Render and Paint report for

LINCOLN'S INN
New Square

Job No: 0400

Date: 20 Dec 2023
Revision: /

Chantrey Conservation Architects Ltd
Tel: 07856 828406
Email: marcus@ccarch.co.uk
Website: www.ccarch.co.uk

CONTENTS

Revisions

Rev /	Date	Action / Notes

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. This report has been commissioned by Lincoln's Inn following the completion of a paint analysis report by Lisa Oestreicher in November 2023 and following render analysis by Rose of Jericho also in November 2023. Cross reference should be made to these documents.

1.2. In advance of this, report, a condition report on the basements elevations was undertaken by b2 architects Ltd and cross reference should be made to this report for both historical background information and the details about the condition of the render.

1.3. The purpose of the investigations is to establish the significance of the various paint and render surfaces to inform an imminent programme of repairs.

1.4. This report has been prepared by Marcus Chantrey, AABC, RIBA of Chantrey Conservation Architects Ltd.

2 REPORT - RENDER

2.1. The below table has been prepared to record and compare the render types together with their likely date of application as estimated by Rose of Jericho.

2.2.

Building	Rose of Jericho Test No	Render / Binder	Date
1 – North	N/a	Hydraulic lime	21st century - Not analysed.
No 1 – South	5687	Portland Cement	Late 19th century or early 20th century
No 2 – North	5521 (1)	Portland Cement	20th century
No 2 – South	5522 (2)	Roman Cement	19th century
No 3	5523 (3)	Roman Cement	Early 19th century
No 4	5524 (4)	Oil mastic render	Late 18th century or early 19th century
No 5 – East	*5525 (5)**	Roman Cement	*Early 19th century**
No 5 – West	5688	Portland Cement	Mid to late 19th century
No 6 – East	5525 (6)	Roman Cement	Early 19th century
No 6 – West	5589	Portland Cement	Late 19th century or early 20th century
No 7 – South	-	Unknown	Not analysed.
No 7 - North	5526 (7)	Portland Cement	20th century?
No 8 – South	5527 (8)	Portland Cement	20th century
No 8 – North	5690	Portland Cement	Mid to late 19th century
No 9 – South	5528 (9A) & 5529 (9B)	Roman Cement	19th century
No 9 – North	5691	Non-hydraulic lime	Possibly late 17th century.
No 10 – South	N/a	Brickwork	N/a
No 10 – North	N/a	Brickwork	N/a
No 11 – South	5530 (10A & 5531 (10B)	Portland Cement	c.1951
No 11 - North	As above	Portland Cement	c.1951

* This sample is visually the same as Sample 6, was not analysed, and assumed to be early 19th Century.

2.3. Of particular note in the above is the analysis of No 9 North which shows a non-hydraulic lime render which could be as early as 17th century. However, with no stratigraphy in the paint sample taken by Lisa Oestreicher, the age of the render could not be determined. However, Rose of Jericho's observational notes on their sample record the presence of oil paint layers and therefore, further samples may be able to determine more about the paint layers present and therefore the age of this lime putty render.

2.4. The presence of an oil mastic render to No 4 is unusual and particular care has to be taken due to the high lead oxide quantities in the binder which makes this material hazardous to disturb. This render probably dates from the late 18th or early 19th century and certainly no earlier than 1773 when the first oil mastic render was patented.

2.5. Furthermore, with the knowledge that Roman cement was not formulated until 1794, it can be concluded that only the renders applied to No 4 and No 9 could have been applied before this date. Notwithstanding this, the presence of Roman Cement renders is significant and these renders should also be considered historically important.

2.6. Portland cement was first introduced in 1830s but did not come into regular use until 1850s. Some of the Portland cement renders appear to be early examples of its use.

2.7. In considering the above, it needs to be noted that the sample only relates to one small area of the wall and, as the walls may have been patch repaired, earlier renders or later renders may be present in adjacent areas. Repairs add to the patchwork and complexity of the wall surfaces.

2.8. Furthermore, the majority of the render has been 'lined' out although in many instances this is now only occasionally discernible through the multiple layers of paint.

3 REPORT - PAINT

3.1. Lisa Oestreicher has identified 47 separate phases of decoration across the various buildings and the table below records the earliest of the schemes identified and suggests dates for these decorative schemes:

3.2.

Building	Earliest paint scheme recorded	Implied date according to Paint analysis by Lisa Oestreicher.
No 1 – North	N/a	
No 1 – South	Scheme 21	
No 2 – North	Scheme 31	c1960
No 2 – South	Scheme 28	
No 3	Scheme 4	c.1870
No 4	Scheme 1	Mid 19th century
No 5 – East	Scheme 32	1950s? (Earlier paint schemes missing)
No 5 – West	Scheme 24	
No 6 – East	Scheme 4	c.1870
No 6 – West	Scheme 30	
No 7 - South	Scheme 15	
No 7 - North	Scheme 4	c. 1870
No 8 – South	Scheme 19	
No 8 – North	Scheme 24	
No 9 – South	Scheme 4	c. 1870
No 9 – North	Scheme 38	
No 10 – South	N/a	N/a
No 10 – North	N/a	N/a
No 11 – South	Not sampled	1951
No 11 - North	Scheme 33	1951

3.3. The paint analysis has revealed a multitude of different colours applied to the buildings with a brownish stone colour applied in the mid 19th century, followed by warmer shades and stone colours. A deep salmon pink scheme was also identified before a late 20th century move towards white albeit interspersed with one-off applications of cream and deep yellow.

3.4. Generally, there is a uniformity of paint use between buildings although there are some exceptions to this rule. Of particular note, is the presence of limewash applications sandwiched between modern

paints. Through analysis, it is also clear that paint layers have been lost either through paint failure or the stripping/sanding in advance of the application of new coats.

3.5. The early paints are exclusively lead paints which have negligible breathability. Furthermore, once multiple paint layers have been applied together with modern titanium paints; the breathability of the wall has been entirely lost. All the samples analysed have multiple layers of non-breathable modern paints in their upper layers.

3.6. In looking in detail, there is an implication that Scheme 4 dates from 1870 when No 9 was extensively rebuilt. However, the basement appears to have been relatively unaltered so this hypothesis cannot be entirely relied on. Notwithstanding this, the presence of Scheme 4 on the walls at No7 and applied over a cement render means that Scheme 4 can be no earlier than the 1850s when cement render started to be commonly applied.

3.7. For No 9 North, the lack of stratigraphy is frustrating but perhaps this suggests that all paints were stripped from the wall in the late 20th century before an application of limewash was applied. Further paint analysis in protected corners may be able to shed more light on this.

3.8. The rebuilding of No11 following war bomb damage confirms that as a minimum, Scheme 33 onwards will have been applied since c.1952.

4 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

4.1. The below table seeks to identify the significance of each of the painted and rendered areas based upon a combination of their age, complexity of paint layers and binder composition.

4.2.

Building	Summary assessment	Significance
No 1 – North	21st century hydraulic lime render.	**Low**
No 1 – South	Late 19th Century or early 20th century Portland cement render with some historic paint.	**Medium**
No 2 – North	20th century Portland cement render with modern paints only.	**Low to Medium**
No 2 – South	Roman cement with one layer of historic paint.	**Medium to High**
No 3	Roman cement with multiple layers of historic paint.	**High**
No 4	Oil mastic render. Important early render.	**Very High**
No 5 – East	Roman cement but with no historic paint.	**Medium to High**
No 5 – West	Mid to late 19th Century Portland cement with some historic paint.	**Medium**
No 6 – East	Roman cement with multiple historic paint layers.	**High**
No 6 – West	Late 19th Century or early 20th century Portland cement with one layer of historic paint.	**Medium**
No 7 - South	Render unknown but some historic paints.	**Medium to High**
No 7 - North	Early Portland cement with multiple historic paint layers.	**Medium to High**
No 8 – South	Portland cement with some historic paint layers.	**Medium**
No 8 – North	Portland cement with some historic paint layers.	**Medium**
No 9 – South	Roman cement with multiple historic paint layers.	**High**
No 9 – North	Potentially early render but no historic paint yet analysed.	**High**
No 10 – South	Brickwork. No render.	**N/a**
No 10 – North	Brickwork. No render.	**N/a**
No 11 – South	Late 20th century Portland cement render	**Low**
No 11 - North	Late 20th century Portland cement render.	**Low**

5 CONCLUSION

5.1. Through analysing the render and paint, a repair strategy can be developed that seeks to retain historic important surfaces whilst also ensuring a coherent redecoration programme.

5.2. The attribution of significance to each area of render needs to be viewed in relation to render defects observed in the earlier report.

5.3. Based on the assessment of significance, a strong case for render replacement to No 11 can be made.

5.4. The case for render replacement to other walls is weaker but can be made in circumstances where the condition of the render is poor and water retention or ingress is an acknowledged problem not attributable to other fabric defects.