



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES OCTOBER 2018

The GT conservation team received 158 new cases in England and 6 cases in Wales during October, 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, 39 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and 6 by CGTs in response to planning applications included in the weekly lists. The list also includes responses to some cases made by other like-minded organisations, with whom we keep in close contact.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Frenchay Park House	Avon	E18/0895	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to residential, the erection of a single storey extension and general refurbishment to include replacement UPVC windows and doors, reconfiguration of internal layout and external works. New vehicular access. Clic Cottage, Beckspool Road, Frenchay, South Glos. BS16 1NT. BUILDING ALTERATION</p> <p>OUTCOME Refused Appeal Lodged Appeal Ref APP/P0119/Y/18/3209995</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.10.2018</b></p> <p>Formed in 1987 the Avon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust which is the national charity dedicated to the research and conservation of the country's designed landscape heritage. One of the roles of the Avon Gardens Trust is to help safeguard designed landscapes in the former County of Avon by commenting on planning applications affecting them. We would like to point out that the report to the Development Control (West) Committee was not correct in saying that the response of the Avon Gardens Trust was "No Comment." The Trust did not receive the consultation letter and so was not aware of the application and did not make any response to it. However, had the Trust been made aware of the proposal we would have submitted a letter of objection.</p> <p>Clic Cottage is one of two gate lodges to Frenchay Park House which was built in the 18th century by Alderman Deane. Later owners George Worrall and William Tanner extended the parkland in the 19th century. The property became a hospital in 1931. The House is a Grade II listed building, Clic Cottage is a curtilage listed building and the parkland is designated as a Locally Important Park and Garden on South Gloucestershire's Historic</p>

					<p>Environment Record.</p> <p>We have considered the proposal and endorse the assessment and conclusion made on it by South Gloucestershire's Senior Planning and Conservation Officer in his comments dated 5th January 2018. As a result the Avon Gardens Trust supports the Council's reason for refusal and asks for the appeal to be dismissed.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Frenchay Park House	Avon	E18/0896	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to residential and the erection of a single storey extension to form additional living accommodation. New vehicular access. Clic Cottage, Beckspool Road, Frenchay, South Glos. BS16</p> <p>1NT. BUILDING ALTERATION</p> <p>OUTCOME Refused Appeal Lodged Appeal Ref APP/P0119/Y/18/3209995</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.10.2018</b></p> <p>Formed in 1987 the Avon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust which is the national charity dedicated to the research and conservation of the country's designed landscape heritage. One of the roles of the Avon Gardens Trust is to help safeguard designed landscapes in the former County of Avon by commenting on planning applications affecting them. We would like to point out that the report to the Development Control (West) Committee about this application was not correct in saying that the response of the Avon Gardens Trust was "No Comment." The Trust did not receive the consultation letter and so was not aware of the application and did not make any response to it. However, had the Trust been made aware of the proposal we would have submitted a letter of objection.</p> <p>Clic Cottage is one of two gate lodges to Frenchay Park House which was built in the 18th century by Alderman Deane. Later owners George Worrall and William Tanner extended the parkland in the 19th century. The property became a hospital in 1931. The House is a Grade II listed building, Clic Cottage is a curtilage listed building and the parkland is designated as a Locally Important Park and Garden on South Gloucestershire's Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>We have considered the proposal and endorse the assessment and conclusion made on it by South Gloucestershire's Senior Planning and Conservation Officer in his comments dated 5th January 2018. As a result the Avon Gardens Trust supports the Council's reasons for refusal and asks for the appeal to be dismissed.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>

Gayhurst Court	Buckinghamshire	E18/0856	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for the removal of existing modern bay window and the erection of a single storey extension to the existing Annexe. The Annexe At The Bath House, Newport Road, Gayhurst, Newport Pagnell. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.10.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Bucks Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could please take our joint comments into consideration when deciding this proposal.</p> <p>Gayhurst Court (formerly Gayhurst House) is registered Grade II and is an 18th century landscape park and mid c19 formal gardens around an earlier house. The gardens are attributed to Lancelot Brown c 1750-60 with modifications by Repton c. 1793. It is also noted that the eastern elevation of the registered park at Gayhurst abuts the Grade II* registered park at Tyringham. The listing for Tyringham contains this reference : "The south and east parts of the inner park are pasture planted with park trees in singles and clumps, with some exotics. This part of the park enjoys views east towards Soane's gateway and bridge spanning the river, across the avenue to the church over the river, and south-west to the Gayhurst parkland and Bathhouse beyond."</p> <p>The application site, The Bath House, is listed Grade II and attributed to Repton. The East front (the elevation subject to this application) is detailed as "East side, front two storey with projecting enclosure with battlemented rubblestone walls with two lancet openings in east wall". From the east elevation, the property looks over a small portion of the registered park at Gayhurst, then across Great Ouse River which is the boundary between the two registered parks and over the Wilderness towards Tyringham Park – the register for Gayhurst notes "From here there are excellent views over the Tyringham Estate and towards Tyringham House and bridge"</p> <p>It is noted that much of the property is a later reconstruction dating from the 1990s. The reconstruction was however, done with some sensitivity to the original structure and retained what original fabric was left. Although the structure is not original does not mean that it can necessarily tolerate further alteration and extension. The footprint, position and setting in the wider protected landscape should mean that careful consideration is given to any further change.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the Design and Access Statement (D&amp;A) accompanying this application emphasises the continuing sensitivity to the original structure and fabric of the building but it is not for the Gardens Trust to comment on such details. It is noted that the current structure has</p>
----------------	-----------------	----------	----	--	--

					<p>a simple bay window on the elevation subject to this application and it situated when the property is raised as can be seen in the applicant's submissions and particularly figure .04 in the above-mentioned D&amp;A. The applicant states that the position of the proposed extension "maximises the views of the countryside to the east".</p> <p>However, the Gardens Trust wishes to express concern that the proposed new extension is similar to a conservatory in design, projects substantially further out from the building and, as shown in Drawing 18-20-P-04 'Proposed Plan and Elevations' is glazed on the three projecting sides which will result in substantially increased light reflection which will be visible from both near and distant views from both the Gayhurst Park and Tyringham Park registered parkland.</p> <p>Furthermore, as this structure is to be used for residential accommodation, this will result in substantially increased light emittance throughout the year, which again will be visible from both registered parklands. The GT and BGT therefore object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derby shire	E18/0871	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of Condition 2 (the approved plans) of AVA/2018/0071 to re-site the approved Driving Range and provide larger Store Room to the rear (The proposal may affect the setting of a Listed Building/Registered Park and Garden). Kedleston Park Golf Club, Kedleston Road, Kedleston, Derby, Derbyshire DE22 5JD. GOLF</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) again as per the variation to the above application. The relocation of the large practice bay further south against the woodland is an improvement, although it will still be visible from within the RPG and possibly the Kedleston Hotel. However, the GT still objects to the inclusion of the car park which is contrary to planning condition 2 of planning permission AVA/2018/0071.</p> <p>The GT would like to reiterate the condition that the practice barn must never be run as a separate business to Kedleston Golf Club. Should the Golf Club cease then the practice barn could not continue.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Thorndon Hall	Essex	E18/0912	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolish attached side garage. Re-build garage and construct single storey outbuilding for gym use construct basement under both elements linking together and provide 2 rooflight windows. Green Keepers Cottage, Thorndon Gate, Ingrave, Essex CM13 3RQ.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust and the Essex Gardens Trust on this application. This house lies within the grade II* registered landscape associated with Thorndon Hall. It occupies a historic position, the site of a small lodge, and remains on an access road to the park. Whilst having no objection to the rebuilding of the garage, or the basement, the outbuilding within the garden would be large and represent a further suburban intrusion into the registered landscape, as well as the Green Belt and the Conservation Area. I would ask you to take this impact on the heritage asset into consideration when determining this application.</p> <p>Regards David Andrews FSA, IHBC</p>
Newark Park	Gloucestershire	E18/0505	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Compliance with condition 3 (landscape) - Installation of play area including installation of compost WC. Newark Park House, Ozleworth, Wotton-Under-Edge, Gloucestershire GL12 7PZ</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thanks for your email. I appreciate that it was your colleague dealing with this not you, but please, please PLEASE can you try to ensure that a serious omission of this nature doesn't occur again? The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee for all grades of registered landscapes and as such our comments are of importance in the planning process. The setting and significance of Newark Park has undoubtedly been negatively compromised by this very ill thought out application. I visited myself last weekend and the new play structure is directly visible from the door of the Gothick Summerhouse, and the noise and disruption to the whole valley seriously affects the way in which the setting of the RPG is experienced. (- HE Setting of Heritage Assets, - Hist Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3, 2nd edit, Dec 2017 – see Part 1, page 2, “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.”</p> <p>Also p 4 “Access and Setting : Because the contribution of setting to significance does not depend on public rights or ability to access it significance is not dependent on numbers of people visiting it; this would downplay such qualitative issues as the importance of quiet and tranquillity as an attribute of setting...”)</p> <p>I am very disappointed that the NT submitted this application despite knowing the GT's grave concerns. I had been watching out and waiting for the original application as I knew that they would submit it, which is why I</p>

					was so disappointed not to hear about it until far too late. Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Abbotswood	Gloucestershire	E18/0883	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Side extension with associated internal alterations and landscaping works at Bowl Farm House, Lower Swell, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL54 1LE. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.10.2018</b> The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee regarding planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered gardens or landscapes has notified Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. In this instance, the proposed alterations to Bowl Farm has marginal impact on the wider parkland setting, and therefore GGLT does not wish to raise any adverse comment on this proposal. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)
Stouts Hill, Uley	Gloucestershire	E18/0950	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Change of use of 14 timeshare units with associated leisure facilities to one residential property (Manor House) and 7 holiday accommodation units (Terraced Houses) with associated leisure facilities. Stouts Hill Club Ltd, Lampern Hill, Uley, Dursley, Gloucestershire GL11 5BT. RESIDENTIAL, HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2018</b> The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning applications that may impact on Listed or Registered gardens and parks, has been alerted about this proposal and has notified Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to make a response on this Change of Use application. The outline proposal to convert the Grade 11* Stouts Hill into a single dwelling and modify timeshare properties to become holiday accommodation would be welcomed in principle. The detailed implementation, and its impact on the wider landscape would however, continue to be of considerable interest to GGLT. In particular, Stouts Hill and its setting, which includes remnants of C18 plantings and historic ornamental gardens, is currently the subject of research by GGLT to determine the characteristics and extent of the historic parkland associated with this estate. The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee and GGLT therefore, would wish to be consulted on any future proposals at Stouts Hill. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)

Broomfield House	Greater London	E18/0220	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of a wetlands area (1500sqm) involving increase in height of bund by 0.8m, restoration of water feature together with associated landscaping to the south east corner of the park. Broomfield Park, Broomfield Lane, London N13 4HE. WATER FEATURE</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2018</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) was notified about this application by Historic England rather than by Enfield. We are disappointed that despite our Statutory Consultee role with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, Enfield failed to notify either us or the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (LPGT) of this application which is actually within an RPG. We are attaching a copy of our leaflet The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens : Guidance for Local Planning Authorities, and would be very grateful if you could ensure that in future we are notified of any similar applications. We have liaised with our colleagues in the LPGT and would be grateful if you could take our joint comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The Park is included on the LPGT Inventory : <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk/gardens-online-record.php?ID=ENF005">http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk/gardens-online-record.php?ID=ENF005</a></p> <p>This entry shows that not only is the Park itself Grade II listed but is the setting of several grade II* historic features including Broomfield House; remains of C16-18th east wall with attached early C18th pavilion/garden house &amp; stableblock. Additionally, the site is part of Metropolitan Open Land and in a Nature Conservation Area of Local Importance.</p> <p>It is not apparent from the documentation online why Broomfield Park was chosen as the site for this SUDs scheme. There is nothing to indicate whether other less sensitive sites were considered, even if they were eventually deemed unsuitable, and if so for what reason(s). The two proposed SUDS wetland cells and their decking bridge sit uneasily in relation to the historic walls (Visualisation Fig 3, Planning Statement, p5) and the formal lime avenue, and are alien in character and appearance to the smooth 'parkland' grass which currently borders these features. Indeed the Heritage Statement 3.6.16 stresses the "relationship between the House, formal gate and parkland form the setting of Broomfield House. The setting makes a high contribution to the importance of Broomfield House." Introduction of wetland cells with their associated informal bog/damp planting/landscaping would considerably alter this key historic setting, and therefore would have a correspondingly negative effect upon the significance of the RPG. We disagree with Para 4.1.6 in the Heritage Statement which states that "it is considered that there will be no impact upon the setting of the surrounding heritage assets, including Broomfield</p>
------------------	----------------	----------	----	---	--

					<p>House (Grade II*), walls associated with Broomfield House/Park Grade II) ...” The undoubted harm caused to the Grade II RPG (see NPPF Para 132) is not given any clear and convincing justification within the application documents. The GT/LPGT remain unconvinced that “The public benefit of the flood alleviation scheme to reduce flood risk ... is considered to outweigh the minimal harm caused to the Heritage Asset.” (Heritage Statement 4.1.7.).</p> <p>The GT/LPGT are unclear as to the level of flood alleviation/water storage required. We would have liked clarification of the capacity of the existing lakes and stemming from this, a SUDs scheme designed proportionately so that the RPG and its constituent fabric/features are not harmed (NPPF Para 132 – great weight should be given to the conservation of irreplaceable heritage assets). The impression given by the available documentation is that this scheme is SUDs-driven rather than considering the overall benefits, which include public amenity value. Broomfield House and its Stable Block are already on the HAR register for London, and any further erosion to their fragile setting can only have a negative impact upon their significance.</p> <p>The GT/LPGT also have concerns relating to the ongoing management of the area and the provision of funding for the future maintenance of the decking/bridge. We can see this potentially falling into disrepair in a short timescale (it will attract vandalism). Since the Friends of Broomfield Park already undertake much of the maintenance of the Park and do not have capacity to take on more responsibility for core maintenance tasks we would like assurance that Enfield has sufficient budget for the increased maintenance this potential new feature will entail.</p> <p>The GT/LPGT would prefer to see the funding from Thamas21 and the Mayor of London being put to use for a SUDs scheme in a less sensitive site, or with a scheme that involves proper consideration of the heritage sensitivities of this site. We therefore OBJECT to the application as it currently stands.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



Marble Hill	Greater London	E18/0850	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 1. Marble Hill House: External decoration and repair work (if a window is substantially rotten, partial or full replacement of joinery) and replacement rooflight. 2. Stable Block: External alterations, installation of mechanical plant, timber plant enclosure to the rear and front landscaping (creating an outdoor seating area) to facilitate the refurbishment of the existing café. 3. Service Yard: new pedestrian access and associated refuse storage facilities. 4. Landscaping: new soft and hard landscaping including restoration of gardens, upgrade of sports pitches and facilities, replacement of seating and new play areas. 5. Sports Centre: External ramp for improved access. Marble Hill House, Marble Hill Park, Richmond Road, Twickenham. HYBRID</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2018</b></p> <p>I am writing to express the support of the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust for the revised proposals made by English Heritage and shown in the application dated 7th September 2018 to carry out works to Marble Hill House and Park which are included at grade I (house) grade II* (park) and grade II (stable block) in the Historic England List and Register. The history of the estate is set out in the application documents, which include recent archival and archaeological evidence commissioned to shine further light on the development of the house and park. The history is important not only for shaping and explaining the estate as it now stands but also for setting the context in which the proposals need now to be considered.</p> <p>The house was built and the estate assembled and landscaped for Henrietta Howard, Countess of Suffolk. She was a very remarkable woman if only one of many important characters in the history of Marble Hill, and it is right and laudable that English Heritage should put her at the centre of the picture in their proposals for restoring and re-presenting the house and garden.</p> <p>The early-to-mid eighteenth century is not currently studied much in popular history, and to that extent may be considered unfashionable, but at the period in which Marble Hill was built and its gardens and park formed, from circa 1724 onwards, Twickenham was the focus for up-to-the-minute developments in literature, architecture and landscape. The poet Alexander Pope moved there in 1719 and started forming his famous grotto and garden, drawing inspiration from the classical poets and contributing to the gradual breaking away from the formality of Renaissance and Baroque gardening, helping to lead towards what has become known as the English landscape garden.</p> <p>The banks of the River Thames between Hampton Court and Kew, as is celebrated and documented in the Thames Landscape Strategy, are an open-air textbook of garden design from the seventeenth to the twenty-first centuries, and Marble Hill is central and essential to an understanding of the “Arcadian Thames”. Mavis Batey, one of the principal authors of the Thames Landscape Strategy, calls Marble Hill (in her “Alexander Pope: The Poet and the Landscape” 1999) “the most exquisite Palladian villa in England... as important architecturally as Chiswick... a little Palladian gem to be seen from the river, giving the Thames an air of the River Brenta”. English Heritage has been assiduous in carrying out documentary and</p>
-------------	----------------	----------	-----	---	---

					<p>archaeological research to establish the original layout of the gardens and park at Marble Hill, and similarly exemplary in carrying out public consultations and revising their proposals to take representations into account. The creation of a complex work of art like Marble Hill involves inevitably the efforts of many minds and many pairs of hands working towards achieving a harmonious whole. The London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust agrees with English Heritage that the drawing in the Norfolk Record Office records in its mature mid-century state a garden laid out and planted a quarter of a century or so earlier to a design that was at the time as fashionable as the villa it complements but which was soon to become overtaken by the more “natural” landscape style – what Horace Walpole later in the eighteenth century called the “modern taste in gardening”. Lottery funding, which is dependent upon the granting of planning permission, will enable English Heritage to carry out works that are necessary for the well-being of the house and the park. Successive national governments have withdrawn funding for the upkeep of the historic environment at the same time as reducing rate support to local authorities, and while Marble Hill park serves primarily as an amenity for the local population it is now run at a very considerable financial loss by English Heritage, which is now a charity. The house is of national importance in terms of its architecture and history, and there is now an opportunity to reinstate the park and garden setting that it deserves.</p> <p>The London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust, which is affiliated to the Gardens Trust and a statutory consultee in respect of planning applications affecting registered historic landscapes, fully supports the current English Heritage planning application and urges your Council to grant consent.</p> <p>Helen Monger</p> <p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.10.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust is writing to support the resubmitted application by Historic England for the landscape at Marble Hill. It is clear that they have thoroughly researched Henrietta Howard’s C18 Pleasure Garden and a c1749 plan has informed the subsequent restoration strategy. They have also listened to local residents who know and love the site and taken on</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>board their concerns, particularly in relation to placing increasing emphasis on encouraging biodiversity and wildlife and giving careful thought to the siting of the play area for younger visitors.</p> <p>The GT has seen at first hand the meticulous restoration undertaken by English Heritage elsewhere (eg Wrest Park). The documentation supplied with this application demonstrates the great care and attention they have taken in order to achieve similar results here. The GT hope that your officers will support this application so that Lottery funding (which is dependent upon the granting of planning permission) can restore the house and landscape for the enjoyment of this and future generations. We also endorse fully the comments submitted independently by the London Parks and Gardens Trust and will not repeat the many points raised by them.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.10.2018 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust understands that your officers require a response to the lengthy reports submitted by the <i>Love Marble Hill</i> (LMH) group by tomorrow. We would like to record our disappointment that a more collaborative approach was not taken by LMH at an early stage. This would have avoided the extremely regrettable recriminations and last minute additional responses from consultees and others, which threatens to jeopardise the very welcome proposals by English Heritage (EH), and divert attention from the urgent need to halt the deterioration of this extremely important historic garden.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust have already made their endorsement of HE's thorough and careful research quite clear. We do not propose to spend any more time going over similar ground, or refuting any more of the numerous and lengthy comments made by LMH. Instead we would like to simply reiterate that we fully support HE's proposals.</p> <p>We do however, take issue with the interpretation of some planning points outlined in their covering letter. We disagree with LMH's comments that the proposals are contrary to NPPF para 195. Indeed we feel that the proposals will certainly not '<i>lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset</i>'. On the contrary we feel they will enhance Marble Hill's significance and are fully compliant with Para</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>193 (<i>“great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation”</i>). We also reject LMH’s assertion that EH have not provided sufficient <i>‘historical evidence for the proposed “restoration”</i> and that the restoration will cause harm which outweighs public benefit. We feel that they have taken enormous care to research the history of the site, and have listened to local opinion, amending their original application accordingly. Should your officers approve this application, the benefits of the restoration will be enjoyed by a wide section of the public, freely and for many years to come. The Gardens Trust would like to reiterate our wholehearted SUPPORT for this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Willesden Jewish Cemetery (United Synagogue Cemetery), Roundwood Park	Greater London	E18/0869	II II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a detached 3 storey residential block comprising three flats. Flats 1-16 Norman Court, 59 Pound Lane, London NW10 2HH. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.10.2018</b></p> <p>The Trust is grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which has a material impact on the significance of Willesden Jewish Cemetery (United Synagogue Cemetery), Roundwood Park, a historic designed landscape which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration. We write as the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (LPGT). The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (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. The LPGT is the Gardens Trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the Gardens Trust in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPGT’s Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk">www.londongardensonline.org.uk</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>We object to this application as currently presented, because of its impact on the nationally designated Willesden Jewish Cemetery and the lack of strategy to consider this. It is unacceptably difficult to assess this application, as the applicant has not produced an adequate assessment of the significance of the heritage asset or the impact of the proposal on it. It fails to set out a strategy for conserving the nationally designated historic environment around it (NPPF 185) and on this basis, we urge you to refuse</p>

					<p>this application.</p> <p>By way of example of how a lack of understanding of the significance has led to a proposal, that fails to conserve the cemetery in a manner appropriate to its significance (NPPF 184), we note that the proposed building would be viewed along one of the main axis views within the cemetery, yet the application contains nothing that reflects the relationship between the proposed building and the cemetery. For example, no consideration has been given to the juxtaposition with the historic lodge or gateway, for example with the materials chosen to match Willesden Fire Station rather than the lodge attached to the national heritage asset of Willesden Cemetery.</p> <p>We therefore conclude that this proposal has not been designed with an understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and how to guard against damage to it, and therefore contains several elements which will have a detrimental impact on it. We therefore urge you to refuse this application and we would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Monger Director On behalf of the Planning and Conservation Working Group London Parks and Gardens Trust</p>
Oshwal Centre, Northaw	Hertfordshire	E18/0607	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Pre-application advice for the erection of elderly residential accommodation, central community building, crematorium and community farm. Oshwal Centre, Coopers Lane Road, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4DG. HYBRID</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member. We are disappointed that neither the Landscape Report nor the Heritage Statement takes into consideration the historic designed landscape, remnants of which remain. HGT has researched this site and a report is available from HGT on request. We are concerned at the extension of the buildings eastwards into the landscape which is agricultural Green Belt and consider that the total amount of building proposed would overdevelop this rural site and further harm the setting of the original mansion.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfordshire	E18/0865	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a detached dwelling and two replacement bridges following the</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for your message via the Gardens Trust. I have read Lee Prosser's Heritage Statement and consider it a fair evaluation. There are 2</p>

			<p>demolition of existing buildings. Land rear of Nos 10-18 Mymms Drive, Brookmans Park, Hatfield AL9 7AF. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>points arising from his document</p> <p>1. He is citing an outdated version of the NPPF - probably because his document is dated 2015. The updated paragraph is 194. and states that Any harm to, or loss of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification. We do not consider that the proposed development causes substantial harm but does cause (less than substantial) harm as it is within the designated landscape area and within the setting of the core garden features. Much work has been done by a team of HGT surveyors led by Tom Williamson on the core features but no investigation has been done on the outer areas. Mr Prosser relies on map evidence for claiming that no features were ever there. Until such time as thorough investigation (including archaeological) has taken place, we consider that this cannot be proven and that there may be undocumented features.</p> <p>2. Mr Prosser does not consider views from the core area towards the proposed development and whether they would be affected by any development.</p> <p>We consider that much harm has been done in the past by the insertion of Mymms Drive and the building of the houses along it. This development would cause further harm to the Registered site.</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Hamels Park	Hertfords hire	E18/0923	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Tennis court to be constructed in the garden of Hamels Mansion. Hamels Mansion, Hamels Park, Buntingford, Hertfordshire. SPORT/LEISURE	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.10.2018</b></p> <p>The landscape at Hamels is of Local Historic Interest and Importance and is included on the EHDC and HGT lists of such landscapes. We are disappointed that the Design and Access Statement does not refer to the historic nature of the gardens. Further no attempt been made within these documents to consider whether the conserving and enhancing of the former, well-levelled tennis courts, still in use in the 20th century with which this garden was equipped would be viable. EHDC policy HA2 and HA8 and NPPF paragraph 192 all stress the desirability of enhancing the significance of heritage assets.</p> <p>We consider that re-use of the former tennis courts would be preferable to putting in a new court with fencing which is more appropriate to urban parks than country house gardens and which entails more ground disturbance and adverse impact on the character of these historic gardens.</p> <p>Mrs Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Markyatecell Park	Hertfords hire	E18/0973	II	PLANNING APPLICATION CONSTRUCTION OF 9 DETACHED DWELLINGS LAND SOUTH-EAST OF NEW LODGE (CELL PARK), DUNSTABLE ROAD, MARKYATE, AL3 8QJ.	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2018</b></p> <p>We are very familiar with the landscape history of Markyate Cell and have visited the Registered Park on several occasions.</p> <p>We object to this application on the following grounds:</p> <p>The proposed development is wholly within the boundaries of the area registered at Grade II by Historic England contrary to:</p> <p>The NPPF (paragraph 184) states that heritage assets are ‘an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance’. This application would result in the irretrievable loss of a historically important section of the Registered Park, formerly the first sight visitors would have had with all the designed views associated with that. It would also result in a loss of setting and therefore significance for the Listed mansion house and cause harm to the rural setting of the listed Red Cow Farm.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 189. The application contains no assessment of the significance of the heritage assets (Listed Markyate Cell House, Registered Park and Listed Red Cow Farmhouse and Barn) affected, including any contribution made by their setting.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 194 We have seen no clear and convincing justification for the harm to and loss of significance to the park that this development would cause.</p>

					<p>The designed views along the valley of the river Ver, here historically extended to form a Broadwater, are key to the parkland and to the setting of the Grade II* mansion house. These views historically included those along the approach from New Lodge which this development adjoins. This development therefore also harms the setting, and significance of this important house by Robert Lugar.</p> <p>The importance of views and vistas has been emphasised in The Setting of Heritage Assets (HE GPA 3v2) which states 'many heritage assets have settings that have been designed to enhance their presence and visual interest' This is the case here at Markyate Cell.</p> <p>This application contains no assessment of how the views along the valley to and from the house and within the wider parkland would be affected or if any mitigation measures have been considered, contrary to Part 2: Setting and Views (paragraph 19 onwards).</p> <p>Markyate Cell lies on the northern edge of the village with no major development adjoining it. To permit development within the park would set an unwelcome precedent in terms of harm to setting and fabric of designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Regards  Kate Harwood  Planning &amp; Conservation  Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincoln shire	E18/0809	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Part demolition of the existing pavilion, scout hut and nursery buildings, alterations to the existing tower house to include raising the roof height. TOWER GARDENS, PAVILLION, RUTLAND ROAD, SKEGNESS. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.10.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Lincolnshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if your officers could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The condition of the Pavilion is dire and the survey summary by Alex Rosen and Associates paints a depressing picture. It is clear that the Pavilion has been an integral part of the community within the town, from its opening in 1879 as a venue for dances, concerts and parties, right up to its more recent incarnation as a public house. With the final loss of the Pier in 1984 the Pavilion, even in its dilapidated form, remains an important focus of local history and communal value. Therefore the GT would encourage ELDC to photograph and record the structure as far as possible and salvage whatever is financially feasible, even if only the iron frame. This could be reused in any replacement building, with interpretation to enable an understanding of the building and its history and significance within the Tower Gardens.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	------------------	----------	----	--	--

Alnwick Castle	Northumb erland	E18/0937	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed single height education centre to replace existing unsuitable temporary accommodation, comprising classrooms, gardener's welfare facilities, glasshouse and accommodation block. Land West Of Head Gardeners Cottage, The Alnwick Garden, Greenwell Road, Alnwick, Northumberland.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumberland Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The site analysis in the The Design Access and Heritage Statement acknowledges [3.0] that the proposed development site lies within a walled garden. There is also mention of agricultural buildings (which perhaps means horticultural buildings?) and the accompanying plan shows the footprint of historic conservatories.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement is basic and generic with very little reference to the specific history, development and interest of the proposed development site. It does however include a Historic Plan 1827 (source?) which appears to show garden plots to the north of Bondgate which we feel may possibly reflect the medieval boundaries of properties along one of the principal streets in Alnwick. We would suggest that there may well be potential here for earlier remains associated with the development of the town.</p> <p>The Archaeology section does provide a little more detail (but no suggestion of potential for earlier remains) with mention of a vinery, apparently on a different alignment to the later glass, attributed to the 3rd Duke in the period 1817 to 1847. We would like to have seen some attempt at examining whether this is when the site passed from town to castle ground and whether the enclosing walls date from this period. The 4th Duke added a glazed hothouse to the east wall of the vinery. The hothouse of the old vinery was removed leaving only the backhouse which remains on site. This tantalising snippet suggests that there is reasonable survival of earlier structures, perhaps incorporated in the later buildings on the site. The steam plant which was built as part of the garden of the 6th Duke and remains today indicates further significant interest, as such survivals are increasingly rare.</p> <p>The Historic Plan 1865 (source?) shows building ranges (confirmed by Historic Plan 1867) as 2 big glasshouse ranges and further glass and lean-to shed ranges along the walls, indicating that what remains of historic interest predates 1865. The As Existing elevations show what appear to be historic glasshouses surviving within the site – one range could perhaps be</p>
----------------	--------------------	----------	---	--	---

					<p>a propagation pit.</p> <p>Given the location of the walled garden this leads us to wonder whether this was in effect the frame yard – the power house of any large walled garden complex where the plants were established under glass before being planted out for display or production in other areas? Ancillary sheds stored equipment and materials and provided work spaces (and heating plant?). Proximity of the Head Gardener's residence allowed close supervision of this important part of his domain. As ever it is frustrating that little reference is made to the potential of the extensive archives at Alnwick, which would no doubt be able to provide a wealth of detail on the development of this important area of the gardens.</p> <p>Given the scale, quality and long development of walled garden provision at Alnwick Castle we would anticipate that the site retains significant garden history/archaeology interest. Before any informed planning decisions can be made we would like to see a full programme of research and recording of both the standing structures and below ground survivals. In the absence of sufficient information on the documentary background and description of the surviving features of historic environment interest to assess what is being lost in the proposed development we must OBJECT to the proposal at this stage.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Temple Grounds	North Yorkshire	E18/0922	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission to Raise Height of Existing Garage Building for Accommodation Above at 9 Cravengate, Richmond, North Yorkshire DL10 4ED. BUILDING ALTERATION, CHANGE OF USE	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee regarding the proposed development affecting Temple Grounds, a nationally important historic park and garden included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts regarding this application. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>9 Cravengate is on the north eastern boundary of the Temple Grounds. Having considered the application details, we have no objection in principle to this application but we have concerns regarding the North Yorkshire County Council Highways comment that should the proposed annexe pass into third party ownership then there should be the minimum of one off-street parking space and that the 'main' house should retain a minimum of two off-street parking spaces. We are not aware that there is available space for such provision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Malcolm Barnett Trustee, Yorkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Coverham Abbey	North Yorkshire	E18/0955	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for alterations to existing barn with the addition of a mezzanine floor and change of use of outbuilding from garage/store to kitchen/preparation area and installation of below ground services. Coverham Abbey, Coverham Lane, Coverham BUILDING ALTERATION	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.10.2018</b></p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust is a member of the Gardens Trust; the statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens. The Gardens Trust supports the County Gardens Trusts in the protection and conservation of designed landscapes and gardens.</p> <p>Thank for your notification. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust is responding on behalf of both Trusts regarding this application.</p> <p>We have no specific comments to make on this application however we are pleased to note that all excavation works will be undertaken under the supervision of an archaeological watching brief.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>

Plumpton Rocks	North Yorkshire	E18/0965	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Part demolition of single-storey extension; Demolition of outbuilding; Erection of single-storey extension; Installation of fenestration and door; Alterations to fenestration. The Carriage House, Farrar Wood To Plumpton Park, Plompton HG5 8NA.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting Plumpton Rocks, a grade II* site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts.</p> <p>The Carriage House is listed grade II* and is now part of a cluster of residential buildings originally designed as stables by John Carr of York for Daniel Lascelles in the mid 18C. They are part of the Plumpton Conservation Area. Due to its location we do not consider that this proposal will have an impact on the wider Registered Park and Garden. However we note Historic England's comments that the proposal would cause some harm to the significance of the listed building both in terms of character and visual impact, and the apparent lack of consideration of the preplanning advice. We have no further comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens	North Yorkshire	E18/0977	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Refurbishment and structural works to re-open tunnel under funicular cliff railway and removal of adjacent steps with second tunnel under. Alterations to levels with associated drainage, retaining and landscaping works. South Cliff Gardens, Esplanade, Scarborough, NORTH YORKSHIRE.</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting South Cliff Gardens, Scarborough, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens and on their Heritage at Risk Register. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts.</p> <p>We are very pleased that there is a detailed Conservation and Management Plan for the entirety of the Saving South Cliff Gardens Project. South Cliff is a designed seaside landscape of national importance within the Scarborough Conservation Area and its condition has been of much concern for some time. Scarborough South Bay was probably the country's first seaside holiday resort and the funicular railway is a very historic passenger railway and of outstanding significance. The tunnel link is as important now as it was when constructed, integrating the whole garden/designed landscape. It's refurbishment and re-opening makes economic sense as well as giving aesthetic and pleasurable outcomes for pedestrians.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust supports this planning application and the</p>

					<p>details that have been drawn up.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
Memorial Gardens, Nottingham	Nottinghamshire	E18/0853	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION War Memorial. Victoria Embankment Park, Victoria Embankment, Nottingham.</p> <p>SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.10.2018</b></p> <p>NGT: NO OBJECTION</p> <p>Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust has previously commented on the proposal to install a new 'roll of honour' memorial to commemorate the centenary of the First World War. At the pre-application stage we raised a number of issues some of which have been addressed in the submitted application. It is helpful that the proposals are accompanied by a well-researched heritage statement that provides valuable information about the origins and development of the Memorial Gardens and is sufficient to respond to the requirements of the NPPF paragraph 190.</p> <p>Unfortunately, at the time of writing the Design and Access Statement was not available on the planning authority website, so the following comments are made without the benefit of having seen that document. The Memorial Gardens are a grade II registered park (List Entry Number 1001506). The Heritage Statement confirms the information about the origins of the gardens that is provided in the official list entry, but adds considerably more information about the lead up to the creation of the Memorial Arch. To summarise, it is clear that the Memorial Gardens were being considered in outline form at the same time as the development of plans for the Memorial Arch and that they form a group together. It appears from the archival evidence that the detailed design of the main part of the Memorial Gardens evolved around the initial symmetry and that the bandstand to the south was also considered at the outset, but did not get installed until 1937.</p> <p>The Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust, no longer objects to the proposed new memorial. The Heritage Statement has confirmed that the design chosen and location are sufficiently sensitive to the original layout and present character of the registered park. The suitability of a formal monument to honour the centenary of WWI is also acknowledged.</p> <p>We remain very concerned about the overall condition of the registered park and listed Memorial Arch. The Heritage Statement acknowledges the issues that we have highlighted previously and it is clear that the long term low levels of maintenance to the planting and paths, along with the</p>

					<p>condition of the Victoria memorial (with inappropriate fencing) and fountain, are presenting the Memorial Gardens in a run-down poor condition. The proposals for the new memorial are not accompanied by any information that provides confidence that these issues will be addressed by Nottingham City Council. We remain unconvinced it is appropriate to be seen to be investing heavily in a new memorial in the absence of a scheme of restoration, repair and maintenance for the original WWI memorials (garden and archway) .</p> <p>It is noted that there have been proposals submitted by the City Council for Listed Building Consent this summer, that include for new gates, replacement of the vandalised windows and stolen cappings to cornices (18/01278/LLIS1). It is noted that the Gardens Trust was not consulted on those proposals and that LBC has been granted for the works in September. This would appear to suggest that the City Council has begun to address some of the issues around the condition of the Memorial Gates, but the LBC application was not accompanied by any information that would confirm that the council has the long term plan and a list of prioritised work. In light of the acknowledged funding squeeze on public parks, a fully comprehensive condition and management plan should be considered essential to ensure priorities are addressed and budgets maximised. There is no condition assessment accompanying the Listed Building Consent so we are compelled to question whether these works are the most appropriate way to invest public money in the park, and whether this addresses the priorities of the present condition of the Memorial Park? Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust is supportive of the plans to commemorate the centenary of WWI with a new memorial and raises NO OBJECTION. We are keen to promote a longer term project that would attend to the existing commemorative heritage of the Memorial Gardens and Arch. The Gardens Trust is keen to assist the City Council with planning for the future of the Memorial Gardens and offers assistance in the form of advice and guidance.</p> <p>Jason Mordan Senior Practitioner Historic Buildings Nottinghamshire County Council</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Badger Dingle	Shropshire	E18/0609	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of a fish stock pool. Land East Of Badger Hall, Badger, Wolverhampton, Shropshire WV6 7JR. WATER FEATURE</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.10.2018</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust disagrees with the opinion of your officers that the amended position of the proposed pool and landscaping is not contrary to adopted policies. We reiterate the comment from our letter of 21st August that “the proposed development, which is for business reasons and for the benefit of a private individual, fails the test of public benefit and hence of the key principle of sustainable development that is at the core of the NPPF.” We quote paragraph 196 from the revised NPPF:</p> <p>‘196. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.’ As the proposed development is wholly for private commercial benefit, there can be no public benefits accruing.</p> <p>The addition of this enormous new fish-breeding pond will in addition compound damage already done to the fabric of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden, all of which was carried out without proper consultation. The GT continues to OBJECT to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Compton Castle	Somerset	E18/0595	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The carrying out of internal alterations, replacement windows, new decking to rear and parking area and conversion of garage to habitable space and new vehicular access. Sherborne Lodge, Old Bristol Road, Compton Pauncefoot, Yeovil, Somerset BA22 7EG. BUILDING ALTERATION, PARKING</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.10.2018</b></p> <p>Please accept my apologies that it has taken me a while to get back to you following your email of 7th September. We are glad to note that the height of the gate to the adjoining fence has been reduced as per our request. As there was no mention of the potential tree issue or landscaping in front of the fence, we assume that no trees will be impacted and that landscape details will be a condition of any planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>



Mells Park	Somerset	E18/0849	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Deepening of Halecombe Quarry by the extraction of limestone, replacement of existing asphalt plant with a new asphalt plant and associated facilities, retention of the concrete batching plant and the reopening of the access road to Rookery Farm with relinquishment of the existing permission and extension of end date for the entire quarry and all quarrying activities to 31 December 2044 with restoration to be completed by December 2046. Halecombe Quarry, Leigh On Mendip, Somerset. MINERAL EXTRACTION</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.10.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust.</p> <p>We do not feel that deepening of the Quarry will have a direct impact upon the significance of Mells Park historic landscape. However, we would concur with the comments of Managing Agent, Mr Stephen Ellam, that there need to be some conditions and monitoring methods imposed to prevent the problem of dust affecting the health of the screening tree belt separating the Quarry from Mells Park. Should the health of the trees be negatively affected and the Quarry became more visible, then the setting of the RPG would be adversely threatened; a situation I am sure none of us would wish to see.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Ven House	Somerset	E18/0982	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Reinstatement of 2 no. stone eagle statues. Ven House, London Road, Milborne Port, Sherborne, Dorset DT9 5RA. REPAIR/RESTORATION, SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Ven House, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>We have considered the information provided in support of the application and on the basis of this confirm we do not wish to comment, other than to state that we welcome the proposed reinstatement of the eagle statues which are original features of the Ven House designed landscape.</p> <p>If you have any further queries, please contact us at this email address and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the application in due course.</p> <p>With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>

Norbury Park	Surrey	E18/0910	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of facilities for and use of Phoenixe Fields for camping in up to 30 No. tents and bases for up to 6 No. portable, serviced, camping huts. Phoenixe Fields, Norbury Park, Mickleham, Dorking, Surrey RH5 6DN. CAMPING</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.10.2018</b></p> <p>The attention of the Surrey Gardens Trust (SGT) has recently been drawn to this application. The site adjoins the western edge of the Historic England Register site of Norbury Park and the Trust is surprised that the Gardens Trust was not notified as the national Statutory Consultee. This would have triggered an earlier response from SGT.</p> <p>In general the proposals look to be unwelcome with the introduction of quasi-commercial activity to an isolated part of Norbury Park. The proximity of the Register site is not addressed in the submitted Design Statement which mostly seeks to downplay significance and impact assessments.</p> <p>The immediate location of the application site next to the Register boundary will impact severely on its setting along the field margins. It is accepted that the wooded character of the Register site is a mitigating factor but the introduction of vehicle movements, parked cars, the entrance hut, glamping huts, the services blocks and the potential numbers of campers on site would all seem to be to the physical and visual detriment of the adjoining Register site and, indeed, the wider Norbury Park.</p> <p>Don Josey On behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust</p>
Lower Gatton Park	Surrey	E18/0911	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing dwelling &amp; outbuilding and erection of new build replacement dwelling and ancillary accommodation with new soft and hard landscaping proposed. High Beeches, Gatton Bottom, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0TU. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.10.2018</b></p> <p>This comment is submitted on behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust. High Beeches sits within the widely drawn boundary of the Lower Gatton Park Historic Park or Garden Register site. The existing house of the 1960s was placed within Tower Wood part of the parkland and woodland setting of Gatton mansion and its pleasure grounds. (Register description - Park section).</p> <p>Some care has been taken in the design and location of the replacement dwelling to reduce its visual impact on the wider landscape of the Register site and on balance the impact seems, at the worst, comparable with the existing structures on the application site.</p> <p>Don Josey</p>

Brookwood Cemetery	Surrey	E18/0914	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The on-site remediation and processing of approx 7000 cubic metres of material in existing stockpiles, up to approximately 3 metres in height, including sorting, riddling, screening and crushing using mobile/temporary plant and equipment to create two landscaped terraces for future burials, with tree and shrub planting, habitat creation, footpaths, boardwalk, furniture, ancillary car parking, the making good of Eastern Avenue together with access alterations at junction of Chapel Avenue and Cemetery Pales. Brookwood Cemetery, Cemetery Pales, Brookwood, Woking, Surrey GU24 0BL.</p> <p>MINERAL EXTRACTION, CEMETERY</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.10.2018</b></p> <p>I refer to Jeffrey Ng's email consultation to the Gardens Trust dated 3 October.</p> <p>The Surrey Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust, the Statutory Consultee for Historic Parks and Gardens. I have corresponded with the conservation staff of the latter and this response is submitted on behalf of both organisations.</p> <p>During a recent visit member of SGT were pleased to see the results of ground clearance, rhododendron removal, and monument cleaning in the larger southern section of the extensive Cemetery. The application site is in the north section at its east end and alongside the railway. This general area is equally in need of renovation and its appearance is not helped by the waste material that was tipped here some years ago ostensibly for ground improvement.</p> <p>The current scheme has been well prepared with appropriate Design and Heritage Statements. It is accepted that there is little archival evidence for the detailed design of this northern area. The Register entry refers, by comparison with the south section, to a more open character with less evergreen planting. Eastern Avenue loops round with dissecting pathways, an arrangement that was in place and shown on OS plans of 1871/1882. The application site is to the north of this circular avenue between it and the railway, and is thus at the margin of the extensive cemetery.</p> <p>The creation of burial terraces seems to be a significant change in character by introducing height into an otherwise relatively flat landscape. However, the gradients of the terrace sides will reduce their visual impact and they will be partly masked by associated landscaping with new plantings of trees and shrubs. The terraces will also help define the outer limit of the cemetery.</p> <p>The proposals would seem to be acceptable from the parks and gardens point of view by reason of their design and location, with a localised physical and visual impact in a limited area of the extensive Register site. No doubt conditions will be imposed to ensure removal from the cemetery of any of the waste materials not used and/or unusable in the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Don Josey On behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust a member of the Gardens Trust</p>
--------------------	--------	----------	---	---	--

Spa Gardens, Royal Leamington Spa	Warwicks hire	E18/0731	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Improvements to existing municipal car park as part of the Leamington Spa car park displacement programme. Improvements include new asphalt surfacing, lighting, CCTV, pay machines and formalised parking bays. Car Park, Archery Road, Leamington Spa. PARKING, EXTERNAL LIGHTING</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on these applications. We apologise for the lateness of the response, but hope that you will bring this letter to the attention of your planning committee. We understand that both these applications are to be heard at the same committee meeting, so we have rolled our comments together to avoid unnecessary repetition.</p> <p>We are liaising with the statutory consultee, The Gardens Trust, in sending this objection to the applications. The objection primarily relates to the detrimental impact on Victoria Park, by reason of the loss of trees and the provision of additional lighting.</p> <p>You are well aware that Victoria Park is part of the Leamington Spa Gardens, registered at Grade II on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. The extension of the original 1985 designation of Jephson gardens to include the entirety of Leamington's riverside parks occurred in 1999. The designated area now runs from Newbold Comyn to the Princes Drive weir. The existing Princes Drive car park and Lodge are included in the designated area, although the CA boundary does not include both. The designation boundary oddly excludes much of the Archery Road car park (former tennis courts) but this is irrelevant to the determination of W18/1551 as the trees to be removed lie along this boundary and the impact of the parking is immediate.</p> <p>The park was procured to be the "People's Park" dedicated to that use in 1897 in celebration of the Queen's Jubilee. Its layout reflects its intended use for informal recreation, and although formal games (cricket and football, Association and Rugby) were played here, they did not preclude the use of the main central area of the park by the people at other times. Although the town successfully saw off the council's attempt to build an indoor bowling arena on the park, there has been a progressive erosion of the informal open space in recent years. However, such erosion cannot of itself be used to justify further damage to the park. Warwick District Local plans have included an exemplary policy for the protection of historic parks and gardens since 1995. It is distressing to see that other arms of the Council have no compunction in attempting to raid its own nationally or locally designated historic parks for other purposes</p> <p>Archery Road</p> <p>The former tennis courts have been the subject of earlier applications. We responded to application W13/0827 with an objection. In the event the proposal to resurface and mark out parking bays was deemed to be</p>
---	------------------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>permitted development and permission was granted for the present unworthy storage buildings. The accompanying statement assured that the availability of the parking would be restricted via permits and passes. In fact the bays were not marked out, but access appears not to be restricted.</p> <p>When seen in comparison with the 2013 application, the present one assumes a much greater magnitude. In order to produce a paltry number of parking spaces to make up a temporary deficit during the rebuilding of Covent Garden a row of trees which makes a significant contribution to the park is to be removed, leaving the cars exposed to full view, forming a considerable visual intrusion into the park. It will be many years before the proposed mitigation produces the desired effect. The council's agents wilfully misrepresent the arboricultural report. The line of trees is implied to be of less worth than that adjacent to the houses, though in fact the majority have been categorised as Category B and many require no remedial work. The whole point for the presence of the trees, to form a screen between the open area and the tennis courts (now the car park) has been ignored.</p> <p>We are surprised at the small consideration which has been given to the strong but constructive objection of the WCC landscape unit, while the Historic England "No comment" has been represented in your report as "No objection." It is well-known that HE only very seldom sends comments on Grade II assets, whether the proposals are objectionable or not.</p> <p>We also object to the provision of lighting. Although the new tennis courts are lit, that does not seem a justification for bringing yet more light into the park.</p> <p>Prince's Drive</p> <p>The present car park occupies the site of the former open air swimming pool. The land was acquired for the purpose by the then borough in 1889. It ceased to be used in 1928, left empty and was levelled after the war. The land for the park was acquired in 1897. As it currently exists, this car park is largely separated from the park by the early twentieth century lodge and its hedged garden, though the cars do impinge on the New /river Walk as it approaches the viaduct.</p> <p>In terms of visual impact the proposed work is not as objectionable as that to Archery Road. We do, however, have concerns at the potential for loss of category B trees arising from the work, particularly with regard to compaction of the roots as indicated in the arboricultural report. We are</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>also concerned that screening from the rest of the park is proposed by an earth bund, rather than continuation of the existing garden hedge.</p> <p>We also register objection to the proposed lighting, particularly along the northern perimeter. This is alien to the concept of a park and marks out the path as the route to a car park, rather than an important design element.</p> <p>General</p> <p>We also wish to comment on the council's general policy with respect to the Victoria Park car parks. The two current applications are termed part of the Covent Garden displacement strategy, then, rather less conspicuously, they are presented as part of a long term ambition to increase the number of parking spaces in the town overall. The only justification for the provision of car parks in parks must be to enable people to enjoy parks. At the moment neither of these car parks is shown on the WDC parking information and they are clearly mainly used by people wishing to visit the park. It appears that the car parks are now more widely known and becoming used for all-day (free) parking. In that case, a charging strategy with ticket machines, would be reasonable, to return the balance in favour of park users.</p> <p>The proposed pricing strategy has been spelled out in the Report to Executive of February this year and also in the summary submitted with W18/1551. The intention is clearly stated to use the financial "incentive" of very cheap all day parking to encourage use by commuters and shoppers. Although one of the beneficial impacts is said to be allowing residents greater access to parks by the provision of extra parking, the two benefits cannot co-exist, as the pricing strategy will ensure that the car parks are full by the time recreational users arrive. It is apparent that an increase in parking revenue is a major factor in the current applications.</p> <p>We therefore urge that both these applications be refused.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Christine Hodgetts</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Spa Gardens, Royal Leamington Spa	Warwicks hire	E18/0913	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed improvements to Victoria Park car park and change of use to Victoria Park Lodge garden to provide improved and extended car parking as part of the Leamington Spa car park displacement programme, including new lighting, CCTV, pay machine and additional parking spaces. Victoria Park Car park, Princes Drive, Leamington Spa. PARKING	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.10.2018</b> See response to E18/0731 above
Priory Park	West Sussex	E18/1011	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Temporary change of use to Christmas ice rink with ancillary food and drink uses, including the installation and removal of ancillary temporary structures. Priory Park, Chichester Castle, Priory Lane, Chichester PO19 1BL. VISITOR ATTRACTION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.10.2018</b> Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) has considered the above application. Whilst the Trust has reservations about the use of the park as envisaged in the application, it is recognised there would be public benefits that may justify approval. Detailed comments are shown below. Priory Park is recorded as an "Historic Park" at para 19.67 of the Chichester Local Plan (2014 - 2019), hence under the National Planning Policy Framework it is a "non-designated heritage asset". In determining the application, the Planning Authority should make a balanced judgement with regard to the scale of any adverse impact on the significance/ harm and any public benefits (NPPF para 135). The application does not include a "Statement of Significance" or an assessment of the effect of the proposals. The Trust considers the significance of the park is associated with the many listed historical buildings within and surrounding the park (Roman and medieval walls, Guildhall, the Motte, Priory Lodge and White Pavilion) - together these Heritage Assets have great Historical Significance; moreover, the park provides the setting for all of these and hence has great Aesthetic Significance. Additionally, the Park has great Evidential Significance because the site is thought to have extensive unexplored roman and medieval remains. As a public park it also has Communal Significance. The Trust has reservations about the use of the Priory Park for unrelated events which cause visual harm or physical damage to this non-designated heritage asset. In this case this application, the proposals, if approved, would cause harm to the Aesthetic Significance of the Park due to the visual impact and noise intrusion, which could be substantial harm during the

					<p>short period the ice rink is in use – and this has been reflected in the objections from some nearby residents. Nevertheless, the Trust recognises the use of the park as proposed for a short period during the quieter winter period might be acceptable, particularly if the public benefits are used to help fund the continued repair and maintenance of the park. There is a risk that grass and other garden features (ie trees, shrubs, plantings etc) could be damaged during the period the ice rink is used. For this reason, it is suggested any approval should include a condition that “the land should be restored to its condition immediately prior to the buildings being situated on the land by [say 31st March 2019]. This mirrors a condition attached to the approval of the Brighton ice rink; in practice we understand new turf is laid each year at Brighton.</p> <p>Yours faithfully  Jim Stockwell  On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust.</p>
St Ives Estate	West Yorkshire	E18/0860	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Reserved matters application for 28 dwellings approved by outline permission 15/01039/MAO requesting consideration of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping. Land At Harden Road And Keighley Road, Harden Road, Harden, Bingley, West Yorkshire.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee regarding the proposed development affecting St Ives Estate, a public park included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts regarding this application. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We refer to our letter of 21st May 2018 objecting to the previous application (REF: 18/00158/MAR) for this site which we considered would harm the significance of the Registered landscape of St Ives Estate due to the proposed urbanisation of its rural setting. We find that this application is an almost identical proposal to that refused by your council in August this year.</p> <p>St Ives Estate is a nationally important designed landscape, which was in the ownership of the Ferrand family for nearly 300 years. Between 1858 and 1889 it was developed by William Busfeild Ferrand as a romantic wild landscape "imbued with a variety of historical and mythical associations linking the past with the present. Conscientious enhancement of a naturally dramatic landscape reflects the fashion of the time for nature as a powerful force. It manifests in physical form its association with the philosophy of an important C19 Tory radical, a close friend of Disraeli and a</p>



					<p>leading member of the young England movement".</p> <p>This proposed site for housing, which bounds St Ives Estate, currently makes a positive contribution to the estate's significance through its rural character and is an important part of its setting, as seen from Harden Road and Keighley Road in Harden village. It is a prominent location and any development will particularly affect the setting of the western section of St Ives Estate which W B Ferrand was still improving in 1886 and where he noted 'his plantations were very fine in 1888', the year before he died.</p> <p>This new application appears to be extremely similar to the previous application (Ref:18/00158/MAR) and has not addressed our concerns about the harm the proposed development would cause to the significance of the Registered landscape of St Ives Estate.</p> <p>The layout and house types appear to have been imported as standard designs without any attempt to relate them to the local architecture and their proximity to a Registered park and garden.</p> <p>We note that the building materials appear unspecified, thus it is not obvious that this current proposal is for houses in the traditional regional stone with stone or slate roofs, or indeed any kind of stone.</p> <p>We thus again conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the setting through its position and scale. Particularly the proposed designs of the 3 storey houses for plots 12-17, 20- 25, would result in an urbanisation of this rural site and cause severe harm to the setting of the Registered park.</p> <p>We therefore consider that the proposed development would harm the significance of the Registered landscape of St Ives Estate, and strongly object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Chairman</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Shibden Hall	West Yorkshire	E18/0878	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Alter surface of the car park from grass to hard surface (retrospective). Shibden Park, Godley Lane, Halifax, Calderdale. PARKING	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee regarding the proposed development affecting Shibden Park, a nationally important public park included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts regarding this application. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The location of the car park is alongside the access drive to the lakeside car park and we understand that it has been in use as an overflow car park. As noted in the Heritage Statement, Shibden Park is the 'jewel in the crown of Calderdale' and is much used and loved by the community and visitors. We note however that there is no reference to the Conservation Management Plan for the park in the supporting statement and suggest that this should be consulted.</p> <p>From our knowledge this area should not have a notable impact on the significance of the historic landscape and the setting of grade II* Shibden Hall, however the use of road planings as a surface material is, in our view, not acceptable. Reinforced grass would be of a more appropriate quality and better in keeping with the historic landscape. A second option would be crushed stone (but not limestone chippings). If, having referred to the Conservation Management Plan it is considered to be acceptable to have a permanent car park in this location it is important to ensure that it is properly designed and of the same quality as the rest of the park where there has been significant investment in landscape restoration in recent years.</p> <p>Although we have no objection to the car park, we do object to this retrospective application as submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
<b>WALES</b>					
Iscoyd Park	Clwyd	W18/0018	II	PLANNING APPLICATION LISTED BUILDING CONSENT TO CONSTRUCT REPLACEMENT LARCH WOOD PERIMETER FENCING WITH A LIKE FOR LIKE DESIGN, SCALE AND FORM. ISCOYD PARK, HALL	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2018</b></p> <p>The Iscoyd Park planning application for replacement fencing came to the Welsh Historic Gardens Trust via The Garden Trust (TGT). WHGT has no objection to the proposed fencing.</p> <p>Regards Glynis Shaw (WHGT Clwyd)</p>

				GREEN, ISCOYD, WHITCHURCH	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------	--