



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES DECEMBER 2018

The GT conservation team received 134 new cases in England and one case in Wales during December 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, 37 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and 12 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
Oaklands, Almondsbury	Avon	E18/1115	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing building. Erection of care home with 26 no. nursing bedrooms and 15 no. assisted apartments (Class C2), parking, landscaping and associated works. Oaklands, Oaklands Drive, Almondsbury, Bristol, South Gloucestershire. INSTITUTION	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2018 We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this proposal, which affects the Grade II listed building, Oaklands House, and the grounds, which are on the council's register of Historic Parks and Gardens in South Gloucestershire. We note that the C19 house and the grounds have suffered neglect and vandalism in the recent past. The commitment to restoration of the grounds and summerhouse are welcome. Also, we note that existing woodland will be retained and protected, with woodland walks to follow original path routes. The stated aim is to protect these heritage assets with secure fencing, which is essential. However, our research indicates that the Naturalistic garden, over 12 acres, created by Hiatt Cowles Baker from 1895, featured a Japanese garden with a series of pools, a bridge; stone lanterns; statuary; rockery and pond; a Ha-Ha; an extraordinary plant collection, many rare and exotic; fine specimen trees; spring bulbs in a woodland garden; sundial; and a summerhouse on the mound. The pools in the Japanese garden have, in the 1990's, been restored by the Avon Gardens Trust. [Parks and Gardens of Avon 1994 by S Harding and D Lambert].

					<p>Primary source documentation, in the form of plant lists, photographs and papers created by the Head Gardener at oaklands, were given to Avon gardens trust in 2012, and an article appeared in the AGT Summer bulletin 2014 which includes several photographs of the garden in the 1930's. Another indication of how important the garden was, is the description by Tony Titchen, of the Trees at Oaklands c2012 – 14. The Japanese garden included the Nikko Maple – <i>Acer maximowiczianum</i>. On the rockery by the house, a Chinese holly [female] <i>Ilex pernyi</i> – named after Paul Herbert Penry who discovered it in China 1901. The Oaklands specimen could be an original, with triangular leaves with spines. Near the Japanese water feature should still be a Japanese yew – <i>Taxus cuspidate</i>; a Hinoki cypress – <i>Chamaecyparis obtuse</i> 'Nana Gracilis' with dense compact habitat; dark green, neat shell like sprays of foliage. A strange cultivar of the Sawara cypress from Japan – <i>Chamaecyparis pisifera</i> 'Filifera Aurea' raised in 1879. A large specimen of <i>Picea orientalis</i>, the Oriental Spruce, should still be evident. Whilst we welcome the restoration of the Summer House, with so much original documentation, it would be a missed opportunity not to restore the Japanese Garden and to seek out the specimen trees that we have photographs and descriptions of.</p> <p>It would also be desirable to install interpretation boards with the history of the House and Park, Illustrated with maps and photographs. An appreciation of the heritage, particularly the Summer House and the Japanese Garden should inform, generate interest, and thereby help protect the restoration, once completed.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal. 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 sincerely Ros Delany (Dr)</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E18/1128	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent 1 & 1/2 storey extension in place of the existing extension. Minor internal	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the</p>

				<p>alterations. Replacement structure of the existing/outbuilding shed. Brewers Yard, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire HP18 0SB. BUILDING ALTERATION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>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. We are pleased to note that the revised application has removed the 'glass box' on the north side and offer no objection to the proposal for a single storey replacement for the shed outside the west side of the courtyard/flat roof proposal for the current sheds on the west side. However, the GT/BGT still feel that the third aspect, the pitched roof building on the east side within the courtyard, remains visually as damaging to the main north drive through the Grade I landscape as previously. In this respect the revised proposals have not addressed the landscape concerns that we expressed to the previous application. Despite being disused as a vehicle approach to Wotton House, the north drive remains a key part of the landscape design at a highly sensitive point in the north approach to the Grade I house. When it was laid out, it was the most important ornamental approach through the designed landscape to the mansion. There is no historic landscape or visual impact analysis to demonstrate objectively the effect of this proposal on the character of this highly important element of the Grade I designed landscape. Even so, we assess from our own considerable knowledge of the site and its history, that it has significant visual harm upon the designed landscape. We therefore object to the proposal. As we previously pointed out, the new structure next to the north drive is substantially higher than the previous structure, and the continuous roofline will run south-north along the historic eastern wall which is adjacent to this key drive. The substantial pitched roof will be visible from the drive and the designed landscape to the east and the north. The design of the roof and the ridgeline parallel with the boundary wall are not consistent with the surrounding structures and will give the impression that the historic wall is part of a domestic structure rather than defining the courtyard. The chimney will also be removed which adds to the loss of character. The considerable visibility of this new structure above the historic yard will intrude on views from the main approach drive just before it reaches the great set piece of the forecourt and mansion, even though it is now disused as a through route, but it survives largely intact. We urge that the proposal for the building on the east side adjacent to the main drive is refused. As previously stated, there may be alternative ways of obtaining similar accommodation for the property without causing the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>same level of damage to the historic character.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E18/1207	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for reserved matters pursuant to outline permission 16/02745/AOP for layout, scale, external appearance, the access, and the landscaping of the site. Silverstone Park, Silverstone Motor Racing Circuit, Silverstone Road, Biddlesden, Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The application site lies to the northwest of Grade I listed Stowe park, which itself lies immediately adjacent to the southern tip of Silverstone Park. The Historic England register entry describes Stowe as an : 'Extensive and complex pleasure grounds and park around a country mansion. Main phases C18 and early C19, utilising late C17 base, with early C18 work by Charles Bridgeman, Sir John Vanbrugh, James Gibbs and William Kent, and mid C18 work by Lancelot Brown. Stowe was supremely influential (our emphasis) on the English landscape garden during the C18.' Despite part of the Silverstone Circuit and the Silverstone Golf course lying between the application site and the RPG, we were surprised to see that the applicants had not submitted a Heritage Statement of any kind with their documentation. Whilst your heritage officer is no doubt correct to state that 'the site is not near to any listed building or conservation area' that totally fails to appreciate that the application site is intimately related to the Stowe registered area and its setting even though it is some distance away. There is considerable potential for damage from large scale buildings in the circuit area. We would like to know how the proposals relate to the topography or whether there are any interconnecting views, particularly north from the ridings in Stowe Woods. One of the key axial views is already marred by an insensitively placed building. We feel that your officers cannot make a decision on these reserved matters until they can be satisfied that they will not further detract from the setting and significance of Stowe.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
River Gardens	Derby	E18/1184	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2018

	shire		<p>Alteration, conversion and erection of buildings and associated change of use to buildings collectively known as Belper Mills, to include: East Mill- Conversion to form 117 residential apartments (C3), formation of an atrium through floors 1 to 6; alteration of loading bay; formation of public viewing platform to northwest tower (sui generis) and alteration to open-up ground floor pedestrian route adjacent to North Mill, one commercial unit (Classes A1, A3/A4) (total 190m2) at ground floor, with amended vehicular access to east elevation and 37 surface parking spaces on external deck. North Mill- Alteration, restoration, replacement and repair to windows, doors, external and internal walls and roof, alter 5 windows to door openings to south elevation, to retain as museum (Class D1) at ground and lower ground, and offices (Class B1) at first and upper floors, change of use ground floor unit to commercial (Classes A1, A3/A4), and ancillary uses. Workshops- alteration, restoration, replacement and repair of windows, walls and roof Strutt House - Alteration, restoration, replacement and repair of windows, external and</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in Derbyshire Historic Gardens (DHG) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The River Gardens (Grade II*) were specifically created by local industrialist G Herbert Strutt for worker recreation and are therefore inextricably linked with the Mills site. Their juxtaposition plays a major part in the Gardens' significance, as well as it being an early example of a C20 municipal pleasure garden complete with extensive Pulhamite rockwork, boathouse, tea-house and bandstand, essentially unchanged from its original layout designed by Pulham and Sons in 1906. The Mills and River Gardens both lie within the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site and are very important elements of that because of this linkage. The Mill site is in a poor state of repair and there is popular support locally for a sustainable solution to save it from further deterioration. The wish to increase and solidify the links between the Mills and the Gardens are to be welcomed, and therefore the GT/DHG are supportive of the extensive restoration plans.</p> <p>Our chief concerns lie within the details of the proposals. Whilst the application will increase pressure on parking, many local people walk to use the Gardens and there are good public transport services. The Gardens are also of value to people with disabilities providing level access to an attractive riverside promenade. The GT/DHG are therefore keen that any scheme should carefully manage the number of such reserved spaces in the existing Gardens car park, whilst ensuring that the current screening is maintained and thickened in places if necessary. We would also concur with Historic England's comments regarding planting within the River Gardens and about parking places being unobtrusively demarcated, perhaps with metal studs within historic paving.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	-------	--	--	---

				<p>internal walls and roof, alter 9 windows to doors on east elevation, to facilitate internal subdivision into 4 units for flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A3/A4, B1 and D2) at ground, first and mezzanine levels. At Archway Bridge/Gangway restoration and repair external and internal walls and roof, alteration to ground floor structure to retain in ancillary use to offices (Class B1); optional change of use first floor to ancillary use to venue (Class D2) associated with Strutt House (The proposal may affect the setting of a Listed Building) (The proposal represents a Departure from the Development Plan). Belper Mills Complex, Bridge Foot, Belper, Derbyshire. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	
Quardon Neighbourhood Plan	Derbyshire	E18/1340	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Consultation	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. We have been forwarded the revised Submission Version 10.03, November 2018 of the Quarndon Neighbourhood Plan and have one comment about an inaccuracy in para 7.4.4 (see below) in relation to Kedleston which we would like to draw to your attention.</p> <p>“4. Preserve or enhance the setting of Kedleston Hall, Park and Gardens. 7.4.4 Kedleston Hall and its surrounding parkland, was designed by Robert Adam in the 18th Century to take advantage of its context in the surrounding tenant-farmed South Derbyshire Claylands”.</p> <p>It has long been thought that Robert Adam was responsible for the design of the park at Kedleston, after he wrote to his brother in Dec 1758 stating that he had “...got the intire management of the Grounds put into my</p>

					<p>hands...' but as it turned out, this was not to be. The 1st Lord Scarsdale's contract with Adam of 1761 limited his design input at Kedleston to specific parts of the house, much of which had already been built prior to Adam's involvement at the property and for the designs of certain buildings in the park & gardens as specifically requested by Lord Scarsdale.</p> <p>Unfortunately, Adam's letter has since been taken at face value and repeated so many times, that this inaccuracy has become accepted as true. What seems instead to have been the case, is that the overall design for Kedleston was the brainchild of Lord Scarsdale himself, working with a team of specialists including Robert Adam. This is a more challenging explanation of the creation of the parkland design at Kedleston, but has the merit of being supported by the available evidence, which the previous 'story' does not.</p> <p>The arrangement at Kedleston is thus similar to that at Croome in Worcestershire, where the genius behind the overall design appears to have been the 6th Earl of Coventry himself, working with Robert Adam, Sanderson Miller and Lancelot 'Capability' Brown to create a unified plan for the house, gardens and parkland.</p> <p>We would be most grateful if you could please amend the relevant paragraph in your final submission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
The Hoe	Devon	E18/1225	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of new Merchant Navy & Fishing Fleet memorial. The Promenade, The Hoe, Plymouth. SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application which affects The Hoe, a designed landscape of national importance, included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on planning applications affecting all sites on the Historic England Register. The Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We visited the site with your Officers in June 2017 and accept that the proposal for the Merchant Navy Memorial would have a less than significant impact on the The Hoe.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>

					Devon Gardens Trust
Danbury Park	Essex	E18/1126	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 11 Log Cabins. Danbury Outdoors, Well Lane, Danbury, Chelmsford CM3 4AB. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION OUTCOME 20.12.2018 Granted	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2018 I am familiar with the documents associated with the application. This application would add considerably to the amount of built form in the country park and registered landscape. This will apparently be permanent. It will constitute incremental erosion of the historic and natural landscape. There is no argument that I spotted in the application justifying this in terms of why it is thought necessary, what the business plan and vision are, and perhaps more importantly where all this will end. It would be helpful to have a visual showing what the cabins would look like in the landscape. The heritage statement talks about a relocated marquee. The application seems not to mention marquees. Removal of the marquees could be seen as a benefit of the provision of the cabins. But the application is not clear on this. Do the marquees have or need planning permission? You will have noted my comments on the planting. Regards David Andrews FSA, IHBC
Colchester Castle Park	Essex	E18/1203	II	PLANNING APPLICATION To demolish the existing Pavilion and replace with smaller Pavilion built on the same foundations. To replace the bowls green with a Landscaped design Mini Golf Course. Upper Bowls Green and Upper Pavilion, Castle Park, High Street, Colchester CO1 1UN. SPORT/LEISURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2018 I am commenting on this application for the Essex Gardens Trust representing The Gardens Trust. The bowling green is now a very neglected space occupying a discreet and screened off site at the eastern edge of the Castle Park, which is a grade II registered landscape. It is also within the Conservation Area and partially within a scheduled monument. The application would see the bowling green replaced with a miniature golf course. This would not really affect the immediate setting of the site, and arguably would be an improvement of it. To that extent, I have no objection to the principle, but the application is defective in detail which could have an effect on the success of the scheme. There is no information on the materials which would be used for the replacement pavilion, nor is there a drawing of the proposed metal railings. The use of synthetic grass is regretted. Nothing is said about the materials for the paving etc within the golf course. This information must be provided and the materials and detailing should be of high quality consistent with the importance and sensitivity of the site. Regards David Andrews FSA, IHBC
Hylands Park	Essex	E18/1276	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of sail awnings to	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.12.2018 I am commenting for the Essex Gardens Trust, representing The Gardens

				west side of Stables Visitor Centre. The Stables Visitor Centre, Hylands Estate, London Road, Chelmsford, Essex. MISCELLANEOUS	Trust. Would you please put these comments on the consultee part of the website. Hylands House is a grade II* country house set in a 500a parkland setting for which Repton prepared a Red Book, and which is a grade II* registered landscape. This application is inadequately prepared: it does not explain the location of the proposal in relation to the House and landscape, nor does it attempt to justify the application or set out why it is necessary or why this solution has been adopted. Structures like this within the setting of heritage assets do not enhance them but are usually tolerated on a temporary basis because they can benefit them economically. I recommend that this approach be adopted here, that temporary approval be granted for a limited period of time until a more fitting solution can be identified, one that is more suitable for the premier visitor attraction in the Chelmsford district... Regards David Andrews
Newark Park	Gloucestershire	E18/1326	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for Restoration of historic ha-ha within the garden at Newark Park House, Ozleworth, Wotton-Under-Edge, Gloucestershire GL12 7PZ. REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.12.2018 Thank you for consulting The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for planning applications having an impact on Listed and Registered parks and gardens. Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) has been alerted to make a response on the Garden Trust's behalf. Newark Park has a Grade 11 Listed park (PG 1767); and the National Trust's planning application for Listed Building consent is supported by a site assessment prepared by an expert supervising archaeologist. The CAD drawing prepared by the National Trust shows appropriate existing and reconstructed detail, and one assumes that the c.i. railings will not be replaced. The information in the Design and Access statement was unavailable on CDC's website on 29th December 2018. GGLT is of the opinion that this restoration project should be supported. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)
Westminster City Plan	Greater London	E18/1107	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Westminster's new City Plan 2019 - 2040 consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2018 Insert "heritage" in Policy 35 A Green infrastructure policies are not strong enough to protect and conserve designed landscapes in the consideration of planning applications within and beyond their boundaries. Development should seek to avoid such detrimental impacts – insert new

					<p>clause in Policy 35 D.. Para 35.2 Westminster is the LPA determining applications which have potentially damaging impact on the significance of historic parks and gardens including the Royal Parks. There should be strong policies to ensure that the impact of new development elsewhere in the borough does not adversely affect these strategic heritage assets. Para 35.3 Insert criteria to protect and conserve designated and non designated designed landscapes. NB tranquil spaces are shown on Map 25 Para 35.7 Object - this consideration only applies to defined tranquil spaces (Map 25) This will result in the deterioration of less tranquil spaces which are also highly valued as a refuge from the city for residents and workers. Strongly support Policy 38 Policy 38 K Insert views Policy 38 L Insert provision for mitigation Para 38.15 Strongly support Omission Policy 35/38 (see Para 35.1) Registered parks and gardens and locally listed designed landscapes are not identified on a map whereas designated Biodiversity sites are shown on Map 26. This could be rectified on Map 23 open space or Map 25 tranquil spaces. Omission Policy 35/38 There is no specific policy reference to "London Squares" Support Policy 39 A & B Para 5.3 Support Para 7.7 support Support Policy 40 B, I & J</p>
Willesden Jewish Cemetery (United Synagogue Cemetery), Roundwood Park	Greater London	E18/1145	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a single storey storage and welfare building. Willesden United Synagogue Cemetery Lodge, Glebe Road, London.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, CEMETERY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2018</p> <p>The Trust is grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which has a material impact on the significance of Willesden Jewish Cemetery (United Synagogue Cemetery), Roundwood Park, a historic designed landscape which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration. We write as the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT). The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LPGT is the Gardens Trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the Gardens Trust in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). We object to this application as currently presented, because of the lack of strategy to</p>

					<p>recognise and mitigate its impact on the nationally designated Willesden Jewish Cemetery, contravening NPPF 185. The Design & Access Statement goes so far as to say: "Willesden Cemetery Lodge building and existing maintenance are not listed or in a conservation area. The boundary wall is not listed and trees within the compound are not subject to Tree preservation orders." Continued/...</p> <p>In particular, we are concerned about the proximity of the storage building to the lodge and its impact on its setting, and its positioning in key views within the cemetery. We do however appreciate that such facilities are needed within the cemetery and so would be pleased to consider a further application based on a proper understanding of the site's vulnerabilities. We therefore conclude that this proposal has not been designed with an understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and how to guard against damage to it, and contains elements which will have a detrimental impact We therefore urge you to refuse this application in its current form and we would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Linden Groves Volunteer On behalf of the Planning and Conservation Working Group London Parks and Gardens Trust</p>
Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	Greater London	E18/1271	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 12.33 metre high Alpha monopole and 2 No. equipment cabinets. Telecommunications Site 78220, Twickenham Road, Richmond TW9 1PQ. COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.12.2018</p> <p>Comment: I write as a long-term resident of LB Richmond and as a former Chairman of the London Parks and Gardens Trust to object on behalf of the Gardens Trust to the above proposal. LPGT is affiliated to the Gardens Trust, formerly the Garden History Society and Association of Gardens Trusts, which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning applications affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of parks and gardens of special historic interest.</p> <p>The Old Deer Park is registered at grade I, the highest grade of listing, together with the adjacent Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, and forms part of the buffer zone of the RBGK World Heritage Site. It also forms part of the conservation area, is adjacent to the River Thames, and contains or is close to a number of important listed buildings including the King's Observatory and the associated Obelisks, Asgill House, Twickenham Bridge, and Richmond Railway Bridge.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust considers that the proposed mast will be unacceptably damaging to the character and visual amenities of the Old Deer Park and to</p>

					the setting of the associated registered heritage assets, and respectfully requests your Council to refuse the current application. Chris Sumner
Lambeth Local Plan	Greater London	E18/1299	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.12.2018</p> <p>Section 2: Evidence Base and Issues</p> <p>Built Heritage</p> <p>This section (paras 2.53 – 2.56) relates to open spaces and designed landscapes yet it is titled “built heritage”. “Registered landscapes” should be edited to “registered parks and gardens”.</p> <p>A planning issue which does not appear to have been addressed is the use of public parks for events and the criteria that will be applied in considering applications. Issues this raises includes affect on character of the space and the experience of being within the space (accessibility, tranquility/noise, health and well-being.)</p> <p>Policy ED13 Visitor attractions, leisure, arts and culture cultural uses insert into Policy ED13(d) “and complete reinstatement.”</p> <p>We wish to ensure that any damage to parks following an event is repaired and paid for by the event organiser and not be a liability for the council.</p> <p>Summary of Spatial Planning Issues</p> <p>Welcome inclusion of parks and open spaces as essential infrastructure requiring investment (para 2.100 & 3.6).</p> <p>Policies</p> <p>section 9</p> <p>Policy EN1 Open space, green infrastructure and biodiversity general support for approach to protect and enhance parks and open spaces</p> <p>Section 10</p> <p>Policy Q21 Registered parks and gardens general support for approach to protect and enhance parks and open spaces</p> <p>Policy Q23 Undesignated Non-designated heritage assets: local heritage list general support for approach to protect and enhance parks and open spaces</p> <p>Policy Q26 Tall and large buildings general support for approach to protect and enhance parks and open spaces</p> <p>Planning & Conservation Working Group London Parks & Gardens Trust</p>

Central Parks	Hampshire	E18/0680	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings (Bargate Shopping Centre and multistorey car park, 77-101 Queensway, 25 East Street, 30-32 Hanover Buildings, 1-16 East Bargate and 1-4 High Street, excluding frontage)</p> <p>refurbishment of basements and mixed use development comprising 244 flats (102x one bedroom and 142x two bedroom) (use class C3), 152 units of student residential accommodation (353 bedrooms), retail use (class A1), flexible retail, office or food and drink use (Classes A1-A3), in new buildings ranging in height from 4-storey's to 12-storey's, with associated parking and servicing, landscaping and public realm (Environmental Impact Assessment Development affects a public right of way and the setting of the listed Town Walls) - Scheme amendments to planning permission 16/01303/FUL seeking changes to residential mix, design and additional height along Queensway. Bargate Shopping Centre and adjoining land In Queensway, East Street, Hanover Buildings and High Street, Southampton. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.12.2018</p> <p>(We do not wish to burden your officers with further paperwork to wade through. We continue to OBJECT to the above application for all the reasons given in our original letter of 18th September 2018 and fully endorse the subsequent comments made on 7th December 2018, by Mr Linecar, Secretary of SCAPPS with regard to the additional information submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hertsmere Local Plan	Hertfordshire	E18/1025	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN Public engagement on 'Potential Housing and Employment sites'</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.12.2018</p> <p>Potential sites for housing and employment 2018 (25/10/18 to 20/12/18) Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (Mrs Kate Harwood 1192781)</p>

					<p>HGT has concerns about the adverse affect on the heritage assets nearby, for example Grade II Bushey House, Herkomer House and especially the setting of the Bushey Rose Garden, which is on the Historic England Register. These issues on specific heritage assets, as opposed to the 'historic core' have not been addresses</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (Mrs Kate Harwood 1192781)</p> <p>Area S1 covers part of the remaining Porters Park. This is on the HGT List of Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest, has tentatively been attributed to Lancelot 'Capability' Brown and should be considered as an heritage asset. Development of S1 will also adversely affect the setting of the historic Cricket Ground and Victorian cricket pavilion. Development of this area would be contrary to provisions of Chapter 16 of the NPPF (2018) and would be contrary to the Sustainable Development criterion (8c) of the NPPF . Serious harm has already been permitted with the development of the Porters Park housing estate. Cumulative Harm, as defined and exemplified in 'Vulnerability Brown' by The Gardens Trust, would result from yet more development here.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Hatfield Business Park	Hertford shire	E18/1153	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for a large-scale mixed use development including 1,100 new homes and supporting infrastructure including a primary school, local centre and open space with all matters reserved. Hatfield Business Park, Hatfield AL10 9SL. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We object to this application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not included as a development area of any kind within the emerging Local Plan 2. It is within the Green Belt and designated so to remain in the emerging Local Plan. GB land within the Borough is already planned to be reduced from c. 79% to c.74%. 3. The recent GB review concluded that this area contributed a significant amount to preventing coalescence of neighbouring towns and safeguarding the countryside 4. The proposed development extends Hatfield westwards towards St Albans District (which is itself proposing development towards Hatfield) contrary to GB Review findings, NPPF Chapter 13 and WHBC Policy SADM34 5. It adversely affects Ellenbrook Fields, an area used as a local open space by runners, walkers and cyclists <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Dimsdale House,	Hertford	E18/1185	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2018</p>

Essendon	shire			Listed Building Consent Erection of a new timber clad garden room to the rear garden and alterations to garage roof. Dimsdale House, Essendon Place, High Road, Essendon.	Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are aware that the former landscape at Essendon Place is one of a number of interconnecting gentry landscapes of the 18th and 19th centuries. However, little remains in the area around Dimsdale House. We therefore do not wish to make any comment on this application, based on the details provided. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Woodhall Park	Hertford shire	E18/1206	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of car park for 86 vehicles, new access and relocation of security hut with associated landscaping. Heath Mount School, Woodhall Park, Watton At Stone, Hertfordshire SG14 3NG. EDUCATION, PARKING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.12.2018 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which Herts Gardens Trust is a member. We support the preparation of a masterplan to inform future development at Woodhall Park which is a Grade I mansion surrounded by a Grade II* Registered park. We understand from the documents presented with this application that this is part of the rationalising of the car parking, which includes removing unsightly car parking from closer to the mansion. We would support this approach on 2 conditions: 1. There is sufficient screening for the new car park so that it does not have an adverse impact on the mansion approach. 2. There is detail of which car parking spaces are to be removed from near the mansion to this site. We can find no detail of the car parking spaces to be removed from around the house so that this application appears to be merely an increase in total car parking provision with no gains for the heritage assets, contrary to NPPF (Chapter 15) and EHDC policies HA1, HA7.ii, HA8. We would require clarification on this matter of car parking . If there is to be no removal of car park spaces from near the mansion then we would object to the scheme as presented in this application. Kate Harwood
Panshanger	Hertford shire	E18/1262	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed discharge of conditions 16, 17 and 24 of planning permission 3/0527-15. Panshanger Park, Panshanger, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 2NL. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2018 Thank you for consulting HGT, a member of The Gardens Trust. We have no comments on Condition 24. We have no comments to make on the Restoration of Phase F as detailed in the Information supplied by Pleydell Smithyman for Conditions 16 & 17. We are concerned about some aspects of the detail on Phase H. 1. The ground levels should be restored to those pre-extraction, not to 'near' (undefined). That is the rationale for importing inert materials. HGT

					<p>requested a site survey prior to extraction in 2013 which should contain this information</p> <p>2. We are unclear as to why the Repton period was chosen as the date to restore to. The 1704 and Brown phases are of more importance here</p> <p>3. The planting in the parkland does not reflect planting as shown on any historic map and we consider that the siting of clumps detracts from the impact of the avenues and the setting of The Oak Avenue leading up to the ha-ha. The planting plan needs to be refined.</p> <p>4. The avenues, or partial avenues, need to be all of oak to emphasise the design intent and to reflect the historic oak trees. Other species need to be carefully considered and sited.</p> <p>We consider that these issues be addressed before any permission is given on discharge of conditions.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
10 Corn Mead, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfordshire	E18/1330	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension with alterations to openings. 10 Corn Mead, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7QR. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Corn Mead is built on the former Digsweil landscape designed by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown in the 18th century and the rear view overlooks the historic Monks Walk. On the basis of the information enclosed in this application we do not consider that this application would cause further harm to this heritage asset.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Lavenders Road And Swan Street, West Malling	Kent	E18/1165	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Application: Development comprising up to 80 residential dwellings (including 40% affordable housing), open space, drainage, access and associated works, with all matters reserved except for access which is to be considered in detail at this stage. Field At Corner Of Lavenders Road And Swan Street, West Malling, Kent. RESIDENTIAL	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2018</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, and write to object to this application.</p> <p>Having studied the detailed responses from West Malling Parish Council, Historic England, KCC Heritage Conservation and numerous replies from local residents it would appear that all aspects of this application have been considered.</p> <p>We wish to support the parish council in its objection and echo the concerns raised by Historic England and KCC Heritage Conservation.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Mike O'Brien (Trustee)</p>
Knole	Kent	E18/1181	I	PLANNING APPLICATION The	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2018

				<p>replacement of one cricket pitch with an enclosed 3G Multi Use Games Areas (MUGA), a 3G cricket wicket and two multipurpose grass pitches, including associated landscaping, lighting and enclosures. Sevenoaks Rugby Football Club, Plymouth Drive, Sevenoaks KENT TN13 3RP. SPORT/LEISURE, EXTERNAL LIGHTING</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have checked the photographs at the end of the planning statement submitted with this application. These show what appears to be a perimeter tree belt around this sports field on Knole Park land. There appears insufficient room around the playing field perimeter for planting a screen, so the presence of this tree belt is vital. The section of Knole Park adjacent to the application site is very undulating and we have some concerns that the proposed floodlighting would be visible from other areas of the park further away. We would ask that the three floodlighting columns (currently shown as 15m) adjacent to the park should not be visible from Knole Park. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincolnshire	E18/1082	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a community building to consist of council offices, community hall, and cafe and to include associated landscaping, car parking and bin store on the site of an existing building which is to be demolished. TOWER GARDENS PAVILLION, RUTLAND ROAD, SKEGNESS, LINCOLNSHIRE PE25 2AX. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.12.2018 Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) welcomes this opportunity to comment on this planning proposal. As a member of The Gardens Trust (TGT) LGT works closely with the TGT (formerly the Garden History Society), the statutory consultee for all planning and development proposals affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. Thanks to local knowledge, LGT advises the TGT and, on occasion, comments on their behalf. Lincolnshire Gardens Trust welcomes the proposal design access statement regarding aims to create a seamless link between the proposed building and the existing gardens. Where appropriate, new tree and shrub planting is planned to soften the streetscape and provide a more visually appealing development. The site layout plan (page 16) appears to contain greenery, perhaps hedging, surrounding the contemporary building, yet the drawings of proposed elevations (page 17) appear to show only lawn and trees, and no extra shrub or planting detail to relieve or soften the extent of concrete walkway and the stark lines of the contemporary building. Why were the other plans, elevations and topographical survey not made available? With the unique heritage of significant sea-side public gardens,</p>

					<p>as the recent Historic England Grade II listing has successfully highlighted, it is hoped more attention, effort and funding will be given to enable the new structure, not only to sit comfortably and marry into the public gardens and bandstand setting, but also to provide a suitable level of aesthetic enjoyment for visitors. We would have welcomed a more detailed professionally designed scheme rather than a vague promise of seasonal refreshment of native plants and shrubs. Our main concern is the lack of planting detail and appropriate, sustainable design innovation and future management for a site of such historic significance.</p> <p>Steffie Shields Chairman, Lincolnshire Gardens Trust</p>
Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincolnshire	E18/1238	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a building to provide a cafe with an outdoor seating area, existing cafe on site to be removed. Conversion of part of the existing chalet building to provide an associated office, storage space and locker rooms. Erection of a high wire leisure facility to a maximum height of 21.0metres. SKEGNESS SPORT AND LEISURE CENTRE, GRAND PARADE, SKEGNESS PE25 2UG. VISITOR ATTRACTION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.12.2018</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) welcomes this opportunity to comment on this planning proposal. As a member of The Gardens Trust (TGT) LGT works closely with the TGT (formerly the Garden History Society), the statutory consultee for all planning and development proposals affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. Thanks to local knowledge, LGT advises the TGT and, on occasion, comments on their behalf.</p> <p>As stated in response to the previous planning application S/153/01108/18 dated 5 July 2018, LGT view this application for a high wire leisure facility in this significant site as a retrograde step. The Historic England description in the recent listing emphasises the value of the site:</p> <p>" The design interest is they are a significant creation both in scale and detail, embodying many of the design elements of a seaside landscape of the period. The well-structured composition, punctuated by bridges, sunken formal gardens, pavilions, bowling greens and mock castles, is linked by water features to create a visual and textural interest in what were formerly sand dunes."</p> <p>At 21 m high the high wires would be 3 m higher than the existing 18 m high Giant Wheel and 15 m high roller coaster. LGT considers this new leisure facility to be inappropriate, too high and too near to the setting of the Esplanade and Tower Gardens, HE Grade II, and would add distracting visual clutter and doubtless noise particularly to the adjacent Compass Gardens which are designed for rest, recuperation and visual pleasure. If this facility were installed, the view north-east for all visitors on the main approach to the sea-side, first arriving at the focal Clocktower and central Tower Esplanade, would be extremely chaotic, messy and even ugly</p>

					<p>judging from the generic mock-up images, and would do nothing to enhance the significant Skegness Foreshore. Therefore, LGT wishes to register again its objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Steffie Shields Chairman, Lincolnshire Gardens Trust</p>
Allerton Cemetery	Mersey side	E18/1232	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION To erect a private mausoleum within the cemetery. Allerton Cemetery Lodge, 192 Woolton Road, Liverpool L19 5NF. SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We have reviewed the application documentation, but not visited the site. It is noted that the application site occupies a prominent location within the Grade II Registered Allerton Cemetery, laid out by the City Engineer based on influence of contemporary European examples and opened in 1909. The current application concerns development within the central section of the Cemetery which is dominated by the three mortuary Chapels, the Anglican Chapel at the central avenue, the Non Conformist and Roman Catholic symmetrically arranged to the north and south respectively.</p> <p>LGT objects to the current application for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is not clear from the application documentation whether mausoleums already exist within Allerton Cemetery, or whether this current application is setting a precedent. There is no Design and Access Statement to give the context for the style, scale or siting of the structure.</p> <p>The application plans indicate the proposed location of the mausoleum on one of the curved driveways linking the central avenue to the Non Conformist Chapel. This is an important link and an intrinsic part of the symmetrical layout of the site. It is also in a very prominent location immediately visible from the central avenue. The application states that the location is on a 'cemetery roadway'. The photographs included with the application indicate that the site is beyond the tarmac roadway yet still within a more informal grass trackway which is indicated on all the historic OS plans. Perhaps there is a new masterplan for the revision of driveways but this is not clear. If this is</p>

					<p>the case, such a new design can be judged on its merits. However this would not be appropriate to be considered as part of this application. For present purposes, LGT regards the trackway as part of the design of the cemetery which should be retained.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the location intended for the mausoleum actually been defined as a burial space by the City Council. We would hope not, in view of its significance in relation to the layout of the cemetery and the prominence of the site.</p> <p>Subject to the comments on precedent above, LGT would not object to the principle of construction of a mausoleum, however in this instance where the structure is of modest materials such blockwork and render on its sides and rear a more discreet and screened location should be found. We therefore object to the application as submitted.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
St Mary's Hospital, Stannington	Northumb erland	E18/1183	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of three dwellings Location Land At Strathmore St Marys Hospital Drive, Stannington, Northumberland. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumberland Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and it is disappointing that the D&A statement makes no acknowledgement of the Parks & Gardens designation or history of the site proposed for development. The grounds surrounding St Mary's Hospital, Stannington are listed Grade II by Historic England. The former Gateshead Borough Lunatic Asylum opened in 1914, and was designed in 1910 by the architect and asylum designer George T Hine to accommodate 400 patients, with the intention of extending the building to accommodate 500 patients eventually. The airing courts were arranged adjacent to the wards and the parkland, including a large kitchen garden, enclosed the buildings and courts. Several peripheral buildings were added during the later C20.</p> <p>Even given the extensive re-development of the hospital site it is to be regretted if further erosion of the designed landscape is to take place,</p>

					<p>placing the site at risk of de-registration. Despite the modern housing development to the west of the proposed development site, The Villas (to the east of the site) and the approach drive appear to be part of the planned hospital layout. The proposed development site appears to have been taken in from agricultural land when the hospital site expanded post-War to form the Burnholme development to the north of the original hospital. Simple map regression and a brief search online indicates that the garden (not just 'land south of Strathmore') served as the setting for the former Deputy Medical Superintendent's house (Strathmore/Ravensworth) for the hospital. The detached large house now proposed for development, still has its own fairly formal landscaped layout complete with fountain but this will be obliterated by the three new houses. It would have helped to have some indication of how the site formed part of the designed landscape of the hospital grounds (presumably why it was included in the designation in the first place). In the absence of basic information such as whether original features and planting elements survive, it is difficult to assess the significance of the site. We would ask that the applicants provide this application before your officers determine this application. We would also draw your officers' attention to The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views, 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.'</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Parcevall Hall	North Yorkshire	E18/1138	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for the creation of 8 no. additional car parking spaces. Parcevall Hall Gardens, Skyreholme, Appletreewick. PARKING Andrew Moxon</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. 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>Though we support in principle this application we have serious concerns about the applicant's understanding of the area's significance and this lack of understanding potentially undermines any proposals. This is an historic</p>

					<p>walled kitchen garden; the ‘engine’ of Sir William Milner’s propagation work and important plant introductions from c.1930 eg. The Harlow Carr Plant Record Books show that he gifted thousands of his seedlings to these gardens, which included more than 150 distinct species/forms of rhododendrons and those raised from rare seed from the Ludlow, Sherriff & Hicks 1949 expedition to Bhutan. The description in the documents as a ‘utility space’ (eg at Heritage Statement: 2.2, 6.1 and 8.1) is a misnomer. The Historic England (formerly English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens description for Parcevall Hall clearly mentions the kitchen garden by name and it is described as having ‘several uses’. (Contrary to the assertion in the Heritage Statement at 6.1 which writes that ‘The utility area is not acknowledged in either the list description of Parcevall Hall or its gardens...’.) The kitchen garden is of course located within the boundary of the registered site which is strongly indicative of its status. It is important to understand the significance of the site, and the association of the glasshouses and walled kitchen garden with Sir William greatly enhances this significance.</p> <p>We refer to the details in our letter of 31st January 2018 in response to the earlier application: C/02/106M, C/02/106N/LB.</p> <p>The greenhouse known as the propagation house and the two lean-to glasshouses in Parcevall's walled kitchen garden were constructed by W. Richardson & Co, Darlington, c. 1930. Despite their poor condition they are a rare surviving example of a glasshouse complex by one of the leaders in glasshouse construction in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Sir William Milner was an architect and ran his own practice, Milner and Craze, Fleet Street, London, as well as being one of the most knowledgeable amateur plantsmen of his era and a founder of the Northern Horticultural Society which established Harlow Carr Gardens. He became the Chairman of the Gardens Committee and the second Honorary Director of the Gardens, a post he held until his death in 1960.</p> <p>His own walled kitchen garden was intensively cultivated as can be seen in a 1953 aerial photo (MZ44, Cambridge Air Photos). His glasshouses were sited within a large area of cold frames, which also included two additional free-standing glasshouses, of which the more western one was his original alpine house constructed c. 1930. Thus, the walled garden was not only functional but was designed to be aesthetically pleasing, with show glasshouses terminating the view from the central path. We consider that it is extremely important that any proposal for this walled kitchen garden</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>should retain the original aesthetic and legibility.</p> <p>During the summer Gail Falkingham (archaeologist), Jane Furse (landscape architect), Anne Tupholme (researcher) and myself (historic landscape conservation) had a meeting on site with the Phill Nelson (Head Gardener) and Jess Johnson (Strutt and Parker). We regret that a number of the conclusions that we came to are not reflected in this application. We totally disagree with the Heritage Impact Assessment and believe that this proposal will have an impact on the registered park and gardens.</p> <p>We note the National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 (NPPF) 192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. <p>We approve of the concept of rebuilding a run of the cold frames, but as the plans only refer to the height (350mm), we would please further like details of its proposed construction in order to comment. We consider that the height would be inadequate for the overall height of the cold frames, which would have had sloping lights with the back of the frame at least 24 inches high (approx. 600mm) as in the early Richardson catalogue, or possibly up to 1.0 – 1.2m high and sides with specially cut top bricks in order to create the required smooth slope.</p> <p>We also approve of the concept of constructing a wide appropriately edged border adjacent to the western facing wall on part of the site used in recent times for muck heaps, together with the reinstatement of a bounding path. This would be a continuation of the original path bounding the long wide eastern garden border. There is archaeological evidence visible on the surface of the new car parking area which shows the former features/structures, such a path edges and planting beds. The path width should follow the archaeology on site. At the meeting, it was confirmed that ground levels would not be affected by the current proposals. Please could we have more details of reinstating the path in order to comment?</p> <p>The extant narrow border bounding the south facing wall adjacent to the site of the proposed Brick Cold Frame is not shown on this plan. Thus, it is not clear if it is intended to continue it around the corner until it meets the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>northern end of the proposed 2300 mm wide border. We would advise the latter in order to restore wall trained fruit trees to the northern section of the western facing wall.</p> <p>We have previously advised that new permanent car parking should be sited in an area of less favourable growing conditions, ie in the southern shaded part of the garden currently laid to grass. This is also for aesthetic reasons and to give shade to cars during good weather when the car park is likely to be busy. We still hold this view. We advise that the northern section should not be permanently marked out for car parking, and clear signage should indicate that this northern section of the garden is for overflow car parking only, as was the case a few years ago.</p> <p>We have also previously advised that soft landscaping should be introduced to improve the view from the entrance. In particular we advise that soft landscaping is required between the present gravel parking area and the proposed extension and recommend detailed proposals need to be submitted in order to ensure that the proposal for an extended gravel area does not cause additional harm to the view from the entrance or the setting of the glasshouses and frames.</p> <p>We have also previously recommended that it is desirable that the more modern additions of a tool store and adjacent tractor shed should be removed, particularly as the latter blocks the original extant pedestrian entrance, designed by Sir William Milner and both have a negative impact on the walled kitchen garden. These should have been sited outside this walled kitchen garden as traditionally would have been the case and where they would be no less secure than they are currently. Their removal could provide at least 2 more permanent car parking spaces and would enable the planting of the adjacent walls to be restored and Sir William's original pedestrian gate reopened, which would greatly enhance the whole walled kitchen garden.</p> <p>Overall, we regret that there is no professional Conservation and Management Plan which can guide future works.</p> <p>In conclusion although we support in principle the proposal for restoring the recently removed cold frames, the creation of a wide border adjacent to the western facing wall and an extension of the gravelled area in the northern section, for the reasons outlined above we regretfully cannot support these current proposals in their present form. We therefore with regret object to this planning proposal and listed building consent application and trust that it can be refined to give a more sympathetic</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					outcome for this site, the only Registered Historic Park and Garden in the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman
Castle Howard	North Yorkshire	E18/1152	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey extension to existing visitor centre, formation of new pathways and ramps with associated lighting and landscaping. The Arboretum, Castle Howard, Malton YO60 7BY. BUILDING ALTERATION Gary Housden	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens at Grade I 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. This is a well - documented application and we support the provision of a Tree Health Centre at the Yorkshire Arboretum. The work and teaching should be very timely as we consider how to ameliorate the impact of climate change and increased disease incidence on our native and ornamental tree and shrub species. We commend the pre-application discussions and the reduction of height from two storeys to one storey, the careful consideration of the landscape and visual impact, the new planting and that there will be no external lighting in the proposed development apart from low level bollard lighting. We have no objection to this application. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman
Whitby Abbey House	North Yorkshire	E18/1186	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of existing Lodge building to Cafe with associated outdoor seating. Abbey House, East Cliff, Whitby, North Yorkshire YO22 4JT. CATERING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.12.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We regret that we weren't consulted on the previous application 18/00984/FL which included the new landscaping and seating schemes, more appropriate to our knowledge, and which was approved on 21st June 2018.

					<p>We note that research and tree pits indicate that the northern courtyards may historically have been planted as an orchard. We are not aware that the proposed avenue of trees has any historical justification. We have not noted any reference to the species or varieties that English Heritage intend to plant. As you know Whitby Headland is very exposed and the air can be salt-laden at times making tree growth slower and more difficult than in more clement places. We recommend that local advice is sought. R.V. Roger Ltd, Pickering is a knowledgeable local nursery.</p> <p>We understand the need for accessible access, but perhaps with all the other surface changes proposed, there may have been an opportunity to remove the five car parking spaces from the northern courtyard as these reduce the clarity of the sense of arrival.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make on this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
York Cemetery	North Yorkshire	E18/1204	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Single storey extension and alterations to building to form volunteers centre with associated facilities and tool store (resubmission). York Cemetery Trust Kiosk, York Cemetery, Cemetery Road, York. CEMETERY, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The new building is within the curtilage of the area on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens and at the western edge of the site, adjacent to the grade II listed Lodge (1837) in Greek Revival Style. In principal the new building seems of a scale which will not impose too much on the almost adjacent Lodge although when the proposed gates into the service yard are shut the whole composition when viewed from within the cemetery would appear as a linked group as the gates link the lodge with the new build. We understand that in the resubmission the building has been slightly moved to allow more space between the railings, lodge and proposal, but this issue of massing does not seem to have been considered when viewed from within the cemetery and in our view detracts from the historic integrity of the cemetery.</p> <p>We appreciate that this area of the cemetery has historically been a utilitarian one and formerly housed the greenhouses for the cemetery and</p>

					<p>this project is for a utilitarian use, however in considering the scheme from the point of view of impact on the registered landscape and listed buildings, our concerns about the project are as follows, should the City of York be proposing to approve this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new building intervenes between the road and grade II* listed chapel (1837) along its length. The new building will be very evident from Cemetery Road. It has a long curtain wall and will prevent glimpses to the chapel when walking along beside the railings on Cemetery Road. • The project seems to involve the removal of some small trees which currently form part of a belt of trees adjacent to the railings. No soft landscape proposals for the area between the railings and the new building accompany the application documentation yet such a scheme would seem desirable. • Similarly, for the other facades of the building no soft landscaping scheme is indicated. A planting scheme could soften the impact of the building. • We are concerned about sight lines between the Chapel at the centre of the site and the new building when in the cemetery. This does not appear to have been considered at all and when on the chapel steps this new utilitarian building will be seen as a linked extension to the Lodge. It does not seem that the setting, required to be given consideration under the NPPF (July 2018, 190), has really been considered fully in relation to the Chapel. The chapel and lodge are linked in terms of style and materials and physically linked by a serpentine drive which was part of the original landscape design. The location of the new building may draw the eye away from the Lodge and impede on the natural tension between the two buildings. <p>We welcome the intention is to remove the pebble dash/concrete garage/store building. This sits amid a very messy area strewn with bins and redundant materials. It would be a great improvement if the project could ensure that the area adjacent to the railings and behind the current store would be required to be cleared up as a condition of the application, as well as making the removal of the concrete building a condition of the approval.</p> <p>We strongly recommend a planting scheme is drawn up for the setting of the new building and Lodge using a range of plants sympathetic to the Victorian character of the cemetery if this proposal is to be acceptable from an historic landscape point of view.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman
Rowntree Park	North Yorkshire	E18/1231	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to existing Park Keeper's Lodge including removal of existing external fire escape stairs and the blocking up first floor external door in connection with use as holiday let accommodation. Rowntree Park Lodge, Richardson Street, York YO23 1JU. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.12.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and the York Civic Trust. We understand that your Council has advised that any profit from the proposed lettings would be spent on Rowntree Park. We will respond in full when we have had further discussions with our colleagues. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Stanford Hall	Notting hamshire	E18/1291	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed erection of x2 modular cabin units to the space in front of the energy centre. Stanford Hall Estate, Melton Road, Stanford On Soar, Nottinghamshire LE12 5QW. MISCELLANEOUS	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have looked at the plans submitted on the Rushcliffe Planning website. They are very poor and insufficient for the purposes of statutory consultation with the Gardens Trust. In addition to the poor quality of the plans there is also no additional information in the form of a heritage impact assessment. A 'supporting statement' is referred to in the planning application form but if this does exist it has not been posted onto the website. We are also concerned to note that the planning application ticks the box to indicate that the work has already started. It also states that the application has been submitted because the cabins will be in place for more than 28 days, but it does not indicate how long they will be used for. This type of building is often 'temporary' and if that is the case it will affect the final response the GT will eventually submit. We would ask that your officers require the applicant to provide better plans, further information with regard to the heritage impact, clarification of the timings (ie has the work commenced, and how long will the modular units be in place?). Without this information we are unable to provide a considered response. Yours sincerely,

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Albert Park	Oxford shire	E18/1076	II	PLANNING APPLICATION 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>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2018</p> <p>Further to my email of 22nd November 2018 concerning the misleading description of the the scheme, I note that the conservation officer Sally Stradling has submitted a comprehensive report on the site, now describing the proposed extension as ‘a 3 storey extension, (with) wrap around single storey extensions and new porch’ which ‘impacts on the rear historic extensions.’ The Gardens Trust would like to fully endorse her comments and in light of this revised information, we object to the proposed application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.12.2018</p> <p>We note the provision of a Heritage Statement & Design & Access statement by the applicant for the above application as requested in our letter of 11th November 2018. However, the GT has not changed its views and would still like to OBJECT as per our comments in our 2nd letter of 9th December 2018.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Blenheim Palace	Oxford shire	E18/1215	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Temporary siting (4 months) of a Shakespearian theatre at Blenheim Palace. Blenheim Palace, Blenheim Park, Woodstock. PERFORMANCE	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We note that in essence the proposal is to construct a four-storey temporary (4 months) structure to be erected in the area of park adjacent to the east drive within the loop of the mini railway. The proposed location falls within the visual envelope of the principal entrance façade. The elevations appear to be in a white board with reddish joining strips and a complex roof line.</p>

					<p>The building proposal does not appear to be especially attractive and is very large. However, important views to the lakes and Brownian landscape are not seriously impacted. The Oxfordshire Gardens Trust has no objection on the basis that it is a temporary structure, with the proviso that no alteration to the ground levels/surfaces are incurred in its erection and removal. However, it is certainly not something that we would support on a year on year basis due to its visually intrusive location.</p> <p>Regards, Marybeth Harasz Secretary</p>
Attingham Park	Shropshire	E18/1217	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act for the retrospective change of use from agricultural land to recreational use to include siting of play equipment, natural play area, field shelter, toilet block(s) and landscaping. Land North Of Attingham Park, Atcham, Shrewsbury, Shropshire. PLAY AREA, VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to retrospective permission for development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application.</p> <p>Our main concern at this stage, is that the NT have still not produced a CMP for the parkland at Attingham, which is Listed as Grade II* on Historic England's National Heritage List, to guide this kind of development in the future. We have previously requested that such a study be carried out and we feel it should be a priority, given that Attingham is also still included on Historic England's 'Heritage at Risk' register as being 'of concern.'</p> <p>Our own concerns are emphasized by the apparent lack of understanding that is evident in the NT's Heritage Impact Assessment, as submitted with this application. Here, (para.5.1, p.6) Attingham Park is described as '...an ambitious experiment in the Picturesque...', whereas in fact, Repton's proposals for Attingham were specifically intended to be his riposte to Picturesque theories, as stated bluntly in the Red Book's Introduction.</p> <p>With regard to the play area itself, had the GT been consulted in the first place, it seems unlikely that we would have objected to the playground per se, given its mode of construction, its apparent low-key nature and its location outside of, albeit surrounded on 3 sides by, the pleasure grounds to the east, kitchen garden & orchard to the south and parkland to the west, as depicted on the OS 1st Ed. 6" plan (1887). We note however that the play area lies within the Historic England Registered Park boundary, and it is regrettable that the National Trust, which is a conservation charity, was apparently unaware of this fact.</p> <p>We would certainly have requested restrictions on the kinds of structures which could be included in the area and that there should be no future development in areas adjacent to it, for example for a dedicated car park.</p>

					<p>We would also firmly resist any application that might come forward in future for access to this area which does not come through the property (from the west for example, directly from the main road.)</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Sheffield General Cemetery	South Yorkshire	E18/1178	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of garage/office buildings and erection of 22 apartments in 4/5 storey block including semi-basement/part ground floor car parking and ancillary accommodation. Cemetery Road Car Sales, 300 Cemetery Road, Sheffield S11 8FT. DEMOLITION, CEMETERY, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We much regret that we were not informed earlier in the planning process. 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>This planning application affects an outstanding example of a Victorian cemetery, recently awarded £3m Heritage Lottery Funding for its restoration. The cemetery's national importance is signified by its being listed at grade II* (a high grade for a cemetery) on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. Not only that but the area for this proposal is very significant as it is within the boundary of the original and most historic part of the cemetery – this piece of land is located on high ground and is the area that was for many years used as a stone yard, where gravestones were prepared, before being sold off separately by the council after they acquired the General Cemetery. We understand that the reason for including this site within the boundary of the Registered historic landscape is because this section is important for the understanding and visual appreciation of the whole of the site.</p> <p>The Sheffield General Cemetery was set up in response to overcrowding and poor conditions in Sheffield churchyards, exacerbated by the cholera epidemic in 1832. It was the emancipation of the independence movement in Sheffield (independence from the Church of England regarding burial). The original section of the Cemetery - immediately to the north of this planning application - was unconsecrated ground to symbolise the agenda of the non-conformists and the buildings were in classical style, recognisably different from the gothic style of the Church of England. The design (1834) was by Samuel Worth, with assistance from Robert Marnock. Worth was a well-known architect who also designed the Cutlers' Hall and</p>

					<p>Moorgate Cemetery in Rotherham (1841); Marnock became a designer with a national and international reputation who in addition to his work nationally on public parks was known for cemetery designs including, Northampton General Cemetery, Stroud General Cemetery and Ely Cemetery. The design of the Sheffield General Cemetery was used by John Claudius Loudon, (a notable designer of parks and gardens and arguably the most distinguished gardening author of the age), as a prototypical example for a hilly site in his influential book on cemetery design (see below). For this purpose, it was slightly simplified, but is still recognisable. This planning proposal to replace a one-story garage and car repair shop with a four/five story apartment bloc will overpower the most historic parts of the site. It will reduce the realisation of the registered historic landscape and its listed buildings, which will now be hidden behind the new building. Instead of an improvement to the heritage; this development will not only remove significant features of the registered historic landscape in the walls, the archaeology, and the planting (trees) within the cemetery grounds, it will also change its character (and that of the wider area).</p> <p>It will also destroy the unique relationship of the cemetery buildings and the original symmetry i.e. 'the axis of symmetry' (of the dissenters' section) which means that the buildings were symmetrically placed upon the slope, i.e. in the centre of the site above each other. By positioning a building to one side would destroy this relationship, and create imbalance, making the site more difficult to read as a historic landscape in design terms. It is the application of this axis of symmetry which is such a unique feature of the Sheffield General Cemetery, being one of the first sites where this was applied to a cemetery, and which later was followed widely in the cemetery building boom after the Burial Act of 1852. (For an explanation of the design principles, including the axis of symmetry see J. C Loudon, On the Laying Out, Planting, and Managing of Cemeteries: And on the improvement of churchyards, London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1843; p.18-19; and Brent Elliott Victorian Gardens, B T Batsford, 1986). The Grade II listed building - the general cemetery's office and accommodation- will become insignificant, being over-towered by a much taller block; and by the pulling forward of the building line it will not be read as the major landscape feature it was, as intended in the original design where it was the pinnacle of the axis of symmetry.</p> <p>The planning proposal only considers the building from the road, and from</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the false perspective of tidying up, and whilst seen from that perspective it might form a reasonable proposition but when this building is being considered from the perspective of the Grade II* historic registered landscape of national significance, this proposal is wholly unacceptable. The reason for including this site within the boundary of the Registered historic landscape in the first place, must have been because of the realisation of the importance of this section for the understanding and visual appreciation of the whole of the site, which should be subservient. Although we understand that demolishing the car servicing/garage and replacing it with residential accommodation utilises brownfield land, and in this respect, complies with local and national planning policy and also provides residential accommodation in an area very well served by public transport, this proposal for a four/five storey block is totally unacceptable for the reasons outlined above. Its scale and massing will have a significant damaging impact on the Grade II* Registered site, its listed buildings and the General Cemetery Conservation Area.</p> <p>From the documents we note the Principal Planning Officer's comments but we cannot support the scale and massing. In addition, we note his comments that from the submitted drawings, it appears that retaining structures to the rear of the site will be rebuilt and this could have a major impact on existing trees in the cemetery in terms of engineering works and construction access. We also note the roof terraces on the third floor which will impact on the privacy of surrounding residents and the general area.</p> <p>From the Design and Access Statement 2.2 we completely disagree that this proposal will be an 'improvement to the unique heritage setting of the General Cemetery' or at 3.7 that 'the re-development of the site will enhance the character of the Conservation Area by improving the context / setting of the Grade II Listed former cemetery building adjacent and the wider neighbourhood as a whole.'</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 Registered Park and Garden), the local planning authority shall have special regard 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</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>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>In our view this planning proposal does not comply with NPPF paragraphs 190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.</p> <p>Also NPPF 192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. <p>And NPPF 194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.</p> <p>Substantial harm to or loss of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional. <p>Sheffield General Cemetery is a significant part of cultural and social history. Its landscape setting is an important part of how the whole Porter river valley was envisaged; an open and treed landscape in which buildings were set. The cemetery is one of the remnants of this vision that is recognised by its registering, and should not be sacrificed.</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust wishes to register their strong objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Val Hepworth Chairman
Ickworth House	Suffolk	E18/1221	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of Multi-Use Trail within Ickworth Park (i) Upgrading of existing surfaced tracks and paths (ii) Resurfacing existing compacted earth paths (iii) Widening of existing surfaced paths and (iv) Construction of new trail to make circular route (amendment to previously approved under DC/18/0656/FUL). National Trust, Ickworth Park, Horringer, Suffolk. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. The GT has already responded twice with regard to DC/16/1966/FUL and our comments below are in addition to those letters. The Gardens Trust objects to proposal (iv) as outlined above, in its current form. We are puzzled as to why the National Trust feel it necessary to create an entirely new route across open parkland which if implemented will be in full view of the Rotunda, Church and walled garden, all of which are designated heritage assets of the highest significance, when in the woodland only about 40 feet away there is an existing track which although grassed over, clearly has some kind of hard surface/gravel beneath. This existing track could easily be upgraded to fulfil the same purpose and thus avoid the intrusion of a new path with no historic precedent and an unwelcome visual impact within the Registered Park and Garden, combined with an increasingly visible visitor movement within the pristine parkland. We hope that the National Trust will think again about this proposed modification and avoid the unnecessary damage it will cause to this exceptionally significant historic park. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Claremont	Surrey	E18/1254	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Detached two-storey dwelling with rear balcony, swimming pool, alterations to the roof of existing detached garage, new gates and piers to a height of 2.4m and retention of existing outbuildings following demolition of the existing detached house. 24 Claremont Drive, Esher, Surrey KT10 9LU. RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.12.2018 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens. The Surrey Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on the GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The Claremont Park Register area is drawn extensively and encompasses built structures and landscapes of many periods. The wider landscape setting does not appear to be affected by the proposed replacement

					<p>house.</p> <p>The comments made by Historic England and the Council's specialist advisers draw attention to the significance of the listed Kitchen Garden walls that are extremely important in their own right and as survivors in the landscape history of the estate. The sections relevant to this planning application do not appear to be physically affected but their protection during any construction works should perhaps be emphasised by condition or informative. The proposed replacement house will greatly exceed the footprint and bulk of the existing dwelling and will, in part, therefore be closer to the walls and more visually dominant. This affects their setting by reduced visibility and foreshortened views. However, from the parks and gardens perspective alone this would not seem to be of significant harm.</p> <p>Don Josey</p> <p>On behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust a member of the Gardens Trust</p>
Sedgwick Park	West Sussex	E18/1108	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing 3no. dwellings and associated buildings, retention of existing ponds and erection of 7no. dwellings, associated improved access and provision of hardstanding, parking, landscaping and garden and amenity space. Ghyll House Farm, Broadwater Lane, Copsale, West Sussex. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding the above application. The Gardens Trust (GT) is a statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>Representatives of the Trust have studied the documents submitted with the application. Part of the site lies within the boundary of the Sedgwick Park Grade II Registered Park and garden and the whole site is close enough to affect the setting of the park. We have reviewed the Heritage Statement and note the section (pages 29 – 37) that assesses the significance of the Grade II Registered Sedgwick Park and the impact of the proposals on that significance. This process is in line with the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>We agree with the conclusion, i.e. that the proposals would have no impact on the significance of the Registered Park and garden. Therefore, SGT does not object.</p> <p>However, neither does SGT support the application and we fully appreciate there may be other planning considerations arguing against approval of an application which would result in the creation of a remote enclave of 13 substantial houses in otherwise largely undeveloped countryside.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Jim Stockwell.</p> <p>On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust</p>

St Ives Estate	West Yorkshire	E18/1312	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Lowering of boundary wall section to former height, re-bedding of coping stones and re-pointing. St Ives Mansion, St Ives Estate, Keighley Road, Harden, Bingley, West Yorkshire BD16 1AT. BOUNDARY, REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2018</p> <p>The St Ives Estate was added to the then English Heritage (now Historic England) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England in 2009 principally for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The early-mid C19 phase is a good example of a parkland landscape • The mid-late C19 phase developed a Romantic and wild landscape imbued with a variety of historical and mythical associations linking the past with the present • The conscious enhancement of a naturally dramatic landscape reflects the fashion of the time for nature as a powerful force • The site manifests in physical form its association with the philosophy of an important C19 Tory radical, a close friend of Disraeli and a leading member of the Young England movement • It has a strong group value with more than a dozen Listed Buildings and provides the setting for an important Grade II listed mansion. <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Yet the Gardens Trust does not appear to have been notified about this application and HPD writing in the Design Access & Heritage Statement, p.5, also notes that a contribution from the Yorkshire Gardens Trust would be welcomed. We should be grateful if you would investigate as to how this has happened a second time in the last few months for applications re this estate.</p> <p>Historical Context</p> <p>After Edward Ferrand inherited the St Ives Estates in 1803, his brother Walker occupied Harden Grange and built a new mansion there, c.1807, also then named Harden Grange. The section of boundary wall referred to in this application bounded an orchard for the old Harden Grange, as shown on a Plan of Harden Grange, by John Rudman, 1805 (Bradford Metropolitan Library). This plan also shows three walled gardens close to the old house.</p> <p>In 1824 Adam Mickle advised on the layout of new gardens for Harden Grange and was the guest of Walker Ferrand for several days. (Adam Mickle, together with his father and grandfather, both of whom had</p>
----------------	-------------------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>worked for Lancelot (Capability) Brown, played an important role in the landscaping of parks and gardens of Georgian Britain.) Also, Mr Backhouse from the famous Backhouse nursery in York visited in 1824, and his nursery was involved with laying out the new gardens. Some of the walls from these three old walled gardens were then taken down. Thus, it seems extremely likely that their stone was then used to raise the former orchard wall to form a high wall bounding the new pleasure gardens, the subject of this listed building application.</p> <p>In particular this high wall formed the north-western boundary of a Hidden Garden approached through an archway, still extant, near the conservatory (then known as a greenhouse), also originally built in 1824. (Though in poor condition, this conservatory is still extant including a fine example of a heated rear wall.) This garden boundary wall would have been specifically designed as a high wall in order to provide shelter within the gardens from the northerly winds including a warm sheltered area within this new Hidden Garden, and also of course for privacy.</p> <p>Privacy was a fundamental element of garden design in the C19 as it is today. e.g. The English landscape architect Edward Kemp (1817-91) wrote in his book <i>How to Layout a Garden</i>, 1850, "All that attaches us to a garden and renders it a delight and cherished object seems dashed and marred if it has no privacy." This desire for privacy is particularly evident at St Ives as a rock hewn track was built to link the pleasure grounds with the Coppices in order for the family to avoid meeting any employees or strangers on the estate road to the farm buildings. This route under an ornamental early C19 packhorse style bridge is still extant.</p> <p>25" OS maps show evidence of a path from the archway in the Hidden Garden leading past designed areas of shrubberies before turning towards a gateway in the boundary wall. Maps as late as c. 1933 still show this feature. The position of this former gateway is clearly evident in the wall's stonework today, and so it seems likely that the lowered section of this boundary wall adjacent to this former gateway, does not predate 1930 and thus is not part of the original designed landscape. i.e. all the wall would have been approximately 2.8 metres high. We also note the quality of the original extant stonework relating to this former gateway.</p> <p>Public Viewing</p> <p>a) The Hidden Garden was designed to be totally hidden by the high wall from the adjacent estate road, and certainly it was not designed to be viewed from it, nor to become a woodland. Thus, we do not agree that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>lowering the wall would lead to public benefit. On the contrary it would lead to the loss of an important feature of this Registered Garden and severely harm its legibility. Though it would be certainly regrettable for the wall to have to be taken down stone by stone in order to repair it, we see no reason why a master stonemason could not repair/rebuild it satisfactorily and in our view should be the only way to go forward.</p> <p>b) The public can today still see views of the gardens from the public footpath bounding the gardens to the south but due to the current appalling condition of the Terrace Walk all public views of it from the west are currently lost. This is partially due to a huge pile of garden waste blocking this iconic feature, begun by William Busfeild Ferrand in 1844. This walk can be clearly seen in the C. H. Woods aerial photos of 1987, AC25334/87, AC25335/87 & AC25337/87, when these gardens were immaculate and open to the public, as they had been for many years following the purchase of the St Ives Estate by Bingley Urban District Council in 1928 for use as a public park. We hope that in the future they will again be opened to the public.</p> <p>Conservation Management Plan</p> <p>We are disappointed to find that no conservation management plan has yet been prepared, and urge the applicant to address this very soon, especially as we are also extremely concerned about the future of the old conservatory/greenhouse.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Trust much regrets the progressive erosion of St Ives Registered Historic Park and Garden and for the reasons outlined above, we consider that this proposal will cause further harm and also to the setting of the Mansion. Hence, we strongly object to this listed building application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--