

THE GARDEN  
HISTORY SOCIETY

## Planning Conservation Advice Note 11

# Development in the setting of historic designed landscape



*GHS Head Office, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ*

*Tel: 020 7608 2409 Fax: 020 7490 2974 Email: [conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org](mailto:conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org)*

*[www.gardenhistorysociety.org](http://www.gardenhistorysociety.org)*

The Planning Conservation Advice Notes (PCANs) listed below have been devised by the Garden History Society to advise those wishing to determine the impact upon historic designed landscape of specific proposals for change. This includes local planning authorities, potential developers, owners or other interested parties. These PCANs seek to inform on necessary background information and good conservation practice while at the same time encouraging critical evaluation of the likely type and extent of potential impact. Not all impact is adverse, change is not necessarily detrimental, and opportunities do exist both for development and, where adverse impact has been identified, for appropriate mitigation. Informed evaluation is essential however, if irreversible damage is to be avoided and change is to be implemented in a way that is sympathetic to the historic and visual value of designed landscape.

### **Titles List**

*PCAN 1: Change of Use (of landscape, and of principal and/or subsidiary buildings)*

*PCAN 2: Hotel and Leisure Development*

*PCAN 3: Extension of Educational/Institutional Establishments*

*PCAN 4: Executive Housing*

*PCAN 5: Golf*

*PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access*

*PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances*

*PCAN 8: Telecommunications Masts*

*PCAN 9: Development of Domestic Amenities*

*PCAN 10: CCTV and Lighting*

*PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape*

*PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features*

*PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*

*PCAN 14: Management Plans (including Statements of Significance)*

*Appendix 1: Lists of subsidiary development generated by particular types of change*

*Appendix 2: General Evaluation Checklist (All types development/all types landscape)*

*Appendix 3: Planning Context*

Planning Conservation Advice Notes 1 to 12 deal with some of the most common types of change proposed in historic landscape or its setting. Notes 13 and 14 describe documentation required to evaluate and support proposals for such change. Appendices 1 to 3, which separate out specific aspects of proposals in note form for quick reference, may also be useful for evaluation of types of change not covered in PCANs 1 to 12.

### **Format**

PCANs 1 to 12 are divided into the following sections:

Section 1.0: Introduction

Section 2.0: Information Needed to Evaluate the Impact of Proposals

Section 3.0: Further Information Needed

Section 4.0: Potential for Mitigation

Section 5.0: Watchpoints

Section 6.0: Unavoidable Development/Damage

Section 7.0: Application of Advice

Section 8.0: Planning Context

Section 9.0: Evaluation

## **Evaluation**

Most sections follow a set format but Section 9.0 on evaluation differs between various PCANs.

**PCANs 3; 6; 8; 9; 10; 11** have a flow chart evaluation questionnaire. This may assist planning officers in particular, both in assessment of proposals and in preparation of recommendations for committee – the advice shown in upper case and bold type being intended to inform particularly on the following:

- level of potential impact
- further input which may be needed from other professionals
- further information which may be required
- where condition or legal agreement would be required to avoid adverse impact

**PCANs 1; 2; 7** have checklists of questions intended to:

- highlight other relevant evaluation tools
- highlight potential implications of proposals
- list questions relevant to evaluation of impact

**PCANs 4; 5** have short checklists of questions intended to:

- direct evaluation to specific conservation advice in the relevant PCAN
- assist evaluation by highlighting potential implications of proposals

**PCAN 12** seeks to assist evaluators by offering conservation advice for particular situations.

## **Current status of advice notes**

These planning conservation advice notes may be amended following trialling or with the introduction of new legislation. Any comments, and suggestions for improvement would be welcomed by the Society and feedback on content, usefulness, layout etc. of the sections on evaluation (including flow-charts) would be particularly appreciated.

## **Acknowledgements**

Individuals and organisations too numerous to mention have been involved in various stages of preparation of these PCANs and the Society would like to acknowledge this invaluable assistance and to offer its thanks to them all.

The Society would also like to highlight the input of the Society's conservation team in place at the time the original concept was devised (David Lambert, Anthea Taigel, Kath Gibson, Sarah Couch and Linden Groves), with particular thanks to David Lambert for identification of subjects, Sarah Couch for invaluable advice and for her work on PCAN 14 and advice flow charts, Kath Gibson for invaluable advice, particularly on PCANs 1 and 7, and Linden Groves for her support and enthusiasm. The Society is also indebted to the Jubilee Fund Trustees who provided initial funding for 'pilot' PCANs, and to the GHS Conservation Committee, which has supported this initiative throughout, with particular thanks to John Sales who has provided the text for Statements of Significance (included in PCAN 14). Format and text of PCANs and Appendices were otherwise devised by Anthea Taigel (former principal conservation officer of the GHS), with the advice and guidance of Elisabeth Whittle, (Chairman of the GHS Conservation Committee).

Copyright of the text of PCANS and appendices rests jointly with The Garden History Society and Anthea Taigel.

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Historic designed landscapes may appear to have a finite boundary, where the layout of the landscape outside the boundary differs markedly from that within it. Such a boundary may be marked by walls, fences or hedges, by belts of trees or by public roads, but parts of the land outside may also be integral to design within it and thus constitute essential setting.
- 1.2 In an urban context, designed views from public landscapes (e.g. public walks and parks, seaside gardens etc.) might focus on prominent municipal or ecclesiastical buildings. Promenades along sea fronts or river banks might offer extended views, and prospects of distant countryside might be gained from raised banks and terraces. Views from private landscapes in urban settings could be similarly contrived. Such prospects, in both private and public landscapes, increased in importance as areas around became more densely developed. In the 20th century, the maintenance of visual connection between urban and rural landscapes was a theme taken up by the landscape designers in New Towns.  
On country house landscapes too, designers incorporated distant focal points, prominent views or panoramas. Such focal points might be already in existence (e.g. a distant church tower, view along a chasm or gorge, or panoramic sweep e.g. of plain and river) or might be specifically designed and constructed (e.g. ruins, follies and other 'eyecatchers'). Terraces and avenues within the ornamental landscape, might be specifically aligned, and planting on mounts, knolls, scarps and other high points might be designed to focus such views. Alternatively, high points could be kept deliberately clear of planting to allow appreciation of a panorama. In periods when interest in the agrarian or rural scene was fashionable, designed views beyond the clear boundary of an ornamental landscape could include farms, fields (both arable and pasture) villages etc. Where such views or prospects, or the potential for their repair, remain they continue to be part of the setting of the designed landscape.
- 1.3 Where a designed landscape was part of a country estate, much of the land beyond the ornamental boundary would be within the same ownership. Such land could be manipulated to present a particular view or panorama to the designed landscape (e.g. by removal of intervening planting or structures; by planting to contain or focus views; and, in extreme cases, by remodelling of contours).
- 1.4 Manipulation of ground adjacent to an ornamental landscape was also achieved with some urban sites; particularly those where the designed landscape was part of development of a single, major landholding (including municipal parks). Where a public or communal landscape was designed as part of such (usually exclusive) development, a 'buffer zone' might be created around it, in which gardens rather than structures predominated, public roads were removed from immediate view and where the apparent openness of the landscape was extended beyond the defined boundary. The visual cohesion of the setting of such landscapes might be extended by the use of regular detailing (architectural style of residential terraces along public walks, patterns of railing or planting etc.).
- 1.5 Similarly in the country, wider estate land (see 1.2), and the buildings it contained might be ornamented in a distinctive style or painted in 'estate colours', to emphasise that it belonged to a particular estate (a technique described by Repton in the later 18th century as 'appropriation').  
This might include the planting in agricultural land of overtly ornamental trees (e.g. specimens of cedar or purple beech), or exotic hedgerows, or more formal planting such as clumps and avenues. All could extend for considerable distances over the wider estate land. Buildings in the wider landscape might be designed to fit a pattern of 'estate architecture'; the 'estate village approach' being a well-recognised example of this technique. Such 'appropriation' would be a recognised feature of the approach to these designed landscapes.
- 1.6 Conversely, a clear distinction might be made between land management inside a defined boundary and land outside, to emphasise the contrast between functional and ornamental and to increase the sense of surprise as the latter was reached.

Where such distinction has been preserved, it remains important to the overall ambience of the designed landscape and, in particular, to the approaches to it.

- 1.7 The way in which an ornamental landscape was perceived from outside was an important consideration. For maximum effect, the eye had to be drawn towards the designed landscape and designers were careful to avoid potential visual conflict.

A boundary could be planted to give staged views into the interior (e.g. vistas cut through boundary woodland to focus in sequence on a mansion and landscape, being approached along a public road). Public roads were often realigned either to give the best view, or to increase the status of an approach. In an urban setting a public road might be widened and lined with trees to form a prestige approach to a new public park or ornamental cemetery; on the country estate, a public road might be turned away and/or narrowed beyond a main entrance (such entrances usually being further embellished by ornamental gates, lodge etc.).

Alternatively, the presence (and status) of a designed landscape could be emphasised by dense and continuous boundary planting, broken only by a series of entrance lodges around the perimeter; the significant contrast with the landscape outside being sufficient to raise the profile of that inside.

See also *GHS PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances*

- 1.8 Setting may also include sensitive areas of former designed landscape, e.g. where a park has shrunk or shifted over time. Physical remain may be minimal but its former status will increase these areas' sensitivity .

## 2.0 Information needed for evaluation of proposals

2. 1.1 With the help of the English Heritage or Cadw (for Wales) Register description of the site or of local inventory entries\*, and of any available listed building or conservation area descriptions, identify:

- historically significant areas and designed points of view (e.g. garden terraces; high points in the landscape which command views beyond the boundary; specific views/vista lines – including avenue lines).
- additional points and areas of public access within the landscape (including footpaths, bridleways etc.) and potential views out from these.
- areas/points beyond the boundary of the landscape from which land inside the boundary is seen by the public (particular attention should be paid to main approaches and to external views of significant features within the landscape).

\*Where a site is unregistered but designated of local or regional historic significance, local inventories (as produced by local authorities, county gardens trusts or other interested organisations) may provide a similar level of information to the *English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest*. Further information may be gained from historic building listing or conservation area descriptions.

N.B. While the Register is a reliable guide, it should not be viewed as a comprehensive description, and the potential for additional areas of view should be explored on site. A historic landscape assessment should be used as a supplement if Register or Inventory entries and historic buildings listing and conservation area descriptions do not fully explain potentially affected areas in the context of the designed landscape, and insufficient information is presented with an application.

See *GHS PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*

- 2.1.2 As well as identified views, information on the character\*, history and appearance\*\* of setting, as it relates to the historic landscape, should be used as a benchmark for assessment of impact of proposed changes. See also 1.8 above.

\*e.g. urban residential; industrial; rural; pastoral etc.

\*\*e.g. urban street scene; houses with gardens; panorama of gently rolling countryside; rugged and Picturesque landscape – i.e. 'wild/desolate; regularly graded ground/lands etc.

- 2.2 For comprehensive evaluation of potential impact, any subsidiary development which would arise from proposals should be clearly identified at the outset. Information should also be available on any potential increase in numbers or sizes of vehicles using public roads adjacent to historic landscape; particularly where these pass an entrance.

## 3.0 Additional information required

- 3.1 The potential impact of the bulk and height of primary structures, and in some instances of the extent of areas proposed for subsidiary development, may be difficult to evaluate in long views. Marking out an area



with posts or in the case of tall structures (e.g. telecommunications masts\*) the setting up of a 'Red Flag Test' will materially assist evaluation.

\*See *GHS PCAN 8: Telecommunications Masts*

- 3.2 In assessing the potential impact of proposals on historic landscape, the potential for repair of the landscape also needs to be taken into account.

(Where a historic landscape has been unmanaged or inappropriately managed for some time, there is potential for view points and vistas to become restricted or, in some instances, entirely obscured.

Evaluators need to ensure that development will not compromise future repair of important historic landscape areas and features e.g. the reopening of a vista through woodland; replanting of an avenue etc.).

Any evaluation of change on historic landscape should therefore include assessment of:

1. Existing damage (e.g. areas of tarmac for vehicle parking; modern buildings, structures, access ways etc. which were not designed to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a historic landscape) and its potential reversibility.
2. Decay (e.g. lost features, lost or overgrown planting) and potential for its repair.

A full historic landscape assessment can be an invaluable aid to understanding the provenance and significance of structures, features and areas of a historic landscape. A Conservation Management Plan, based on a Historic Landscape Assessment will confirm such potential for repair in cases of doubt.

See *GHS PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*

*GHS PCAN 14: Management Plans*

#### **4.0 Potential for Mitigation**

Where potential adverse impact upon a historic landscape has been identified as arising from proposed development within its setting, consideration may be given to the following:

- 4.1 Where development impacts on a focussed or framed view (i.e. where there is a limited arc of view from the landscape), relocation away from sensitive areas may be considered.
- 4.2 Reduction in overall height and/or scale, of primary or subsidiary development, to bring it below eye-level in identified views from the historic landscape, may reduce adverse impact.
- 4.3 The existing topography of a development site may be utilised to reduce perceived height of development. Similarly, potential for parts of development to be located below ground level may be explored (e.g. vehicle parking). See also 5.1 below.
- 4.4 Use of different materials or colours for structures and surfaces, or planting (e.g. on facades of new buildings, as a backdrop or to screen) may reduce visual impact. See also 5.2 below.
- 4.5 Views from historic landscape of parked or moving vehicles can be particularly damaging. Where buildings are proposed, the siting of all vehicular access and parking on the opposite side from the historic landscape may significantly reduce adverse impact.
- 4.6 Where mitigation of adverse visual impact of specific types of subsidiary development is required, Section 4.0 in the following planning conservation advice notes may assist:  
*GHS PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances* (includes signage)  
*GHS PCAN 10: CCTV and Lighting*

#### **5.0 Watchpoints**

- 5.1 Existing topography of land within the setting of historic landscape may be of historical significance to the designed landscape (See 1.2 and 1.3 above).
- 5.2 Proposed screening may alter the character of setting or compromise a view – e.g. a high earth bund, Leylandii hedge or belt of coniferous trees may restrict visibility of development but present an incongruous line or obstruction across a view from historic landscape.

- 5.3 Potential impact of the scale, bulk and particularly height of proposed structures changes with relative height of vantage point.
- 5.4 Views across and beyond historic landscape change markedly with different seasons.
- 5.5 Structural facades in close proximity to the boundary of a historic landscape may significantly alter the light quality within it, and increase sense of enclosure of specific areas.
- 5.6 As well as potential adverse visual impact upon the setting of historic landscape, a significant increase in weight of traffic (numbers and/or sizes of vehicles) on public roads running alongside historic landscape boundaries may have other implications; particularly where such roads pass entrances, and new or upgraded traffic management measures are required.  
See *GHS PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances*
- 5.7 Visibility of proposed development does not necessarily equate with adverse visual impact, although in the majority of cases the two will be synonymous, and views of subsidiary development can rarely, if ever, be deemed to preserve and enhance.  
However, if evaluation identifies that significant damage already exists to an area of setting (e.g. parking of industrial vehicles; incongruous buildings etc.), replacement with a structure designed to respond to and enhance the historic landscape could be beneficial.  
If, after the following the evaluation questionnaire, it remains unclear whether a structure or new landscaping enhances the setting of a historic landscape, the advice of an independent historic landscape expert is recommended.
- 5.8 Mitigation measures should be appropriate to the specific historic setting, and to achieve long-term conservation aims should be secured in perpetuity as part of any consent which an authority may be minded to grant.

## 6.0 Unavoidable Development

- 6.1 If significant adverse impact has been identified, but development is difficult to resist (e.g. both location and scale of development have already been approved in a local plan), every effort should be made to mitigate against such impact and corresponding gain for the affected historic landscape should be secured as part of the application. This may include funding for a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (the essential blueprint which should underpin repair and future conservation management on all historic sites) or, if such a plan is already in place, funding for specific repair projects, planting etc.

## 7.0 Application of Advice

- The appended evaluation checklist is intended to identify whether development would adversely impact on the setting of a historic landscape.
- 7.1 If an application is not deemed unavoidable development (see 6.0 above) and would result in significant adverse impact, and potential for appropriate mitigation has not been identified or cannot be secured as part of any consent which an authority may be minded to grant, the Society would anticipate that the authority would refuse consent to the application.
- 7.2 Where proposals were deemed unavoidable development, the Society recommend that the general guidance given at 6.0 above be followed, and would not anticipate consultation.
- 7.3 If an application would not result in significant adverse impact on a historic landscape, or if appropriate mitigation of any potential adverse impact could and would be secured as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to grant, the Society would be unlikely to have any objection in principle to such an application and would not anticipate consultation.
- 7.4 Should there be doubt over the potential for proposals to generate a high level of adverse impact upon the setting of a historic landscape, we advise that a request be made via our London office\* for the Society's regional conservation officer to discuss the case with the local authority.

\*Such request should be made to the Society's Conservation Casework Manager, at The Garden History Society, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ. Email [conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org](mailto:conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org) or telephone 020 7608 2409.

## 8.0 Planning Context

*This section highlights some parts of government Planning Policy Guidance notes (general guidance on specific topics), which may be particularly relevant to applications for change on historic landscape. Further information may be accessed via the planning website (see 8.4 below).*

### PPG15: Planning & the Historic Environment

- 8.1 Para 2.24 instructs that 'planning authorities should protect registered parks and gardens in preparing development plans and in determining planning applications'.  
Para 2.24 also confirms that the effect on a registered park or garden or its setting is a material consideration in assessing an application.  
N.B. It is important to recognise the difference between setting of a listed building, which may comprise historic landscape, and the setting of the landscape itself, the evaluation of which involves a range of different issues (See *GHS PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape*)
- 8.2 Para 2.16 notes that when authorities consider applications for planning permission or listed building consent for works which potentially affect a listed structure they should pay special regard to certain matters including the desirability of preservation of the setting of a listed building.  
Para 2.16 also notes that, 'The setting is often an essential part of the building's character, especially if a garden or grounds have been laid out to complement its design or function and para 2.17 continues, 'In some cases **setting** can only be defined by a historical assessment of a building's surroundings'.
- 8.3 Para 5.2: **Transport & Traffic Management** continues, 'Local highway and planning authorities should ... integrate their activities and should take great care to avoid or minimise impacts on the various elements of the historic environment and their settings'.  
Para 5.3 notes that, 'The Secretaries of State also attach particular importance to early consultation in traffic management and highway maintenance schemes, and associated development proposals which could affect listed buildings or conservation areas or parks, gardens or battlefields, and their settings'.

### Planning Website

- 8.4 The website of the office of the deputy prime minister ([www.odpm.gov.uk](http://www.odpm.gov.uk)) may be accessed for full information on the above PPGs and other relevant planning guidance e.g.

*PPG13: Transport*

*Planning and Access for Disabled People: A Good Practice Guide*

See also *GHS Appendix 3* for further parts of

*PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment*

*PPG16: Archaeology and Planning*

*PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation*

AND *Planning Policy Wales*



## 9.0 Assessment of Impact: Evaluation Checklist

The following evaluation checklist is intended to identify where development beyond the boundary of an historic landscape could result in adverse impact upon it or its setting. Questions should be answered in order. The findings of each section should enable a summary of type and level of impact to be devised. Any finding of 'IMPACT HIGH' should be regarded as potentially damaging to the historic landscape.

While for simplicity questions refer to 'the view', it is probable that more than one view/viewpoint will be potentially affected and the questionnaire should be applied to each. Similarly, questions refer to 'the structure' but should be applied to each included in a proposal.

### 9.1 Assessment of Visual impact

#### Q1

9.1.1 Would the structural parts of the proposed development be visible from any points/areas identified in 1.1 or 1.2?

9.1.2 Would any associated subsidiary development\* be visible from any points/areas identified in 1.1 or 1.2?

*\*Include areas of vehicle parking; new access routes; increased traffic movement on existing routes, (particularly of high or service vehicles), CCTV and lighting columns; signage.*

9.1.3 Would any new landscape features\* included in the proposed development be visible from any points/areas identified in 1.1 or 1.2? *\*Include tree planting, sculptures, ground recontouring.*

If No, go to Q2

If Yes, go to Q3

Q2 What would prevent development being visible?

a. too far away **NO VISUAL IMPACT**. Go to Q7

b. lie of the land **NO VISUAL IMPACT**. Go to Q7

c. planting intervenes

Is such planting deciduous or evergreen?

If deciduous treat as visible. Go to Q3

If planting is evergreen, is there potential within this application for condition for maintenance of such planting in perpetuity?

If No, treat as visible. Go to Q3

If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED** Go to Q7

d. existing buildings intervene

Are such structures temporary or permanent?

If temporary treat as visible. Go to Q3

If permanent treat as not visible. Go to Q7

#### Q3

What is the 'character' of the existing view (e.g. urban residential; industrial; rural; pastoral)?

Would the proposed structure alter that character and so compromise the view?

If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to Q4

If Yes, Go to Q3A

Q3A Is there potential to appropriately\* screen the proposed structure so that it does not affect the character of the existing view?

*(\*Such screening should not in itself alter the character or compromise a view – e.g. a high earth bund,*

*Leylandii hedge or coniferous tree planting may restrict visibility of development but present an incongruous line or obstruction across a view from historic landscape.)*

If No, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q4

If Yes, Go to Q3B

Q3B Is there potential for condition to ensure such screening is maintained in perpetuity?

If No, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q4

If Yes, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to Q4

- Q4** What is the appearance of the existing view (e.g. urban street scene; houses with gardens; panorama of gently rolling countryside; rugged and Picturesque landscape [e.g. ‘wild/desolate’]; regularly graded ground/lands)? (*Occasionally land beyond the historic boundary is artificially contoured/levelled to enhance a view.*)  
Would the proposed structure alter that appearance and so compromise the view?  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to Q5  
If Yes, Go to Q4A
- Q4A** Is there potential to appropriately\* screen the proposed structure so that it does not affect the appearance of the existing view?  
(\*See Footnote to Q3A)  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q5  
If Yes, Go to Q4B
- Q4B** Is there potential for condition to ensure such screening is maintained in perpetuity?  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q5  
If Yes, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to Q5
- Q5** Are other structures of similar height and scale visible from the same view points/areas?  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q6  
If Yes, Answer Q5A & Q5B
- Q5A** Is the proposed structure(s) significantly\* closer to the historic landscape boundary than the closest of those identified?  
(\*closer than 75% of the intervening distance)  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to Q6  
If Yes, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q5B
- Q5B** Would new structures increase the level of those existing by more than 25%?  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to Q6  
If Yes, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q6
- Q6** Have any specific focal points to views out, prominent views or panoramas been identified (see B1.1–B1.5)?  
If No, Go to Q7  
If Yes, answer Qs 6A – 6C
- Q6A** Would the proposed structure come within the arc of vision\* which includes such focus?  
(\*Include any framing of view e.g. vista between hills.)  
If No, Go to Q7  
If Yes, Go to Q6B
- Q6B** Is there potential to appropriately\* screen the proposed structure so that it is not visible within the arc of vision?  
(\*See Footnote to Q3A)  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q7  
If Yes, Go to 6C
- Q6C** Is there potential for condition to ensure such screening is maintained in perpetuity?  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q7  
If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED**. Go to Q7
- Q7** Would any parts of the development be visible within the arcs of view of the historic landscape seen from areas or points outside the boundary (See 1.3)? For parts of development which may affect views of entrances also answer Qs 7D – 7E.  
If No, **NO VISUAL IMPACT**. Go to 9.2  
If Yes, Go to Q7A
- Q7A** Is the development of sufficient scale to dominate the arc of vision and deflect attention from the identified view of the historic landscape?  
If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to Q7B  
**VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q7B

**Q7B** What is the character of the area within the identified view?

*(See explanation Q3.)*

Will development result in a change of that character?

If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to Q7C

**VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to Q7C

**Q7C** What is the appearance of the area within the identified view?

*(See explanation Q4.)*

Will development result in a change of that appearance?

If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to 9.2

**VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**. Go to 9.2

#### **FOR ENTRANCES:**

**Q7D** Is alteration to or upgrading of adjacent tracks or highways proposed? (Include assessment of alignments, width, surfacing, lighting and signage and any new entrances within the arc of an approach view.)

If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**. Go to 9.2

If Yes, Go to Q7E

**Q7E** Is the existing status of the entrance relative to the approach track or highway subordinate, equal or dominant?

If subordinate, Go to 9.2

If equal or dominant, Go to Q7F

**Q7F** Would the relative status between the two be altered?

If No, Go to 9.2

If Yes, **POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. PROFESSIONAL ADVICE REQUIRED.**

Go to 9.2.

*(Assessment of impact on entrances is an aspect on which it is difficult to generalise. Professional advice should be sought where impact appears potentially significant.)*

## **9.2 Assessment of Other Impact**

In terms of potential adverse impact upon the historic landscape of development within its setting, visual impact is likely to be the most significant issue. However, noise\* may also be a significant adverse factor, particularly where 'quiet enjoyment' is a feature of an adjacent historic landscape. This can be as relevant to an urban ornamental cemetery as to a landscape park and should be carefully assessed.

In cases of significant levels of development proposed within the setting of a historic site, an Environmental Impact Assessment should inform on any other factors which may affect the designed landscape.

\*As from industrial activity; increase in traffic noise (e.g. through increased weight of traffic or alterations in road layout requiring braking etc.) or equipment related to specialised facilities (e.g. wind farms).

## **9.3 Additional Guidance**

9.4 In Wales, Cadw (*Cadw/ICOMOS Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales*) has identified and mapped both historic parks and gardens and their settings. The criteria which are used by evaluators to identify such settings are included in the attached Appendix.

## **Appendix to GHS PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape**

- 1.0 In Wales, Cadw (*Cadw/ICOMOS Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales*) has identified and mapped both historic parks and gardens and their settings.
- 2.0 The Explanatory Notes to the *Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales* Part 1: Parks and Gardens define Essential Setting as,  
'... a concept developed for the register in order to safeguard areas adjacent to the historic parks and gardens which, although outside them, form an essential part of their immediate background and without which, in their present state, the historic character of the site in question would be diluted and damaged'.
- 3.0 A map accompanies each Register entry. These are based on the current Ordnance Survey and the individual scale is marked on each. Each map is annotated to identify the boundaries of:
  1. Park and Pleasure Grounds (may also be referred to as 'the site boundary' – solid line)
  2. Gardens (dashed line)
  3. Kitchen Garden (dotted line)
  4. Essential Setting (shading)Significant views are also marked (by arrows showing the direction of views – see e.g. Hafod).  
Examples of entries including maps in the Welsh Register can be obtained from Cadw, Plas Carew, Unit 5/7 Cefn Coed, Parc Nantgarw, Cardiff CF15 7QQ, Tel: 01442 33 6000.

- 4.0 *The Fieldworker's Manual for contractors for the Cadw/ICOMOS Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales* offers the following guidance in determining the areas to be included in each of the above categories:

### Site boundary

Careful consideration should be given to the exact delineation of the area to be included in the Register.

Important points to consider are:

1. How much of the historic parkland or garden can still be considered as 'designed'? If outlying parts of a park or garden have become so degraded or altered as to have lost all designed features then they should not be included (for example, park that has completely reverted to farmland, with no remaining planting, layout or boundaries). Where the framework remains but the detail has been eradicated, then the area should be included.
2. Has the park or garden been divided in such a way as to make part of it meaningless? This would apply to parts of parkland that have been sliced off from the main part by road building or other destruction. For some sites a case can be made for including both or all parts even though fragmented (for instance, where a site has been divided into two more or less equal parts); in others, for instance where a small part has been isolated, fragments should not be included.
3. Are there any outliers or inliers? Occasionally there is a significant part of the layout that is removed from the rest (e.g. a flower garden or kitchen garden). This should be included.
4. The essential setting. Care should be taken to examine the area around the park or garden to assess which areas should be included on the map as 'Essential Setting'. Any area adjacent to the boundary should be included that, if altered (developed, roads, housing etc.), would detract from the setting of the park and/or garden.

### Views

Views to be shown are those of major importance both from and to the site. These are likely to include those from and to the house, from and to eye-catchers in the park, and from and to picturesque viewpoints. These may lie outside the site.

5.0 Although the above is specific to the *Cadw/ICOMOS Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales Part 1: Parks and Gardens*, this demonstrates a number of important points to be considered in identification of essential setting elsewhere.

For example:

- ... Identification of Essential Setting is dependent on site-specific evaluation.
- ... Identification of Essential Setting is not a matter of drawing an equidistant line at a defined distance outside a site boundary.
- ... The extent of Essential Setting may vary considerably in its distance from a site boundary.
- ... Essential Setting is not necessarily related to significant views out from a site.
- ... Areas where visibility is currently restricted (e.g. wooded) may still be considered to be Essential Setting.