carried out by Robert Howie & Son of Catrine, Ayrshire. The damage to the plaster ceiling in the New Dining Room appeared to be localised and was probably due to the fact that the laths were too thin and too close together in places, with damp penetration from above, perhaps from a sink on first floor level. The ornamental areas of the ceiling were not affected by the repair. There were no particular records of the colour scheme for the redecoration work and it appears to have been off-white and eggshell for the woodwork.

The North Drawing Room (also known as the Chinese Room) was redecorated in 1992, as well as an unspecified bedroom and the Entrance Hall. The gold leaf in the latter was washed and glue size was applied coloured with Raw Sienna to match the Antique Gold.

The area at the back door was frequently used for access and was concreted over after drainage had been improved. The heating and hot water system was reassessed in July 1992 and nine radiators were replaced by December 1992 (rooms not specified). The chosen design of the radiators was relatively plain and was to be screened to match existing woodwork; works were undertaken by Hulley & Kirkwood of Glasgow.

A summary list of works undertaken between 1989 and 1993 are as follows:

- Roof inspection of Mansion House by George Murphy & Son, Mauchline 18/12/1989: lead repair works, loose/ split slates, repointing of chimneys; billiard room and east wing staff rooms: Nuralite in good condition.

- Letter from Lord Bute 22/01/1990: carried out restoration works some 20 years ago; front door steps now seriously damaged, in need of considerable repair. Flat-roof over billiard room needs attention. Stone repairs cannot be made from original quarry as it is thought to have been “worked out”. Adam bridge has been subject to vandalism and should be protected and consolidated as best possible. (Followed by condition survey of Adam Bridge and front steps (both 24/01/1991)

---

21 From correspondence file supplied by B Heath.
22 Condition survey drawings 24/01/1991; survey report 20/02/1990; information supplied by B Heath.
• Letter from Heath to Marquess of Bute 20/02/1990:
• Roof of billiard room at current covered with felt-based material (short-lifed material).
• Steps need repair and can be replaced, but beer room underneath will never be watertight and should be abandoned as a useful space.
• Chinese room ceiling, water damage from first floor sink, minor plaster repair require, ornamental areas not to be touched.
• Adam bridge: anchoring the stonework against all but the most violent attentions. The lack of cramps and the high cement content of the mortar both contributed to the stonework becoming loose even before vandals appeared. Repoint cope stones to keep water out, monitoring for current movement. [report from Jim Simpson estate factor: sceptical about vandalism proofing as mild steel rods were put through some of the tapering pillars and even these were broken very quickly].
• Drawings and specification from S&B works to Adam Bridge in 1987(?).
• Sagged ceiling in New Dining Room was repaired by Len Grandison, Peebles in Spring 1991 Letter Jim Simpson to MoB 23/04/1991. Most likely causes are that the laths are too thin and too close together in places and damp penetration (Letter L Grandison 23/04/1991). Laths appears to have been metal (invoice dated 20/03/1992.
• Redecoration in June 1991 of dining room. No colour scheme mentioned, it appears to have been off white at present, by Robert Howie & Son. £5,500 (New Dining Room); plasterer costs £5,741.93. Floor to be left natural and unsealed. This is not the Chinese Drawing room which was done at a later stage in 1992.
• Dismantling of old Auchinleck gateway to the Dumfries Estate, which is reached by driving down the lane next to the church for about 200 yards (letter from B Heath to G Reid & Son Ltd, Catrine Ayrshire, 03/08/1991). Careful dismantling of iron gates and attendant stonework, numbering stones and placing stonework on pallets and deliver to stables by Dumfries House (work for £2,140). if required to be re-built. Work is include din the Accommodation Works under the new bypass contract (?); i.e. costs of the dismantling of the gates will be met by contractor working on the bypass. Gates were offered to the National Trust but not considered suitable for Brodick or Culzean, perhaps needed for new drive at House of Dun. Were then transported to Hill of Tarvit, Fife, rebuilding at some later date (NTS property). Area of gate needs to be cleared before end of Jan 1992. £3,000 for removal and transport to St Andrews (Bill Watson’s yard, to be rebuilt in Fife?, letter 18/02/1992 from D Learmont NTS to Bob Heath).
• Also problems with paint peeling off in White Drawing Room and Pink Drawing Room, but no great urgency for both.
• Complete redecoration of North Drawing room or just making good problems in ceiling, estimated in June 1992.
• Upgrading of heating and hot water equipment July 1992, including renewal of plumbing from the existing radiator in the passage into the defective
radiation at the far end of the billiard room. Nine radiators to be replaced and screened; previously painted to the same colour as surrounding woodwork. (Ronald Kirkwood, Hulley & Kirkwood, Glasgow for radiator design). It seems radiators were replaced in December 1992.

- **Restoration of China Room, Dumfries House** (letter by Robert Howie & Son, Mauchline to B Heath, 10/08/1992: ceiling and frieze washed, plait oil paint or acrylic material, gold leaf work after careful washing apply glue size coloured with Raw Sienna to match up to Antique Gold (£1,000). Woodwork, windows, doors and panelled walls washed down, remove ornamented mirrors and replace again. Flat oil paint, finish one coat Eggshell enamel. All ironmongery removed and cleaned, polished, replaced. Floors polished (£3,100). Redecoration scheme agreed Sept 1992.

- June 1993: letter from B Heath to estate office (Nick Mellish). Painterworks, repairs to window, mastic to windows also require stone repair by mortar, mastic 1005 replacement, traditional sand, linseed oil type. Bedrooms painted as well. Paint (for windows?): Lead based oil paint from Craig & Rose Edinburgh; white 10B 15 ri windows. Doors and metalwork colours to be decided on site. 29/07/1993, repainting of all woodwork to the outside confirmed, highest standard for Grade A listed building. Reid & Sons Ltd, Catrine: £11,272 (12/08/1993); D S Wilson, Mossblown, £9.500/£7.350. Lady Bute the Dowager died before the paint works commenced (letter 10/09/1993 acknowledges her death). 6th Marquess died 22/07/1993. work was first postponed to May 1994, then cancelled/postponed without date.

- Weight restriction of 5t was put in for Adam Bridge when home farm was leased to Mr Stitt, however, his tractors weighs 5t and with loaded trailer could sum up to 15t (letter from Bute estate to B Heath 25/10/1994. Structural survey required.

- 20/11/1997 B Heath to Factor Mount Stuart: billiard room needs lead roof £33.500-45,000; main roof £9.000; outer steps £9.500-11,000; repairs to windows now £15,000. Repairs to front steps were excluded from works (24/03/1998): majority of works is replacement lead work to billiard room roof, general pointing to chimney heads, repairs to overflashings; tender (undated) lists: Roof repairs; Pointing rubble walls; Pointing Ashlar Works; plumbing installation of lead sheets and lead sheet flashings; Woodwork/structural timber, Ironmongery and plywood and blockboards. Tender for roof repairs £41,000 James Wilson & son (Auchmillan) Ltd. accepted was Reid of Catrine for £47.500 and Bob Thompson, Edinburgh for masonry repairs. Works described 09/09/1998 B Heath to Reid & Son: Large rectangular rooflight to the centre valley is to be removed and not replaced; circular rooflight into WC is to be removed; false ceiling put in to disguise downpipe. Roof [from billiard room] is concrete underneath.
Letter 18/06/1998 from B Heath to Nick Mellish, Factor: Adam Bridge: works suggested to properly prop up the cornice, then the stonework under could be taken out and replaced in a sort of underpinning type sequence. Bridge structurally sound but still in danger of careless hits by farm vehicles. Structural engineer survey 06/10/1998 (Adams Partnership, Kilmarnock, Glasgow): the right hand abutment on the house side of the bridge has failed over a length of approx. 17-20m. this is evidenced by outward bulging of up to 200mm to the external sandstone face. Take down and rebuilding recommended (detail enclosed).

Observations in follow-up from roof repairs (10/03/1999): B Heath to G Reid: Water appears to be getting into and lying within the bellcote to the front wall

**Landscape & Estate Buildings**

The policies suffered a severe intrusion in the last ten years of the 20th century, when the A76 was built through the eastern part of the designed landscape. The neighbouring Auchinleck, although it remained in the Boswell family, became eventually ruinous and was later restored by the Landmark Trust for holiday accommodation.

**Plantations and Commercial Forestry**

Commercial forestry was planted on areas of the policies, in most cases following existing patterns, and continuing the exploitation of the land on the model established 250 previously. Stair and Bland Mount were both replanted in the later 20th century, with coniferous crops replacing the broadleaved crops which would have been grown previously. A considerable portion of Shaw Wood had been cut down by 1974, although mature individual trees were carefully preserved, and remain among younger trees (figure 234).

The Nest, the small thatched cottage beside the Nest Burn, built in the mid 18th century to house construction workers for the new house, had fallen into ruin by the 1980s, and was demolished.
The decision to take the A76 through the east of the designed landscape was the single most destructive event to affect the policies. The road cut through the Auchinleck Avenue, the Cumnock Avenue, and Lord Bute's Walk, and due to the ground level both a deep cutting and an embankment were constructed. Most importantly it irreversibly destroyed the connection between the house and Terringzean Castle, which had been one of the four principal axial relationships of the mid 18th century design. The policies had been designated under Historic Scotland's 'Inventory of Designed Landscapes and Gardens in Scotland' in 1987. It is not known whether any separate assessment of the significance of the designed landscape was made at the time of the decision to build the road.

The gates at the Auchinleck Gate were removed, and the lodge itself sold to a private owner. Although apparently architecturally identical to the Category B Listed Stockiehill and West Gates, the Auchinleck Gate was not protected. It has since been concealed by modern extensions.

3.9 22nd July 1993 - 28th November 2007: John Colum Crichton-Stuart (John Bute), 7th Marquess of Bute (b.1958)

3.9.1 Repair Works

The Marchioness of Bute, Lady Eileen Beatrice Forbes, wife of the 5th Marquess of Bute, died at Dumfries House in 1993, the same year as her son, the 6th Marquess of Bute, John Crichton-Stuart, who died on 22nd July 1993.

The house was little used following the death of the Marchioness in 1993, and although no major further works were carried out, the house was well maintained and repairs carried out.

At the beginning of 1993 it became clear that repainting of the woodwork of the main façades was necessary to retain water tightness. Bob Heath proposed stone repair with mortar, replacing mastic with the traditional sand, linseed oil type and using lead-based oil paint from Craig & Rose Edinburgh for the woodwork. The costs at the time were estimates as about £10,000. Unfortunately these proposals were made at the time of the death of the 6th Marquess. Shortly after, Lady Bute the Dowager died, and works were postponed, first to May 1994, and then cancelled.
There were rumours that Dumfries House may be occupied again soon, and Heath recommended to Lord Dumfries at the time to provide for the upkeep of maintenance of the house as conditions would only deteriorate.

It appears that no further works were undertaken until 1997, when the felt-based roof above the billiard room was in need of replacement. It had been put in as a replacement of the existing lead roof, presumably in the late 1960s and it was recommended to replace it with lead again. These works were carried out in September 1998, and totalled approximately £50,000. It seems that the window repairs were undertaken as well, for an estimated £15,000. Although included in the original estimate, works to the stair were still not carried out.

Figure 235 Work being undertaken to the lead roof over the Billiard Room, 1998. Bob Heath

Heath had already commented on the beer room (cellar) below the stair that even with repair it ‘...will never be watertight and should be abandoned as a useful space’. During the course of the roof repairs, a large rectangular roof light to the centre valley was removed, and a circular roof light into a wc was removed. The wc also received a false ceiling to disguise the insertion of a downpipe. Minor damage were noticed at the bellcote, where water appeared to be getting into and lying within the bellcote at the front wall.

All roof repairs were carried out by G Reid & Sons Ltd., building contractors of Catrine Ayrshire.

No new estate buildings were constructed during this period.

3.9.2 2004-2006: Initial Proposals

There was an initial suggestion in 2004 that Dumfries House might become available for sale. However, it was not until 2006 that this was explored further. One of the early ideas for the property was to open the main rooms to the public, but instead of converting the rest of the building into self-contained houses for sale, convert them into holiday apartments to generate income for the new trust. With this scheme, an anticipated 26

23 Condition survey report 20/02/1990; information supplied by B Heath.
24 www.countrylife.co.uk/ culture/ articles/ 57872/ Dumfries_House_for_Sale.html, 7th September 2004
units would have been possible, including six apartments in the main house and 20 cottages in Dumfries Mains; the gate lodges; Coach House and Laundry. 25

As part of this suggestion, it is clear that the Tapestry Room, Billiard Room, Drawing Room and Dining Room would have been ideal for receptions, weddings and other events, with a shop and tearoom suggested for the ground floor Chapel Library in the east wing. 26

3.9.3 2007-2008: Dumfries House For Sale

The sale of Dumfries House was formally announced in April 2007 by Savills. 27 The contents were due to be sold by auction at Christie’s on the 12th and 13th July 2007.

During the marketing of the estate, developers approached SAVE and the Art Fund to offer solutions that would have been dependant on the development of the estate. This was not considered desirable for the treatment of the estate and would also have gone against the East Ayrshire Council Local Plan. 28

The deadline to confirm funding was the 28th May 2007. Following a failure to raise needed funds by this date, HRH Prince of Wales offered to meet with John Bute to explore a possible solution. 29

The meeting between HRH Prince of Wales and John Bute occurred on 12th June 2007 and to stop the sale proceeding, an estimated £43 million was needed.

The announcement of the purchase of Dumfries House and its contents was made on 27th June 2007 and completion date set for 28th November. 50 acres of additional land on the edge of Cumnock were purchased with a further 21 acres of woodland which would shield the housing from view, for a new community development masterplan spearheaded by the Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment.

3.10 28th November 2007 - Present: Great Steward of Scotland’s Dumfries House Trust

3.10.1 Purchase of Dumfries House Estate and Collection

Dumfries House and its collection were secured for the nation through a consortium of organisations and individuals brought together by the intervention of HRH The Duke of Rothesay.

The consortium included:

- The Prince’s Charities Foundation
- The Scottish Government
- The Art Fund
- The Monument Trust
- The National Heritage Memorial Fund
- The Garfield Weston Foundation.
- The Siegmund Warburg Voluntary Settlement
- SAVE Britain’s Heritage
- The Dunard Fund

---

25 Country Life August 9, 2007. p44
26 Country Life August 9, 2007. p44
27 www.countrylife.co.uk/property/article/116548/Country_estates_for_sale.html 19th April 2007
28 Country Life August 9, 2007. p46
29 Country Life August 9, 2007. p46
With £25 million contributed by the Scottish government and heritage organisations and trusts, and £18.3 million borrowed and provided by His Royal Highness personally, the House, its wonderful collection of furniture and estate were saved for the Nation only hours before the expiry of the deadline for sale at auction (Savills as the agent for the house and Christies for the auction of the collection).

The Art Fund acted as the formal legal purchaser of the house and its contents and subsequently passed them to the independent charity, The Great Steward of Scotland’s Dumfries House Trust, on 28th November 2007.

An independent trust, The Great Steward of Scotland’s Dumfries House Trust, was established to manage the presentation and maintenance of the house, its collection and grounds.

Also included in the purchase of the estate was 66 acres of land in nearby Cumnock which it is hoped can be developed for housing. It is hoped that outbuildings on the estate may also be upgraded and used as workshops, housing and for other business opportunities.

3.10.2 Opening to the Public

Initial Work

The dramatic purchase of Dumfries House initiated an ambitious programme of works prior to the opening of the house and estate to the public.

In October 2007, following an invited competition, Oliver Chapman Architects were appointed to form and co-ordinate a Design Team to deliver the objectives of the newly formed Trust. The success of the sale hinged on getting the team in place and the production of a Conservation Statement in a restricted three week period. This Conservation Statement not only had to pass scrutiny by the Heritage Lottery Fund, National Heritage Memorial Fund and Historic Scotland (all key funders) but also set the future direction of a full Conservation Plan.

Fortunately, the house was generally in good condition and a strategy was then needed to transform a private house into a public attraction. It was recognised that this new chapter in Dumfries House’s history would be part of an ongoing process over a number of years. So rather than moth-ball the house for several years to facilitate a comprehensive package of works, a strategy was needed to fast-track a limited number of essential facilities in order to open the house to the public by summer 2008. The fundamental challenge was to open up the house and estate to the public without adversely affecting the atmosphere of the private house.

Beyond the Adam brothers’ purist Palladianism, the principal influence in the evolution of the house, was that of Robert Weir Schultz. The additions by Weir Schultz are often over-looked partly because they dovetail so seamlessly with the original house. These additions, commissioned by the 3rd Marquis, are conveniently corralled into the wings leaving the integrity of the main house generally intact.

Oliver Chapman Architects’ first undertaking was to review the house in the context of the wider estate. Initial proposals for the development of the Coach House and Stables (as café and retail outlets) were prepared following the completion of accurate survey drawings. However, the implications of the Traffic Impact Assessment sparked considerable discussion regarding the fundamental issue of site access and public safety.
It was agreed by the Trust to change the entrance orientation and bring all visitors in from the north of the estate. This move enabled a more meaningful engagement with the wider estate, re-establishing the historic approach to the house across the Avenue Bridge, a key element in the designed landscape, before sweeping visitors past the Coach House and Stables, on their final approach to the house.

**Proposed & Actual Works within the Estate**

Interventions within the estate proved a sensitive issue, particularly in archeologically susceptible areas where the earlier house (Leifnorris) had stood. Equally, inserting new elements within the house was a delicate matter. It was considered essential to leave principal spaces undisturbed. Upon detailed consideration, it was decided that the west wing leant itself to new staff and visitor facilities. Phasing of the works has also allowed the staggering of costs, ongoing review of key decisions and ensure decisions were not rushed unnecessarily.

Following the review of vehicular access and egress, the proposed car park was relocated to the north of the river adjacent to the existing Cow Sheds. This required minimal physical intervention in the landscape and served as a temporary measure until various plans and options have been further reviewed. The surfacing of the car park and existing roads within the estate have been carried out with a layer of crushed stone. The intention was for low impact intervention and to avoid the introduction of tarmac. A Tree Survey was commissioned to identify any pressing maintenance concerns and a controlled programme of felling has been undertaken.

The issue of installing new visitor toilets into the ground floor rooms posed a different challenge. The former Laundry (G27) was identified in practical terms as an appropriate place for the new Ladies Toilet. Additionally, knocking through from a small Store (G8) to a Pantry (G7), provided adequate space for the Gents Toilet. The Butler’s Bathroom (G30) was selected as the Accessible Toilet. Within the west wing, another practical solution was to separate staff and visitor areas by utilising the existing glazed screen and level change between corridors in the west wing (G31 & G32). The Toby Jug Room (G37) was chosen as the Chief Executive’s Office with the former Nursery (G39) as a general Administration Office with minor changes and cleaning of fabric.

Careful consideration was given to the choice of materials and fittings for the new interventions. The extensive use of limed oak panelling was an idea borrowed from Weir Schultz’s choice of flooring to the Pewter Corridor. Panelling to the toilet cubicles employed the limed oak in 13 inch bands (corresponding to the stone coursing of the external facades coursing) with walnut beads and brass skirtings. Wherever possible, original fabric was retained in situ, such as the Laundry’s existing deep sink and curved workbench. New basins simply sit on top of this workbench – an arrangement which was repeated in the Gents Toilet.

The decision was made to surface-mount services as a more minimal intervention than cutting into the original wall fabric. Not only is this approach in keeping with best conservation practice (ensuring that works are reversible) but is in keeping with the handling of existing services in areas throughout the ground floor.
Figure 236  Plans and Sections showing alterations to form the new Ladies Toilets in former Laundry (G27) (left), and the Gents Toilets (G7 & G8) (right), 2007. Oliver Chapman Architects
Perhaps the most contentious issue faced was locating and designing a lift for disabled visitors, to enable them to access the Principal floor level of the house. The issue of concealing or expressing the lift raised considerable debate and it was agreed to develop something contemporary, marking a clear addition to the Adam/Weir Schultz legacy. Rising up into the Pewter Corridor, the proposal would have minimal impact on the existing fabric, sitting within a fully glazed shaft. At the time of writing this report, development of the lift proposal was on hold.

Finding a contractor capable of delivering the works in a short, five-week programme called for a concerted effort by the whole design team. The selected contractor delivered on time, with the quality of work meeting the high standard required. Indeed, it was in the final few weeks in the run up to the opening that the true nature of this new chapter for Dumfries House became apparent. The house was a hive of activity with staff, various contractors, conservation cleaners, trainee guides, decorators and many more besides, accommodating one another in a shared desire to ensure a timely and polished opening.

It is this commendable spirit that will continue to drive the restoration and development of the house and wider estate over the coming years.
The Design Team

The design team for the works to Dumfries House in the lead up to the opening of the house to the public included the following individuals and companies:

Client: The Great Steward of Scotland's Dumfries House Trust
Architect: Oliver Chapman Architects
Structural & Civil Engineer: David Narro Associates
Quantity Surveyor: Morham & Brotchie
Conservation Consultant: Simpson & Brown Architects
Services Consultant: Irons Foulner
Landscape Architect: Peter McGowan
CDM Coordinator: Stephen Newson
Traffic Consultant: Faber Maunsell
Contractor: Elmwood
Electrical Subcontractor: William Miller
Plumbing Subcontractor: Alexander Brothers
Decorator: John Nevin
Roadworks: Hillhouse Quarries
Fire Detection: Chubb
Tree Surgery: Cut Above
Archaeology Consultant: Addyman Archaeology (a division of Simpson & Brown)
Collections Care Consultant: Wilma Bouwmeester
Furniture Consultant: David Jones
Textiles Conservator: Sophie Younger
Landscape Historian: Christopher Dingwall
Interior Designer: McWhirter Morris
Art Consultant: Andrew Graham Dickson
Surveyor: Mason Land Surveys

Dumfries House was officially opened to the public for the first time by HRH The Prince of Wales, Duke of Rothesay, on Friday 6th June 2008.

The management of the estate is currently overseen by a Chief Executive and a Curator has recently been appointed to manage the fabric of the house and its collections.