

THE GARDEN
HISTORY SOCIETY

Planning Conservation Advice Note 9

Development of Domestic Amenities



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

Tel: 020 7608 2409 Fax: 020 7490 2974 Email: conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org

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.

Domestic amenities are facilities designed for the enjoyment of owner and family within the curtilage of an individual property, or communal facilities provided for exclusive use of residents of a group of dwellings. Such facilities may relate to services or to leisure pursuits.

1.0 Introduction

For a brief history of provision of public leisure and sports facilities, and of such provision within the wider landscape of the country house (including equestrian activities) see Introduction (section 1.0) to: *GHS PCAN 2: Hotel and Leisure Development*.

1.1 With the exception of the country house, domestic provision for games was rare before the end the 19th century and, few if any areas in the gardens and pleasure grounds of even the most fashionable of the middle classes before World War II would have been designed exclusively for that purpose. Enjoyment of gardening – designing, choosing the plants, planting, nurturing, propagating, ornamenting etc. – was usually supplemented only by quiet recreation such as strolling or sitting. However, under certain circumstances, other activities could be accommodated.

By the mid 1880s, questions in *The Gardeners Chronicle* suggested a general widening of interest in tennis. Until around 1940 the game was played on grass, and most ‘courts’ were unenclosed. Lack of enclosure and of definition was important since it allowed games to be played close to the house without disruption to garden design. It also allowed a range of games to be played within the same space; architects at the turn of the century (c.1905) were specifying lawns which could be used variously for bowls, tennis or croquet, in their designs for the garden. Where discrete children’s areas were not included in a garden design (see 1.3 below), in either private or communal grounds (e.g. town squares), grass offered similar versatility for ball games, gymnastics etc.

1.2 Cold baths featured in fashionable designed landscapes from the 17th century, and lakes and ponds which could be used for swimming had also existed in many larger designed landscapes for centuries, but there were few private swimming pools before the Edwardian era, when interest in open air activities increased (sunbathing slopes and areas could also be found in gardens from the 1920s). Even then, as other writers have pointed out, these were invariably designed to look like something else; thus the open air swimming pool designed as a formal canal (with the changing pavilion disguised as one of a pair of classical temples) or that proposed as a water feature within a rockwork garden. For the majority of people, swimming pools remained prohibitively expensive until the later 20th century.

1.3 Provision for children’s activities arrived in the designed landscape rather earlier and the most fortunate might have a garden designed for their exclusive use. However, since privileged children of earlier centuries were constrained as much by behavioural codes as by dress, these activities were limited, and the gardens usually of relatively small-scale, with a formality and neatness unsuited to more active sports and games. The 1814 design by Repton for the children’s garden at Endsleigh in Devon did include a raised perimeter rill for sailing model boats, but the remainder of the garden seems to have been devoted to geometric flower beds and neat gravel paths. Children’s areas were carefully located, and most were out of general view – some at the end or corner of formal terraces, some screened by surrounding shrubbery (or, as in the case of Endsleigh, at a different level from ‘adult’ garden areas).

Play equipment was known in public parks in the 1840s but the advent and extent of the domestic version is less clear. The architect M.H. Baillie-Scott, when designing a house and garden for a client in Switzerland in 1906, included both swing and giant stride* within the children’s garden and recommended that the woodwork be painted bright colours. While such elements might have been exclusive to the continent, Baillie-Scott, in his explanation of the design, did not appear to find the provision in any way unusual. This was still a long way, however, from the progressive tide in affordable, mass-marketed childrens play equipment which was to sweep across Britain in the latter part of the 20th century**.

*a popular feature in playgrounds in British public parks

**See also *GHS PCAN 2: Hotel and Leisure Development*

- 1.4 More passive leisure activities within garden and pleasure ground in the 19th century included the keeping of birds, bees and fish. Bee-keeping and gardening is a timeless association, and fish have added interest to water features in the designed landscape since at least the early 1600s, but in the 19th century both also became denizens of the new gardens of suburbia. Ornamental Ponds and aquaria, and the delicate and highly ornamental iron and rustic work, in which apiaries and aviaries were constructed, were eminently suited to the minutely detailed gardens of the period, and all could be designed to suit almost any size of grounds.
- 1.5 The keeping of fowl and show birds and small animals, while unquestionably popular – particularly amongst town gardeners – was usually regarded rather differently and these were rarely housed within dressed grounds; more often occupying utilitarian areas of the garden along with essential store sheds and shelters.
- 1.6 The last major domestic amenity to be considered in this section is personal transport. Until the advent of the motor car in the early 20th century, and for some people for several decades to come, such transport was invariably provided by horse or donkey. Stabling, tack rooms, fodder stores and pasturage were the necessary adjuncts of this form of transport, although these did not have to be within the immediate curtilage of a property (the renting of stables and ground a short distance away was made possible by the employment of servants who would fetch horse and carriage [or donkey and gig] at need). Where space was available, in town as well as country, provision was made within the curtilage of a property, with buildings usually confined to a service yard. However, for most urban and suburban dwellers such provision was not only beyond their means, it was also unnecessary. Public and hired transport was readily available, goods were delivered and walking was the norm rather than the exception. As motor cars gradually took over from horses as a means of personal transport, stables were progressively converted to garages and purpose built structures for motor cars started to be included in designs for new dwellings. Without precedence to follow, architects in the early part of the 20th century had to devise a new aesthetic and there were many variations – from structures which bore a marked resemblance to the open-fronted garden houses of the time (with steeply pitched tiled roofs and arched openings) to barn-like buildings in vernacular materials. However, although the form of the building remained fluid for some time to come, its function was clear and there were few exceptions to its location within the service yard.

2.0 Information needed to evaluate proposals

- 2.1 With the help of the English Heritage or Cadw (for Wales) Register entry for the site, or of any district inventory* entry for sites not on the Register, establish the design intention and significance of the features and areas from which the proposed facilities would be visible.
- *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 contained in listed building and 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 structures and areas of importance to be identified should be recognised. A historic landscape assessment should be used as a supplement if Register or Inventory entries and listed building or conservation area descriptions do not fully explain structures and areas in the context of the designed landscape, and insufficient information is presented with an application.
- 2.2 Identify any additional points and areas of public access within and outside the landscape (including footpaths, bridleways etc.) and potential views of proposed facilities from these (particular attention should be paid to external views of significant features within the landscape).
- 2.3 Establish what, if any, subsidiary development will be generated as a result of proposals. (See *GHS Appendix 1*)

3.0 Additional information required

- 3.1 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 features and areas of significance to lose definition or, in some instances, to be entirely obscured)

e.g. where these are overgrown or where new structures have been sited, or areas hard surfaced. 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 a pleasure ground, re-establishment of formal garden features and layout 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

4.1 Adverse visual impact may be reduced by selection of materials and colours (for structures, facilities and hard landscaping associated with them) which blend with the surrounding landscape. Colours should be particularly carefully selected where a large, continuous surface area would be on view (e.g. a court surface or open air swimming pool).

Visual prominence of a structure may also be reduced by clothing it in planting and, where the surface of a facility is grass, by ensuring that species and grass management regimes are integrated as far as possible with those of the surrounding landscape.

4.2 Advantage may be taken of existing topography to reduce visibility of a proposed structure or facility. In this respect, facilities viewed from above are likely to have less visual impact than those viewed on the same level or from below, particularly where the latter view is against a skyline. Structures designed to follow existing contours are likely to be less visually prominent than those which do not.

N.B. Where topography mitigates against potential adverse visual impact of domestic amenities (e.g. a tennis court or garage) associated subsidiary development, such as high fencing and lighting columns, should be similarly obscured.

4.3 Service facilities which historically related to domestic use (e.g. rubbish sites, drying and bleaching yards etc.), were invariably screened from external view – within enclosures, behind planting or sited below ground level. Where such areas are no longer in use but external view remains limited, they may be appropriate for facilities which would otherwise result in adverse visual impact.

N.B. Historical evaluation is needed to ensure these are not confused with areas integral to the designed landscape (e.g. walled ornamental produce gardens, sunken quarry walks etc.).

4.4 Amenities restricted to ground level works (e.g. unfenced tennis courts, open air swimming pools) will have less impact than those with associated above ground elements.

4.5 Where facilities are proposed for seasonal use, removable above ground structures (e.g. fencing around tennis courts, lighting etc.) may restrict adverse visual impact.

4.6 In considering potential for mitigation, consider also need for mitigation of subsidiary development, including vehicle access for delivery and servicing.

4.7 Provided that the site for domestic amenities (e.g. swimming pool, tennis court) is carefully chosen, innovative solutions and design excellence can result in enhancement of the historic landscape.

4.8 When considering proposals for new residential units, or change to residential use of structures erected for other purposes, the potential for siting of domestic amenities should be evaluated. Where such potential appears limited or uncertain, the removal of permitted development rights from any consent which an

authority may be minded to give may mitigate against future adverse impact, from development of domestic amenities, which would otherwise be difficult to control.

5.0 Watchpoints

- 5.1 In identification of historically significant areas, particular attention should be paid to designed points of view (e.g. garden terraces; high points in the landscape which command views, specific views/vista lines etc.).
- 5.2 Some types* of provision will generate the need for high level security measures (high fencing, CCTV, additional lighting, etc.).
*e.g. security is usually required for livestock, particularly horses.
- 5.3 Some locations are a greater security risk than others, and may generate added security requirements.
- 5.4 New or altered access points within the wider landscape may be required for service and delivery vehicles to a proposal site.
- 5.5 Proposals may also lead to altered circulation patterns within the immediate area. Resulting desire line paths, ground compaction etc. can be visually damaging, particularly in intricately detailed or formally laid out landscape areas.
- 5.6 Where screen planting is proposed, this should be appropriate to the historic landscape if additional adverse impact is to be avoided.
- 5.7 Where proposals are for the interior of the planted area, the provenance of its design intention should be ascertained (e.g. location within a pleasure ground could preclude repair of the area).
- 5.8 Level areas of landscape, particularly those in the immediate vicinity of an ornamental building, or primary structure or residence, are often favoured as proposal sites for obvious reasons **BUT**, unless this is an already developed site, such levelling is frequently an indication of (former) landscape design (see also 5.13 below).
A Historic Landscape Assessment will inform.
(See *GHS PCAN 13: Brief for Historic Landscape Assessments*)
- 5.9 Views within and across historic landscape change markedly with different seasons. Evaluation should include any seasonal variation, particularly where colours and materials are chosen specifically to mitigate against adverse visual impact.
- 5.10 Mature planting may be adversely affected by below ground works or permanent hard surfacing in the area of root spread.
- 5.11 The potential cumulative effect of development is a key issue on historic landscape. Proposals for domestic amenities, on landscapes divided into individual residential units, needs careful consideration in this context; i.e. if the proposed development were to be repeated within all other such residential curtilages on this landscape, would the cumulative result be damaging? If so, then consent to such proposals may create an undesirable precedent and ultimately result in extensive damage, since further such proposals may be difficult to resist.
- 5.12 Visibility of proposed development/facilities does not necessarily equate with adverse visual impact. However, unless proposals been designed to integrate with or to enhance specific areas of the historic landscape, visibility **will** equate with adverse visual impact in the majority of cases.
N.B. Views of subsidiary development can rarely, if ever, be deemed to preserve and enhance the historic landscape.
- 5.13 The more areas of a landscape from which development is visible the greater will be the cumulative effect.

- 5.14 Where the development history of a site (as identified through a Historic Landscape Assessment) suggests existence of areas of potential archaeological significance*, and changes in levels or contours are proposed, consider archaeological evaluation.
- *Not all areas of potential archaeological significance in respect of designed landscapes, have yet been identified on county Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs).

6.0 Unavoidable Development

Domestic amenities are usually desirable rather than essential, and authorities may therefore resist proposals which would result in adverse impact, on the grounds of damage to historic landscape.

However, the following circumstances may arise:

1. Proposals for relocation of domestic amenities where consent has been granted but not implemented and where the new site would result in less (rather than no) adverse impact
2. Proposals for relocation of existing domestic amenities to an area of less (rather than no) adverse impact
3. Proposals for provision of domestic amenities in an area considered to be already developed
4. Proposals for provision of domestic amenities submitted as a detail of an application which has already received consent (e.g. large scale residential conversion of a primary structure – asylum, country house etc.).

For '1' and '2' Such proposals usually reflect the concern of the owner for conservation of the historic landscape, but authorities should ensure that the new site is indeed the optimum location before recommending consent. In addition, every attempt should be made to mitigate against any adverse impact and the potential for proper future conservation management of the areas of historic landscape in an applicant's ownership may be considered in this context.

For '3' Consideration should be given to the significance and potential for repair of the landscape area concerned. Where a high significance is discovered and repair would substantially enhance the historic landscape (e.g. where previous development has been sited on a key 'link' area, or within an important vista or panorama), the applicant should be advised of findings and of good conservation practice in this respect (i.e. that an alternative location should be sought and repair undertaken). Where no other suitable location can be found, the exact siting and details of screen planting may be devised to fit the historic layout*. In all such cases, design excellence of structures and planting should be a priority.

*The advice of a professional Historic Landscape Consultant should be sought on what may be appropriate and relevant for a specific site.

For '4', as for '3' exact siting and details of screen planting may be devised to fit the historic layout* and here too design excellence of structures should be a priority.

*The advice of a professional Historic Landscape Consultant should be sought on what may be appropriate and relevant for a specific site.

7.0 Application of Advice

- 7.1 Where proposals for domestic amenities on historic landscape would result in adverse impact and are not considered to be unavoidable development, the Society would anticipate that the authority would refuse consent to the application.
- 7.2 Where proposals for domestic amenities on historic landscape constitute unavoidable development, the Society would anticipate that the advice outlined in Section 6.0 above would be followed and would not anticipate consultation.
- 7.3 Where proposals for domestic amenities on historic landscape would not result in adverse impact or where such impact could be appropriately mitigated against, the Society would be unlikely to object in principle and would not anticipate consultation.
- 7.4 Should there be any doubt over whether proposals for domestic amenities on historic landscape would result in adverse impact, or where further advice for procedure to follow in the case of unavoidable development is required, 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 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'.

PPG16: Archaeology and Planning

A significant number of historic parks and gardens (registered and unregistered) are included on county sites and monuments records (SMRs) either in their own right or as part of the setting of other monuments.

- 8.3 B18: **Planning applications** 'The desirability of preserving an ancient monument and its setting is a material consideration in determining planning applications whether the monument is scheduled or unscheduled' '...Where local planning authorities are aware of a real and specific threat to a known archaeological site as a result of the potential exercise of permitted development rights (as set out in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act General Development Order 1988) they may wish to consider the use of their powers under **Article 4** of that order (see also 8.5 below) to withdraw those rights and to require specific planning permission to be obtained before development can proceed'.

Planning Website

- 8.4 The website of the office of the deputy prime minister (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

Permitted Development Rights

- 8.5 Local planning authorities may consider the serving of an Article 4 Direction to withdraw permitted development rights and to require specific planning permission to be obtained before development can proceed in a number of other situations (see 8.3 above).

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 Evaluation of Impact

- Q1** Does the proposal site lie within a domestic curtilage in a development of individual domestic housing units?
If Yes, Go to Q1A
If No, Go to Q2
- Q1A** Does the curtilage lie on the ‘outside’ of the area of domestic housing (i.e. visible from undeveloped areas of the historic landscape)?
If Yes, Go to Q1C
If No, Go to Q1B
- Q1B** Do proposals include subsidiary development which would impact on wider landscape areas (e.g. high structures, including lighting, need for new access ways, signage etc)?
If Yes, Go to Q1D
If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT LOW**
- Q1C** Would the facility or any subsidiary development generated (see Q1B) be visible from outside the curtilage (i.e. from the wider landscape)?
If Yes, Go to Q1D
If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT LOW**
- Q1D** Is there potential for appropriate* mitigation of adverse visual impact upon the wider landscape? (**Mitigation of impact – e.g. by visual screening – should not in itself alter the character of a landscape or compromise historic design – 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.*)
If Yes, Go to Q1E
If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**
- Q1E** Is there potential within this application for Condition/Legal Agreement to maintain such mitigation in perpetuity?
If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**
If Yes, **CONDITION/AGREEMENT REQUIRED**
- Q2** Does the proposal site lie within formally laid out garden areas adjacent to a mansion (include grassed terraces, and walled and part-walled compartments, even if currently laid to grass) or attached to a square or terrace of houses? **OR**
Does the proposal site (or elements of the proposal e.g. structures) lie within woodland?
If Yes, Go to Q2A
If No, Go to Q3
- Q2A** Has the historical significance of the proposals site been adequately explained?
If Yes, Go to Q2B
If No, **FURTHER INFORMATION NEEDED (Before proceeding with evaluation)**
- Q2B** Would proposals be visually contained within an existing garden or woodland compartment? (include also visibility of subsidiary development)
If Yes, Answer Qs 2C to 2E
If No, Answer Qs 2C to 2E **AND** Q3 onwards
- Q2C** Would proposals result in change to a historic designed layout or impact upon existing historic features [include archaeology], (e.g. views from a garden building, a vista or ride between hedges or avenues of trees, views along or over a platform or terrace etc.)?
If Yes, Go to Q2D
If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT LOW**
- Q2D** Is a new landscape design layer appropriate for this area?
If Yes, Go to Q2E
If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**
- Q2E** Are proposals put forward as part of a new landscape design layer (e.g. grass court surrounded by piers and swags of planting, swimming pool designed as a formal landscape feature etc.)?
If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**
If Yes, **CONSULT** *GHS PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features*

For Qs 3 to 7, the extent of adverse impact requires individual assessment of the particular historic landscape and the type of proposal (if in doubt, see 7.4 above). However, an accumulation of answers of ‘**potential adverse impact**’ to Qs 3–7 will almost certainly indicate that the level of adverse impact would be high.

- Q3** Is the proposal site a part of, or would it be visible from, other significant historic features or areas (as identified in Register or Inventory entry and as supplemented by site investigation).?
If Yes, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT** Go to Q4
If No, Go to Q4
- Q4** Do proposals include new structures (e.g. garaging, stabling, stores etc.)?
If Yes, Go to Q4A
If No, Go to Q5
- Q4A** Have structures been designed to integrate with* or enhance the historic landscape?
N.B. The scale of structures in relation to existing buildings and features should be assessed.
If Yes, Go to Q5
If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT** Go to Q5
- Q5** Would proposals result in subsidiary development either within the proposals site or within the wider historic landscape or its setting? (Include new access ways, changes to entrances, service and delivery arrangements, stock fencing, lighting etc.)
See also *GHS PCANs 6, 7 and 10: Vehicle Parking and Access; Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances; and Lighting and CCTV* for detailed evaluation of these elements.
If Yes, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT** Go to Q6
If No, Go to Q6
- Q6** Would proposals affect existing land management? (Include altered grassland management, potential for waste run off etc.)
If Yes, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT** Go to Q7
If No, Go to Q7
- Q7** Would proposals result in increased security measures (e.g. high security fencing, CCTV, lighting, on site security premises)?
If Yes, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT** Go to Q8
If No, Go to Q8
- Q8** Is there potential for appropriate* mitigation of any adverse impact upon areas and features identified? (Refer to 5.11 above.) (*See explanation Q1E above.)
If Yes, Go to Q9
If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**
- Q9** Is there potential within this application for Condition/Legal Agreement to maintain such mitigation in perpetuity?
If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**
If Yes, **CONDITION/AGREEMENT REQUIRED**

A1.8 Use for Animals and birds

Grazing enclosures
Perimeter (security) enclosures
Animal housing and aviaries (with solid bases and dry access routes)
Feed and equipment stores (potential for additional structures)
Delivery access (feed)
Waste disposal (run off to ornamental water features/courses with alteration in vegetation)

HORSES

Subsidiary buildings (horses are bulk fed from other sources and subsidiary buildings are often needed: stables, tack rooms, feed stores)
Vehicular access (for feed delivery)
Vehicle Standing (horse boxes)
Grazing enclosures (usually require post and rail site division for security; similar requirements with special surfacing [e.g. bark] for areas of manege)
Growth of grass over parkland becomes uneven (partially because of paddocking but also because horses dung in particular areas)
Horses hooves cut deeply into turf (uneven appearance of grassland)

A1.9 Domestic Amenities

SWIMMING POOLS

Servicing (pumps and plant housing)
Additional facilities (changing and showering)
Colourful pool and play equipment (particularly diving boards)
Hard surfacing (around the edges of a pool, and for access, seating, barbeques etc.)
Potential for later additional structures (e.g. covering of an initially open-air pool)

TENNIS (AND OTHER) GAMES COURTS

Contours which conflict with surrounding topography (and highlight the presence of the amenity)
Coloured and hard surfacing
High perimeter enclosures
Equipment stores (nets, line markers, mowing machines etc.)
Lighting

CHILDREN'S PLAY AREAS

Surfacing (and internal boundary delineation of 'safe surfaced' areas)
Access paths
Highly coloured play equipment
Play equipment sited at high level
Security fencing (if the area is some distance from a main residence)
Ground compaction, and 'wear and tear' on existing planting (+ difficulty of establishing new planting in such areas)

GARAGES

New entrances and access routes
Changes to entrances and access routes (including surfacing)
Hard standing (with views of parked vehicles)
Potential for increased traffic on the wider historic landscape
Lighting and security measures
Potential for increase in height at a later date (e.g. for games rooms, storage areas etc.)
Potential for dominance in scale of existing historic buildings (e.g. where associated with converted lodges or ornamental landscape buildings)

GHS Head Office, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ Tel: 020 7608 2409

Email: conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org Fax: 020 7490 2974

For information and very latest news see our website: www.gardenhistorysociety.org

PROVISION FOR ANIMALS AND BIRDS (See A1.8)

HORSES (See A1.8)