



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES NOVEMBER 2018

The GT conservation team received 176 new cases in England and 8 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, 27 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and 10 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
Warmley House	Avon	E18/1032	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 6no. hardstanding bases for caravans (resubmission of PK18/0244/F). Kingsway Park, Tower Lane, Warmley, Bristol, South Gloucestershire. CAMPING	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.11.2018</b></p> <p>The Avon Gardens Trust notes that in this application the “Combined Proposed” plan is the same as the “Combined Existing” plan (i.e. the survey Drawing No. 1819 – 02b). So a proposed plan needs to be submitted. This is a serious omission, considering that the proposed development will affect a site included by Historic England on their Register of Parks and Gardens, being within the Grade II registered gardens and within the core of the Warmley Conservation Area.</p> <p>This proposed plan should show a realistic layout of the caravan park with the concrete bases specified by the make/type of caravan to be placed on them, and showing the parking spaces, refuse bin areas and gardens for the residents. Plans in the Silverback arboricultural report show two long and narrow bases which seem an unsuitable size and shape for a caravan. If a caravan does not fit on them, or if the areas for parking, bins and gardens are inadequate for the other four caravans, then these two bases should be omitted.</p> <p>The South Gloucestershire Local Plan, [SGC 2013], describes how applications for development which affect heritage assets and their</p>

					<p>settings directly or indirectly will need to describe the nature of the significance of the assets affected, and set out how development will maintain and enhance heritage assets and their settings in a manner appropriate to that significance. New development should seek opportunities to draw on the historic environment in order to maintain and enhance local character and distinctiveness.' [Policy CS9 8.8].</p> <p>No soft landscaping plans have been submitted, which were requested with the previous application. As the Siston Parish Council has suggested, consideration should be given to improved tree screening of both the northern and southern sides of the site.</p> <p>The Avon Gardens Trust object to this proposal and feel that if it is allowed, it will not only make maintenance of the Registered Park and Garden almost impossible, but it will further encroach upon this fragile site, detract from its significance and not make any positive step towards removing the site from the 'Heritage At Risk' register.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Tyntesfield	Avon	E18/1079	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Excavate and remove existing 5,000 litre compost run-off tank. Extend the excavation including the foundation slab and install a new 15,000 litre tank, reconnect all pipework, backfill and make good the surface. Land North West Of Wraxall Drive Lodge, Tyntesfield, Wraxall. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2018</b></p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal. We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. The proposed site for the excavation is within the registered Grade II* Tyntesfield Estate, on Historic England's Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.</p> <p>Having studied the application, the proposed excavation and works are shielded from any direct views of the heritage assets. Therefore we consider this proposal to cause less than significant harm to the registered garden.</p> <p>As previously notified to you, The Gardens Trust, which is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens is now working closely with County Gardens Trusts, and the responsibility for commenting on planning applications in this context has now passed to Avon Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
St Pauls Church, Yate	Avon	E18/1081	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of hard standing to form 9 No.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.11.2018</b></p> <p>SUMMARY: The Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal.</p>

				<p>additional parking spaces. St Pauls Church, Sundridge Park, Yate, South Gloucestershire BS37 4DX. PARKING</p>	<p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. St Pauls Church lies within a non-designated heritage asset as identified by South Gloucestershire Council. The asset comprises the gardens of Stanshawes Court Hotel, now part hotel and part public park known as Kingsgate Park, and is a locally registered garden in the gazetteer of Historic Parks and Gardens in Avon.</p> <p>We note that the area immediately around the church, and adjacent nursery and school, already has access roads, paths and parking spaces. The proposed parking spaces would be seen in the context of the existing buildings and hard surfaces and the impact to the wider park and garden would be limited. However, some of the proposed parking spaces are close to an existing tree or trees and full details of how existing tree roots would be protected have not been provided.</p> <p>As previously notified to you, The Gardens Trust, which is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens is now working closely with County Gardens Trusts, and the responsibility for commenting on planning applications in this context has now passed to Avon Gardens Trust.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Kings Weston House	Avon	E18/1097	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed change of use to D2 (recreation and leisure). Fairways, Penpole Lane, Bristol BS11 0EA. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2018</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust is a 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. On 24th May 2018 we wrote to you pointing out your original failure to consult us, and outlined our concerns about the YardArts group's proposals for filling the above site with their dome/big top and associated workshops, social area, spa/steam room and café. We are therefore extremely surprised and concerned that your internal notification processes seem to have failed a second time, as you have still omitted to notify us about the above application. The 'Constraints' section of your website has no reference to the fact that the whole area lies within the Grade II designated landscape of Kingsweston.</p> <p>The application includes amongst other things, 20 proposed residential caravans which the Design and Access statement describes as being "20</p>

					<p>plots for showman and their live-in vehicles, these will be spaced to allow residents to have either a garden or a parking space next to their plot.” This takes up a considerable proportion of the site and as such is a large incursion into the Grade II registered landscape of Kings Weston. We are concerned that if the caravans are considered ‘ancillary’, their numbers could creep up and cover yet more of the site. We already feel that the quantity proposed is too dominant. A permission for a D2 use of the land could result in any number, size and location of tents, marquees, caravans etc anywhere on the land including on the road frontage. This is completely inappropriate for a site within a Grade II RPG, which forms the setting of Grade I Kings Weston House.</p> <p>The red-edged site plan for which the permission is being sought is the whole site, including that in front of the warehouse (the subject of 18/02279/F currently under Appeal – which we note we also have not been informed about). If permission is granted with that site plan, the D2 use (and the ‘ancillary’ caravans) would be for that land as well and anyone, not just YardArts, could implement the D2 use in an even more intensive way.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building (Grade I listed Kings Weston House) or its setting (ie. the RPG), the local planning authority shall have special regard (our emphasis) to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 66(1)). The Courts have interpreted preservation as meaning to keep safe from harm. The statutory duty to have special regard to a listed building means that decision makers should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise. The considerable importance and weight applies to all harm, although with greater force the more important the listed building or setting. If harm is identified then there is a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>The Design and Access statement pays lip service to the importance of the designed historic landscape but is factually inaccurate. On p10, it states that ‘The site itself is not designated as part of the Historic Landscape’ and goes on to say ‘The designated boundary of the Listed Parkland does not represent the park as it is perceived or enjoyed today.’ Both these</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>statements are completely wrong.  The Gardens Trust feels that this application is entirely inappropriate for within a RPG, especially with the ambiguity about D2 use. We therefore OBJECT to 18/03220/F and urge your officers to refuse this application.  Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p> <p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2018</b>  Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust objects to this proposal because it would cause substantial harm to the designated heritage assets of Kings Weston, contrary to national and local planning policies. No public benefits from the development would outweigh this major harm.  The Avon Gardens Trust, formed in 1987, is part of The Gardens Trust which is the statutory consultee for proposals affecting sites on Historic England’s Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. One of its roles is to help safeguard the heritage of historic designed landscapes within the former County of Avon by advising local planning authorities on statutory and non-statutory parks, gardens and designed landscapes of importance. From its inception the Trust has been interested and concerned about the historic landscape of Kings Weston. The Trust’s first article about Kings Weston was used by Historic England as a reference in their Register entry for the Park.  Planning History  Contained within the red-edged application site and excluded from it is a former, single storey water reservoir building. In 1986 permission was granted for its conversion to “light storage use” with three parking spaces adjoining to the east having a right of access to Penpole Lane. This building is in a different ownership to the application site and is used by Karakal for the storage of racket sports equipment.  In 1987 English Heritage designated a small area of parkland around Kings Weston House as a Grade II Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest. A single storey, football changing room/social club known as Fairways was located between the Karakal building and Penpole Lane. In 1992 outline permission was given for its replacement on the same site by a single storey public house. The Fairways building was then demolished.  Subsequently English Heritage extended the boundary of the Kings Weston Park to include the whole parkland associated with Kings Weston, bringing</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the application site within the registered historic landscape.</p> <p>In 1994 the Government published Planning Policy Guidance 15 which advised local authorities to “protect registered parks and gardens in preparing development plans and in determining planning applications”.</p> <p>In 1997 the Council adopted the Bristol Local Plan which accorded with this Government advice by containing</p> <p>Policy NE9 “Historic parks and gardens and other designed landscapes of national and local importance defined on the Proposals Map and described in the Appendix will be protected. Development which would adversely affect the character or appearance of historic landscapes, and in the case of nationally important sites, their settings will not be permitted.” and</p> <p>Policy NE10 “...Priority will be given to pursuing restoration of the following historic landscapes (iii) Kingsweston House grounds”</p> <p>In view of these changed material considerations, in 1997 the Council refused the renewal of the outline permission for the public house due to its harmful effect on the Grade II registered Kings Weston House Park, on the setting of the Grade I listed Kings Weston House and on the Kings Weston and Trym Valley Conservation Area.</p> <p>An appeal against this decision was dismissed in 1998, the Inspector concluding that:</p> <p>“4. The buildings on the site have been demolished.....</p> <p>5. In <i>Iddendum v SSE</i> [1972]WCR 1433 it was held that a use cannot survive if the buildings necessary to sustain it are removed. It follows that any use rights, associated with the former public house, have been lost in planning terms.</p> <p>11. The appeal site is in a prominent position near to Shirehampton Road. The proposed development would introduce buildings and commercial activity into the heart of the registered Kingsweston Park. In my view the development would seriously intrude into, and harm, the spacious open parkland appearance and natural landscape character of Kingsweston Park contrary to Policy NE9 of the adopted Local Plan and national policy advice in paragraph 2.24 of PPG15. It would also harm the setting of Kingsweston House, a Grade I listed building, insofar as Kingsweston Park provides a fine and appropriate setting for the House, contrary to the aims of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>12. I reach these conclusions notwithstanding the presence of nearby buildings to which you refer, in particular the converted reservoir building (contained by the appeal site) and the two-storey pavilion to the west.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>These buildings detract from the appearance and character of Kingsweston Park. Nevertheless the proposed development would considerably add to the harm caused by built development even though it would screen these buildings to some extent. Moreover it would run counter to Policy NE10 of the adopted Local Plan under which the Council would well bring forward proposals for the removal of existing inappropriate buildings in “Kingsweston House Grounds”, such as the existing buildings referred to above.</p> <p>13. The Kingsweston and Trym Valley Conservation Area comprises the prominent ridge of land linking the villages of Shirehampton and Henbury, and contains the former estates of Kingsweston House and Blaise Castle House. Almost all the registered Kingsweston Park falls within the Conservation Area. Kingsweston Park makes a significant contribution to the fine quality of the landscape in the Conservation Area. Harming the character and appearance of Kingsweston Park would seriously harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) and Policy B13 of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>14. In summary the proposed development is contrary to policy in the development plan, contrary to the requirements of section 72(1), and contrary to national policy advice...</p> <p>15. There have been significant changes in material circumstances since the outline planning permission was granted in 1992. These changes fully justify a counter decision on this occasion.</p> <p>16. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I dismiss your client’s appeal.”</p> <p>In 2010, 2013 and 2014 applications were submitted for Use Class B1 and B8 enterprise units on the application site to the side and rear of the Karakal building. The last application was for 9,000 sq ft of floorspace. Objections were made by English Heritage, the Garden History Society, the Georgian Croup, the National Trust, the Council’s Conservation Advisory Panel, the Kings Weston Action Group, the Avon Gardens Trust, the Oasis Academy, the Shirehampton Cricket Club, local Councillors and members of the public.</p> <p>The Council refused all these applications, for reasons including:</p> <p>“2. The proposed development, by reason of the combination of its location, scale, character, and nature of use, would be detrimental to the function, historic interest and visual amenity of the Grade II registered park of the Kings Weston House Estate, the setting of the Grade I listed Kings</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Weston House and the Kingsweston and Trym Valley Conservation Area, contrary to Policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Bristol Local Plan Core Strategy (June 2011), and Policies DM26, DM27, DM29 and DM31 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014).”</p> <p>In 2011 the Kings Weston Action Group was formed to promote the conservation and enhancement of the historic, registered Kings Weston Park <a href="http://www.kwag.org.uk">www.kwag.org.uk</a> The Action Group has worked closely with English Heritage (now Historic England), and the Council and the National Trust as majority landowners of the Park, tirelessly championing the Park, undertaking physical restoration work, making new discoveries through their research, and holding exhibitions, tours and talks. As a result, the interest in the history of the Park and support for the future restoration of its key features is now huge.</p> <p>In 2014 the Action Group carried out the first phase of the restoration of the Great Avenue of lime trees shown on an engraving by Jan Kip circa 1710 and the estate map of 1720. The map shows the extent of the Great Avenue from the front of the Kings Weston House through to meet the top of Park Hill, Shirehampton. The Avenue passed through ‘The Circle’ from where other paths radiated out into the landscape. Some of the original Great Avenue planting remains along the carriage drive leading to King Weston House. The Group restored the corresponding arm of avenue trees, planting 15 lime trees, and the intention is to extend this avenue south west along its original alignment to the top of Park Hill.</p> <p>In 2014 the Council adopted the Kings Weston Estate Historic Landscape Conservation Management Plan, which officers had researched and drawn up in consultation with all stakeholders. The Preface says:</p> <p>“For the communities of Avonmouth, Shirehampton, Sea Mills, Lawrence Weston and Henbury, Kings Weston is a much loved local green space. For the wider city, the estate represents a major heritage and green infrastructure asset supporting Bristol’s credentials as European Green Capital 2015. With community support and partnership there are rich opportunities to make good past problems, to deliver sustainable heritage uses, promote healthy lifestyles and support lifelong learning. The Kings Weston Conservation Management Plan describes the history of the estate and how it has evolved. It sets out the ways in which the estate is valued, and provides a framework for conserving and enhancing those values. It offers an ambitious and clear set of conservation recommendations for the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>future care, management and promotion of the historic assets. We ask that landowners, tenants, developers and development control committee members take this conservation management plan into account when considering future changes in and around the Kings Weston estate.”</p> <p>In 2016 the Shirehampton War Memorial on the opposite side of Penpole Lane was designated as a Grade II listed building. The application site is within the setting area of the war memorial.</p> <p>In 2017 an application was submitted for the change of use of the site to Use Class B8 “Storage or distribution”. A plan showed 77 shipping containers in three rows to the side of the Karakal building, and two rows to the rear, 2.6 m high and clad with larch timber boards. This was refused for the reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed storage containers would be of a poor quality design, and would dominate the site - interrupting views into and out of the Kings Weston and Trym Valley Conservation Area, views of the Grade II listed War Memorial, and towards the Registered Park and Garden to the rear. As a consequence, the containers would result in substantial harm to the aforementioned heritage assets with no commensurate public benefit that would outweigh this harm. In addition, the containers would offer a poor response to the site which would fail to respond to (and to incorporate) existing land forms, green infrastructure assets and historic assets and features (including archaeology). The proposal is therefore contrary to the The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; the NPPF, policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Core Strategy 2011; and policies DM26 and DM31 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014.</li> <li>2. The proposal would introduce structures and activity which would impact directly on trees, and areas protected for their nature importance, with no supporting survey and with no proposed mitigation, and which has not been informed by the correct surveys required by National and Local Plan policy. It is therefore contrary to the NPPF, policy BCS9 of the Core Strategy 2011, and policies DM17 and DM19 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014.</li> <li>3. The proposal would result in increased transport movements on the site and its impacts have not been properly and fully explored within a Transport Statement. Essentially, the application has failed to provide key information on baseline travel data, multi-modal trip generation, an assessment on the impact on junctions, and robust visibility splays. The</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>proposal would therefore negatively affect the safe operation of the highway, and as a result, would fail to comply with the NPPF, policy BCS10 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM23 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014.</p> <p>In April 2018 permission was again sought for a B8 "Storage or distribution" use, with 20 shipping containers for self storage located between the Karakal warehouse and Penpole Lane, and the rest of the site used for customer car parking.</p> <p>Permission was refused for the reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed storage containers would be of a poor quality design, and when seen in the context of the existing warehouse on site, would dominate the site - interrupting views into and out of the Kings Weston and Trym Valley Conservation Area, the Registered Park and Garden, and harming the setting of the Grade II listed War Memorial. As a consequence, the containers would result in less than substantial harm to the forementioned heritage assets with no commensurate public benefit that would outweigh this harm. In addition, the proposal would offer a poor response to the site in terms of its failure to demonstrate that green infrastructure assets and historic assets and features could be incorporated. The proposal is therefore contrary to The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; the NPPF, policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Core Strategy 2011; and policies DM17, DM26 and DM31 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014.</li> <li>2. The application would introduce a risk to pedestrian safety and does not enable adequate mitigation to be provided for its impact in this regard. This impact is seen as severe in the context of the NPPF, as, although the number of trips associated with the development is seen to be minimal, any number of additional vehicles in this location would place pedestrians at risk due to the lack of space within the development application site to provide a public footway, and as a result, it would fail to comply with the NPPF, policy BCS10 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM23 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014.</li> </ol> <p>An appeal has been made against this decision.</p> <p>In April 2018 all vegetation was removed from the land to the rear of the Karakal warehouse and to its side from its roller shutter doors northwards (land which is designated as a Wildlife Corridor in the Bristol Local Plan.) Without planning permission the ground surface was raised by importing hardcore and gravel to form a new and level hard surface. This material</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>infilled the Georgian ha-ha running along the north and across the property boundary which was defined by an iron railing running along its bottom. The new hard surface extends over the rooting area and up to the trunks of some remaining trees threatening their future survival unless it is removed.</p> <p>Most of the trees and saplings and all the undergrowth along the east and north margins of the land were felled and cleared making the application site highly visible from the parkland, whereas previously it was well-screened.</p> <p>A 2 m high security fence was erected under permitted development rights along the north and east boundaries of the site and a portacabin brought onto the land.</p> <p>These works were in preparation for the use of this part of the application site by YardArts, a performing arts and circus organisation which in public consultation said was proposing to take a ten year lease of the land.</p> <p>Current Application</p> <p>This was registered for a “Proposed change of use to D2 (recreation and leisure)” with the application form saying the current use was a “B2 car park with porous hard standing and 2m fences.” The proposal has now been re-registered as an “Application for temporary change of use of land from B2 to sui generis for a period of two years...”</p> <p>However, the site has never had permission or been used for a B2 general Industrial use and so this is not correct. Also, no reason has been given by YardArts explaining why they now only need a two-year permission and that they will be relocating to a specific place after then.</p> <p>YardArts is a performing arts company which proposes to create “The YardArts Village” using it as a training, teaching and workshop venue, with a 7m high,10 m wide, cream canvas-covered geodome for public performances, training and workshops, associated car parking, 20 residential plots for travelling showpeople, and welfare facilities in the portacabin already on the site. They say that permission for a café and workshops will be applied for in a later stage. During public consultation a social area for residents with a steam room, jacuzzi and sauna was also proposed. The company would have one full-time and five part-time employees on the site.</p> <p>An indicative plan shows 20 caravans at the back of the site separated by a fence from the geodome. The residents would have parking alongside their caravans, and there would be parking for six cars and five cycles at the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>front part of the site. An event at the dome would be held once a month. With about 60% of the tickets being sold, and some customers car-sharing or coming by public transport it is predicted that the events would generate only 20 vehicles a month. No opening hours for the events are given.</p> <p>The public benefit offered would be the use of the geodome by the local community for events and workshops.</p> <p>The application is deficient in not giving accurate and sufficient details to fully assess the proposal.</p> <p>Designated Heritage Assets</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Grade II registered, Kings Weston House Park, a historic landscape of national importance described by Historic England as “A mid to late C18 park, laid out with advice from Lancelot Brown, containing the remains of a formal layout dating from Sir John Vanbrugh’s early C18 redevelopment of an earlier site”. The Park is the designed setting of the Sir John Vanbrugh-designed Grade I listed House. It contains three other buildings designed by Sir John Vanbrugh which are also Grade I listed (the Loggia, Brewhouse and Echo), two Grade II* listed buildings designed by Robert Mylne (the Stables, and the two lodges, pool and walled garden) and fourteen Grade II listed buildings (eg the five Lodges to the Park and the ice house). Apart from the application site and the Karakal building which are in private ownership, the 220 acres of the Park are owned either by the Council or (south of Shirehampton Road) the National Trust, and are accessible to the public either as a public park or by using public footpaths.</li> <li>2. The Grade I Listed Kings Weston House, designed by Sir John Vanbrugh for Edward Southwell and built in 1712-19. Grade I Listed Buildings are of “exceptional interest, sometimes considered to be internationally important. Just 2.5% of Listed Buildings are Grade I” (Historic England). The House is accessible to the public through its use for corporate and private events, and as a café.</li> <li>3. The Grade II Listed Shirehampton War Memorial. Historic England’s reasons for its designation were : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Historic interest: as an eloquent witness to the tragic impacts of world events on this community, and the sacrifices it has made during the First World War;</li> <li>* Architectural interest: a well-crafted cross design in dressed stone to the design of Ernest Newton;</li> <li>* Intactness: the structure is largely unaltered;</li> <li>* Group value: it provides an additional feature of note within the Kingsweston Estate (Registered at Grade II) dating from the ownership</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>of the philanthropist Philip Napier Miles.”</p> <p>History : The war memorial to the men of Shirehampton Parish who died in the First World War was designed by Ernest Newton CBE RA FRIBA and constructed on land given to the parish by Philip Napier Miles of Kings Weston House. The house served as a military hospital during the First World War. The memorial was unveiled by Brigadier-General C. G. Bruce CMG DSO on 4 September 1921 and dedicated by the Archdeacon of Bristol.”</p> <p>4. The Kingsweston and Trym Valley Conservation Area, covers the historic registered Parks of the Kings Weston and Blaise Castle Houses and provides an area of quasi-rural character within the urban area of Bristol.</p> <p>National Policies</p> <p>Paragraphs 132 and 133 of the National Planning Policy Statement say 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 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.”</p> <p>“Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss...”</p> <p>Local Policies</p> <p>The Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011: Policy BCS22 Conservation and the Historic Environment “Development proposals will safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including: Historic Parks and Gardens both nationally and locally listed”</p> <p>The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 : Policy DM31: Heritage Assets “Development that has an impact upon a heritage asset will be expected to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the asset or its setting. Registered Historic Parks and Gardens: Development will be expected to have no adverse impact on the design, character, appearance or settings of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>registered historic parks and gardens and to safeguard those features which form an integral part of their character and appearance.” The Policies Map shows the application site as being in the ‘Registered Parks and Gardens’ boundary of Kings Weston.</p> <p>The Kings Weston Historic Landscape Conservation Management Plan 2014 (p 86) :</p> <p>“The privately owned Karakal warehouse occupies unused land between Shirehampton Park and the Twyford Cricket Club. The warehouse is a single storey, utilitarian business unit, with associated informal car parking and a large subsoil heap stockpiled at the rear of the warehouse. The informal car parking lies within the line of the Great Avenue that extended from Kings Weston House.”</p> <p>Policies for the Penpole Lane part of The Little Park (p 124) :</p> <p>“Strengths: Hedgerows and hedgerow trees reinforce a rural landscape character. Sense of enclosure offered by surrounding trees structure Weaknesses: Presence of Karakal industrial units/uses within the designated historic landscape and close to the historic avenue. Opportunities: Potential to relocate the Karakal warehouse off site and to reintegrate the land within the designed historic landscape Vulnerability: Future re-development, expansion and/or intensification of the sports ground and industrial sites</p> <p>General Conservation Management Policies:</p> <p>a Maintain the semi-rural character of Penpole Lane b Consider reintegration of the Karakal warehouse area within the historic landscape should the opportunity arise through relocation of the business off site and return of the land to public open space c Prevent further visual and physical impact of built features on the designed historic landscape, particularly the principal axis from The Circle</p> <p>Specific policy for site LP7 Karakal warehouse: Conserve and maintain Penpole Lane hedgerow and trees. Consider reintegration of the Karakal site within the historic landscape should the opportunity arise”</p> <p>Assessment of Proposal</p> <p>The proposal has already had a damaging effect on the landscape of the Kings Weston Park by the owner preparing for YardArts by the removal of the boundary trees, saplings and undergrowth on the land and particularly along its east and north sides. The Karakal building was previously well-screened by this planting to public view from these directions, and having no signs or lighting its impact on the landscape was minimal. Now the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>building and the application site are highly visible to public view from the Park, particularly by people using the adjacent footpaths. The view from Penpole Lane of the rear half of the site is now of an unsightly expanse of hardstanding rather than attractive vegetation.</p> <p>The applicants say that the 20 plots for the showpeople and their live-in vehicles would have little to no impact on the view from the street, and due to the coverage of the trees and 2m fences only the very top of the tallest units will be visible from the park. Only the very top of the geodome would be visible from the road, and being a cream colour it will have limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>Due to the openness of the land to the Park and to the Lane, this would not be the case. The caravans or live-in vehicles, the geodome, and the employees' vehicles and other YardArts vehicles of an unknown size and number parked on the front part of the land would all be visible from the Park and Lane.</p> <p>Furthermore, as the caravans and geodome do not need planning permission because they do not have foundations they could be placed elsewhere in the red-edged site plan, including adjoining Penpole Lane. Additional structures also not needing permission, like marquees and stalls, could also be brought onto the land increasing the site coverage of the development and its visibility.</p> <p>YardArts say that performances at the geodome for the public would take place once a month. However, this frequency does not seem financially viable for the 20 showmen to make a living. It's likely therefore that performances would be held more often than that. The geodome could also be sublet to other groups, with the possibility that it could be used daily, making this a very intensive use.</p> <p>No provision is being made for off street, public car parking so vehicles would have to be parked in Penpole Lane or Shirehampton Road, close to this difficult junction. YardArts predict there would be 20 vehicles per performance, but this also seems an underestimate. This number is likely to be much more, especially if there were outdoor and daytime events as well. There would be no planning control over the number of vehicles brought to these roads by visitors to the Village.</p> <p>The signs to advertise YardArts, the lighting of the site both for public events and for the showpeople, and late evening noise and disturbance from vehicles and traffic would add to the harm caused by the proposal. As a result this objectional use would be most damaging to the heritage</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>assets referred to above. In particular the peaceful, natural background and setting of the listed Shirehampton War Memorial on the opposite side of Penpole Lane would be disturbed and harmed by it. Remembrance Sunday services are held here every year to honour those who lost their lives in the two World Wars.</p> <p>The community benefit offered by YardArts of a venue for performances and workshops has been overwhelmingly rejected by the local community. There are plenty of venues locally that the community uses.</p> <p>“The YardArts Village” has no connection to or association with Kings Weston House and its Park. It has no need to be located in such an important historic environment, and could be sited elsewhere without causing such harm.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that “The appeal site is in a prominent position near to Shirehampton Road. The proposed development would introduce buildings and commercial activity into the heart of the registered Kingsweston Park. In my view the development would seriously intrude into, and harm, the spacious open parkland appearance and natural landscape character of Kingsweston Park....It would also harm the setting of Kingsweston House, a Grade I listed building, insofar as Kingsweston Park provides a fine and appropriate setting for the House....” This would be the case for the YardArts Village too.</p> <p>The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies BCS22, DM31, and the CMP policies to “Maintain the semi-rural character of Penpole Lane” and “Prevent further visual and physical impact of built features on the designed historic landscape, particularly the principal axis from The Circle” No such “clear and convincing justification” for the proposed storage use has been made nor would any “substantial public benefits” result.</p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Management Plan’s policy is to “Consider reintegration of the Karakal warehouse area within the historic landscape should the opportunity arise through relocation of the business off site and return of the land to public open space”. Future funding may well be forthcoming to enable the Council to buy the whole site, demolish the warehouse and return the land to open parkland.</p> <p>However, if permission is given for “The YardArts Village” this restoration of the historic landscape will not be possible.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Avon Gardens Trust considers the proposal would not conserve but cause serious harm to the nationally important, Kings Weston designated</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>heritage assets, and would conflict with both the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Policies particularly those of its Conservation Management Plan. We urge the Council to refuse planning permission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p> <p>References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Planning Inspectorate's letter dated 12.05.98 ref.T/APP/Z0016/A/97/289338</li> <li>2. Kings Weston Estate Historic Landscape Conservation Management Plan p 2 Preface p 7 Site Features, p 16 and 17 1712 : The Kip Engraving, p 28 and 29 The Halett survey 1720, p 86 The Little Park, p 124 Conservation Management Policies The Little Park and p 150 Appendix B: Gazetteer The Little Park.</li> </ol>
Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E18/1043	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of detached car port. Gardens House, Queen Street, Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire HP18 0JW. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2018</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have reviewed this application for a new detached carport adjacent to Gardens House which sits within the Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Waddesdon Manor. The new proposed site has been moved from beneath a tree, immediately opposite an existing ancillary building and opening west towards the house. We are unclear why it was deemed necessary to relocate the carport. There were no arboricultural concerns recorded on the website. In our opinion the previous position was preferable as it contained the garage within the immediate domestic curtilage rather than pushing that into the garden. The revised site has the garage swivelled on its axis, facing south and stepped north of the building line, more in the garden. Whilst we would prefer that this garage were not constructed, we acknowledge that this design does not damage the significance of the RPG any more than having cars already parked in front of the house, although it is of course more permanent.</p> <p>We therefore offer this merely as a comment for your officers to bear in mind when considering this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E18/1020	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning consent 13/2935M for siting, design, appearance and landscaping details for residential development (C3 Use Class). LAND NORTH OF PARKGATE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, PARKGATE LANE, KNUTSFORD, CHESHIRE. RESIDENTIAL	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2018</b></p> <p>Response as per 18/2104M</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. Please accept my apologies for the very late submission of our comments.</p> <p>As previously notified to you, the Gardens Trust, which is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with County Garden Trusts to comment on planning applications and fulfil this statutory role. For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication, The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2016), available at <a href="http://thegardenstrust.org/">http://thegardenstrust.org/</a>.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>We have lodged an objection to a previous application to vary Condition 4 as we consider that the significance and setting of the adjoining registered landscape could be affected by the increases in height of the proposed houses which this variation would allow.</p> <p>The current submission provides proposed details in relation to the original approved scheme. We have assessed the likely effect of the proposals on the character and setting of Tatton Park, and in relation to the objectives that were set out in the outline application. Unfortunately, we have concerns about this application too, as set out below, and would recommend that it is refused.</p> <p>Proposed character of the development</p> <p>The proposed housing is far too urban in character for this greenfield site next to a historic parkland which is nationally of 'more than special historic interest'. Only one small residential character area in the plan shown on page 8 of the Design Statement dated April 2018 is 'semi-rural'. We would like to see a more sensitive and lower-key approach to development in keeping with the need to retain as much as possible of the currently rural ambience of the Tatton Park setting. Since this new development will be isolated from the rest of Knutsford it could be treated as a village, which seems to have been the original approach (see references to 'Village South', 'Village East' etc on the plan in page 12 of the Design Code dated</p>

					<p>July 2013) rather than a central part of a town. It does not need to have a very urban character because there is an industrial estate to the south, nor does it need to 'make a statement'.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Chatsworth	Derby shire	E18/1002	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Improvements and expansion of the existing car park associated with Chatsworth House, together with the creation of a new access road via a spur off the existing A619/A621 roundabout east of Baslow. PARKING,</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Chatsworth 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 I.</p> <p>It is clear from the documents submitted with this application that the current parking arrangements are insufficient and unsatisfactory, leading to the unwelcome build up of traffic, congestion in Baslow, possible damage to the Grade I Three Arch Bridge, as well as occasional overflow parking to the west of the house. The GT welcomes the careful consideration given to overcoming these problems. We feel that the new entrance off the A619, the removal of pay kiosks from the north front, the resulting improvements in traffic flow and the increase of pay kiosks at the northern end of the car park extension will outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to the setting and significance of the Grade I RPG. The Gardens Trust SUPPORTS this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung 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><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.10.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust on the Historic Impact Assessment in relation to the above application.</p> <p>We would comment on the Historic Impact Assessment as follows: The report is obviously attempting to make the case that the proposed development would be acceptable by downplaying the comments made by both the Devon Gardens Trust and East Devon District Council's Conservation Officers.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory</p>

					<p>Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and responds on behalf of The Gardens Trust to consultations in the County of Devon. The Gardens Trust is the acknowledged authority on historic parks and gardens. The DGT Conservation Officer has 20 years experience of advising local planning authorities about development proposals affecting historic parks and gardens in Devon and, as the Garden History Society's Conservation Officer for the SouthWest Region for over 9 years, this experience extended across the whole of the South West.</p> <p>Whilst the Devon Gardens Trust (DGT) speaks for the historic landscapes in Devon, many of its members have a far wider experience of historic designed landscapes. The DGT Trustees include a former National Trust senior curator and the former National Trust head gardeners of Saltram and Knightshayes, the Director of Grounds of Exeter University, former Chartered Town Planners, an eminent local architect as well as several garden historians.</p> <p>The planning application for the luxury cabins was discussed by the full Council of Management of the Devon Gardens Trust on 10 October 2018 and all the Trustees agreed that the proposal was unacceptable.</p> <p>This is the Minute of the meeting:</p> <p>'John Clark, (DGT) Conservation Officer reported on his visit that morning to Sidbury Manor to meet with George Cave to discuss the planning application for three holiday cabins in the walled garden. CoM noted that the landscape at Sidbury Manor was of sufficient national importance to be on the Historic Register of Parks and Gardens, the walled garden being particularly fine. It was agreed that DGT should not support the proposal, also that Michael Hickson would write to George Cave (as he had originally written to Michael) reaffirming the Trust's position, noting that perhaps consideration might be given to another site on the estate for the cabins.'</p> <p>The DGT considers that the walled gardens are of considerable architectural, aesthetic and historic significance; they could well be unique because of their particular design, terraced into the hillside, with large underground water tanks.</p> <p>We must dispute the conclusions of the Historic Impact Assessment that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the walled garden. We consider that the Historic Impact Assessment underestimates the significance of the heritage assets and harm that the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>development would cause. We find it incredible that the Historic Impact Assessment suggests that a 2m x 2m x 2m excavation to install a 'biodisc' type sewage processing plant would be acceptable, or that consideration should be given to siting the said sewage processing plant in one of the large underground water tanks which are a unique feature of the gardens. Sidbury Manor is, without doubt, of National interest and should be included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The parkland relates to a previous house on the site; it dates from the eighteenth century and was well established before the current house was built in 1879. The site has connections with Sir Stephen Cave, a significant member of Disreali's cabinet of 1870 and the eminent architect and garden designer, Walter Frederick Cave. And the site has strong group value.</p> <p>Walter Frederick Cave FRIBA(1863-1939), the son of Sir Charles Daniel Cave, was articled to Sir Arthur Blomfield. He was responsible for numerous garden designs, including Tyntesfield, Sidbury Manor, and Sherwood. He worked in the Arts and Crafts style and Classical Revival, as exemplified at the Orangery at Tyntesfield.</p> <p>His first garden was designed in 1896 for Antony Gibbs of Tyntesfield in North Somerset. The gardens at Tyntesfield, known as the Lady Garden and the Jubilee Garden were adjacent to the walled kitchen garden just as was to be done at Sidbury Manor a few years later. Such gardens were intended as the final delight at the end of a stroll. Within the Lady and Jubilee Gardens at Tyntesfield were included an Orangery, a Loggia, a Bothy, garden offices and a range of glasshouses.</p> <p>Walter Cave's first Devon garden at Sidbury Manor was for a Rose Garden, separate from the house, but built on terraces on the slope below the already in place kitchen gardens. The latter were walled and contained substantial glasshouses and a range of workshops, offices and bothies. Though only the footings of the glasshouses remain the walls still stand, the offices and bothies are in good condition. The materials in the construction of the Rose Garden were brick and Ham Hill stone, which relate to those of the house and those previously used to build the earlier kitchen gardens. The lowest terrace designed by Cave had a tennis court, followed by the Rose Garden terrace with a fine balustraded staircase to the next level where there were two parallel ranges of glasshouses. The terraces fit into the sequence ascending the slope to the walled kitchen garden. Behind the substantial retaining walls are four cisterns, built to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>feed the fountains. The whole five level complex of tennis court, Rose Garden, glasshouses, bothies and kitchen gardens are a 'set piece' and must be considered as an entity in terms of architectural and garden design.</p> <p>Judith Patrick wrote an article on Walter Cave, FRIBA and his Two Devon Gardens for the DGT Journal Issue 2 in September 2009, as a precursor for her book of the same name, published some years later. I sent you the extract from DGT Journal - Issue 2 September 2009 by email on 12 October</p> <p>Sidbury Manor has all the hallmarks of a Registered landscape: entrance lodges, a long winding drive through picturesque parkland in the English Landscape style, a balustraded bridge, a manor house sited to take advantage of the fine views across the valley to Sidmouth in the distance, a stable bock, a balustrade lower terrace, a lake, an arboretum and a Victorian garden by Walter Cave screening the walled gardens which are terraced into the hillside above the house.</p> <p>The manor house with its lower balustrade terrace and the stable bock were designed by David Brandon and built in 1879 of brick and Ham Hill stone; these structures, together with the Rose Garden &amp; walled garden complex have group value. Only the Manor house including the conservatory and screen wall to the west, forecourt railings, gates and piers, are listed Grade II on the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. But this is because, at the date of the listing by English Heritage, the emphasis was on the principal building. We have no doubt that if Historic England were to revisit Sidbury Manor, these group value buildings and the balustrade bridge would be added to the List.</p> <p>In 1999 English Heritage commissioned The Devon Gardens to carry out a Review of historic designed landscapes in Devon. The Review was commissioned, supervised and fully discussed with Friddy Duterloo-Morgan, the English Heritage Inspector responsible for the Register at that time, who stated that Sidbury Manor and a number of the other identified sites were of national importance and should be added to the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. However, English Heritage, now Historic England, have not had the resources to add further sites to the Register and will only give consideration to sites which are actually threatened by development proposals.</p> <p>The fact that Sidbury Manor has not been yet added to the Historic England Register does not detract from Sidbury Manor, including its walled gardens being of the highest significance. We would suggest that as</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Sidbury Manor is now under threat from this development, it would be appropriate for East Devon District Council to make an application to Historic England to add the site to the Register. A concurrent application should also be made to add the lower balustrade terrace, the stable bock, the Rose Garden, together with the walled garden and balustraded bridge to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest as a matter of urgency, before the planning application is determined.</p> <p>The late Victorian walled gardens at Sidbury Manor are magnificent. They are an excellent example of how walled kitchen gardens should be maintained, in accordance with the long standing advice of The Garden History Society (now The Gardens Trust), which is that the preferred option for walled kitchen gardens that are no longer viable for their original purpose should be grassed over with the walls and paths maintained in good condition. We find it difficult to reconcile the many improvements that have been made to the Sidbury estate with the current proposal. In particular, the Rose Garden has been transformed in recent years and the hard surface of the tennis court has been removed and replaced with grass.</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). Para 131 of the NPPF states: '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>The Devon Gardens Trust, acting on behalf of The Gardens Trust, has considerable expertise in advising local planning authorities on development proposals affecting historic designed landscapes and would suggest that, in view of our combined knowledge and expertise, our advice on this proposal should be given greater weight than the conclusions of the Historic Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust is concerned about the adverse impact of the proposed development, which would severely detract from the character and appearance of this historic landscape. We advise that the proposal to install three 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. We would suggest that your Planning Committee</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>might consider visiting the site before making a decision on the planning application in order to see for themselves the historic and aesthetic significance of the gardens. We would be happy to accompany the Committee, if you felt that this would be appropriate.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Creedy Park	Devon	E18/1066	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline for the erection of up to 65 dwellings, public open space, ancillary works and associated infrastructure, including access. Land at NGR 282727 100936, Higher Road, Crediton, Devon. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 13 November 2018, consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Creedy Park, an historic designed landscape included on the Devon Gazetteer of parks and gardens of local historic interest. The site is one of some thirty sites in the county identified as being of national interest which should be included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Unfortunately, Historic England currently do not have the resources to add further sites to the Register unless they are threatened by development.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and responds to consultations on its behalf in the county of Devon.</p> <p>We have visited the site of this application and have studied the planning application documents on your web site. The reason that the above site is not allocated for development in the Mid Devon Local Plan is patently obvious. We wish to OBJECT to the above planning application and would ask you to consider the following comments:</p> <p>Crediton is a small market town, situated in the narrow vale of the River Creedy, between two steep hills and is divided into two parts, the north or old town and the south and east or new town. South east of the town, on a ridge overlooking the river, is Downes, a 17th century country house, remodelled in the 18th century and set in an historic designed landscape. It was the birthplace of Sir Redvers Buller whose family were lords of the manor of Crediton. To the north east of Downes lies Shobrooke Park, which is a Grade II Registered park and garden. From the parkland of Shobrooke Park there are views of Creedy Park and vice versa. All three gardens and parks are in the English landscape style and, as was often the case with 18th century designed landscapes, they 'borrow' each others' landscapes with inter-visibility between them.</p>



					<p>Crediton expanded up the steep hillsides in the 20th century, but did not extend beyond Higher Road, a country lane acting as an 'outer by-pass' to Crediton. The lane is narrow with high Devon banks containing mature oak trees. Higher Road runs along and then just below the ridge of the hill. The application site is a field approximately 500m long and 65m wide to the north of Higher Road, which forms the southern border of the site. The northern border is Long Plantation, shown as Ancient Woodland in the Mid Devon Local Plan. The land falls from west to east. The application site is on higher ground than the 20th century houses to the south of Higher Road, as can be seen from the contours on the OS Map (See below).</p> <p>To the north east of the application site is Creedy Park, situated in a secluded valley between Crediton and Sandford. The mansion was built in 1846 by William Burn for Colonel H R Ferguson-Davie but was destroyed by fire in 1915 and rebuilt in 1916-21 by Walter Sarel for Arthur Ferguson-Davie. Henry Walter Molyneux Sarel used the name Walter Sarel in his professional career as an architect. Seven of his architectural commissions had some involvement by Gertrude Jekyll in their garden layouts or planting schemes. There are also a few sites where he is said to have designed gardens contemporary with his architectural work. The Creedy Park mansion was converted into thirteen residential units by Lucas, Roberts &amp; Brown, c1982.</p> <p>Creedy Park was laid out in the English landscape style with extensive woodland on the perimeter hillsides, sheltering the mansion and screening it visually from the adjacent village of Sandford to the north and Crediton to the south. The stone boundary walls of the park survive, although in need of repair in places. The small lake is now used for fishing. There were two carriage drives from the East and West Lodges; the principal approach was from the East Lodge but today the approach is along the secondary carriage drive from the West Lodge; the drive from the East Lodge can still be discerned. There are walled kitchen gardens to the north of the house, the smaller one unfortunately is now a garage court, there are 'allotment gardens' for the residents in another, and a modern house has been built along the north wall of the largest walled garden. North of the house there is a Rookery and woodland forming part of the pleasure grounds with some specimen trees, and to the south open parkland with specimen and small clumps of trees. There are formal gardens near the house with stone balustraded walls.</p> <p>Polwhele noted in 1793 that it '... is delightfully situated in a large park</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>which is surrounded by a strong wall.’ Three years later Revd John Swete visited Creedy and wrote that, ‘The situation at Creedy is fine, surrounded by what was a park, but what had been converted by the late baronet, who was a great practical agriculturist, into pasture grounds. The whole consisting of [-] acres he had surrounded by a wall at a vast expense, which rendering the grounds more compact and less liable to being trespassed on did not add to the picturesque; there was not much variety in the disposition of the lawn, and though there was a good deal of timber wood and many clumps dispersed about it, yet there was something in the general appearance, which betrayed neglect or inattention which is not usually met with around seats of similar consequence.’ White (1850) noted that it was, ‘... delightfully situated on the west bank of the River Creedy . . . The mansion, built by the first baronet, has been frequently altered, and has still a modern appearance.’ While Stockdale described it as, ‘... a handsome spacious mansion very delightfully situated on a gentle eminence, in an extensive park about 3 miles in circumference.’</p> <p>A copy of the Report on Creedy Park by Nicholas Pearson Partnership which details the historic development of Creedy Park was sent to your office last week by email. Its conclusions note that ‘Creedy Park merits inclusion on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it was laid out between 1750 and 1840. This layout survives and reflects the original design;</li> <li>• the formal gardens are attributed to W A Nesfield and were, if so confirmed, laid out at a time when his work was at its most influential;</li> <li>• Creedy Park has a notable group value with Shobrooke Park and Downes;</li> <li>• recent research has added significantly to the documentary evidence for the site;</li> <li>• although the house was rebuilt 1916-1921, a full range of late eighteenth-century landscape features including park wall, lodges, fishing lodge, ponds and circuit paths survive;</li> <li>• the natural topography and productive landscape which provides the historic and natural setting to Creedy Park, Shobrooke and Downes together survives, albeit that it has been eroded at Shobrooke and Downes by development, which also now threatens the setting of Creedy Park;</li> <li>• Creedy Park remains in reasonable condition, with only quite small</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>component areas lost irreversibly, at present;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The distinctive fine oaks and grassed-over sunken road routes have been key elements of the character of Creedy Park and remain in generally good condition.’ The Gardens Trust disputes the conclusion of ‘The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’: “The assessment has shown that landscape impacts would be largely as a result of the addition of built form on the Site. Due to the scale, location and nature of the development it is not considered that this change will result in an important impact on the character of the wider study area or the more sensitive local landscapes such as the Shobrooke Park and Creedy Park to the north and east. Due to these factors, along with the proposed scale of the development, impacts are not considered important at a regional level.”</li> </ul> <p>‘The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’ accompanying the planning application for the proposed development of the land at Higher Road, Crediton, includes a map showing Creedy Park and Shobrooke Park, which is Grade II on the Historic England Register. But the impact of the proposed development on these historic landscapes is not evaluated in the Zones and Visual Influence section of the Assessment, save for a mention of the view from a footpath in Shobrooke Park (Viewpoint 18: Users of permitted footpath on Shobrooke Estate, Figure 2).</p> <p>Long Plantation is visible from the historic carriage drive to Creedy Park and we are concerned that the applicant fails to acknowledge the potential impact on this designed landscape.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust would draw your attention to the photograph illustrating Viewpoint 14 - Users of PRow Crediton Footpath 10. This clearly shows that the existing houses in Higher Road Crediton are on the skyline to the north of Crediton. Therefore, the proposed 65 new houses being on higher land would be on the skyline from the other side of the hill looking toward Crediton including when viewed from the carriage drive to Creedy Park, where the development would be seen through the Ancient Woodland of the Long Plantation particularly from November to April.</p> <p>We share the concerns of The Woodland Trust about the Long Plantation but would further argue that trees have a limited life and are subject to weather conditions and climate change. The Great Storm of 15-16 October 1987, when hurricane force winds (up to 120mph gusts) decimated huge swathes of woodland across England, having a disastrous impact on many historic<sup>[1]</sup> designed landscapes across the south of England. This ‘once in 200-year’ storm was repeated on 25-26 January 1990 which had a more</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>dramatic impact on the south west. Climate change is a factor that must be borne in mind and the potential for more major storms. If Long Plantation were to be lost, in whole or in part, the proposed houses at Higher Road would form the skyline to Creedy Park, causing substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets of Creedy Park.</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>The application site is not allocated for development in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Part 3 Development Management Policies of the Local Plan, adopted October 2013, states: Development affecting heritage assets Heritage assets and their settings are an irreplaceable resource. Accordingly, the Council will: a) Apply a presumption in favour of preservation in situ in respect of the most important heritage assets. b) Require development proposals likely to affect heritage assets and their settings, including new buildings, alterations, extensions, changes of use and demolitions, to consider their significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness, and the opportunities to enhance them. c) Only approve proposals that would be likely to substantially harm heritage assets and their settings if substantial public benefit outweighs that harm or the requirements of paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework are met. d) Where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, that harm will be weighed against any public benefit, including securing optimum viable use.</p> <p>e) Require developers to make a proportionate but systematic assessment of the impact on setting as set down in the guidance from English Heritage: "The Setting of Heritage Assets", 5.1 The historic environment is an asset of great cultural, social, economic and environmental value. It contributes significantly to our quality of life and to the character of the district, representing a non-renewable resource that once lost is gone forever. Heritage assets are defined as those parts of the historic environment that have significance because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest over and above their functional utility and covers both designated and non-designated assets. 5.4 Proposed development that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>would lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset will be assessed against national policy, which requires that such proposals should be refused unless there are substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 133 states that, ‘... where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to, or total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.’ We consider that the proposals would not constitute substantial public benefit to outweigh the harm to the significance of the setting of Creedy Park. The NPPF defines ‘conservation’ as the process of managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains, and where appropriate, enhances its<sup>[SEP]</sup>significance. The proposed development would considerably harm the significance of the heritage assets and therefore should not be permitted. We would advise that the proposal for the erection of up to 65 dwellings, public open space, ancillary works and associated infrastructure, including access, on land at NGR 282727 100936 Higher Road, Crediton, would harm the<sup>[SEP]</sup>significance of the heritage asset of the nationally important historic designed landscape of Creedy Park.</p> <p>In conclusion, the proposed development would clearly conflict with the policies of the adopted Mid Devon Local Plan and the National Planning Policy<sup>[SEP]</sup>Framework with regard to the conservation of the historic environment and therefore we must urge your Council to refuse the planning application for the proposed development.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Dipl TP (Dist) (Leeds) Conservation Officer</p>
Danbury Park	Essex	E18/1126	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 11 Log Cabins. Danbury Outdoors, Well Lane, Danbury, Chelmsford CM3 4AB. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.11.2018</b></p> <p>Danbury Park is a grade II registered landscape, which has evolved through a succession of ownerships and management regimes since the Middle Ages. Its history and significance are described in a guidebook by Kate Felus. The northern part of the park, which contains some of the better preserved parkland, is managed by the County Council as Danbury Outdoors, a recreational centre for young people. The site already has ten cabins and a dining hall. An application for an amenity block was approved in 2017.</p> <p>This application is for eleven bunk blocks or chalets which would be located</p>

					<p>close to the amenity block. It is acknowledged that the siting of these has been selected so as to make them fit into a compact area not far from the site entrance and be relatively unobtrusive. However, their construction would add significantly to the built form within the registered landscape, in what looks potentially like an incremental process of development capable of eroding any sense of wildness and remoteness. It would be damaging to the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced, to use the wording of the NPPF. The NPPF says that any damage to the historic environment should be balanced by a public benefit. In this case, the application fails to identify the historic significance of the heritage asset as required by the NPPF, whilst the supporting letter does not set out or justify the need for these buildings. The proposed planting to screen the bunk blocks also seems rather suburban in character.</p> <p>The Essex Gardens Trust, representing The Gardens Trust, does not welcome or support this application.</p> <p>Regards David Andrews FSA, IHBC</p>
Stansted Park	Essex	E18/1160	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from agricultural land to non-residential childrens outdoor nursery. Elms Farm, Church Road, Stansted, Essex CM24 8PX. EDUCATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2018</b></p> <p>This application affects land within Stansted Park, a historic landscape included in the Essex Gardens Trust's Inventory of historic and designed landscapes in Uttlesford District. In origin, the park was associated with the Norman castle. It was later dependent on Stansted Hall, the owner of which commissioned Humphrey Repton to improve it in 1790. It is difficult to see that this application would have an adverse effect on the landscape, but the wire fencing would be an intrusion into it, and could be softened by planting a hedge behind it.</p> <p>Regards David Andrews FSA, IHBC</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</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2018</b></p> <p>Type of comment: Support the proposal Comment: I write as Director of the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust to confirm support for this planning application, and to urge your Council to grant consent. LPGT is affiliated to the Gardens Trust, a statutory consultee in respect of planning applications affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Marble Hill Park is registered at grade II*, the House is listed at grade I, and the Stables and Ice House are listed at grade II. Marble Hill House is held in the highest esteem and is regarded as being among the earliest and finest of</p>

			<p>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>the Palladian Revival villas of the 1720s. The house and park survive thanks largely to the intervention in 1901 of the London County Council and other local planning authorities and private donors, who purchased the estate from the Cunard shipping line family, which had acquired the site for development following the death of the last private owner and had already started laying roads and sewers at the north end. The saving of Marble Hill came about as part of the popular movement to protect the view from Richmond Hill (1902 Act of Parliament), and resulted from a series of so-called Indignation Meetings (see Indignation! The campaign for conservation. Batey, Lambert, Wilkie. Kit-Cat Books, 2000). The amenities, and especially the riverside amenities, of Richmond and Twickenham have always inspired strong affection and sometimes provoked heated debate, and that is clearly still the case with the current planning application. The 25,000-word document recently submitted by the Love Marble Hill group seeks, but in the view of LPGT fails, to undermine the scholarship of English Heritage and also fails to address the major issue – which is that the house and park are deteriorating and looking shabby and need substantial investment of money and effort to bring them back to an acceptable (one might hope exemplary) condition. There can be no doubt that Alexander Pope and Charles Bridgeman had a formative influence on the park and gardens, and to suggest otherwise as LMH do is untenable. Pope was a friend and neighbour of Henrietta Howard as well as being the leading literary figure of the day and promoter of a less formal, more “natural” (however contrived it may appear to us now) style of gardening, and Bridgeman was royal gardener to Queen Caroline at Kensington Gardens and Richmond Gardens. Caroline, who in 1726 “travelled by water with her children to Henrietta Howard's new estate at Marble Hill” (Letter Books of John Hervey, 1st Earl of Bristol), led the fashion in gardening at the time and had summoned Pope and Bridgeman to her garden conference at Kew in 1719. Henrietta was part of the Queen's household and was at least as up-to-date as her royal mistress, with whom she had at best an equivocal relationship. The repair or restoration of an historic garden is an imprecise art compared with the restoration of a building, subject as it is to the passage of time and natural growth and decay as well as to a more or less complete knowledge of what has gone before. Inevitably it involves the occasionally subjective interpretation of physical, archaeological and documentary evidence and new intervention, and factors such as familiar if sometimes unplanned views, modern financial and social realities, and the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>continuing suitability of historic plant material which may now be subject to pathogens. The HLF has offered funding for English Heritage's proposed works, and have themselves the rigorous expertise to be satisfied that the scheme is practically and historically sound. A number of eminent garden historians including Dr Marion Harney, Dr David Jacques and Michael Symes have recently written to you in support proposals, and the LPGT wishes to add its endorsement and respectfully requests that your Council grant consent.</p> <p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for notifying us about the re-consultation documents for the Marble Hill application. The Gardens Trust has nothing further to add to our previous correspondence, and continues to fully support English Heritage's proposals for the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Christchurch Gardens	Greater London	E18/1080	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Hard and soft landscaping improvements to public open space, with new and realigned paths, enhanced signage, lighting and planting. Christchurch Gardens, Victoria Street, London SW1H 0AY. PUBLIC PARK</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2018</b></p> <p>I write on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (LPGT). The LPGT is affiliated to the Gardens Trust (GT, 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.</p> <p>The LPGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT 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 London Inventory (see <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk">www.londongardensonline.org.uk</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Assets Register (HAR).</p> <p>Thank you for seeking our comments on the proposals for reinvigorating this garden.</p> <p>The site is not listed, nor in a conservation area but it does have some historic merit – it is the site of the former burial ground for St Margaret Westminster dating from 1625. Later it became the site of Christ Church which in turn was destroyed in the Blitz in 1941 and the site has been left as open space ever since converted into a public garden in 1950. For further information about the interest of the garden on our inventory can</p>



					<p>be found here:  <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk/gardens-online-record.php?ID=WST018">http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk/gardens-online-record.php?ID=WST018</a>  However, the value of the area relates mainly to it's public amenity value. Having reviewed the documentation we are supportive of the proposals which will enhance the space and improve the usage for those in the area. This space provides rare access to green landscape in an area of open space deficiency and we recommend support - these proposals will improve the amenity value.  Yours sincerely  Helen Monger  Director  Tel: 0207 839 3909  For and on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group  London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust</p>
South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan	Greater London	E18/1085	n/a	<p>NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours (SoWN) Neighbourhood Forum submitted draft of South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan to Lambeth and Southwark councils; seeking representations on the plan from anyone with an interest in the future development of the area</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2018</b>  Thank you for consulting the London Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT) on the above Neighbourhood Plan. I write on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group.  The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (GT) which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (HE) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LPGT is the county gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT 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>).  We welcome the principle of neighbourhood planning and that local people are being given the opportunity to define their priorities within the planning system. We support in general, the proposed Green Infrastructure, Open Space and Air Quality proposals. We would have liked to have seen more detail around projects that protect the specific green spaces beyond Jubilee Gardens, with priorities for parks such as Ufford Street and Archbishop's Park and greater investment there with project details.  If you have any further queries, please contact us at this email address.</p>

					Yours sincerely Helen Monger Director London Parks & Gardens Trust
Grovelands Park	Greater London	E18/1133	II*	PRE-APPLICATION Use of the lake for boating in Grovelands Park. Proposed boating dock on an existing concrete landing located toward the southern extent of the lake, accessible via an existing pathway. Proposal includes a new bridge, floating walkway, and container cabin. Boating Lake, Grovelands Park, The Bourne, London N14 6RA. MISCELLANEOUS	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.11.2018</b></p> <p>Your email has been passed to me by the Gardens Trust to respond. Thank you for seeking our advice at this early stage in the planning process. I write as a member of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (LPGT).</p> <p>The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (GT) which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (HE) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LPGT is the county gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT 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>The Trust undertakes historic research of historic parks and gardens and makes the information available online through it's inventory, London Parks and Gardens Online. The entry for Grovelands Park is available here: <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk/gardens-online-record.php?ID=ENF021">http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk/gardens-online-record.php?ID=ENF021</a></p> <p>As you will know Grovelands Park is Grade 2* on the National Heritage List for England, Parks &amp; Gardens. The house and landscape were originally planned in the 18th Century by John Nash and Humphry Repton. Repton, laid out gardens and pleasure grounds, carriage drives and entrances, planted the park and created the fine artificial lake and islands, which form the main feature of the park. The lake was formed by damming the Bourne stream. Repton's scheme for the lake included a bridge to the southern island, removed by the 1950s and a fishing temple, which had disappeared by 1896.</p> <p>After successive ownership Grovelands Park was officially opened on 12 April 1913 and the park was later extended following further land acquisition by the Council to become the largest public park in the area of c.40 hectares. Thomas Mawson landscape architect for Southgate UDC</p>

					<p>from 1912 and another highly significant landscape architect was responsible for some of Grovelands Park design, particularly the layout of paths, and fencing the lake with post and single rails amongst other innovations.</p> <p>There is a precedent for boating on the Lake at Grovelands Park, and use of the lake for such activity does form part of the site's significance. Historic England have informed us that there are records of a boat house (assumed from the site's time as a private estate) demolished in the 1890s. The existing landing stage is all that remains of C20 public park boating activity - the associated boat house shown in 1935 and 1958 OS Maps, which also refer to the Lake as a 'boating lake'. However, as we have outlined above in the history of the development of the site, the primary design intent for the Lake is its role as a feature within the late C18/early C19 picturesque designed landscape associated with the mansion.</p> <p>Whilst we support increased public amenity value through the introduction of means to enjoy the parkland we share Historic England's concerns about the visual impacts to the Lake. In particular we do not support the proposed blue cabins and would prefer to see an alternative style of structure which either adds value to the site (through exception modern design) or blends in more effectively (taking into account historical precedents). We concur that the applicant must supply a Heritage Statement setting out in detail the likely impacts of such a development, including information about where the style of boat and where they will be stored in summer and winter; alongside any infrastructure they foresee to manage the visitors – these too can have a detrimental visual impact if not thought through.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Monger Director London Parks and Gardens Trust</p>
Bramshill Park	Hampshire	E18/1017	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Development of 308 residential units (new build and conversion) and associated parking, access and landscaping at Bramshill House and Gardens. To include the demolition of non-listed listed buildings, the	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2018</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 Hampshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>It is clear from reading the Historic Environment (incorporating Heritage</p>

				<p>construction of a replacement cricket pavilion, the conversion of Bramshill House the Stable Block and Nuffield Hall for use as a single dwelling. Along with Demolition of curtilage listed buildings and maintenance and restoration works. Bramshill House, Bramshill Park, Bramshill, Hook RG27 OJW. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>Impact Assessment) chapter 8 that City and Country have taken on board the objections and queries raised with regard to the historic setting. The GT welcomes the removal of the development of large houses around the lake. The ride from the house to the lake, which exits through the triple-arched gateway, which it is planned to upgrade as access to the new build, if tree lined and screened as proposed, would appropriately reinstate the line of the original ride. If the lake were to be glimpsed between the trees that would also echo the original intention of the lake being 'a destination' garden feature intended to surprise and delight when first seen. We would also concur with Paula Henderson's research regarding the Green Ride, in that is just one of many rides created in the park, so not of special importance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Central Parks	Hampshire	E18/1027	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of the site. Demolition of the existing building and the erection of a 9-13 storey building comprising 39 flats (11 x 2-bedroom and 28 x 1bedroom) together with 160 sq.m of commercial floorspace (Use Class A1). The Fire House, Vincents Walk, Southampton. RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2018</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 Hampshire Gardens Trust and SCAPPS and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The GT has read the online documentation and is concerned that there does not appear to be a Heritage Statement/Statement of Significance for Central Parks, as required by NPPF Para 189. Over the past couple of years the GT has been consulted about several high-rise buildings directly overlooking the Grade II* RPG, and we would suggest that the cumulative effect of these is becoming too dominant and adversely affecting the setting and therefore significance of the Registered Park. This would appear to be contrary to the intention of CCAP Policy AP17 (Map 12 – Tall Building Locations) which proposes 'individually designed buildings to provide variety adjoining the Central Parks... that contribute positively to their setting and respond to the scale of the parks.' The proposed building in 18/01820/FUL is very close to the permitted 11 storey building in Vincent's Place, as well as another 12 storey building (18/01515/FUL) in Bargate Centre. These cannot be said to respond to the scale of the parks, and are proliferating to such an extent that the character of the whole Victorian Central Parks area is being changed. The original buildings,</p>

					<p>generally of less than 5 storeys, are giving way to new towers, intruding and changing the atmosphere of the previously low key, inner city haven within an increasingly busy urban environment. This part of the city has not been designated for 'Tall Building Clusters', but the rapidity of change/tall buildings proposed, indicates otherwise.</p> <p>Looking at the Overshadowing Assessment it is clear that should this building be allowed, the small park, directly in front of the proposed new 13 storey building will receive considerably less sunlight from 2pm onwards than before, so that by 4pm just under a third of the park will not receive any direct sunshine at all.</p> <p>We would draw your officers' attention to HE's Setting of Heritage Assets : '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.' It also states, (p2) : When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.' The way in which visitors will experience Central Parks will be adversely affected by the cumulative change in surroundings/setting.</p> <p>The GT OBJECTS to the above application and considers it will have a detrimental impact, both visual and cumulative, upon the Grade II* Central Parks.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hewell Grange	Hereford and Worcester	E18/0979	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Replacement of existing structural scaffold and extension to access road. Ruins Of The Old Hewell Grange HM Prison, Hewell, Hewell Lane, Tardebigge. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.11.2018</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 fully endorses the proposed renewal of re-scaffolding of the ruins of Hewell Grange and the thoughtful proposals for work to be undertaken to prevent further deterioration of the structure. The ruined mansion, dismantled in the 1890s, includes the great portico built at the recommendation of Repton as a focus for views within his surviving park layout.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Three Rivers Local Plan	Hertfordshire	E18/1023	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Potential Sites Consultation Document	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, on Potential Sites.</p> <p>We have the following concerns about a number of sites which could have an adverse impact on our historic parks and gardens:</p> <p>Rickmansworth CFS40. The eastern section of this is part of the designed views from Moor Park (Registered Grade II*) across the river valley. Any development here should take this into account in terms of height and landscaping.</p> <p>Batchworth PCS15. This also forms part of the setting of Moor Park, albeit with a ribbon of later housing development. If development should be permitted here it should not be higher than the existing houses to retain the long views from Moor Park.</p> <p>Abbots Langley CFS26B We are concerned that this, together with proposed allocations in Bedmond, will result in coalescence of the two communities Abbots Langley CFS28 Hunton Park Gypsy Lane. Although we do not have a detailed report on this site as yet, HGT are aware that it was a historic designed landscape and there may be relic remains on it.</p> <p>Chorleywood CFS 18 and OSPF3. If developed, both of these would destroy the setting of Heronsgate (O'Connorville) which was set up as a deliberately rural farming colony by the Chartists in 1848. Although the area within Heronsgate has undergone changes, it is still recognisable as the important first Chartist settlement and development which would adversely affect the significance of this important social experiment should not be permitted.</p> <p>Kings Langley CFS 23 Langlebury. This is one of the Locally Important landscapes of Three Rivers.</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Tewin Water	Hertfordshire	E18/1046	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Link extension to outbuilding. First floor rear extension with alterations to roof. Insertion of 5 no. dormer windows and 2 rooflights.	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This site is within the Registered landscape of Tewin Water but we can find no assessment of the significance of the heritage assets of the listed house or registered parkland, in this application, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 189.</p>

				Alterations to outbuilding to include insertion of doors and windows to side. The Garden House, Tewin, Welwyn, Hertfordshire AL6 0AB. BUILDING ALTERATION	Until this has been submitted so that the impact on the significance of the designated heritage assets of the proposed changes can be assessed, we wish to register an objection. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Pishiobury	Hertford shire	E18/1077	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of dwelling. Erection of 2 No. detached 4 bedroomed dwellings. 24 Pishiobury Drive, Sawbridgeworth, Hertfordshire CM21 0AE. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2018</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information included in this application we do not wish to comment except to note our disappointment at the lack of any assessment of the impact on the Registered Landscape of Pishiobury which adjoins this application site. Kate Harwood
Putteridge Bury	Hertford shire	E18/1102	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of cricket wicket; fencing around pond and bunding along boundary. Land To Rear Of Putteridge High School And Community College, Putteridge Road, Offley, Hertfordshire. SPORT/LEISURE	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2018</b> Thank you for consulting Herts Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust. The NHDC website is not accepting online comments, although the deadline given in your letter of 5 November is 27 November. We have discussed these proposals with Luton Borough Council in detail and are happy with the design of the fencing. However we do have some serious concerns. 1. We requested the removal of the bunding along the east side of Area B if there was to be fencing installed as there is no need for both. The fencing or bunding in this location would be needed only if the land between the cricket ground and the Home Farm complex is to be restored to pasture. There is nothing within this application to confirm the intention (indicated merely on the plans) or time scale. We would object to crops being planted in this area as it needs to be a green sward to retain some integrity as a Registered parkland. 2. The cricket wicket is visually intrusive and we discussed with LBC the importance of putting a time limit on its use and that regular reviews of the use of this area as a cricket pitch be done. Once it is not in use then we would want the ground re-instated to parkland. We understand from LBC that recently planted trees along the perimeter and the former field boundary across the site which have died are to be replaced and we are happy with their proposals for that. We would therefore propose that if NHDC were to give permission for the proposals in this application, conditions be put on the installation of fencing along the east side of Area A so that bunding is removed

					<p>beforehand and that assurances are given of the use of the land to the east of that current bunding; and that the cricket wicket has temporary permission to be reviewed at intervals.</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Markyate Cell, Caddington Hall	Hertfordshire	E18/1124	II N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION DEMOLITION OF ALL BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF A MAIN BUILDING AND TWO OUTBUILDINGS COMPRISING OF 46 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED SOFT AND HARD LANDSCAPING, BIN STORE, ENTRANCE GATES AND HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENTS. CADDINGTON HALL, LUTON ROAD, MARKYATE, ST ALBANS AL3 8QB. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.2018</b></p> <p>We are unable to assess this proposal from the information submitted. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is aware that the site is of a substantial early 19th century mansion with significant gardens developed over the Victorian period, remnants of which survive.</p> <p>The scanty heritage information contained in the Design and Access Statement does not describe these remaining features such as the walled garden and the trees from the ornamental gardens and parkland. There is no detail on how the walled garden is to be 'appropriately enhanced' and Appendix A of the Arboricultural Report, showing the plan of the trees on the estate is missing. There is mention of views southwest, which are clearly designed and visible on the 1st edition (and later) Ordnance Survey maps. These look towards the Registered park of Markyate Cell. There is no consideration of the impact that this building would have on the views from Markyate Cell and the impact that would have on its significance. We would be able to supply comments on this application once the missing information is provided.</p> <p>If the application is given permission we would recommend that a survey of the historic gardens and the mansion site is done before any work commences. This should include an archaeological survey. Any finds should be recorded and mitigation measures put in place to preserve their significance.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Land off Monkswood, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfordshire	E18/1129	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion, extension and change of use of stables building and part paddock to single dwelling, with parking provision, access driveway, amenity space and landscaping.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.11.2018</b></p> <p>We are disappointed that there is no mention of the heritage aspects of the site, falling as it does within a medieval park and a landscape laid out by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown in the 18th century.</p> <p>We consider that the provision of parking to the front of the property is inappropriate in an area of open land and 18th century Brownian parkland.</p>



				Land off Monkwood, Welwyn Garden City. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	There are no details of landscaping or treatment of garden land which could also compromise the openness of this area. Together with the proposed track across middle of the current grassland, this development would harm the significance of this Locally Important designed parkland. It is possible that modifications to parking, access track and details of landscaping of the garden area would make this proposal less harmful and acceptable on heritage grounds" Kate Harwood
50 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertford shire	E18/1162	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey side and two storey rear extension following demolition of side garage and utility room, alterations to openings with removal of rear chimney and front canopy with new drive way. 50 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LB. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2018</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member. Having studied the documents supplied with this application we have no comment to make on the extensions to the house. We are, however, concerned about the removal of 7 trees and some hedging without any indication of any replacement trees. This area is traditionally well-wooded and we would welcome some appropriate new planting. Kate Harwood
Dalton Hall	Humber side	E18/1003	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of a lean-to toilet building to the North side of and outside the Walled Garden including installation of door in existing wall. South Dalton Hall, Park Road, South Dalton, East Riding Of Yorkshire HU17 7PW. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.11.2018</b> 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 at Grade II*, as per the above applications. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding these applications. We have visited South Dalton Hall in the past two years and consider that the proposed door entry will be sympathetic to the existing door entries to the walled garden and that the height and design of the proposed lean-to building will have minimum impact on the setting of the walled garden and the Registered landscape. We have also considered the garden pavilion (listed grade I), a very significant building attributed to Colen Campbell or Roger Morris but some distance away, and do not consider that the proposals will have any effect on its setting. We have a query as to what may have historically been in place where the new lean-to is proposed to be located, as we note some possible limewash on the brick wall on the photo at 1.2, Heritage and Design and Access Statement. Our other comments are that in our opinion the bricks of the

					<p>walled garden have probably been re-used from the earlier kitchen garden of 1737 and are probably not 19C ones. A Brick Tax was introduced in 1784 to help pay for the wars in the American colonies and this was not repealed until 1850. The Brick Tax resulted in larger bricks in that period to reduce the tax liability (4s/1000 bricks) and made it economic to re-use the earlier smaller bricks.</p> <p>We would also like to point out that the plan for the toilet building shows the door opening out into a blind space between the greenhouses and where the greenhouse door is located, which may be a problem for those working there. Perhaps the door could open inwards but be left handed? The new roof is mentioned as matching the potting shed but is only described as grey tiles ie concrete. We wonder if the potting sheds still have slate roofs?</p> <p>We consider that the proposals will give a viable new use to the walled garden, generating income and that this will outweigh the small loss of historic fabric and comply with the NPPF. We have no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
Tonbridge and Malling Local Plan	Kent	E18/0901	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) and the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) on this application. The Gardens Trust, as Statutory Consultee regarding planning proposals, that might impact on Listed or Registered Gardens or Landscapes, has notified KGT to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council (TMBC) Local Plan has to identify sites to accommodate the building of 6834 dwellings between now and 2031. KGT's concern is that approximately 65% of these houses are to be located in four large sites at Eccles, Kings Hill, South Aylesford and Borough Green Gardens which will create overdevelopment in these four areas. Of particular concern is the fact that the Borough Green Garden City (BGGC) proposal of 1720 dwellings, which is 25% of all the dwellings, are all to be located within the Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>This local plan has been produced in accordance with the 2012 edition of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which in paragraph 79 states that 'the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'. Paragraph 83 states 'once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in</p>

					<p>exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan'. The 2018 edition of the NPPF does require in paragraph 137 that TMBC should be able to demonstrate that it has looked at all reasonable options for development of suitable brownfield sites and underutilized land. Although not a statutory requirement for this plan, TMBC has not offered this demonstration, nor has it stated what the exceptional circumstances are which has led to the proposed use of Green Belt land for housing.</p> <p>TMBC state in Paragraph 5.1.14 of the Local Plan that the establishment of BGGC 'provides an opportunity to deliver not just a significant number of homes, but also a relief road for Borough Green...' It is our view that a road built to provide access to 1720 homes and a further 1280 dwelling post 2031, will be unable to also act as a relief road to the adjacent villages of Borough Green and St Marys Platt situated along the busy A25 road.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.15 argues that this development 'will provide a significant degree of sustainable development on currently 'despoiled' and inaccessible land that is well contained'. This is contrary to Paragraph 79 of the 2012 edition of NPPF 'to prevent urban sprawl'. This land has and is currently being used for mineral extraction, and some landfill has subsequently taken place, which is why it is inaccessible, but this is not a reason for covering with houses, proper reinstatement would be preferable.</p> <p>The development lies immediately to the east of Ightham Court which has a Grade II listing on Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens (RHPG). The proposed development lies partly within and adjacent to the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which will obviously affect the setting of the AONB.</p> <p>Paragraph 129 of the 2012 NPPF states that 'the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset)' should be taken into account.</p> <p>Policy L11: Designated Areas of the Local Plan, which includes Green Belt and Historic Parks and Gardens, states that the Council will apply the relevant policy of the NPPF</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.5 of the Local Plan states 'Within AONBs the Government policy is to conserve and enhance their natural beauty. Policy L12: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty states in paragraph 4.8.6 that 'major development within AONBs will only be permitted in exceptional</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>circumstances and when it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest'. The exceptional circumstances have not been stated nor has it been demonstrated that it is in the public interest.</p> <p>To the east of BGGC a further section of agricultural land and an existing sand quarry, (which has reinstatement conditions), has been removed from the Green Belt and identified as Safeguard Land to meet long term development post 2031. The 'exceptional circumstances' have not been given and the term 'despoiled and inaccessible' cannot be used as a reason for removing this land from Green Belt.</p> <p>KGT considers that in respect of Borough Green Garden City the Proposed Local Plan has not properly considered the effect of the development on the setting of Ightham Court and the Kent Downs AONB. In addition, KGT considers that the exceptional circumstances for development of the Green Belt have not been demonstrated, which if allowed, will create an urban sprawl between the A25 and M26 roads.</p> <p>M O'Brien (Trustee) For Kent Gardens Trust</p>
Heigham Park	Norfolk	E18/0516	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of 3 all-weather hard tennis courts, with flood lighting on the former grass courts. Heigham Park, Recreation Road, Norwich.</p> <p>SPORT/LEISURE</p> <p>OUTCOME 08.11.2018 Granted</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.11.2018</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust has read the Officer's Report (OR) recommending approval for the above application, submitted prior to the Committee meeting on 8th November 2018 to decide this application. As you are aware, the GT is the statutory consultee for Grade II Registered Parks &amp; Gardens , so our comments on this important historic site within Norwich are extremely important. We are anxious that your Planning Committee is fully aware of our strong OBJECTION to this application.</p> <p>We would like to stress the irreversible harm that 18/01062/NF3 would cause to Sandys-Winch's nationally important design. There are gradations in the amount of harm caused by any particular application. We feel that this has not been fully understood in the OR. In our opinion, as stated in my email of 22nd August 2018, the complete loss of all the grass tennis courts and replacement with hard courts which obstruct and effectively destroy Sandys-Winch's main vista to the Pavilion, would cause harm which is very "high on the less than substantial side' to the significance and understanding of S-W's design intent for this designated heritage asset. We feel that the OF has not fully understood this. It is therefore directly contrary to the revised NPPF para 195 and as such we disagree with Para 57 of the OR : "The Gardens Trust and other consultees have agreed that the proposals result in less than substantial harm. The test to require</p>

					<p>refusal or support for alternative management under para. 195 of the NPPF falls away.” We also maintain that it fails the public benefit test within Para 195 as it is clear that “.23 hard courts within one mile of Heigham Park, a further 18 within 2 miles and a total of 46 hard courts within the city of Norwich (yet no other grass courts), ” indicates more than sufficient hard court provision nearby. The submission of Heigham Park’s Grass Tennis Group’s Business case, which removes any running and maintenance costs from Norwich City Council also means that this application clearly fails NPPF Para 195, paras b &amp; c.</p> <p>Norwich CC’s own Urban Conservation &amp; Design response states that “it should be clearly demonstrated that there are no other feasible alternatives to enable the.. hardcourt tennis facilities.’ The materiality of the sound Business case is valid on principle as being relevant to the application of para 194 : the loss and harm to the significance of Heigham Park is not clearly or convincingly justified.</p> <p>The GT finds it hard to understand how the OR can recommend approval when it so clearly fails key NPPF conditions as well as your own Policy DM9. The development results in great harm to this heritage asset and the Business Plan demonstrates a viable alternative. We also refute Para 53 of the OR as it is highly unlikely that if the ten grass courts are replaced with hard courts, these will ever be removed in future.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could please put both our letters of objection regarding this application before your Committee and urge your officers to REFUSE this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E17/0884	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of barn to form dwelling and installation of package treatment plant. The Pheasantry, Studley Park, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 3DY. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2018</b></p> <p>Further to my letter of 27th October 2017 regarding the poor documentation accompanying the application at that time, we are very glad to receive the very useful Heritage Statement. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and although we are not commenting on the design details we are now satisfied that the alterations do not appear to impact on the designed landscape and tree cover prohibits views in from the RPG itself.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens	North Yorkshire	E18/1045	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing maintenance shed and erection of single storey community/training facility (D1) and maintenance / operations centre (B8). South Cliff Gardens, Esplanade, Scarborough, NORTH YORKSHIRE. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2018</b> 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. As noted in our recent previous letter of 29th October, we are very pleased that there is a detailed Conservation and Management Plan for the entirety of the Saving South Cliff Gardens Project. This proposal for enhanced maintenance facilities and community/training facility should better ensure the longevity of this major project to restore a significant seaside designed landscape and gardens. We have no objection to the proposals but would like to query whether there may be some new tree and shrub planting round the boundary of the depot and facilities to reinforce that already present and as a necessary frame to views and to protect the Rose Garden nearby. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
Japanese Garden at Grantley Hall	North Yorkshire	E18/1094	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The use of land for a helipad. Grantley Hall, Stephenson Bridge To Grantley Hall And West Lodge, Grantley HG4 3ET. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2018</b> 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. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. Although we appreciate that Grantley Hall (listed Grade II*) is being developed as a five- star luxury country resort and spa with many facilities including a nationally important Japanese garden, we cannot support this helipad application. The Design and Access Statement (incorporating a Heritage Statement) is an inadequate appraisal and is in our view misleading. At 1.1 it refers to a 'country resort', which in itself indicates a measure of calm and peacefulness; totally at odds with 500 helicopter flights per year and up to 15 flights in a single day. There is no reference or appreciation of the Grantley Hall estate being in a delightful valley setting in the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There is no appreciation or consideration of the fact that the Grantley Hall estate is only three fields</p>

					<p>away from the World Heritage Site of Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal Park and that all flights will inevitably destroy its tranquility and distract tourists. We would also like to point out that the Japanese garden at Grantley Hall is an Historic England Registered Historic Park and Garden (Grade II).</p> <p>The illustrations show a small and modest helicopter but larger helicopters carrying larger number of passengers may be used, and these would have a significantly larger downdraft impacting on the Japanese garden and the World Heritage Site (WHS). We do not agree – at 3.5 – there will be no unacceptable noise impact as a result of the proposed helipad either for guests, staff or people locally and at the WHS. In our view any helicopter landing or taking off where it is proposed would be unpleasant and have a considerable impact on anyone walking or sitting in the gardens. In addition we have not noted any provision for parking a helicopter should it be piloted by a guest staying overnight.</p> <p>The Trust therefore objects to this application for a number of reasons relating to wind/downdraft, noise, visual disturbance in this quite valley in the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the estate setting of the Grade II* historic hall and immediately adjoining the Grade II historic park and garden and close to a WHS.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E18/1123	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Reserved matters application for Phase 1 business park including development of key infrastructure and serviced plots together with an Eco Lodge office complex, Creche, Reception Hub and Doggy Day Care within the woodland with access, appearance, landscaping and layout considered. Land Comprising Os Field 6482, Allerton Park, North Yorkshire. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2018</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. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. The application site has outline approval, is quite a distance from Allerton Park on the opposite side of the A1M road and is low build in an extensive wooded location. We think that this phase will not impact on the Registered Park and have no comments to make however we understand that later phases will be in open fields and need more consideration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
Albert Park	Oxford	E18/1076	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2018</b></p>

	shire			Demolition of existing outbuildings and the erection of a new rear extension featuring a two storey pitched roof extension and a single storey flat roof extension. 5 Park Crescent, Abingdon OX14 1DF. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>The Gardens Trust has had the above application brought to our attention by a private individual. VWDC is usually meticulous in consulting us 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, so we were surprised not to receive notification this time. We would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have read the online documentation and would have expected this application to have included a Heritage Statement, given the property's proximity to the Grade II listed Albert Park. We are conscious that over the past few years the GT has been consulted about at least twelve other applications for extensions of one sort or another on houses around Albert Park. As far as we can see, all have been approved. We would suggest that your officers bear in mind the cumulative effect these various extensions will have on the setting of Albert Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2018</b></p> <p>We have been made aware that the above application has a misleading description and that the wording does not accurately describe the scheme. We will be re-examining the application and will submit a further response in light of this in due course.</p> <p>With best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Marston House	Somerset	E17/1066	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Restoration of 114 Acres of Grade II listed Park and Garden including Marston Pond, Thickthorn Wood, Orrery Wood, the Keeper's Cottage and Boat House with enabling development to include 20 Lodges, Hub and Reception buildings. Change of land use from agricultural to Hotel, Leisure and	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2018</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has looked at the additional information provided since our original response to 2017/2814/FUL on 24th January 2018. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our further comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The development, if consented, will bring about a permanent, irreversible and, we believe, detrimental change to this nationally important landscape. The harmful impacts include: the physical presence of a holiday village in the middle of the designed landscape adjacent to a lake which</p>



				<p>Recreation. Marston Pond, Thickthorn Wood And Horley Wood, Tuckmarsh Lane, Marston Bigot BA11 5BY. HYBRID</p>	<p>acts as the principal eyecatcher/destination from the house (the heart of the Gilpin Picturesque landscape and the major vista from the elevated position of the house); lighting along the principal woodland access routes; lighting from the lodges set within predominantly deciduous woodland (with the implications of increased visibility in the winter months); elevated lighting from the 'tree house' lodges; and new roads. Marston House has always looked out over its (unlit) park to a largely un-peopled, undeveloped 'borrowed view'. The application document Sitepack verified views Pt 4 shows how this would change. At night, the middle ground landscape, which is essentially the area of proposed development around the lake, will become illuminated and thus destroy the sense of being in an undeveloped, rural landscape, compromising the integrity of the Gilpin landscape. The lodges on the periphery of the lakeside woodland will be visible during daylight hours, especially when the trees are not in leaf (from mid November to April). However well designed the proposals are, it does not address the fundamental question of 'why here?'</p> <p>The documentation does not include evidence of exceptional circumstances that might justify the development. The grade II RPG is not on HE's HAR Register and the main house is in good condition, so the principle of Enabling Development does not apply. We note that the phrase 'enabling development' has now been dropped from the online documentation, and has been substituted by 'restoration'. As a consequence, as noted in the Pegasus report (para 9.3), 'the application now stands only to be considered on its merits against the strong national and Local Plan policy presumption against such major new development in the open countryside.' In the interests of brevity, rather than repeat the numerous national and local plan policy points raised in the Pegasus report, we would simply like to fully endorse them. For the same reason we are not quoting paragraphs from HE Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (published December 2017).</p> <p>Marston is a rural, farmed landscape that could be recovered/restored at any time in the future, which is something that will not be possible if the current scheme is consented, because there will be a holiday village present in perpetuity, compounded by the fact that the site will remain in divided ownership. This is explained in detail in the Pegasus report Threat to existing and proposed activities at Marston House paras 8.5-8.12. Restoration of the walled garden and other planned restoration works at Marston House are on hold until this application has been decided.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>In my letter of 24th January 2018 I mentioned that the estate would be a good candidate for Higher Tier Stewardship. The restoration could be mostly delivered through Stewardship without the cost of development to the designed landscape. This would include replanting lost parkland trees, restoration of the lake, consolidation of the boathouse and possibly the Keeper's Lodge, but of course this would not be possible to deliver as historic landscape mitigation for a planning application by the applicants. The 'restoration benefits' quoted by the applicants would in our opinion, not be outweighed by the negative effects of the holiday village and associated development. The long-term neglect of the estate cannot be used as justification for the scheme. NPPF para 191 states that 'the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.' Bearing all this in mind, plus the fact that Mr &amp; Mrs Sanderson and Mr Rohan Masson-Taylor have 'offered to purchase the site at market value with a premium attached' and they 'would restore the parkland as part of their overarching restoration of the historic estate for its own benefit' it is difficult to fathom the reasons for the applicants persisting in this scheme.</p> <p>If despite the all the policy arguments against this proposal, your authority should be minded to approve the applications, a management plan is essential in order to conserve what is left of the historic landscape. This should be provided as a condition and as well as the development being subject to a phased programme, with each phase of development being linked to a phase of landscape restoration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Porter Valley Parks	South Yorkshire	E18/0994	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a training wall within the river channel, restoration works to existing stone wall, introduction of interpretation boards and access improvements to the site. Forge Dam, Brookhouse Hill, Sheffiel, S10 3TE. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.11.2018</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. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We are pleased to support the proposals to ensure the long-term protection and enhancement of the industrial heritage, ecological diversity and the historic public parks along the Porter Valley including the site at</p>

					<p>Forge Dam. In September 1938 the J G Graves Charitable Trust acquired the land to create the public open space, Forge Dam, and with the acquisition of Porter Clough also that year the Trust was able to complete the walk linking an area near the city centre, up the valley of the Porter, to the edge of what was to become the Peak National Park. This chain of parks and walks is a very important part of Sheffield forming a unique sequence of municipal parks and green spaces.</p> <p>We note the need to carry out tree works for reservoir safety and to repair and stabilise walls and to protect the industrial heritage and we recognise that the de-silting works are a priority. There are a number of mature and semi-mature trees in the area of Forge Dam and the Carr woodland supports Ancient Woodland indicator species. We wish to raise our concerns about wholesale tree clearance on the edge of Forge Dam Lawn; this should be balanced with opening up the views. We support the Council Tree Officer's advice to retain oak and sycamore and crown lift where possible and we request that a replacement tree planting plan is drawn-up particularly for the Forge Dam Lawn and café area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
City Road Cemetery, Sheffield	South Yorkshire	E18/1148	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Alterations to upgrade fire precautions including fire doors, escape routes, fire alarms and emergency lighting in the main entrance building, adjoining buildings, the central clock tower, chapels and crematorium.</p> <p>Cemetery And Crematorium, 441 City Road, Sheffield S2 1GF.</p> <p>CEMETERY, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.11.2018</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. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. The City Road Cemetery is a good example of a late Victorian public cemetery built in 1881 for an expanding industrial city and designed by the Sheffield architectural practice of Messrs M E Hadfield and Son. Its formal layout makes dramatic use of sloping ground and it was added to the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens in 2002. The site was formerly dominated by a pair of chapels standing on a great terrace with the monumental gateway ensemble which includes a tower, in Tudor Revival style. The chapels flanked the axial rond point. The Anglican chapel was demolished but the remaining Non-Conformist chapel was extended as an early example of a crematorium (1904-05). The later Roman Catholic chapel, gifted by the Duke of Norfolk (1898-1900) and now derelict stands towards the back of the site. The cemetery planting largely survives,</p>

					<p>particularly dense avenues of trees lining the main carriage routes, boundary tree planting, more open avenues on minor routes, and some specimen planting.</p> <p>We note that the proposed works are to be carried out with consideration given to the listed status of the buildings and in full co-operation with the conservation officer. We have no further comments to add.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E18/0934	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of new vehicular Access. Chilton Priory, Waldingfield Road, Chilton, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 0PP . ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting all grades of historic parks and gardens included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application.</p> <p>To avoid the repetition of certain factual matters and legislative provisions and guidance relating to the heritage assets at Chilton Hall we refer you to the letter of objection dated 31 October 2018 from Mr M Collins, a listed building planning consultant. We have been sent a copy of this document and are surprised that it has not yet made its way onto the website. We agree with the matters set out in that letter.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting (ie. the RPG), the local planning authority shall have special regard (our emphasis) to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 66(1)). The Courts have interpreted preservation as meaning to keep safe from harm. The statutory duty to have special regard to a listed building means that decision makers should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise. The considerable importance and weight applies to all harm, although with greater force the more important the listed building or setting. If harm is identified then there is a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Application DC/17/04052 was given planning consent last year for a housing development of 130 houses with a new access on Waldingfield Road just to the west of Chilton Priory. Application DC/18/03778 proposes a third entrance onto Waldingfield Road to the east of the current entrance</p>

					<p>to Chilton Priory. The Grade II listed RPG of Chilton Hall (Grade II*) is situated directly across the road, separated only by the width of the road. The first question that springs to mind is why the owners of Chilton Priory need a new entrance when they already have a perfectly good one. This is clearly contrary to NPPF para 194 : 'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset .... (including from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.' The application materials contain no explanation.</p> <p>The GT is concerned about the further urbanisation of what is currently a far more rural setting for the RPG. This is covered comprehensively by Suffolk Preservation Society's comments with regard to the loss of hedgerow/trees which we endorse. HE's The Setting of Heritage Assets (SHA), states on p4 : 'Cumulative Change : Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.' It goes on to say (Access &amp; Setting, p 4) that significance also depends on "the importance of quiet and tranquility as an attribute of setting'. The RPG is currently a tranquil place which has already been compromised by the approval of DC/17/04052 and the enormous increase in traffic that will bring to Waldingfield Road. The addition of another entrance drive, the further loss of trees and hedging, and increased urbanisation compounds the harm. The GT would urge your local authority to bear in mind the way in which the setting and approach to the RPG currently affects its significance. The SHA assessment checklist suggests that one considers the significance of the heritage assets : Chilton Park (II RPG), the wall around the walled garden (Grade II) and Chilton Hall (II*) and then establishes the contribution made by their setting. The checklist lists mentions factors such as 'Green space, trees and vegetation; Openness, enclosure and boundaries; Surrounding landscape or townscape character; noise, vibration and other nuisances; tranquility; Accessibility, ... and patterns of movement'. Further urbanisation of Waldingfield Road will negatively affect all these characteristics, and therefore detract from the setting and significance of the RPG. The SHA states (para 35) 'it would be helpful for local planning authorities to consider at an early stage whether development affecting the setting of a heritage asset can be broadly categorised as having the potential to enhance or harm the significance of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the asset.’ The GT considers that the current proposal is without doubt harmful to the significance of the heritage assets. It is contrary to NPPF Para 192c as this new development does not make ‘a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.’ We also consider that this application fails NPPF Para 195’s public benefit test, as the loss of significance will achieve no public benefit.</p> <p>Further, your authority’s saved policies of the Local Plan provide that proposals for new work within the setting of a listed building should respect those features which contribute positively to the setting of a listed building (CNO6), and that proposals for development adjacent to historic parks and gardens which would lead to the erosion of their character, appearance or setting will be refused (CN 14 and CN 15). This development in our opinion will erode the character, appearance and setting of the RPG. A further saved policy deals with hedgerows (CR08) which provides that where development affects hedgerows of amenity or landscape significance, permission will only be granted where the hedgerows are retained in full or suitable mitigation such as replacement planting is proposed</p> <p>Accordingly the GT OBJECTS to this application and advises that your authority should refuse permission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Westbrook	Surrey	E18/0757	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 262 dwellings (Use Class C3) and 88 sqm community building (Use Class D1) and associated works including informal and formal open space, internal road network, landscape enhancement and access; following demolition of existing dwellings at Ockford Wood Farm, No.19 and No.21 Aarons Hill. Land Between New Way And, Aarons Hill, Surrey. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for bringing the various amendments regarding the above application to our attention.</p> <p>With reference to the built heritage clarification statement, the Gardens Trust does not accept the interpretation of the Thackeray Turner and Gertrude Jekyll garden layout as an inward-looking scheme and support the views of Historic England in this regard set out in their response dated 21st November 2018. The west boundary of the garden was left open to the adjacent agricultural land and indeed, a ‘Thunder House’ (platform) was specifically located here, a unique Gertrude Jekyll design feature employed here as elsewhere, ... ‘to ...provide a look-out place over the fields and the distant range ...’ .</p> <p>In the interests of brevity, we confirm that we have seen and read both responses from Historic England, and rather than repeat their points, we would simply like to fully endorse them. The Gardens Trust’s statutory</p>

					<p>remit relates solely to the Grade II historic designed landscape, but the associative significance of this with Thackeray Turner's Grade II* house means that this whole site takes on additional significance. Our previous references with regard to the requirements of the NPPF remain valid and pertinent as they have been further reiterated by Liz Pollard in the HE advice and we fully support her recommendation both in its intent and detail.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p> <p>Extract from Gardens for Small Country Houses by Gertrude Jekyll &amp; Lawrence Weaver, pages 44-5</p>
Norbury Park	Surrey	E18/1103	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION FELLING LICENCE APPLICATION Selective Felling of Ash due to Ash Die-back within 30m zone. Norbury Park, Surrey.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2018</b></p> <p>These comments are submitted on behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust a statutory consultee in respect of planning applications. Our attention has been drawn to the Felling Licence for Norbury Park arising from the incidence of ash dieback.</p> <p>Norbury Park is a Grade II item in the Historic England (HE) Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest. Its history and significance are given in the official entry to be found on the HE website. The Register area sits within the wider estate and encompasses many sites of the proposed felling.</p> <p>Copies of the Forestry Commission (FC) letter of 2 November and related information have been forwarded to the writer.</p> <p>There is no doubt that ash dieback is present and extensive. It is accepted that this needs to be addressed in the short term for safety and in the longer term for woodland management. It is understood that the felling is to be selective within the identified 30 metre zones leaving other tree and shrub species. This seems to imply some careful working methods, and the proposed use of machinery needs to be introduced sensitively to achieve selection without collateral damage. The FC letter of 2 November notes adherence to other regulations for protected sites and species. The Surrey Wildlife Trust needs to be clear as to what these are and the implications for their felling proposals. It is understood that Natural England have been consulted.</p> <p>While there are references to natural regeneration, monitoring and the use of enrichment planting there seem to be no specifics presented at this stage. Indeed, the longer term is not really addressed especially in terms of</p>

					<p>ash dieback in those parts outside the 30 metre zones. The Surrey Gardens Trust would be anxious that the wooded character of the Register area, and adjoining parts of the wider estate, is to be considered and maintained as management plans evolve to meet the current difficulties.</p> <p>Don Josey On behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust a member of the Gardens Trust</p>
Great Barr Hall	West Midlands	E18/1047	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed replacement dwelling. 14, SKIP LANE, WALSALL, WS5 3LL. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p> <p>OUTCOME Refused APPEAL LODGED Appeal Ref: APP/V4630/W/18/3207169</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2018</b> Response as per E18/1048 below</p>
Great Barr Hall	West Midlands	E18/1048	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement Dwelling. 12, SKIP LANE, WALSALL WS5 3LL. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.11.2018</b> A local resident alerted the Gardens Trust (GT) to the above application. Due to the delay in the GT being made aware of this application, we are grateful for the time extension you have given us to comment, in our role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Staffordshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We note that we were not consulted on a similar application 17/1638 for 14 Skip Lane which was refused by your local authority and is now the subject of an Appeal. Both applications affect the Grade II landscape (RPG) at Great Barr, an C18 landscape park associated with Humphry Repton, John Nash and Sir George Gilbert Scott, and possibly William Shenstone. The existing house at 12 Skip Lane lies directly across the road and is highly visible from the RPG and is also in the Great Barr Conservation Area. Grade II Walsall Lodge (or Merrion's Lodge) attributed to Sir George Gilbert Scott, is visible from the application site, and as such this application affects the setting and significance of both the RPG and the listed building. The landscape at Great Barr is on the English Heritage At Risk (HAR) register. The proposed replacement building positively dwarfs neighbouring 10 Skip Lane and even its larger neighbour at No 14. Its prominent outline and chimneys would be visually dominant and alien to the character of the</p>



					<p>traditionally styled houses in the street. Should this application be permitted, there is a danger of a precedent being set and all the houses becoming increasingly inflated in scale which would very much alter the character of the boundary.</p> <p>The documentation online does not make any attempt to address the historic significance of Great Barr, a requirement of NPPF para 189. We suggest it is also contrary to NPPF para 194 : 'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset .... (including from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.' We would expect any such application to include a Heritage Statement and a Heritage Impact Assessment. The applicants should be asked to provide this as a matter of urgency, as no decision can be made until this is available to your officers. HE's The Setting of Heritage Assets (SHA), states (para 35) 'it would be helpful for local planning authorities to consider at an early stage whether development affecting the setting of a heritage asset can be broadly categorised as having the potential to enhance or harm the significance of the asset.' The GT considers that the current proposal is harmful to the significance of the heritage assets by its visual dominance and prominence, at odds with the surrounding character of both street and landscape. It is contrary to NPPF Para 192c as this new development does not make 'a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.' We also consider that this application fails NPPF Para 195's public benefit test, as the loss of significance will achieve no public benefit. The Black Country Core Strategy (EMP6, 4.26, p95) highlights the importance of its 'unique past, being at the forefront of the Industrial Revolution, which has left a rich and varied ... cultural legacy'. Great Barr was created by an important figure of the industrial revolution, Samuel Galton Junior, whose membership of the scientific body, the Lunar Society did much to advance the Industrial Revolution. His personal wealth as a gun manufacturer led him to become involved in canal development, a crucial contribution to the region's growth as a manufacturing centre. As such his association with the area raises the significance of Great Barr. The current application is also contrary to Policy ENV2 : 'All development should aim to protect and promote the special qualities, historic character and local distinctiveness of the Black country in order to help maintain its cultural identity and strong sense of place. Development proposals will be required to preserve, and where appropriate, to enhance local character and those aspects of the historic environment together with their settings</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>which are recognized as being of special historic, ... architectural, landscape ... quality.' It continues : 'particular attention should be paid to the preservation and enhancement of : .... Historic parks and gardens including their settings. .... Development proposals that would potentially have an impact on any of the above distinctive elements should be supported by evidence included in Design and Access Statements which demonstrates that all aspects of the historic character and distinctiveness of the locality have been fully assessed and used to inform proposals.'</p> <p>MatLab Architecture, who designed the proposed building currently the subject of Appeal for 17/1638 for 14 Skip Lane are also responsible for the above application. They have repeated the same errors in this instance and so for all the reasons given above and in your local authority's refusal of the previous application, the GT OBJECTS to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Peel Park	West Yorkshire	E18/1101	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of existing vacant care home to 26 apartments and construction of extension to create an additional 28 apartments. The Mount Nursing Home, 43 Lister Lane, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD2 4LP. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting Peel Park, a public park included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens at Grade II* and thus is particularly important nationally. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts with regard to this planning application.</p> <p>The Mount, lies immediately to the north of Peel Park, (at the northwest corner) and due to the topography of the park, which is laid out in the valley, the site prominently overlooks the park and is part of the park's setting.</p> <p>Peel Park (Grade II*) was the first publicly owned park in Bradford, largely due to the vision and efforts of Sir Titus Salt to acquire funding, and he himself was a generous benefactor. The Mount was one of three villas to the north which were designed not only to be part of Peel Park, which is sited in the Bolton and Undercliffe area of Bradford, but also to be key features. Undercliffe Cemetery (Grade II*), designed by William Gay and considered by Historic England to be his finest work, lies extremely close to Peel Park's southern boundary and is also a conservation area. William Gay also designed the iconic 410 m long grand terrace in Peel Park which features an arched cast iron bridge, dated 1857, to carry the eastern end of</p>

					<p>the terrace over the carriage drive below. The area of Peel Park and Undercliffe Cemetery is an extremely significant heritage asset. The Mount had its own private entrance to the Park's Carriage Drive and the stone gate piers of this entrance are still extant. The original landscaping around the stone building provided a picturesque setting both from within the park and its approach from Bolton Road. Much of the original layout of the gardens remained unchanged until at least the 1930s and can be seen in the 1938 C. H. Woods aerial photo of Peel Park (N.2357, C.H. Woods Collection, Bradford Industrial Museum).</p> <p>The NPPF advises that significance of a heritage asset 'derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.' In our view the construction of an extension to The Mount, as proposed, will result in significant harm to the setting of Peel Park and thus to this western area which also includes the listed lodge with gate piers and ornate gates (grade II).</p> <p>The proposed Block B has no pleasing architectural features and is still not of sufficient quality to be sympathetic with the adjacent nineteenth century building, The Mount, and of Peel Park on the boundary. Its proposed height and massing will dominate the very attractive original house which although altered in recent decades retains much of the quality of its original design. The proposed extension will also impact on the character of the neighbourhood, greatly reducing the quality of the original setting of The Mount as seen from Bolton Road and we consider it would result in over development of the site.</p> <p>The landscaping proposals for the site also completely fail to provide a quality setting for The Mount or the proposed extension, especially as they include additional areas of inappropriate asphalt. There appears to be no private communal garden area proposed, despite apartments lacking any balconies. Indeed the proposal is for the reduction in the present tree/shrub border adjacent to the wall bounding Bolton Road in order to create four additional parking spaces, but detailed plans for these have not been included. This development if carried out will result in 54 housing units largely surrounded by a sea of asphalt and cars. The currently proposed eighteen car parking spaces up against the park boundary (where the railings may be original) will also be detrimental to the setting of Peel Park and cause even more harm than the sixteen proposed in the previous application.</p> <p>We appreciate that currently there are deciduous trees on the northern</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>boundary of the park which partially obscure The Mount in the summer, but of course do not do so in the winter. Trees can be lost very rapidly due to storm damage or felling. Indeed, for half the year when the trees are not in leaf, this proposed block B would severely mar views of The Mount from the Carriage Drive, and in particular from the imposing flight of stone steps linking the site of the former late C19 conservatory to the Carriage Drive. Peel Park is a heritage asset much used and enjoyed by the community and for the reasons outlined above we strongly object to the construction of this extension to The Mount.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---