



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JULY 2018

The GT conservation team received 159 new cases in England and four cases in Wales during July, in addition to ongoing work on previously logged cases. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 44 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and 20 by CGTs in response to planning applications included in the weekly lists.

Site	County	GT Ref	Reg Grade	Proposal	Written Response
ENGLAND					
Old Warden Park (including the Swiss Garden)	Bedfordshire	E18/0518	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of new tarmac access driveway together with construction of culvert / ditch crossings and associated fences, gates, drainage ditch, hedges, landscaping and mitigation works to Old Warden Park and removal of the old tarmac driveway crossing the Old Warden airfield runway. Land South of Old Warden Park, Old Warden, Biggleswade. HYBRID	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.07.2018 Bedfordshire Gardens Trust is responding on behalf of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee, to the further comments from Robinson & Hall on behalf of the Applicant, dated 22 June. Our original response was dated 25 May. We also note the views of Historic England on the application, as set out in their response of 8 June. Traffic estimates The estimated traffic flows now provided by the applicant indicate the highest numbers on flying days (12 days in 2018), amounting to 1000-2500 vehicles (ie 2000-5000 vehicle movements daily, or 24,000-60,000 per year) to access and leave the site). The applicant states that other events would involve 15,500 vehicles (31,000 vehicle movements) per year, while the daily flows arising from the college (1000 students, and ancillary traffic) are not specified. Each of these vehicles would pass directly through a small but sensitive area of the registered parkland, and be visible (and audible) across a much wider area, including intrusion into views to and from the

					<p>Mansion (see our response of 25 May).</p> <p>It is appreciated that the application is aimed at accommodating present traffic and not increasing the number of visitors, but as the attractions of the Trust's facilities are well-marketed, it is likely that these numbers will grow.</p> <p>Even without that, the presence of a new length of two-way road passing through the edge of the registered site, and the concentration of all present vehicle movements on it, will have an adverse impact on the historic landscape. The peak flows mentioned by the applicant would occur on only a relatively small number of (mainly weekend and evening) occasions during the May-October flying season, but the road would be a permanent feature throughout the year.</p> <p>We do not agree that this amounts only to "slight harm" to the significance of the registered park. We regard the degree of harm - insofar as it can be assessed from the limited information provided - to be moderate rather than slight. It is for your Council to consider whether there is justification for this harm (National Planning Policy Guidance para 132) and weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal (para 134).</p> <p>Enhancements</p> <p>The applicant states that the new access road would allow some enhancement and reinstatement work in accordance with the CMP (which we have not seen). We accept that the reinstatement of the verges to the Old Warden Drive and the North (Ickwell) Drive would support the significance of the site, and that the new access road would facilitate this. The return of arable to grassland in the North Park, and better management of the lakeside planting, could presumably be effected without the proposed change of access.</p> <p>The longer-term effect of closing the Hill Lane access (also suggested as an improvement if the new access road were to go ahead) is unclear, as the visitor centre and hardstanding for visitor parking is immediately inside that entrance. There would presumably be a future application to resite those facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Mitigation proposals for the new route included the replacement "east copse" of oaks grown from acorns on site to assist in screening the new</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>road from the Mansion. Historic England have pointed out that in order to be effective, the screening proposals would have to include some faster-growing species in the early years, and be carefully managed. We concur. The Applicant has accepted this. It has also offered to “reinforce tree planting on the southern side of the existing drive to consolidate the existing screen of the new college buildings” (penultimate paragraph of the email of 22 June). Your Council will no doubt want to seek further information on this to assess what is proposed and how much mitigation it could provide.</p> <p>All enhancements and mitigation works should be the subject of conditions if planning permission is given. Bedfordshire Gardens Trust remains concerned about the impact of this proposal on the Grade II* registered historic park and garden site, both in its own right and as a setting for the listed Mansion and Queen Anne’s Summerhouse.</p> <p>Yours sincerely CAROLINE BOWDLER Bedfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Luton Hoo	Bedford shire	E18/0406	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Request for Scoping Opinion in respect of the construction and operation of a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility that would import up to 500,000 tonnes per annum of Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) or similar residual waste including new access off Lower Harpenden Road, ancillary development and installation of underground pipeline and cable for transfer of heat and energy to new connection points/substation near London Luton Airport. Proposed Chiltern Green Energy Park, Land off Lower Harpenden Road, New Mill End, East Hyde. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the scoping opinion affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. The GT has liaised with our colleagues in the Bedfordshire Gardens Trust and would like to offer the following comments.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment is most valuable when it influences a prospective applicant’s decision on site selection. Here it appears that that decision has already been taken, and the Gardens Trust has serious concerns about the location. The proposed site adjoins Luton Hoo, a grade II* registered historic park of major importance as an example of the work of Lancelot “Capability” Brown. Brown transformed the landscape east of the house. The park runs down to lakes formed by Brown from the river Lea, backed by a shelter belt of woodland just west of the B653, the proposed access route to the CHP development.</p> <p>The registered site is a heritage asset in its own right, as well as the setting for the Grade I- listed house – and as a heritage asset, the park</p>

				<p>also has its own setting. The request for a scoping opinion largely identifies the factors likely to be of concern to the Gardens Trust, but there are some additional points to make.</p> <p>Section 5.9 – Cultural Heritage – proposes an analysis which appears to be in line with current methodology, for example Historic England’s Good Practice Advice Note 3 (GPA3) on the setting of heritage assets. However the appropriate connections with other aspects of the proposals, and the way in which cumulative impacts will be assessed, are not always clear. This needs to be addressed as set out below.</p> <p>Section 5.5 – Highways and Transportation – states that all HGV traffic would probably come from the north (M1 J10), and Herts CC have confirmed in their consultation response that they would not be prepared for HGV movements to use the B653 south of the proposed site. The alignment and capacity of the B653 is rightly identified as a key issue, but there are implications for Luton Hoo in relation to noise, traffic emissions and possible future land-take which should also be considered.</p> <p>Section 5.7 Ecology – trees are not mentioned. We are told in Section 6.6 that a tree survey has been undertaken and will form part of the supporting documents for the future planning application, but it apparently focuses on trees that would have to be felled and how trees would be protected during the construction. Trees are a very important part of this registered landscape, both individual specimens in the Park, woodland shelter belts, and planting on the far (eastern) side of the valley which form part of the designed views from the house. Their condition, and the likely impacts of pollution from increased traffic and the operation of the CHP plant, should be part of the EIA.</p> <p>Section 5.8 Landscape and visual. There is an implication in the overview that the only “visual receptors” which need to be considered are local residents, users of public rights of way, visitors to the Luton Hoo Hotel and road users. This is too narrow. Views within, from and to the registered site are an integral part of its character and value. GPA3 Part I, Settings & Views (22.12.17) makes this clear: “The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.” It also goes on to say: “The extent and importance of</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places." Similar considerations therefore apply to noise (section 5.6).</p> <p>We are pleased to see that visualisations are to be prepared which show impacts in different seasons, including when deciduous trees are not in leaf.</p> <p>While Luton Hoo is the principal parks and gardens heritage site which would be affected, the document rightly identifies the scheduled monument Someries Castle, which has remnants of an early formal garden layout, and the non-registered grounds and Victorian walled garden of The Hyde which are of local importance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Woburn Abbey	Bedfordshire	E18/0433	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of a new temporary access drive across the Gardens located at Woburn Abbey in order to facilitate works to: a) dismantle and rebuild the North and South Screen Walls (as detailed in the approved Listed Building Consent application number: CB/14/02062/LB); and b) refurbish and alter the North and South Courtyards and carry out landscaping works (as detailed in the approved Listed Building Consent application number: CB/18/00732/LB and Planning application: CB/18/00731/FULL). Woburn</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2018</p> <p>Bedfordshire Gardens Trust is responding to this application on behalf of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for planning applications affecting registered historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>We do not have the technical expertise to assess whether the proposed temporary access road is essential, rather than just desirable from the Applicant's viewpoint, to allow the works to improve the visitor entrance area and the north and south courts, and the rebuilding of the screen walls. Your Council will no doubt want to ensure that it fully understands the restrictions associated with gaining access for construction traffic using the existing route through the North Court. The route of the proposed temporary access is not dissimilar to that of the permanent access through the gardens to the Sculpture Gallery car park for which your Council refused permission in 2011 (CB/11/02548/FULL). The response of 12 September 2011 by English Heritage (as it then was) to that application set out clearly the very substantial harm which would be done to the Grade 1 registered gardens by such a development.</p>

				Abbey, Woburn Park, Woburn, Milton Keynes MK17 9WA. ROAD	<p>Although the present application is for a temporary roadway, with the period of its construction, use and removal lasting for three years from November 2018 to October 2021, it would inevitably cause some harm to the significance of the registered site and its setting. This harm would arise both from the presence and use of this road cutting across the heart of the gardens, and from its construction and removal. There are also risks of damage and compaction while the road is in use by heavy vehicles. The harm would be more than slight although probably less than significant because of its time limitation. Any harm or loss of a heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 132.</p> <p>If your Council decides that the access route is essential to give effect to the planning permissions, it then has to consider whether the harm caused would be outweighed by the public benefits of implementing the permission (NPPF paragraph 134). If the conclusion is that the new access road should be allowed, conditions should be imposed to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implication of the work, including impacts on trees, drainage, ground levels, buried features etc are fully investigated before work starts; • There is a full archaeological watching and recording brief; • The construction methods are as little invasive as possible, and the traffic is carefully managed; and, • The site is entirely reinstated as quickly as possible after the completion of the works which the road is facilitating. <p>According to the draft programme (page 8 of the Design and Access Statement) the temporary access road would be in position, though not in use by construction traffic, during the visitor seasons April to September 2019 and Easter to October 2021. To minimise the harm to the significance of the registered site, access by other traffic should not be permitted during those periods.</p> <p>Yours sincerely CAROLINE BOWDLER</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E18/0331	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Single-storey extension in place of the	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site</p>

			<p>existing, Minor internal alterations, A proposed conservatory/orangery on the rear. Replacement structure of the existing shed. Brewers Yard, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire HP18 0SB. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. Please accept my apologies for the delay in getting back to you on this. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could please take our comments in consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The BGT has written a paper (attached) containing detailed comments on the current applications which outline our considered reasoning as to why the proposals are damaging to the important historic core of the Wotton Underwood landscape. We believe that the proposals as currently set out should be refused, but there may be alternative ways of obtaining similar accommodation for the property without causing the same level of damage to the historic character. BGT would be pleased to discuss alternative approaches with the applicant if the opportunity arises. I would be happy to forward any offers of a meeting to the BGT.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.07.2018</p> <p>The Current Situation The proposals are 1. To reconstruct the existing extension along the east boundary wall – affects landscape and views 2. To reconstruct the existing shed along the western boundary wall – affects landscape 3. To construct a conservatory/orangery on the north elevation – affects landscape 4. Internal alterations – not relevant to remit of BGT Of these, three proposed areas of change affect the designed landscape:</p> <p>The Historic England Register description for Grade I Wotton House in this vicinity is as follows: ‘The main drive continues in a straight line north, past Brewers Yard north of the Clock Pavilion, along the brick boundary wall of the yard, and arriving at a group of six piers 60m north of Brewers Yard (listed at Grade II). The four inner, brick piers are of the early C18, rebuilt in the C20, with C20 cast-iron railings and gates; the two outer, ashlar piers are early C19. Adjacent to the east is a single-storey brick lodge in</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>similar style to that on the south drive, forming part of the old estate yard, where the remains of the former ice house are still visible. The piers and lodge flank the southern end of the north avenue, probably planted initially by London and Wise, and largely replanted in the C20. The north drive runs straight along the avenue, turning north-east 1km north of the house to lead straight to Middle Lodge and beyond to Ham Lodge on the A41. This drive is no longer in use.'</p> <p>Image taken from http://www.historicalgardensblog.com/2013/12/23/garden-front-plans-for-wotton/</p> <p>Proposed conservatory, replacement shed with pitched roof, replacement Eastern wing with realigned roof</p> <p>The listed building description for Brewer's Yard is as follows: House, formerly the laundry for Wotton House, incorporating wall along E. side of yard, with pair of gate piers at S. end. Early C18, altered. Brick. House has tiled roof and brick band course across E. gable. One storey and attic, 4 bays. Left bays have C20 wooden cross casements with original segmental heads. Third bay altered, now with C20 door and paired casement above in small gable. Right bay has C20 flat roofed extension projecting along former wall of yard. E. gable has brick coping and blocked window with segmental head. Gate piers have moulded stone bases and cornices, carved stone urn finials, and carved stone scrolls to walls and side pilasters. Historic Significance of the Site of Brewer's Yard within the Designed Landscape Brewer's Yard is situated adjacent to the most important historic drive to Wotton House, as it reaches the house, and even closer to the Brewhouse Wing which is attached to the central block of the house by a curved wing wall and overlooks Brewhouse Yard. The site is close to several pairs of major C18 ornamental gate piers, garden walls, and the great formal forecourt on the east side of the house, with its impressive iron screen and gateway. This is the main approach from the Aylesbury (and hence London) direction, which although disused beyond Brewer's Yard, survives in relict form as a track and was intended to provide a long and impressive approach to the mansion. This was probably formed by Lancelot Brown, incorporating part of the old village street after the houses had been removed. Thus while Brewer's Yard may make a lesser</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>contribution to the designed landscape, it occupies a highly sensitive part of the landscape at the point where the great ensemble of the three wings of the enclosing the large forecourt is about to open up. Alterations within the yard and to the existing buildings which are not visible from the wider landscape are likely to be acceptable. Changes that are visible from the main drive, the adjacent listed buildings that form part of the designed landscape views and the surrounding ornamental landscape are less likely to be acceptable and in any case require close scrutiny to ensure that they do not damage the historic fabric, character and views. 1. Replacement extension along the Eastern boundary wall Currently there is a 20th century single storey structure with a pitched roof which has been well-detailed to fit in. To the south of this (left in the photo) is a flat roofed extension which runs along the eastern boundary wall towards the gate piers at the south end of the wall. The flat-roofed space is not visible over the wall.</p> <p>The photos of the existing show that the flatroof extension is not visible behind the Eastern boundary wall. The 20th century pitched-roof extension is but it nestles subserviently next to the higher original pitch roof at a smaller scale but the same orientation which feels appropriate to the overall setting and articulation of the historic use of the building. The proposal is to demolish the single storey and the flat-roofed structures and to replace them with a wider two storey extension that abuts the existing north range with a hipped roof at the south gable end.</p> <p>This structure is substantially higher than the previous structure and the continuous roofline, which will run southnorth along the historic Eastern wall, will be visible from the drive and the designed landscape to the east and the north. The design of the roof and the ridgeline parallel with the boundary wall are not consistent with the surrounding structures and will give the impression that the historic wall is part of a domestic structure rather than defining the courtyard. The chimney will also be removed which adds to the loss of character.</p> <p>The considerable visibility of this new structure above the historic yard will intrude on views from the main approach drive just before it reaches the great set piece of the forecourt and mansion, even though it is now disused as a through route, but it survives largely intact. We</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>suggest that it could be possible to reconfigure the internal single storey space if more internal room is required.</p> <p>The flat roof structure will be moved nearer to the gate posts but will not be visible from outside of the yard and will have no impact on the views relating to the main drive, and is thus acceptable.</p> <p>2. To reconstruct the existing shed along the west boundary wall The existing sheds are outside the yard west wall and project into the ornamental landscape adjacent. They are a C20 addition it seems. They do not open to the yard and are therefore not accessed from the yard. The reconstruction of the building will increase the plan by extending the western wall into the garden, and with the addition of a felt pitched roof and a 4 glazed openings into the garden. It would remain as a workshop and storage.</p> <p>On the rear pitch, four new rooflights will face into the courtyard, but will be visible through the gates and from the main drive to the east of the courtyard as is shown in this artistic view by the architect.</p> <p>This contemporary-style addition to the landscape damages the historic character because of the proposed materials, the introduction of a more obvious pitched roof and the addition of a considerable amount of fenestration giving the impression of a domestic structure in the designed landscape, including rooflights. The reconstruction of a flat roof structure of similar outline plan would be acceptable as it would not further damage the historic character and avoid visible rooflights. This could occupy a larger footprint and with timber-boarded doors that could be glazed internally to allow a well-lit interior space, but only when the workshop was in use – to be closed at all other times.</p> <p>3. Erect a conservatory/orangery in the garden to the north elevation of the house</p> <p>The proposal is in the corner space in this part of the garden where the main house meets the Eastern boundary wall to remove a brick barbeque structure and to construct a conservatory. The proposed conservatory appears to incorporate the east boundary wall within its structure.</p> <p>Whilst there have been alterations to this side of the property, they related to a sensitive conversion of the former functional building into a domestic residence, that has caused little damage to the historic</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>character and fabric of the landscape.</p> <p>The proposed conservatory would have a flat roof with a small glazed pitch towards the main house – this part of the roof would project above the boundary wall. The proposed materials (aluminium, copper and glass) are contemporary and damage the historic character. The addition of a domestic structure into an undeveloped part of the garden is an unnecessary extension of the building envelope.</p> <p>Additionally there will be both light emittance and reflection from having a glazed structure in this position.</p> <p>This part of the proposals damages the historic character and fabric in this part of the designed landscape.</p> <p>In conclusion, the proposals in their present form, while individually relatively minor in a less sensitive setting, have a cumulatively damaging effect on the designed landscape at the core of the Grade I Wotton Underwood landscape.</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E18/0356	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extension to detached 3 bay garage. Stowe Court, Dadford Road, Stowe, Buckinghamshire MK18 5DA. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have consulted our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Stowe Court sits to the south of the cross-roads which leads to the Oxford Lodge and across the Oxford Bridge. The property is set back from the road with two access drives and there are already a number of structures there. In principle extending these is not an issue. However, we do have some concern as to the height of the central bay. As far as we can see from the online documentation, there is no clear explanation of the central bay and whether it is two storey or contains a lift. As the building is so close to a significant part of Stowe Landscape Park we are concerned that it might be visible from within the parkland and possibly from the walk from the Corinthian Arch to the Oxford Bridge. Before determining the application, Aylesbury Vale DC need to ensure that the visual effect is not damaging on the view from the Oxford Avenue approach. For this we recommend rigorous appraisal of</p>

					<p>the visual impact in this respect. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.2018 Please accept my apologies for getting back to you since an additional elevation drawing has been put up on the planning portal. I have been away and am only just back. Having done a site visit, I gather from the message left on our conservation mobile that your Heritage Officer is confident that the extended garage will not be seen, having done a site visit. We are happy to defer to you if this is the case. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Doddershall House	Buckinghamshire	E18/0386	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of existing timber frame barn to a dwelling. Barn At Doddershall House, Doddershall, Quainton, Buckinghamshire. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.07.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development. We offer comments on the above application in collaboration with Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) on this site, which although not recognised as a designed landscape of national significance, is undoubtedly of considerable local significance. Bucks Gardens Trust has recently described the key features and their historic significance in the attached historic landscape site dossier, which is available on our web site and at the HER. The preparation of the dossier was aided greatly by the owners allowing members of BGT to visit and see the site as it survives today. As a result BGT has a good understanding of the site, and has produced an overview of the landscape significance of the site as follows: 'A garden and small park, associated with a fine, partly moated, early C16 and later manor house. With Tudor origins, the present layout is mostly from later phases that survive largely intact. The formal and informal mid-C19 layout of the garden incorporates earlier elements including two arms of a moat, and is the essential setting for the notable house. The park has lost most of the mature trees it had by the early C20. The rural Vale of Aylesbury setting makes a strong</p>

					<p>contribution, including views towards the wooded Lodge Hill, Waddesdon. C19 railway developments necessitated the alteration of the main approach from the south-east, which included building a substantial Arts and Crafts-style lodge near the entrance c.1900.' Thus the significance of the Doddershall landscape derives from the typical ensemble of features of a country manor house developed over many centuries, the current features surviving largely in good condition and largely intact. The service yard in which the building in question stands is a typical working element of such a landscape. Although the yard is of lesser significance to the ornamental landscape design, because of its position at the core of the designed landscape, changes have the potential for significant effects on the views and setting relating to the manor house, and to important nearby landscape elements such as the kitchen garden and ornamental gardens which are of higher designed landscape significance than the yard.</p> <p>In summary therefore, in principal, for the following reasons, we have no objection to the conversion of this building which stands in a service yard, in the manner proposed. Our concerns lie with the treatment of the associated landscape and the relationship of this landscape with the surrounding manor house landscape, which we have described in our site dossier. We give further details of our concerns about the landscaping below.</p> <p>The barn is part of the service yard north of the main house: (BGT dossier plan item 2). The barn dates from 2001 and replaced in similar form an earlier building. It was recently being used as a summer house. It faces SE onto the former kitchen garden and is visually associated with the millennium garden - which is aligned on it. It is to the rear of the photo of the 'former kitchen garden from the SE' (BGT dossier P14). The conversion involves the retention of the ground floor as a single space: the first floor will be converted to 4 bedrooms with roof lights. The conversion will not alter the external appearance of the barn significantly. It will be accessed from the service yard to the rear via the western approach and by the track curving round the north and west of the service yard. As it does not face the manor house or the principal approach to it, unlike the converted brick service range (three houses: dossier photo p15), it is likely to have lower visual impact on the house.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>While the building conversion is acceptable from a landscape point of view, we observe that the submitted reports do not cover the landscape importance of the site beyond the service yard. Instead there is more submitted describing the character of the service yard. The application site includes most of the area in front of the barn – between it and the millennium garden – which is currently grass with broad semi-circular steps to the entrance of the barn. These steps will be replaced by a clay-tile-paved rectangular terrace extending towards the millennium garden. A modern conservatory will be demolished and the brick building north of it will be refurbished as a playroom. Attached is a photo showing the building in question behind the conservatory: the paved terrace (raised and matching the entrance to the barn - replacing the curved steps) will continue the edge of the conservatory while the application site runs almost up to the hedges of the millennium garden (on the left).</p> <p>There is, it seems, no detail in either the plans or the reports concerning any proposed boundary treatment for the terrace or for the application site towards the millenium garden. No other tenanted house in the service yard group has a demarcated area outside the yard towards the house or its landscape setting. We are concerned that no such boundary should be erected here (and indeed, perhaps there is none proposed).</p> <p>In conclusion we ask that AVDC ascertain whether any boundary is proposed on the SE side of the proposed conversion and insert a condition to prevent any boundary of any description on the SE side. Otherwise, we have no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E18/0545	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 22.50m high swann engineering column. Land At Wotton End, Kingswood Lane, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire HP18 9RB. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p>

					<p>We are greatly concerned that there is no heritage impact assessment included with the documentation online, as the proposed engineering column will quite possibly affect two Grade I registered landscapes : Wotton Underwood and Waddesdon Manor.</p> <p>We have strong reservations about this mast proposed for a site 230m outside the Grade I Registered Wotton Underwood as it is likely to be damaging in significant views relating to the designed landscape and Grade I listed mansion, and the severity of these effects on views and wider setting must be assessed before a decision is made by AVDC. The mast is likely to be visible beyond the boundary plantation close to the line of the principal early C18 vista west from the mansion across the lake. It is also possible it could be seen from Grade I Waddesdon Manor – as we have no assessment we cannot judge. This should not be treated under Permitted Development Rights but under a Full Application.</p> <p>AVDC is strongly advised, before a decision is made on a full planning application, to require a Heritage Impact Assessment to be carried out that is then circulated to all statutory consultees for their comment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Arley Hall	Cheshire	E18/0359	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New memorial walled garden, including ancillary landscaping, car park area and reception facilities. THE MARL FIELD, ARLEY HALL, ARLEY PARK, ARLEY, CW9 6LZ. SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.07.2018</p> <p>The Garden Trust had requested additional information on the above application related to the visual impact assessment previously submitted. Cross sections that show the level changes and wall heights along with indicative planting to the external walls has made clearer the scale of the proposed development. These were received last night. A revised visual assessment has been promised which will indicate the walls as solid form rather than a location line on the ground. Again this will greatly assist our understanding of scale and massing of the proposed development.</p> <p>The Garden Trust notes that Historic England has made no objection to the project, while the Arley Heritage Statement (4.2.2) points out that ‘although the designed landscape at Arley is of high significance [II*], the proposed development site has always remained in agricultural use and has never been part of the designed garden or parkland landscape’.</p>

					<p>The proposed development should make a positive asset to the estate and the local economy supporting NPPF EG2. Our initial concern regarding scale and mass within the landscape has been partially revised, particularly as the wall height has been reduced and finished ground levels have been adjusted to lessen the impact. The Trust supports the need to sustain financially the estate; however, we wish to abstain from making a final assessment until the revised visual assessment documents with photomontage are received.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2018</p> <p>The additional requested information supporting the visual assessment, specifically the photo montages, have been received and evaluated. The Garden Trust has no objection to the above proposed development. The Trust does recommend that the indicative tree planting is included in Phase 1 of the development. This will be beneficial to reducing the visual impact particularly in the later phases.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E18/0472	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Residential development of up to 38 dwellings with associated landscaping and public open space (outline with all matters reserved except access) (Contrary to the provision of the Local Plan). Land At Moor Lane, Kirk Langley, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application.</p> <p>The site lies within the Defined Setting of Kedleston Hall and therefore we would have expected to have seen a Heritage Impact Assessment. In order for the application to be properly appraised we would ask that this is undertaken before any decisions are made.</p> <p>The land surrounding the site shows the remains of an early field system including a clearly visible remnant of ridge and furrow. The curvy 'reverse-S' shape field boundaries shown on the early OS are still visible in the aerial pictures. The proposed development site may therefore be early enclosures linked to adjacent properties. We would</p>

					<p>suggest that the county archeologist looks at the site and prepares a report to be considered alongside the HIA. This should then be added to the HER as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>We would like to reiterate our comments to the Pre-App enquiry dated 18th April 2018. The site is clearly visible from the RPG and impacts upon historic views and the setting of Kedleston Hall. It is contrary to EN33 and as such we OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E18/0398	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of agricultural land to allow extension to existing golf course including implementation of lakes and associated landscaping. GOLF</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, formerly the Garden History Society, and the Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects the setting of Stover Park, an historic designed landscape of National importance included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The application is to replace the land to be taken by the A382 Corridor road improvement scheme. The Gardens Trust and the Devon Gardens Trust are happy to support this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Sidbury Manor	Devon	E18/0454	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to accommodate 3no luxury cabins for tourist accommodation in the walled garden. Sidbury Manor, Sidbury, Sidmouth. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.07.2018</p> <p>Sidbury Manor is included on the Devon Gazetteer of parks and gardens of local historic interest but is of National interest and should be included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Unfortunately, Historic England do not have the resources to add sites to the Register unless they are threatened by development.</p> <p>Sidbury Manor, situated in a parkland, was designed in the free Jacobean Renaissance style by David Brandon for Sir Stephen Cave M.P. in 1879. It was cut into the hillside to take advantage of the fine views across the valley to Sidmouth in the distance. The house, which has a fine conservatory, overlooks the terraced garden lawns, the fountain in the lower terrace marks the ha-ha boundary with the farmland. A series of walled gardens are terraced into the hillside above the house. The</p>

					<p>heritage assets comprise the House, including the conservatory and screen wall to the west, forecourt railings, gates and piers, all listed Grade II, and the walled garden. Although not listed, the walled gardens are an important part of the designed landscape and, as they are within the curtilage of Sidbury Manor, they are covered by the listing protection.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and the Devon Gardens Trust appreciates that not all walled gardens are viable for their original purpose and understands that some owners tend to regard them as problems rather than valued as impressive spaces with a sense of expansiveness and grandeur. We advise that if a walled garden is no longer viable, the preferred option would for it to be grassed over, with the paths and walls maintained in good condition. Walled gardens should certainly not be regarded as a development opportunity, or a convenient place to site 3no luxury cabins for tourist accommodation.</p> <p>Under the National Planning Policy Framework, it is a core planning principle to ‘conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations’ (para17 NPPF). When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation.</p> <p>We would advise that the proposal to install 3no luxury cabins for tourist accommodation in the walled kitchen garden would harm the significance of the heritage asset of the walled kitchen garden at Sidbury Manor and urge your Council to refuse the planning application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Saltram House	Devon	E18/0481	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Fields Around Drake Memorial Park, Haye Road, Plympton, Plymouth PL7 1UQ. MISCELLANEOUS	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the Scoping Report which affects the setting of Saltram House, an historic designed landscape of national significance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p>

					<p>The Devon Gardens Trust works in partnership with The Gardens Trust in responding to consultations. We concur with your comments on the draft Scoping Report</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Saltram House	Devon	E18/0493	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Approval sought for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved matters in respect of the erection of a two form entry primary school and associated playing fields, sports pitches and facilities, vehicular and cycle parking, internal access road and footpaths, hard and soft landscaping, drainage and infrastructure and associated works. (An environmental statement was submitted at the time of the outline application). Saltram Meadow Primary School, The Ride, Plymouth PL9 7JA.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above reserved matters application which affects the setting of Saltram House, an historic designed landscape of national significance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust works in partnership with The Gardens Trust in responding to consultations. We are happy to support this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Stanmer Park	East Sussex	E18/0352	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed external works (playground, marquee and parking) within the curtilage of Stanmer House. Stanmer House, Stanmer Village, Stanmer Park, Brighton Brighton & Hove BN1 9QA. PLAY AREA, MARQUEE, PARKING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) on the above application.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (TGT) - formerly the Garden History Society (GHS) - is a statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts on matters associated with planning applications and planning policy. Representatives of SGT have reviewed the documentation submitted with this application. Our comments are shown below.</p> <p>We commented at length on the previous application and explained the harm the earlier proposals would cause (see annex), which in our view is substantial harm. In recognition of this harm, the LPA only granted</p>

					<p>temporary planning permission for the re-sited marquee and the car park south of Stanmer House to “allow alternative options for the siting and design of the marquee to be explored”.</p> <p>The current proposals involve permanent/long term planning permission for the car park; a further enlargement to the marquee in its present position; planning permission for a children’s playground in a prominent position close to the Gd I Stanmer House; and extend the planning permissions substantially. Each of these proposals would further worsen the harm caused by the earlier proposals. The incongruous marquee structure would become more or less permanent and the visual harm undoubtedly substantial. No attempt appears to have been made to consider less intrusive locations for the marquee and car park or for a more sympathetic design for the marquee – such as a lower height or camouflaged colouring and better screening. Any new planning application will need to address the issues identified in our letter of 12th December 2016 (see annex), in particular the impact on significance should be assessed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.</p>
Sherborne House	Gloucestershire	E18/0496	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Improvements to existing tracks through woodland at Pleasure Grounds, Sherborne, Gloucestershire. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2018 See response to Ragged Copse app 18/02422/FUL below</p>
Sherborne House	Gloucestershire	E18/0498	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Improvements to existing tracks through woodland at Ragged Copse Sherborne Gloucestershire. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2018 Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) has been notified by the Garden Trust about the proposals to modify the construction of the footpaths in the Ragged Copse and submit comments to Cotswold District Council. From the photographs submitted to support the National Trust's Planning Application, one can see that a substantial level of use in this wooded environment has led to the excessive widening of the paths to avoid particular areas of overuse and waterlogging. GGLT would support a regime of regular maintenance and improvement to contain the estate's rights of way and keep them in</p>

					<p>good condition for local walkers and visitors. However, GGLT would also like to stress that this is a rural estate and would wish that this character is carefully retained. GGLT would both wish to avoid the impact of excessive engineering solutions, and would also wish to see sensitive making good of the ride margins following the works. These comments by GGLT also apply to Application No.18/02394/FUL for works to the Pleasure Grounds, Sherbourne.</p> <p>David Ball</p>
Richmond Park	Greater London	E18/0494	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing buildings and erection of part 2, 5 and 6 storey buildings comprising 41 No. Class C3 Extra Care units and 54 No. Class C3 intermediate affordable units; landscaping and new public realm; energy centre; new basement/lower ground car park accessed off Alton Road (from existing access point); and a new vehicular access off Alton Road into site. Pocklington Court, 74 Alton Road, SW15 4NN. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for your email of 12th July informing me about this application. On behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT), we object to this scheme on the following basis: 1. Failure to fulfil statutory consultation obligations As you know, the LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Neither they, nor we were consulted in the necessary time period. The first we heard of this application was your email. This failure to notify us has given the Trust and our parent body insufficient time. We also believe that Wandsworth council has failed to notify all relevant departments within Historic England of the latest proposals – only archaeology appear to have been notified. The comments from HE also pre-date the amendments to the proposals and there is no evidence therefore that they are aware of the latest plans for this site. 2. Significant and detrimental damage to the setting of a Grade 1 park. The application site is immediately adjacent to Richmond Park, a Grade I registered Park. Further 8 miles of walls around Richmond Park are listed in their own right as Grade II. Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) [I have emboldened for emphasis the key parts]. states that: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost</p>

					<p>through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”</p> <p>The number of stories proposed means that the buildings will be visible from the park at a variety of angles as shown in the Visual Assessment – though the assessment is somewhat lacklustre in terms of details, comparisons and commentary. There are taller buildings forming part of the Alton Estate that are clearly visible from Richmond Park. However, these modernist slab blocks (listed in their own right) are clearly delineated, whereas, the current proposal for mid-rise buildings will blur that distinction visually (even with the setting back of the top floors) and lose the extremely rare sense of space in an urban context that Richmond Park currently gives the visitor. The Trust believes that allowing for mid-rise buildings (that exceed 4 stories) at this proximity to the perimeter of the park is unjustified, would set a dangerous precedent and cause substantial harm to the setting of the Grade 1 Park and it’s listed perimeter wall. The Trust therefore urges the local authority to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely Helen Monger Director Tel: 0207 839 3909 For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group London Parks & Gardens Trust</p>
Hackwood Park	Hampshire	E17/0974	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a new Motorway Service Area to comprise an amenity building, lodge, drive thru coffee unit, associated car, coach, motorcycle, caravan, HGV and abnormal load parking, and a fuel filling station with retail</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.07.2018 The revised planning application by MOTO for a Motorway service station and hotel at J6 of the M3 Motorway fails to address any of the heritage aspects outlined by Hampshire Gardens Trust in its letter of 20 November 2017. We remain extremely concerned and repeat some of the main points of our original submission. Hackwood Park is a Heritage asset of rare and significant value. The whole landscape park, designated by Historic England as one of only</p>

			<p>shop, together with alterations to the adjoining roundabout on the M3 and slip roads to form an access point and works to the highway. Provision of landscaping, infrastructure and ancillary works. Land Adjacent To Junction 6 M3, Basingstoke, Hampshire. ROAD, HYBRID</p>	<p>three Grade I listed landscapes in the country, extends south over 2.5 miles from the Bolton Arch and Crabtree Plantation in the north, which historically connects the Hackwood and Old Basing estates, almost as far as the southern boundary of Winslade parish. It contains Spring Wood, an early eighteenth-century woodland garden designed by Charles Bridgeman with buildings by James Gibbs. No other such garden, a rare early 18th century survival, exists in Hampshire, and there are very few similar examples in Britain.</p> <p>The applicant has failed to answer most of the concerns of heritage parties and it can only be assumed that it is considered that as the development site is not fully visible from the heritage asset, except for one boundary adjacent to the northern arm of the GR I listed Park, it cannot be considered detrimental to the significance of Hackwood Park. However, the Planning Guidance of the NPPF is quite clear that when assessing the significance of a heritage asset, the setting which affects the significance of the site should be considered in its entirety and not solely as having a physical boundary. In the case of Hackwood, the agricultural land, whilst no longer in the ownership of the estate, was part of the whole site designed to be viewed as an expansive agricultural landscape.</p> <p>The applicant has, however, made a limited response to concerns over the lighting of the site referring to the ‘...nearby GR II* listed house and building’ and ‘..... being adjacent to New Park sections of the Hackwood Estate...’. The full response refers to a new baseline survey which was carried out in April 2018 which assesses that in the three vertical planes, East, South and West absolutely zero luminance is measured, giving the indication that the design has retained zero light-spill into the surrounding area, including Dickens Lane and Oaken Plantation. The Report accepts that the new development will, without mitigation, inevitably change existing light levels, however tests carried out state that the intrusion of the proposed vertical illumination will be considered negligible on the parts of the surrounding site and figures are given which appear to support this assertion. Given the height of the development site over its surroundings and the fact there will be lighting throughout the night all year round, this is hard to understand. More importantly it is not the same as assessing the impact on the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>whole of the area adjacent to the development site where a permanent night-time glow will be introduced into the setting, destroying the essential rural nature.</p> <p>Further, as we said in our previous submission, if the agricultural land is developed as a Motorway service station, it will be extensively hard-landscaped, and the buildings will stand out by the colour and texture of the material against the woodland background. The activity on the site will be 24/7 with little attention given to the site in winter. In addition it will be years before any of the trees proposed reach the 12-metre height of the lights close to the Costa outlet, and a permanent night-time glow will be introduced destroying the essential rural nature which this landscape seeks to protect.</p> <p>The Trust is disappointed that few, if any, of the concerns re heritage significance have been addressed in any meaningful way.</p> <p>Yours sincerely J A Hurrell, MCD, BArch, MRTPI (retd) HGT Conservation and Development Team</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.2018</p> <p>... The Gardens Trust has reviewed the new documentation and does not feel at all reassured that the concerns and issues raised in our initial response of 25th November have been satisfactorily addressed. There has been an attempt to mitigate the lighting but we fail to see how all-night lighting, from masts 12m tall, in an area currently dark, can possibly not be visible despite assurances to the contrary.</p> <p>We would like to reiterate all the points we raised previously, and include an excerpt from HE's Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition, Part I, Dec 2017) which states on page 2, "The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity" A motorway service station with its 24 hour activity and traffic would certainly create all the problems mentioned and it is inconceivable that Hackwood would not be seriously adversely affected by this most unfortunate application.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We again would like to strongly OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tewin Water	Hertford shire	E17/0637	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The siting of a temporary agricultural worker's dwelling for a maximum period of 3 years to provide accommodation for a full time agricultural employee. Tewin Water Farm, Churchfield Road, Tewin, Hertfordshire.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL, AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.07.2018</p> <p>The Gardens Trust has looked at applications (3/17/1727/FUL & 3/17/1726/FUL) relating to a 'temporary' 3 bedroom agricultural worker's dwelling as well as associated sheds and storage facilities for a herd of Longhorn cattle within the Grade II Tewin Water historic landscape park laid out by Humphry Repton in 1799. Should this application be resubmitted we would have serious reservations about the siting of the new farmyard and associated buildings/development and wish therefore to put our comments in writing.</p> <p>It is not clear whether alternative sites within the RPG were considered, and if so why this particularly sensitive one was chosen in preference. Historic England (HE) and our colleagues within the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust have outlined the reasons why this historic landscape is of such importance and significance. Tewin Water is not an isolated Repton landscape. He indicated that it should be viewed alongside Digswell and Panshanger as a series of inter-related parklands and specified that it should be all parkland, i.e. not ploughed fields or contain evidence of farming. We would concur with their view that should this development be permitted, the current open character of the historic parkland and Repton's design intent would be lost. Development as proposed within these applications would destroy the unity of the over-arching conception. Tewin Water is still relatively unchanged so it is especially important to ensure that the original design intent can continue to be read within the landscape today and in the future.</p> <p>We understand that HE and our colleagues in the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust have identified a preferable, though still not ideal, site outside the RPG, and should this cattle facility be deemed agriculturally absolutely essential, and no other site outside the RPG be found, we would urge the East Herts Council to support the option suggested by them which we concur with.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Ponsbourne Grange	Hertford shire	E18/0362	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Submission of details pursuant to condition 1 (material samples), 2a (hard and soft landscape plans showing levels), 2b (enclosure and boundary treatments), 2c (car parking), 2d (access), 2e (hard surfacing), 2g (planting plans), 2i (siting and timing details) and 2j (management details) on planning permission 6/2016/2706/MAJ. Ponsbourne Grange, Ponsbourne Park, Newgate Street, Hertford SG13 8QS. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.07.2018 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have looked at the planting proposals for this development and note they are such as would occur in any countryside area. It is unfortunate that the applicants did not find it appropriate to acknowledge the rich 19th/early 20th century heritage of Ponsbourne Park with its (then) 'exotic' tree planting.. Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Historic De Havilland Grass Runway	Hertford shire	E18/0387	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline permission for the Change of Use of land to airfield with runway and support facilities. Historic De Havilland Grass Runway, Ellenbrook fields, Hatfield Buisness park. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have seen no Heritage Impact Statement and the D&A Statement with this proposal does not address the issue of the likely adverse impact from noise and visual intrusion of overflying aircraft on the significance of a number of Registered Parks and Gardens: Hatfield, Panshanger, Brocket, Tewin Water, as well as several Locally Important ones. We therefore object to the proposal and request that it is rejected. Kate Harwood
16 Wendover Drive, Welwyn	Hertford shire	E18/0423	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Corsican Pine tree (T2) covered by TPO 805 (2018). 16 Wendover Drive (Formerly number 10), Welwyn AL6 9LT. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.07.2018 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on this application. We have viewed the limited amount of information available online for this. Although groups of 3 trees were often planted as a picturesque garden feature, which would be destroyed by the felling of one of them, we accept your expert opinion as to Health & Safety issues, as stated in the application, may necessitate the felling of this Corsican Pine. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning

					Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
19 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfordshire	E18/0442	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Oak tree and replace with 1 x Oak tree somewhere else in the garden covered by TPO 738 (2018). 19 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JQ. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2018</p> <p>The Gardens Trust have been consulted on this application at 19 Scholars Mews.</p> <p>It would appear that the tree is healthy and the problem is that the house has been built too close to it. We are happy to defer to your decision on this application but would ask that if permission is granted, the position for the replacement tree is identified and agreed first. In such a crowded area of Welwyn Garden City, it could be difficult to find a position suitable both for the owners and their neighbours.</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Just House, Northaw	Hertfordshire	E18/0531	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of front garden dwarf wall with steel railings and electric gates including relocation of the existing entrance and exiting drop kerbs. Just House, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NJ. BOUNDARY, ACCESS/GATES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member.</p> <p>Well Road is largely rural in character with hedges lining the road. From the information supplied with this application we are unable to determine the species the relocated hedges would be nor their height. The railings and gates as illustrated would seem to be more urban in design than appropriate for this location and would impact on views along the B156 coming from Northaw, to the detriment of the approach to Northaw House, a park and garden considered by HGT to be of Local Historic Significance.</p> <p>We would suggest more modest railings and gates in keeping both with the rural nature of the area and the nearby Northaw House, whose estate railings are of the type appropriate for this location.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
52 Carleton Rise, Welwyn	Hertfordshire	E18/0543	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey rear extension and rear garden landscaping. 52 Carleton Rise, Welwyn AL6 9RG. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.07.2018</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust has no comment to make on the proposed extension of the house which lies in an area formerly agricultural pastureland associated with Danesbury House. However, we are concerned about the introduction of artificial turf, in an areas where high usage, as on sports fields, is not envisaged. A natural lawn surface which can absorb heat and water naturally is usually to be preferred.</p>

					Kate Harwood
Woodlands Vale Estate	Isle of Wight	E18/0486	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed in ground swimming pool: composite decking surround. Woodlands Vale House, Calthorpe Road, Ryde, Isle Of Wight PO33 1PR.</p> <p>SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2018</p> <p>The Isle of Wight Gardens Trust wishes to make the following comment on this application.</p> <p>As submitted, we believe that insufficient information and detail has been included in this application to enable there to be an informed assessment of the potential impact of proposed changes on the park and garden features at Woodlands Vale. This is of great importance as the Woodlands Vale site is recognised as an important heritage asset by being included in the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England held by Historic England.</p> <p>The register entry states the following as reasons for designation – ‘The Woodlands Vale estate is designated at Grade II for the following principal reasons: Design quality: The Woodlands Vale estate contains a good and representative example of a formal garden laid out between the 1870s and 1890s with the addition of some fashionable Japanese features in the first decade of the C20. It is considered to be in the top three Victorian and Edwardian parks and gardens in the Isle of Wight. Designer: the rose arches and a summer house were designed by the distinguished architect Samuel Sanders Teulon. Group Value: the main house and attached garden features are listed at Grade II* and the parkland is integral with the house and garden and provides views to the north-east and south-east with borrowed views of The Solent and Spitbank Fort to the north-east. It is one of the most complete surviving gentry estates on the Isle of Wight and one of the few remaining estates on the Isle of Wight with an open outlook to the sea.’</p> <p>No Heritage Statement or Design and Access Statement has been included with the application and we would wish to see these provided. They should reference the importance of the site and provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed in-ground swimming pool on the existing layout and features of the formal garden and wider parkland. They should also provide evidence of the choice of location of the proposed structure including why this location has been seen to be preferable to alternative locations based on an assessment of the impact on the heritage asset. We would also like to see more information on the intended disposal of the excavated soil required to</p>

					<p>create the space for the in-ground structure and on the physical appearance of the proposed composite decking.</p> <p>In the absence of this information we are unable to support this application and would urge the Local Planning Authority to encourage the applicant to withdraw the application in order to provide the additional information needed to allow the impact on this heritage asset to be given due consideration. If this is not agreeable to the applicant, we would ask the Local Planning Authority to refuse the application.</p> <p>John Brownscombe Chairman Isle of Wight Gardens Trust On behalf of the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2018</p> <p>Our colleagues in the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust have brought this application to our attention. As they were notified late we have therefore not been able to respond within the allocated response period as we did not know until after that date had passed. We note also that you did not contact Historic England until past this response date either. The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We would very much appreciate it if in future you could please let us know in good time. I am attaching a copy of our leaflet : The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens – Guidance for Local Planning Authorities.</p> <p>We are concerned at the lack of a Heritage Statement which is required under the NPPF, and a Design and Access statement with photographs showing the proposed location and how the swimming pool might affect the setting of the RPG. We would like to know whether other locations were considered and why this site was chosen. The details submitted with the application are scant and insufficient. We appreciate that you have visited the site and have reassured us that the decking will be hardwood rather than composite material. We understand that you have also assured us that any spoil will be disposed of off site.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Despite this we feel that due to the national importance of the RPG at Woodlands this application cannot be decided until sufficient information in line with our suggestion is provided.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Langton Hall	Leicester shire	E17/1625	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of low energy dwelling and landscape proposals submitted under paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Land Off West Langton Road, Langton Hall, West Langton, Leicestershire. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.07.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens (RPG), as per the above application. Please accept my sincere apologies for the delay in getting back to you and thank you for making it possible for two local colleagues to visit the site within the past few days.</p> <p>The development site (the paddock) lies within the Grade II listed RPG and also forms part of the setting of the Grade II listed Langton Hall, kitchen garden and stable block. To date most of the new development appears to have been in a cluster around the walled garden area, but this latest proposal is further away on its own. The new house would lie directly on the northern axis from the Hall which may well still reveal below-ground remains of axial garden features (such as avenues/formal gardens etc) from earlier periods, particularly as the ground has not been ploughed. A modern house with intrusive solar panels would not be in keeping with the remaining estate buildings and would therefore diminish the parkland atmosphere. We also have concerns that approval could set a precedent for future development. The GT therefore OBJECTS to this application.</p> <p>We appreciate that the design has respected the existing trees and that more than half of the existing paddock would remain and that the new house would largely be screened by trees from the public footpath to the north and also from the neighbouring village of Church Langton. Should Harborough approve the application we would seek assurance that this would not set a precedent for other development within the RPG. Further development in this area would be very unwelcome. We would also suggest that a blanket TPO be applied to the trees in the paddock and that none of the lower branches be removed as they currently come down to ground level helping to block views. Finally, we</p>

					would ask for an archaeological watching brief on this sensitive site. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincolnshire	E18/0349	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline erection of a high wire leisure facility, extension to the existing kiosk to provide a seating area and conversion of part of the existing chalet building to provide associated office, storage space and locker rooms (with means of access, landscaping, layout and scale to be considered). SKEGNESS SPORT & LEISURE CENTRE, GRAND PARADE, SKEGNESS PE25 2UG. VISITOR ATTRACTION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.07.2018 Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) welcomes this opportunity to comment on this planning proposal. As a member of The Gardens Trust (TGT) LGT works closely with the TGT (formerly the Garden History Society), the statutory consultee for all planning and development proposals affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. Thanks to local knowledge, LGT advises the TGT and, on occasion, comments on their behalf. LGT supports recent moves to investigate proposals to re-invigorate, restore and upgrade the Skegness Foreshore. However, this planning application for a high wire leisure facility, would, in our view, be a retrograde step. At 21 m high the high wires would be 3 m higher than the existing 18 m high Giant Wheel and 15 m high roller coaster. LGT considers this new leisure facility to be inappropriate, too high and too near to the setting of the Esplanade and Tower Gardens, HE Grade II, and would add distracting visual clutter and doubtless noise particularly to the adjacent Compass Gardens which are designed for rest, recuperation and visual pleasure. The recent Historic England description in the listing is worth drawing to your attention: " The design interest is they are a significant creation both in scale and detail, embodying many of the design elements of a seaside landscape of the period. The well-structured 17 composition, punctuated by bridges, sunken formal gardens, pavilions, bowling greens and mock castles, is linked by water features to create a visual and textural interest in what were formerly sand dunes." If this facility were installed, the view north-east for all visitors first arriving at the focal Clocktower and central Tower Esplanade, the main approach to the sea-side, would be extremely chaotic, messy and even ugly judging from the generic image mock-up, and would do nothing to enhance the significant Skegness Foreshore. LGT therefore wish to register its objection to this planning application.

					Yours sincerely, Mrs Steffie Shields M.B.E Chairman, Lincolnshire Gardens Trust
Holywell Hall Park	Lincolnshire	E18/0402	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of Use from Class C3 Dwelling House, to Mixed Use Sui Generis, with the primary use remaining Class C3 and with secondary use Class D2 Assembly and Leisure for the purpose of Weddings. Holywell Hall, Clipsham Road, Holywell PE9 4DT. EVENT/FUNCTION	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) and considered the documents available on line. We are surprised that there is no mention whatsoever of the recent 2017 Grade II listing of the park and gardens (RPG) (see Historic England's website : https://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1444034). We would like to have seen some recognition of the RPG in the form of a Heritage Statement and how the proposed weddings/events might be sympathetic to the landscape setting. As long as the events are temporary in nature with no permanent marquees built and all temporary structures are taken down immediately after events, we hope that the new venture will respect the grounds and even improve them to enhance the setting for wedding guests. We would also be grateful if in future you also consulted the Lincolnshire Gardens Trust for any applications which might affect any grade of RPG. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Leonardslee	West Sussex	E18/0052	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Improvements to visitor car park including refurbishment to access from existing site entrance and exit, landscaping works to the car park, refurbished toilet block and greenhouse and erection of a glasshouse. Leonardslee Gardens, Brighton Road, Lower Beeding, Horsham. PARKING, VISITOR	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2018 Thank you for consulting Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding the above application. The Gardens Trust (GT) - formerly the Garden History Society (GHS) - is a statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications. SGT welcomes improvements at Leonardslee and is pleased that a detailed Heritage Appraisal has now been provided to support the application (Leonardslee Heritage appraisal June 2018 01507256.pdf) .

				FACILITIES, GLASSHOUSE	<p>This document provides a valuable description of the development of the garden and an assessment of its significance.</p> <p>We would have preferred to see an assessment of how the current proposals would affect the significance of the garden; however, with one exception, we consider the proposals will result in less than substantial harm.</p> <p>The exception concerns the proposed kitchen garden. Given the changes at Leonardslee involve the intensification of commercial use and associated public access, the opportunity should be taken to introduce high quality design to all the associated new infrastructure including its impact on the approach and ‘public face’ of the site, particularly given this is a Grade I site. While we fully support the principal of adding a kitchen garden, we question whether the installation of a metal framed greenhouse and polytunnels enclosed by a wooden fence is an acceptable design in this setting.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.</p>
Harewood House	West Yorkshire	E18/0446	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement Jetties & disabled ramp. Harewood House, Harrogate Road, Harewood.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2018</p> <p>As noted in our letter of 26th June (Alterations to grounds to create chain ferry across lake Ref: 18/00421/UOPS3 and 18/03195) in general, the Gardens Trust welcomes proposals for measures to increase access to historic gardens and parks for public enjoyment and education, provided the increased volume of visitors does not cause irreparable damage to the fabric of the landscape. However, we do have real concerns about some aspects of the alterations for this chain-link ferry project for which we understand work has been completed.</p> <p>We are very concerned that the project has been executed without planning permission in a Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden (ie a site of exceptional interest – just under 9% of all registered sites are Grade I). The lake is a fundamental part of the setting of Harewood House (also listed Grade I) and is a fine and relatively unspoilt example of Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown’s work, an imaginative design conceived on an enormous scale, refined over several decades, and later praised by poets. Several prominent artists including Gilpin and Turner have recorded the views of the Brown landscape with the water in the valley</p>

					<p>below the house. Indeed, the mystical experience tracing the passage of the lake waters through the Harewood estate featured in a beautiful Simon Warner video that was shown as part of the major contemporary photography exhibition in London 'Lenses on a Landscape Genius – Lancelot 'Capability Brown (1716-1783)' as part of the Capability Brown Tercentenary Festival in 2016.</p> <p>We are unsure whether Historic England has been consulted.</p> <p>We understand that the new boat is 8.5m long and not 12.0m as we noted in our earlier letter. This is more in scale with Lascelles' original 25 ft boat commissioned in 1780, (very likely the same boat featured in the Turner 1797 painting). We also understand that the chain sits on the bottom of the lake so we trust that the old 'Capability' boat moored nearby will still be used for visitors to enjoy the wider designed views of the park and house from the water.</p> <p>Although in principle we understand the need for better access we do have concerns about this planning application viz the completely inappropriate detailing of the jetties, the associated new path surfaces and their angular construction. Harewood and its visitors deserve better design and materials and we question whether expert historical designed landscape advice has been sought.</p> <p>In particular we would draw your attention to the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Design and Heritage Statement does not address at all the significance and importance of this historic site. We are unable to find any reference to, or understanding of the designed landscape apart from a fleeting reference at 1.0 Introduction '...Grade I listed building/gardens...' and a later reference in 1.1 to 'Listed parkland' - but no specific reference to the Historic England (HE) Register entry. This is totally inadequate and is in our view indicative of the less than sympathetic proposals. - The Design and Heritage Statement at 2.0 Proposed Works indicates wrought iron railings but we understand that they are square section metal railings etc more suitable for an urban setting. - The lamps on the jetties (which we have not seen mentioned on the application) would similarly be suitable for an urban setting and not for a nationally important landscape heritage asset. - The 'reclaimed natural stone' (2.0) and the mason's work is similarly
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>less than the quality one would expect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A '1.1m high timber fence to the lake side' (2.0) is intrusive. - The new access route/path down the steep slope for the shuttle bus would in our view be much more sympathetic if constructed in a gentle curve, especially as it mars the vistas from across the lake. - Although unfortunately tarmacadam (2.0) has in the recent past been used for some of the paths, a resin bound gravel 'Topcoat' to the tarmac would be so much more appropriate and sympathetic for the paths and ramp. (C18 correspondence between Harewood's owner Lascelles and his agent Popplewell contains specific references to gravel paths, including obtaining gravel from the river bed, which would have followed from Brown's advice on the subject as seen on other sites). Ideally, in our view, as the design is so angular we would have preferred to see it completely rebuilt with a 'tarmac' sub-base laid into the (new much shallower gradient) curved timber edging which would sit a 'resin bonded layer's depth' BELOW the wooden edging and then the resin bonded top layer would be added in warm (not frosty or low temperature) weather in order to lay it properly and achieve the correct flush finish.) <p>We note and cannot agree with the Design and Heritage Statement at 1.0 Introduction: 'This statement confirms that the proposals to this Grade I Listed building/gardens are developed in a manner which would have regard to and respond positively to the character of the area and would not cause harm to interests of acknowledged importance'.</p> <p>We refer to our letter of 26th June (Alterations to grounds to create chain ferry across lake Ref: 18/00421/UOPS3 and 18/03195). The southern jetty is situated in what was originally a gated herb garden according to 1893 OS map evidence. HE's Register Entry mentions: "Railings attached to east run between lean-to and lake, have central gate with decorative central splat and cresting, spear-head rods with arrow-head dog-bars set between." The GT is concerned as to what has become of this significant feature mentioned in the listing? Has listed building consent been received for their removal?</p> <p>There is no discussion in the planning documents about the historic position of the jetties which we find extremely disappointing as it should have been a fundamental part of the planning application.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Similarly, there is no explanation of what is meant by "replacement jetties". The one nearer the house appears to be additional, whilst the one on the opposite bank appears not to be a replacement in the sense that there has never been one in that position before.</p> <p>In 18th century landscape design, great importance was attached to judging the right moment at which a particular view, scene or feature should be made visible, and also the sequence in which things were seen. As the spectator moved through the grounds their attention was directed first to one scene and then to another in an orderly manner. The scenes were to be different in content or mood, and in between them there was to be an area of transition in which the impression made by the previous scene diminished, in preparation for the next. We suggest that, due to the site chosen for the new southern jetty, the anticipation of seeing both the Rose Garden and the Walled Gardens when arriving by the new ferry is much reduced and thus the new southern jetty significantly weakens Brown's carefully crafted design. If instead the jetty had been sited in its C19 position then it would cause far less harm to this aspect of Brown's design.</p> <p>A £5,500 contract agreed at Harewood with Brown, makes Harewood the most significant Yorkshire estate in his portfolio, and a fine example of his drive towards aesthetically beautiful landscapes that were both useful, well-managed and worth the long-term investment. 18th century concepts of land stewardship and issues of beauty or profit remain relevant to the 21st century landscape including this latest proposal. It is, of course, to be applauded that easier access is being considered a key priority for visitors with disabilities, but this planning application in no way measures up to the standard that we would expect for such an important assemblage of designed landscape and buildings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---