



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES APRIL 2019

The GT conservation team received 126 new cases in England and two cases in Wales during March, 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, 17 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and 10 by CGTs in response to planning applications included in the weekly lists. The list also includes responses to some cases made by other like-minded organisations, with whom we keep in close contact.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
68 Canterbury Close, Yate	Avon	E18/1821	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. 68 Canterbury Close, Yate, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS37 5TY. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT], in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a locally registered park and garden. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of nationally registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Consequently we have no objection to the application. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal. Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens
Prior Park	Avon	E19/0011	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of cafe on a temporary basis - for 2 years - whilst the refurbishment of the dams takes place. Prior Park Landscape Gardens, Ralph	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Prior Park, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at

				Allen Drive, Lyncombe, Bath. CATERING OUTCOME 09.04.2019 Permitted	Grade I. We have considered the information provided in support of the application and discussed the proposals with your Conservation Officer. On the basis of this we confirm we have no objection to the application. If you have any further queries, please contact us at this email address and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the application in due course. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Eastwood Park	Avon	E19/0056	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing single storey offender management building and erection of two storey offender management building. Eastwood Park Womans Prison, Eastwood Park, Falfield, South Gloucestershire GL12 8DB. INSTITUTION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT], in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a locally registered park and garden. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of nationally registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The Grade II listed Eastwood Park, and stables to the south, are enhanced by the wider parkland setting in which they lie. The main house has views northwards taking in the prison and wider landscape. South Gloucestershire Council has identified a large area at Eastwood Park, including the prison area, as a park of local importance. Given the built up nature of the prison site, proposed changes would not alter the nature of this part of the main house's setting and no further adverse effect would be caused. Consequently we have no objection to the application. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal. Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Wokingham Landscape Character Assessment	Berkshire	E19/0088	-	LOCAL PLAN Landscape Character Assessment consultation	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2019</b> Dear Sir/Madam Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) 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

					<p>the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) welcome the new Landscape Character Assessment and wholly support the inclusion of references to the historic environment and its contribution to the landscape character and landscape value of the District. We also welcome the inclusion of reference to non listed historic assets, mostly buildings, and a few non Registered parks and gardens which are of local heritage value (for example Arborfield Hall is mentioned).</p> <p>BGT are in the progress of identifying and assessing the value of local parks and gardens across Berkshire and to date have drawn up a short list of sites from published sources and aerial photographs that appear to contain and retain historic parkland features. For Wokingham District we have identified around 30 of these, over and above the Registered Parks and Gardens in the District. We believe that it is important that not only the nationally important parks and gardens are protected but also those local parks and gardens which distinguish the District and the local landscape character areas within it should be noted, and if not listed, should be recognised by inclusion within the WLCA's descriptions, the Valued Landscape Attributes, the landscape strategies and guidelines where they occur. To this end we would be very pleased to discuss the BGT short list with Wokingham to explore a way forward to ensure that the valuable historic features of these local parks and gardens are conserved and enhanced and become a positive part of any changes to the properties. Most of the sites are in private hands but some are in the ownership of institutions or public bodies. An example of evidence of surviving parkland is Hurst Lodge which is noted in the WLCA study for its historic buildings and adjacent biodiverse woodland but not for its parkland features. We appreciate that, although important, it may not be possible to identify all the local parks and gardens to enable specific references to be made in the study. We therefore urge Wokingham District to include references to local parks and gardens as local valued landscape attributes which are worthy of conservation and enhancement in general.</p> <p>Your faithfully Bettina Kirkham Planning Advisor Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E18/0791	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of two camping units. Ten concrete pads being created as a base per unit. Installation of</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) again in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as</p>

			<p>two treatment plants. Erection of stables, feed room, tackroom and carriage house. Land At Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>EQUESTRIAN OUTCOME</p> <p>APPEAL LODGED 25.03.2019 Appeal Refs 19/00020/NONDET APP/J0405/W/19/322272 To be determined on the basis of written representations.</p>	<p>per the above appeal. We have again liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would like to reiterate the points we made in our original robust objection for application 18/02271/APP dated 6th September 2018. We reiterate our main reasons for objection below :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The application site lies adjacent to a highly sensitive area of the landscape which relates both to the early C18 London and Wise layout and the seminal Lancelot 'Capability' Brown layout of the 1750s. Wotton Underwood is not only one of Brown's best designs but also one of the least altered, and as such an extremely rare and significant heritage asset, in a genre arguably described as Britain's greatest contribution to Western Arts.</li> <li>- This application for the introduction of new structures adjacent to a Grade I landscape of such quality and almost complete survival is unacceptable and harmful. The RPG is a highly selective designation. Wotton is one of only 145 internationally important Grade I designed landscapes in England, from a total of 1658 designated parks and gardens. This puts Wotton on a par with places such as Stowe and Stourhead, so it is incumbent on Aylesbury DC to robustly uphold the NPPF which makes it very clear that harm to such heritage assets should be wholly exceptional and any adverse impact on key views and settings should be very strongly resisted.</li> <li>- There is no Historic Impact Assessment or Visual Impact Assessment, vital when making decisions on a site of such sensitivity and importance</li> <li>- The existing barn is a substantial structure which does nothing to enhance the setting of the RPG, is visible in some long views despite the surrounding planting and therefore should not be used to excuse inappropriate development within this field</li> <li>- The new structures are large and would be very visible from both the lane and potentially in longer views from the grounds of Wotton House</li> <li>- The Glamping proposal site sits to the north of the RPG and is extremely close to the southern boundary of the Capability Brown designed landscape and will be visible from within the RPG, particularly from the main circuit walk south around the Warrells from the Five Arch Bridge and along the narrow belt to the Tuscan Pavilion, and south alongside the River.</li> <li>- We object to the steady accretion of other structures and paraphernalia associated with holiday accommodation (BBQ equipment, play structures, garden seating, etc)</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>- The lodge and glamping pods would be too contemporary, and the shepherds huts would be faux historic features</p> <p>The appeal process would appear to hinge on the failure of your officers to determine this application in a timely fashion. In our opinion, this is not an acceptable reason for permitting this very damaging application for an RPG of national, and arguably international significance. We strongly urge that the Grade I RPG status adjacent to the planning site should be fully and competently considered, regardless of any error on the part of the planning authority. Preservation of this unique landscape is far too important to fall foul of a technicality in the planning process.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E18/1751	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from agricultural land r/o manor farm to commercial equestrian use including construction of stables (Retrospective). Manor Farm, Main Street, Chackmore, Buckinghamshire MK18 5JE. EQUESTRIAN</p>	<p><b>TGT/CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Stowe, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade I. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We appreciate the expiration date given for our comments was 1 April, however, given that BGT is a charity largely dependent on volunteers and reviewing planning applications from LPAs around the county, it would be helpful if AVDC could provide us with longer notice to respond. We hope that above comments will still be accepted.</p> <p>We note that this is a retrospective application for the change of use from agricultural land to equestrian including the construction of stables and should therefore be possible for AVDC to make a proper assessment of the impact of this development.</p> <p>The GT and BGT support the comments submitted by Ruth Benson, Landscape architect on behalf of AVDC and we make no objection to this retrospective application but would recommend the mitigation proposals for tree planting as suggested by Ruth Benson. We would also recommend that AVDC make it clear that this is the extent of what would be permitted and that there should be no further subdivision or additional stabling.</p> <p>If you have any further queries, please contact us at this email address and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the application in</p>

					<p>due course. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager The Gardens Trust</p>
Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E19/0048	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Landscaping to replace steep clay bank, steps to access existing seating area, retaining wall to secure old yew tree roots, raised beds for planting and a sloping rose garden with steps for access (Retrospective). 5 Rosebery Mews, Mentmore, Buckinghamshire LU7 0UE. GARDEN, LANDSCAPE</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. 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 have studied the online documentation and the change from a 'natural' grass bank to a terrace area with associated paving, planting and manmade features, in our opinion, damages the setting of the mid C19 Grade II listed Dairy by architect Stokes who designed many other estate buildings including the mansion, with Paxton. It also adversely affects the historic character of the wider designed landscape of the walled garden, all of which is within the Grade II* Registered area. The historic character and significance of the RPG has already been negatively affected by the conversion of the building from agricultural to domestic usage with the addition of paving, sheds, seating etc. The above proposal increases this harm. The proposed glass balustrade in particular, in our opinion is especially damaging to the historic character. We OBJECT to this proposal and believe that a more sensitive solution could be found which would be far less damaging to these two important heritage assets. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E19/0049	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Swimming pool and pool house in walled garden. Park Farm, Filgrave To Gayhurst Road, Tyringham. SPORT LEISURE, WALLED GARDEN</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. 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. The grounds at Tyringham have close associations with various eminent</p>

					<p>designers over the past centuries. The registered park and garden (RPG) was originally landscaped by Sir John Soane, followed perhaps by Humphry Repton, and most recently by Edwin Lutyens. The application site lies outside the RPG but adjacent to the NW boundary. Looking at the maps, it would appear that the proposed ha ha would be in a direct sight line from the end of Lutyens grand axial vista. The listing states : ‘From here the view north-west looks across the park towards open countryside beyond.’ Around Tyringham itself Soane designed a ha ha which originally encircled the house on three sides, and although parts survive, Lutyens’ work obliterated much of this feature.</p> <p>We have studied the documentation available with this application. We have not had the capacity to visit in person, and as there is no Visual Impact Assessment, we would recommend that your officers make certain that the proposed works are not visible from the RPG. If the pool and pool house in the walled garden are not visible over the wall, then our main comment would be that this may be an over-development of a former agricultural site. However, as the previous building has already been demolished and there is a new house on the site, these further alterations are unlikely to significantly impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dorfold Hall	Cheshire	E19/0017	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed erection of wedding and events venue with associated landscaping; car parking; and associated development. DORFOLD HALL, CHESTER ROAD, ACTON CW5 8LD. EVENT/FUNCTION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) 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>Cheshire Gardens Trust members participated in the design charette at Dorfold and provided a written response (28.06.2017). We appreciate the further research and informed approach to developing proposals for the former service yard, walled garden and ancillary structures.</p> <p>We do not object to this application, which we consider generally respects the historic significance of the collection of heritage assets while adding contemporary facilities which will enable the history of hospitality to continue at Dorfold. We particularly commend the proposed informal</p>

					<p>recreational use of the walled garden, and the restoration and re use of the only surviving glasshouse and the potting shed.</p> <p>Our comments in detail are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Statement of Significance includes a postcard on page 27 Fig. 41 which we think has been wrongly captioned. This interesting image appears to show the service yard from the west with a defined central feature, which it is proposed to recreate in the form of a contemporary planting bed. We consider that this feature, defined by low walls enclosing ground at a lower level, is likely to have been a midden. The Archaeological Assessment has not commented on this.</li> <li>• The Statement of Significance includes a series of historic plans, the earliest of which (1789, Fig26, p19) shows a series of glasshouses in the walled garden. Though there are no proposals to develop on this footprint, Aeon’s Archaeological Assessment of 2016 only includes the north wall of the garden. The archaeological potential of this area is not investigated but should be noted.</li> <li>• Detailed Hard and Soft Landscape Drawing 4 – we appreciate the new path and restored vista to the small gate in the west wall but are concerned that the proposed planting of Ficus (fig) and Pyrus (pear) that flank the gateway will obscure details of the Grade II* gate, namely the gate pier’s stone panels, the reverse of the niches on the east face.</li> <li>• South elevation and Detailed Hard and Soft Landscape Drawing 4 – while we appreciate that the gap in the wall enables southerly views across the courtyard into the walled garden from the proposed dining hall, we question the appearance of the wall and appropriateness of the proposed boundary planting to the walled garden and views from it. We consider that these proposals do not support the understanding of the walled garden as a space of horticultural excellence, show and productivity as described in the Statement of Significance.</li> <li>• We would like to see detailed planting proposals for the trees and for grassland management in the walled garden.</li> <li>• Detailed Hard and Soft Landscape Drawing 2 includes proposed new tree planting to the west of the proposed car parking. While we note the diversity of existing tree species in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, we recommend that this planting should contain a limited variety of parkland scale forest trees such as Quercus robur and not include Betula pendula.</li> </ul> <p>We would be grateful to be informed of the outcome of this application.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



					Susan Bartlett Planning & Conservation Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust
River Gardens	Derbyshire	E18/1823	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of existing derelict Tea Room and proposed replacement building. Swiss Tea Rooms, Belper River Gardens, Matlock Road, Belper, Derbyshire. DEMOLITION, CATERING	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Derbyshire Historic Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The current Swiss Tea Rooms have been shut since 1981 and their current state of dereliction detracts considerably from the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Belper River Gardens. We note that local people, including the Friends of Belper River Gardens, have been consulted and welcome this proposal. The new design respects the character of the old Tea Room and sits on the footprint of the original building. We are happy with the proposal which recognises and responds to the need for improvement in the visitor experience, and restores the tradition of having a tearoom overlooking the river at this location, provided ever since the gardens opened in 1906.</p> <p>The GT/DHGT are pleased to be able to SUPPORT this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E19/0008	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application with all matters reserved apart from access for circa 600 dwellings, provision of a site for a new one-form entry primary school, two new vehicular accesses onto Radbourne Lane, new walking and cycling routes, structural greenspace and associated landscaping, drainage and infrastructure works (This is a Departure from the Development Plan, this proposal may affect the	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Derbyshire Historic Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have looked at the documentation and the site plan, as well as the recently commissioned Kedleston Hall Setting Study (2017) commissioned by the National Trust. Within this latter study, a detailed panoramic photograph taken from a point immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of Kedleston Park (Appendix 4, Viewpoint 9) includes a view of the proposed development site, clearly visible in that image. Therefore in our opinion, the proposed development will have a negative impact on the</p>

				<p>setting of the Mackworth Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings and the setting of Kedleston Hall Historic Park and Garden). Land Boarded By Ashbourne Road And Radbourne Lane, Ashbourne Road, Mackworth, Derby, Derbyshire. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>setting and therefore significance of Kedleston and is contrary to Amber Valley Borough Local Plan (adopted 12 April 2006), Policy EN32. It also lies in close proximity to the Mackworth Conservation Area, which is similarly clearly visible on the above image The nearby Markeaton Park, which seems in part to have been the work of William Emes, Head Gardener at Kedleston from 1756-60, will also be negatively impacted by the proposed development. As such, this relates to Para 186b of the revised NPPF. The current application is in our opinion, also contrary to NPPF para 189, as Kedleston is a heritage asset of the highest significance, and has a direct relevance to Para 194. Mackworth contains significant archaeology (p18 D&amp;A) and we would ask that a watching brief be kept on the site should planning permission eventually be granted (Policy EN30 &amp; EN31). The Emerging Amber Valley Local Plan is being worked on and further examination will commence this year. In this document Policies EN5 and EN6 seek to ensure that development proposals have no adverse impact upon Conservation Areas and Scheduled Monuments/archaeological sites or their setting. EN7 relates specifically also to the effect of development proposals upon RPGs, including of course Kedleston as here. In our opinion this outline application is contrary to these policies. The GT/DHGT cannot support this application proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Civic Centre, Plymouth	Devon	E19/0001	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion to 144 residential units (Class C3) and mixed uses including A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, D1 &amp; D2 uses, part demolition, glazed extension , alterations to elevation including new cladding, new public realm including staircase, parking and associated works. Civic Centre, Armada Way, Plymouth PL1 2AA. HYBRID</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application which affects the Civic Square, an historic designed landscape of national interest which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The Gardens Trust 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. We have considered the information on your website We are happy to support the proposals. Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
The Italian Garden	Devon	E19/0035	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.04.2019</b></p>

at Great Ambrook				<p>Construction of building for use as holiday accommodation and visitor facilities. Great Ambrook, Ipplepen. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust and the Devon Gardens Trust on the above which affects the Italian Garden at Great Ambrook, which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The Devon 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 do not wish to comment on the merits of this application but we would emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposal.</p> <p>If your Council is minded to grant planning permission we would suggest that it is linked to a Section 106 Agreement to prevent the proposed holiday accommodation being sold separate from the garden.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p> <p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.04.2019</b></p> <p>I am pleased to support this application. The owners have chosen to rescue this rare garden and to make it available to view, by appointment. Although the garden is barely one hundred years old it was at a point where, if rescue work was not undertaken, it would have deteriorated increasingly rapidly - especially the structures that were shaded by tree growth, damp, damaged by falling branches, overgrowth of ivy, and paths disrupted by tree roots of self-sown trees.</p> <p>The garden was designed to stand alone as a place to be visited from Ambrook House and was not directly connected - i.e. it is not possible to walk out of the house directly into the garden; in this, it is more like a remote kitchen garden that is accessed by a short walk through the grounds. The garden and house are now in separate ownership and other houses have been built on the site.</p> <p>The proposal is to create discrete one-storey accommodation that will have minimal visual impact on the historic site. It would be used by the owners as a place to stay when they are visiting to work on the garden and, importantly, to provide dry covered space to act as classroom / induction space for arranged visits - including running water, power and toilet facilities. The access lane is too narrow to allow casual visiting at any time so visits will be pre-booked and limited to numbers that can be accommodated on the site without disruption to the other residents who use the lane.</p> <p>To avoid any confusion I should note that I advised the owners, professionally, on the historical status/importance of the garden in 2017 - in my capacity as a Landscape Architect.</p> <p>Yours faithfully D</p> <p>Dominic Cole CMLI FIOH VMM OBE</p>
------------------	--	--	--	---	--

Hatherop Castle	Gloucestershire	E19/0058	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 2 of permission 18/01548/FUL to substitute a drawing to reflect the development as built. Land Parcel East Of River Coln, Quenington, Gloucestershire.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.04.2019</b></p> <p>The Garden Trust as a Statutory Consultee has notified the Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this consultation on its behalf.</p> <p>Having responded to Application No. 18/0548/FUL, GGLT has no further comment to make regarding this minor amendment to the initial proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball ( on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Abbotswood	Gloucestershire	E19/0085	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of buildings and construction of building to contain an indoor swimming pool with garden room and loggia (Resubmission of 17/02922/LBC) (Part-retrospective). Abbotswood House, Upper Swell, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL54 1EN.</p> <p>GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.04.2019</b></p> <p>The Garden Trust has notified Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf, as in fact CDC has corresponded directly to GGLT for comment.</p> <p>Having considered this proposal in 2007, our advice was that the scheme should be set down as far as possible to reduce its dominance. Heritage England 's response has reaffirmed this view.</p> <p>Following the application's approval at that time; the current proposal extends the south elevation of the approved scheme to form an additional garden room. This increases the overall massing. However, in GGLT's opinion, the proposal does not modify the scheme to a point where it only now creates a totally unacceptably encroachment on Abbotswood's Listed Park and garden or unacceptably disturbs the massing of the main elements of the House.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Harrow Park (formerly Flambards)	Greater London	E16/0168	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings: Existing sports building, Peel House, Museum cottage, Gardeners Compound, Boyer Webb Pavilion, Pavilion next to the athletics track; Construction of new sports building over 3 levels (7307 sqm); new science building over 3 levels (3675 sqm); New landscaping core from existing Chapel Terrace to the athletics track at the base of hill; New visitors car parking on</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2019 APPEAL REPRESENTATION</b></p> <p>I write with regard to the above planning appeal</p> <p>I would draw your attention to the fact that the adjacent Harrow Park is a grade II registered landscape on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. (The full listing for Harrow Park can be found at <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001424">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001424</a>)</p> <p>The drawings submitted with the application indicate that the proposed buildings are to be constructed immediately adjacent to the perimeter of this historic registered landscape.</p> <p>The area of Harrow Park affected by this proposal is probably the most significant and most sensitive part of the landscape because of the serpentine lake which is very typical of Lancelot (Capability) Brown's landscapes of the eighteenth century, the extensive dam, the trees and</p>

				<p>Football Lane adjacent to maths and physics school buildings; re-routing and re-grading of private access road; alterations to landscaping and servicing for dining hall; relocation of multi use games area for Moretons Boarding House to south west of dining hall. Harrow School Sports and Science Buildings, off Football Lane, Harrow HA1 3EA.</p> <p>EDUCATION          OUTCOME Refused          APPEAL LODGED To be determined on the basis of an enquiry</p>	<p>understorey planting considered to be the remnants of the eighteenth century and nineteenth century planting.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework, section 16 addresses conserving and enhancing the historic environment. In particular, points 193 and 194 state:</p> <p>When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.</p> <p>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. Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.</p> <p>In addition, Harrow Council's Core Strategy document sets out the council's policy to safeguard the special character of Harrow on the Hill and its setting. Point 6.3 states</p> <p>The present day hilltop settlement is enveloped by open space which survived the suburban sprawl of the 20th Century, and this space is now of strategic significance expressed through its Metropolitan Open Land designation. On the eastern slopes of the Hill, the grounds of Harrow Park are recognized as a Grade II historic park and garden.</p> <p>Furthermore, Harrow School's Supplementary Planning Document (2.17) regarding the impact on the historic environment states the following: London Plan policy 7.8 and policy DM7 of the Development Management Plan, seek to ensure that future development involving heritage assets, including listed buildings, buildings within designated Conservation Areas, and registered historic parks &amp; gardens, preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the buildings, the parks &amp; gardens, and the Conservation Areas.</p> <p>I would also like to draw your attention to an event of national importance that took place in 2016, namely the tercentenary of the birth of Lancelot Brown who created the eighteenth century landscape at Harrow Park between 1768 and 1771, and whose influence and importance was and remains global. The celebrations organised were supported by the Historic Houses Association, Historic England, the National Trust, Natural England,</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>the Environment Agency, the National Gardens Scheme, the Association of Gardens Trusts, Visit Britain, Visit England and the Landscape Institute among others. Harrow Park is significant in that it is one of very few Brownian landscapes in the London region. Furthermore, it is very typical of his work, with a serpentine lake, trees and grass. It would be ironic if following countrywide celebrations the work of this important figure, development detrimental to it would be allowed to proceed.</p> <p>The wider landscape to the east of Harrow Hill also needs to be considered as the unique setting to the Harrow Hill conservation area, and its many listed buildings. Harrow Park, the Harrow School Playing fields and Harrow School Farm create a green buffer from surrounding development and provides a distinctive green setting to St Mary's Church, The Vaughan Library and the Chapel among other buildings.</p> <p>The proposal would have a detrimental and negative impact on this culturally important setting.</p> <p>With regards to views, St Mary's Church, Harrow on the Hill is an important and famous landmark, which can be viewed from many parts of the borough and surrounding boroughs. The views to St. Mary's Church most affected are from registered viewpoints in the Borough of Brent – specifically from Barn Hill, Elmwood Park, Kind Edward VII Park and Wakeman's Hill.</p> <p>Sophie Seifalian Garden historian and researcher</p>
Westbury House	Hampshire	E19/0033	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extension and subdivision of existing building to form 29 dwellings. Westbury House, Nursing Home, West Meon Road, East Meon, Petersfield, Hampshire GU32 1HY.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL, BUILDING ALTERATION, CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development as per the above pre-application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT) who have visited on our behalf, and we would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration.</p> <p>The main house and grounds lie within the immediate setting of the stables and ice houses which are listed Grade II, the ruins of St Nicholas' Chapel, a Scheduled Ancient Monument, as well as the walled garden which stands on ground that has been in use, until recently, as a kitchen garden since at least the 1730s. The Bridgeman plan was part of the estate inventory following the death of Admiral Philip Cavendish in 1743. This inventory lists 'The Avenue and Pleasure Garden which were laid out by Mr Bridgeman including the Yards'. Bridgeman is a key figure in the transition of garden design from early formal patterned parterres associated with Anglo-Dutch</p>

					<p>formality, to a freer, more naturalistic style, which paved the way for his successors such as William Kent followed by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown. He worked at key sites such as Stowe, Rousham, Claremont and Chiswick amongst others, and was Royal Gardener to Queen Anne, working in the Royal gardens at Windsor, Hampton Court and St James. His importance cannot therefore be underestimated. The only other site in Hampshire where he worked is Hackwood Park, so Westbury is a rare and very important survival.</p> <p>Much of Bridgeman's design of the 1720s at Westbury can still be seen in earthwork remnants, notably the asymmetrical ha-ha with bastions, possibly the first constructed in Hampshire (which lies some way from the house and which we presume is what is referred to in the pre-app document as a 'rampart ditch'), two earth platforms adjacent to the ha-ha, various earth tracks, the vestiges of an amphitheatre, the remains of the Canal and the slightly reduced kitchen garden. The 'Yards' referred to in the inventory description are the coach house, stables and other outbuildings. A site visit by the HGT in Feb 2017 showed that whilst the west canal is now a ditch, the pond remains and there is still evidence of the canalisation of the east canal. The Bridgeman plan shows a curved wall at the eastern head of this canal. That wall, previously unnoticed, is extant. These canals are extremely characteristic of Bridgeman's work, introducing an element of formality to a working landscape. The walled garden stands on ground close to the original axial entrance drive. It seems likely that as part of his design for Westbury, Bridgeman created canals from existing carriers of the River Meon as that was only approx 80m northeast of the house and therefore well within a gentle walking circuit.</p> <p>A second ha-ha closer to the house, also shown in the photographs accompanying the application, is of a later date and contemporary with the current house and has far less historic significance. The original drive and turning circle have gone, but the whole area would benefit from a thorough archaeological survey which should be a condition of any future planning consent. These remnants, and any discovered during an archaeological survey, merit very careful attention and we would recommend also that a Conservation Management Plan be drawn up by a historic landscape specialist, as another condition of any future planning consent. The applicants are fully aware of the importance of the site, having received the following advice relating to SDNP/16/03714/PRE : 'An in depth study of the whole site is needed to fully understand what cultural</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>heritage exists and its significance as well as any potential wider parkland restoration. This research should then inform any master plan of the site. This work will need to be undertaken before any further advice can be given on this type of scheme.' (ie. housing development) It is disappointing that they have chosen to ignore this recommendation. In our opinion, the documentation presented with this pre-application is completely insufficient to either interpret the importance of this historic landscape or to take into account the impact of their latest scheme upon this landscape of such significance and sensitivity.</p> <p>Looking at the previous planning history of the site, it is clear that the house and grounds have been allowed to deteriorate considerably since the Care Home was shut down and plans for a dementia unit came to nothing. The applicant has not to our knowledge demonstrated any attempt to conserve this site or to prevent its deterioration, and has instead submitted several applications for its development, none of which have shown any understanding or sensitivity towards the historic asset in their ownership.</p> <p>In 2018 SDNP/18/00099/PRE your officers' advice letter suggested that the proposed scale of that development (18 cottages, 9 apartments and 2 further cottages = 29 units) was too large for the site. The current pre-application also proposes 29 units, for c100 residents. It is disingenuous to equate this figure with the number of residents formerly in the care home, most of whom would not have driven. No consideration or plans/reports as to the impact on the site of cars/parking areas for these new residents, visitors, delivery vehicles etc is given within the pre-app documents. In our opinion, the size of this proposal is also too great for this historic site without seriously compromising its significance. The conversion of Westbury is compared in the documentation to Avington Park, but the sites are very different. At Avington the residential units occupy the old Coach House and Stables Courtyard, effectively separate from the main house. The house itself is run as a business, open regularly to the public as an events and wedding venue. Opening a few 'common rooms' of Westbury to the public is in no way comparable.</p> <p>In theory we do not oppose the conversion of Westbury House to a smaller amount of residential units, but we would urge that any plans for this be accompanied by an achievable, costed restoration for the garden features, as a condition of approval. There is nothing in the pre-app documentation, or the past planning history, which reassures us that the applicant will</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



					<p>conserve this important heritage asset. We would like detailed information as to how the asset enhancement will be funded, future ownership of the individual units, what the restoration time scale is, how it will be managed and how management and appropriate care of this unique site will be enforced.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Panshanger	Hertford shire	E18/1262	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed discharge of conditions 16, 17 and 24 of planning permission 3/0527-15. Panshanger Park, Panshanger, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 2NL. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Our previous concerns focussed on the post-restoration ground levels and the planting plans for Area H.</p> <p>We welcome the assurance on Sheet 5 of the Information document, dated February 2019, now submitted, that the ground level in Area H will be returned to the original level.</p> <p>With regards to the planting, we are still unclear as to why the planting regime of the 19th century should be privileged over that of the 18th century, which we consider shows a lack of understanding of the history of this part of the estate, and the greater importance of the 1704 and 1750s landscape in this area. We are also unclear as to why a pre-18th century landscape is mentioned when this was clearly an agricultural landscape before the design campaigns of the early and mid 18th century.</p> <p>However, we welcome the changes to the planting design to reflect more accurately the remnant early 18th century avenues and the design intent of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown, as well as the ongoing maintenance with appropriate species of the 'visual gaps' in the A414 hedge.</p> <p>We therefore have no objections to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust cc. The Gardens Trust Conservation Christopher Laine, Historic England</p>
Youngsbury	Hertford shire	E18/1772	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The removal of single storey extension. Removal of conservatory from south</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member.</p> <p>Based on the documents in this application, and our detailed knowledge of</p>

				<p>elevation and construction of garden room. The reinstatement of top floor and pitched roof structure. Restoration of the principal facade (south-west). Alterations to service wing to provide a boot room, kitchen and utility area. Conversion of the Brewhouse into 2 no. bedroomed house for purposes ancillary to the main house. Planting and Landscaping alterations to the area surrounding the site including the introduction of a ground source heat pump and the reinstatement of the walled garden. Introduction of an external pool and pool house within the walled garden. Deconstruct and rebuild entrance gates with increased width. Youngsbury, Wadesmill, Ware, Hertfordshire SG12 0TZ. HYBRID</p>	<p>the Registered landscape of Youngsbury and its history, we fully support this application and the restoration of the James Paine house and Lancelot Brown landscape. We consider this proposal to be an exemplary restoration of the best preserved of the few remaining Brown landscapes in Hertfordshire, set within a historic rural landscape which largely preserves the setting (on the east side of the A10). Kate Harwood</p>
Just House, Northaw	Hertfordshire	E19/0038	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Certificate of lawfulness for the construction of a swimming pool building. Just House, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NJ. SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are concerned that no details of any planting to screen this building from the wider historic landscape have been included. We are aware that the site does contain trees at the moment but it is unclear if any would be felled to make room for this development, and if so, whether there would be replacement planting. The proposed site plan appears to rely on tree cover on the adjacent property to screen this building, which is not in the local vernacular. We would suggest that the plan be amended to include screening on the southern and western sides of the pool building, within the Just House boundary. Kate Harwood</p>
Stanborough Park	Hertfordshire	E19/0052	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of existing children's playground and reinstatement of ground as</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust. On the basis of the information contained in this application and our knowledge of the historic</p>

				parkland; Construction of new playground including splash pad with associated changing room facility; kiosk; fencing around compound; outdoor gym equipment; drainage, earthworks and landscaping. Park North Stanborough Park Stanborough Road AL8 6DF. PLAY AREA	landscape of Woodhall Park, we have no objections to this application. Kate Harwood
The Garden House, Cottered	Hertfordshire	E19/0076	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 4 (approved plans), condition 3 (Ground, slab and ridge levels), condition 5 (Materials), condition 6 (External lighting), Condition 8 (Door and window detailing), condition 16 (Landscaping), condition 17 (Landscaping implementation). Of planning permission: 3/17/1926/FUL - Proposed replacement dwelling with two ancillary outhouses. Garden House, Cottered, Buntingford, Hertfordshire SG9 9PZ. MISCELLANEOUS	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have studied the documents supplied with this application and have concerns over Condition 17. We support Condition 17 for all planting . In the Planning Statement on Page 6 . the applicants ask for Condition 17 (replacement of failing trees and plans within 5 years) should not apply to the cherry trees donated by the Japanese government. These trees are important in the scheme to tie the new development to the II* Japanese gardens, and should be replaced if they do fail. We note the point that the quality of the initial batch of cherry trees cannot be known but that is irrelevant. Plants whose provenance is known can also fail. We suggest that Condition 17 is not varied. We have no comments on the other matters in this application. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
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	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.04.2019</b> Thank you for notifying us that revised plans have now been submitted for the above application. Having studied these revised plans, and the many replies which have resulted from local residents, our objection to the revised application remains. Although these plans propose to move the development further east, it is our opinion the setting of the historic buildings and the conservation area in this location will be significantly affected. We continue to support the parish council in its objection and echo the concerns raised by Historic England and KCC Heritage Conservation. We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if any further information is submitted.

					Yours sincerely Mike O'Brien (Trustee)
High Road, Gorleston	Norfolk	E18/1761	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of one single storey detached dwelling and creation of access to High Road. High Road, Gorleston, GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 OPB. RESIDENTIAL	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.04.2019</b> Norfolk Gardens Trust in association with The Gardens Trust wish to comment on the planning application Ref: 06/19/0113/F which involves the construction of one single storey dwelling and creation of access to High Road, Gorleston, Norfolk. I have discussed the application with Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer at The Gardens Trust in London and she has suggested that I pass on comments direct to you as she is about to go on annual leave. Both Norfolk Gardens Trust and The Gardens Trust have serious concerns about the proposed development and wish these to be taken into consideration by the planning authority, The application will adversely affect the adjacent property Koolunga House. When Norfolk Gardens Trust were researching material for their publication Norfolk Gardens and Designed Landscapes edited by Patsy Dallas, Roger Last and Tom Williamson published by Oxbow Books 2013 an entry was made for Koolunga House. I quote the entry 'The property, now called Koolunga House, was built in 1816 as part of the Garnham Estate and was originally known as Hill House. The grey brick, seven-bay house stands in an elevated position overlooking the river Yare. The facade has a central, three-storey bow topped by a low copper dome, and Greek Doric Columns either side of the entrance. The gardens lie behind the property and in the nineteenth century comprised a walled garden and greenhouse immediately behind the house. To the south there was a large lawn edged by trees and shrubs, with at the western end, a semi-circular banked feature. Beyond this lay another large area of lawn which was surrounded by mature trees and bounded by Clarence Road. In the 1950s, the gardens were remodelled into a less formal layout with larger areas of trees and shrubs Today, the house has been converted into flats and the grounds are almost entirely covered by mature trees and shrubs. Between the house and Riverside Road lies Koolunga Gardens, a small steeply sloping area of parkland which was gifted to the borough by Nrs Williamson, a previous owner of Koolunga, in memory of her husband. The grass slopes are bisected by flights of steps and a viewing platform has been constructed near he top of the bank.' I have quoted this extract in full because this published information has a strong bearing on the proposed development of the garden area which will damage a former historic site. It is vitally important that the historical

					<p>significance and importance of the complete site site is properly assessed before any consideration is given to development within the cartilage of the walled garden which will also involve removing part of the wall for access.</p> <p>I trust that the planning authority will take the matters mentioned above into consideration when dealing with this application.</p> <p>On a separate issue i would like to comment that it is not easy to access planning applications on your online planning portal - are you aware of this problem.?</p> <p>A copy of this email is being filed with The Gardens Trust in London.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,  Peter Woodrow (Treasurer/Planning Representative Norfolk Gardens Trust)</p> <p><b>GEORGIAN GROUP WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.03.2019</b></p> <p>The Georgian Group has been made aware of the above application to develop part of the former gardens surrounding the grade II listed Koolunga House. The Group wishes to make a formal objection to the proposed development, and to forward the following brief initial advice.</p> <p>The Heritage Assets and Their significance</p> <p>Koolunga House (formerly Hill House) is a distinguished classical villa which was built c1826 for the naval officer Captain John Garnham. The house is listed at grade II and stands within the Gorleston Conservation Area. Koolunga House formerly stood in extensive grounds which included a large detached section on the eastern side of the High Street which is now a public park. The former gardens to the west and north of the house have now partially disappeared, however the large enclosed area adjacent to the house's southern (or garden façade) survives. It is on part of this site that the applicant proposes to build a dwelling. The house and the surviving elements of its early nineteenth century designed landscape form one of the Conservation Area's most important assets. Historic designed landscapes surrounding high status dwellings such as that at Koolunga House may also be worthy of being regarded as heritage assets in their own right unfortunately however a detailed appraisal of the significance of this designed landscape has not been provided. An examination of historic maps would suggest that the land to the south of Koolunga House was one of the most important parts of the early nineteenth century designed landscape surrounding the house.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The surviving gardens surrounding the house are not all now in the same ownership, this does not however diminish their importance either to the setting of the grade II listed building, or to the character and significance of the surrounding conservation area. The site's divided ownership also does not affect its status as part of the legal curtilage of the listed building, Koolunga House having been listed in 1953 well before its grounds were divided into multiple separate ownerships.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed development</p> <p>Having briefly visited the site, the Georgian Group must respectfully advise that both the boundary wall to the High Street, and proposed development site itself form a critical part of the house's setting, and that the proposed development would cause a degree of harm to the significance of the listed building and to the character of this part of the Conservation Area. The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area's Act) (66.1) states that 'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State 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.' This instruction is reinforced within the 2018 NPPF.(paras 193-194). NPPF 194 states that '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.' NPPF 193 states that 'when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'</p> <p>Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Planning Note 3 advocates a five stage approach to assessing the impact of a proposed development on the setting of heritage assets. Stage 2. ( 'Assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated') and stage 3 ( ' Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance or on the ability to appreciate it') are both vital parts of this process, and have not been completed adequately by the applicant, and thus an</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>objective assessment of the impact of the proposed works has not been provided.</p> <p>The applicant's supporting documentation fails to adequately acknowledge the historic, visual, and functional relationship of the proposed development site to the house's garden façade, or the critical role played by the attached boundary wall to the setting of the listed house when viewed from the south along the High Street. The significance and level of survival of the nineteenth century garden layout and planting has also not been adequately assessed. We must respectfully advise that this documentation also fails to provide an objective assessment of the impact of the proposed works on the house's setting when viewed from the south and south east and from the garden façade of the house itself. Neither does the supporting documentation fully explain the impact of the proposed loss of trees on the house's setting, or the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is important to stress that Historic England's Guidance reminds those involved in the planning process that 'the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on their being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting' (The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) p2). This is particularly important as the development's potential impact on the setting of the listed building and views from it may affect its future economic viability. As Historic England have advised '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. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its on-going conservation.' (The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) p2).</p> <p>In order to facilitate access to the site a section of the boundary wall would need to be demolished, this structure is at the very least part of the curtilage of the listed building, and listed building consent is therefore required for any works of demolition proposed . We note that at present LBC has not been applied for, which should have been done in conjunction with the application for planning permission. May we also remind your authority that your authority has a legal requirement to notify the National</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Amenity Societies of any works of demolition to listed structures.</p> <p>The supporting documentation fails to provide adequate supporting information to justify the frankly controversial statements made within the accompanying heritage appraisal, not least that “the site clearly has the capacity to accommodate the proposals without harm to the setting of the Koolunga House. The development therefore not only preserves but potentially enhances the setting of Koolunga House and the wider conservation area.”</p> <p>The Georgian Group must respectfully advise that the public benefit which would accrue from the proposed development is minimal and does not justify the harm which would be caused to the setting of the grade II listed building, or to the character and significance of this part of the Conservation Area. We therefore recommend that consent for the proposed development is firmly refused.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely James Darwin (Senior Conservation Advisor)</p>
Wicksteed Park	Northamptonshire	E19/0069	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement of fountain and retaining wall to fountain lawn with landscape works. Installation of rose towers and landscaping with resurfacing of footpaths to rose garden. Wicksteed Park, Barton Road, Barton Seagrave. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northamptonshire Gardens Trust who have followed the development of these proposals for some time. They have been working in partnership with the Wicksteed Park Trust on the Sharing Repton lottery project and the Trust’s support and enthusiasm has been invaluable.</p> <p>The work done on Audience Development of the landscape has resulted in a very positive outcome and it has been heartening to see the plans come to fruition. Great care has been taken to reinstate the historic heart of the Park, described by Charles Wicksteed as "the place where fun was invented". The rose garden and fountain will again reflect their glory in the 1920/30s. From the rose garden, one can view Barton Hall, a landscape pertaining to one of Humphry Repton's Red Books. It is fitting and a happy coincidence that the newly proposed rose garden, complete with trellised rose towers, so closely mirrors his style. The landscape at Wicksteed Park continues to evolve to serve public enjoyment and education together with an understanding of the delicate balance between ecology and people. The new Learning Space within the newly landscaped hub of original single</p>



					storey buildings is an excellent educational resource. The proposals will serve to further raise the importance of Wicksteed Park and give great enjoyment to all who visit. The GT is happy to support this application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Castle Howard	North Yorkshire	E18/1565	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land for the extension of existing children's adventure play area including the erection of boardwalk and ropebridge from existing playground over Great Lake and installation of play structure. The Boathouse, Castle Howard, York, North Yorkshire. PLAY AREA	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2019</b></p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Gardens Trust (GT) and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT). Thank you for consulting the 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 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>Thank you for arranging the site visit that took place on 13 March 2019. My YGT landscape architect colleague Jane Furse found the discussions very useful and we have looked at the revised documents.</p> <p>We are pleased to see the change in position of the bridge and boardwalk and have no further objections to the design of the proposed playground/adventure play area. The masking of the metal structures or 'nests' is now clearly shown on the additional drawings and we trust that their supports, up to 8 metres high in places will also be wooden, although this seems not to be specified. We do however have concerns about the impact of the increased footfall on the ancient trees near the boat house. Landscaping concerns.</p> <p>During the on-site discussions between Ryedale District Council, Historic England, the client's architects and ourselves, attention was drawn to the current compaction and traffic impact, (both pedestrian and vehicular) over the roots of the ancient oak trees en route from the house to the boathouse, close to the edge of Ray Wood.</p> <p>These are the only surviving specimens from the original woodland for Henderskelfe Castle before the early C18th bastion wall was built. (See Estate map of 1694). Since the rest of the woodland (Ray Wood) was substantially felled during the mid C20th, we are concerned that no reference has been made to this important group in the Design, Access, Landscape, Ecology and Heritage Impact Statement. We are concerned that these surviving ancient oak trees are at risk. Urgent amelioration is</p>

					<p>now needed, particularly since the proposed playground is specifically intended to result in much greater footfall through this vulnerable area. We trust that the planting necessary to reroute pedestrians away from the oak's root zone (desire line from Ray Wood exit to current playground in particular) and onto the existing tarmac paths can be secured as part of this work, as well as new screen planting to the existing playground to protect surrounding trees trunks from encroachment of surfacing materials and maintenance machinery. The new screen planting suggested was with native shrubs, probably hollies where the shade will be heaviest and where there will be overhead drips. They will need informal management to be kept low.</p> <p>We trust that our landscaping concerns will be carefully addressed in which case we have no objection to the application and consider that it meets NPPF Feb 2019 paragraphs 193 and 194.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E18/1724	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION ACCOMPANIED BY AN ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT FOR variation of Condition No's 1, 2 &amp; 20 of Planning Permission Ref. C6/500/63J/CMA for the continuation of waste disposal operations for a further 6 years from 31 December 2018 until 31 December 2024 with a further year for restoration, to amend the final restoration levels across the site and to amend the final restoration scheme for the southern part of the site. Allerton Park Landfill, Moor Lane (Off A168), Knaresborough HG5 0SD. MINERAL/WASTE</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, at grade II 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>The GT and YGT appreciate the notification of this complex large application and apologise that as a charity supported by volunteers we do not have the resources to fully appraise the lengthy application and all the 66 items many of which are long reports. We are concerned that the applicant seems to have based the impact on a radius of 1k thereby excluding the important Grade I Allerton Castle despite acknowledging that the works can be seen from the first floor of the Castle.</p> <p>Allerton Park remains on the Historic England (HE) 'Heritage at Risk' register and we would like to point out the significance of the gardens and pleasure grounds to the north of the house; the 'setting' of this continued application.</p> <p>The stone garden terraces (G Martin c 1845, listed grade II) constructed as</p>

					<p>part of the mid C19 improvements form the foreground to a view over the crenellations of the retaining garden wall, down to the southernmost of the lakes, the Lower Fish Pond. In the gardens stands an eleven-bay long, rusticated timber summerhouse. Of Georgian origin, this was redesigned in 1852 by B Banks of London (listed grade II) and is attached to a brick wall as a lean-to structure. A stone ha-ha separates the gardens from the park to the north, an underpass situated c 150m north-east of the mansion leading to the strip of pleasure grounds which links them to the lake. This ornamental planting continues on the far bank, 450m north-east of the mansion, as Jupiter's Coppice. The park was described by John Bigland in 1812 as 'charmingly picturesque, presenting a great variety of hills, dales and groves, delightfully interspersed' (Evans 1812). A series of lakes, Lower Fish Pond, Middle Fish Pond, and High Fish Pond, form a chain running from north-west to south-east across the site, dividing Near Park from Far Park. [We note that 'Near Park' is immediately north of the mansion and not as annotated on the application plan.] The Lower Fish Pond was developed from a pre C18 square pond, possibly medieval in origin, which was fed by the top, High Pond. The stream which linked the two had been widened by the 1770s to form the Middle Fish Pond (map, c 1770), divided in half by a dam which has recently (late C20) been replaced by a large concrete sluice. The Lower Fish Pond was extended to nearly its present form in the late C18 or early C19, the existing square island, with its rectangular pool, being retained as a feature.</p> <p>We note the complex of listed buildings that make up Allerton Park including three listed buildings near the southern boundary of this application: Temple of Victory (grade II*), Lady's Cave Folly (grade II), Bridge (grade II), therefore immediately in the setting. These have already had extensive restoration work and are significant structures. Therefore, we would like to underline NPPF February 2019, paragraphs 193, 194 and the HE 'The Setting of Heritage Assets', Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3.</p> <p>We are shocked that the Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and Heritage Assessment, written by FCC have restricted the consideration to 1km from the site. This should be a minimum of 3 km even if there are no significant designations; and there are significant designations. We are very concerned that both documents consider the proposal will result in no significant effects on the landscape or cultural heritage. This is plainly inaccurate and untrue. The LVIA appears to totally miss the fact that the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>registered park forms the curtilage/setting of the Grade I Allerton Castle and grade II* Temple of Victory. We have recently visited the park and noted that there are significant views of the existing landfill and the incinerator from several areas within the registered park and from the Castle.</p> <p>In addition to our comments above we object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The 1980's gravel extraction/land fill has never been completed and now the applicant wants another six-year extension and time to complete final works.</p> <p>The incinerator has at least a twenty-five- year life so there may well be several more revised schemes.</p> <p>The Registered Park and Garden and listed buildings and the surrounding community has already been disturbed for over thirty years.</p> <p>The applicant admits that the current tipping cannot support trees. The necessary steps to facilitate the planting of hedges and trees should have been a condition.</p> <p>The landowner has already had £1m from the community fund and twenty-five years of rental to restore various buildings at risk and lengths of the parkland wall. We are pleased to see this carried out but it is after years of neglect.</p> <p>We advise the following;</p> <p>That a Master Plan is produced to illustrate fully how the present application might integrate into a long- term scheme parallel with the present life span of the incinerator. It is essential that a skilled landscape architect with historic designed landscape expertise is employed to make sure the master-plan is appropriate for this part of the Vale of York and the setting of the heritage asset, Allerton Park.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that the land conditions are improved to enable new planting to establish and flourish. The design needs to be sympathetic to and integrated with the registered designed landscape to the south and with which it should be linked. The planting should enhance the reciprocal views of Allerton Park and its listed buildings and the species used should reference the historic designed landscape and in their planting arrangement. There should be a maintenance schedule to ensure that the planting is well-managed and thrives.</p> <p>Harm has already been done to this landscape, but this shouldn't justify the continuation of harm or acceptance of poorly thought through restoration</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>proposals that will change the topography and character of the landscape. For the above reasons the GT/YGT request that the NYCC Officers recommend refusal of this application and that County Council Members support the refusal and recommend the restoration of this long- blighted setting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Nunnington Hall	North Yorkshire	E18/1767	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land for the creation of children's play area including the erection of climbing frame. Nunnington Hall, The Avenue, Nunnington, North Yorkshire YO62 5UY. PLAY AREA</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens at Grade II 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>Nunnington Hall is serenely situated near the banks of the river Rye on land leased in the early medieval period from the Abbey of St Mary in York. It was owned by Sir Walter de Treys in the 15th century and subsequently by the Grene and Parr families, but reverted to the Crown in 1553 after the abortive attempt to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne, in which William Parr, Marquess of Northampton, was implicated. Later the Norcliffe family lived at Nunnington and probably gave the Hall (listed grade I) its present shape. Following the Civil War, in 1655, the freehold of the estate was purchased by Ranald Graham whose son, Richard, was created Viscount Preston and Baron Esk in 1681. The formal layout of the walled garden to the south – and the further land in separate ownership - dates from this period. (See Samuel Buck's View of Nunnington from the south (Lansdowne Ms.914, British Library.) It is possible that Guillaume Beaumont, who visited Nunnington in 1702, and was gardener to Viscount Preston's cousin, Colonel James Graham of Levens Hall, advised on the layout. We also note that this was a recusant house, with links to the 1715 Jacobite uprising with perhaps Jacobite landscape associations – see note below. In the 1920's Nunnington's planting scheme was carried out by the then owner, Mrs Fife.</p> <p>This planning application for the creation of a children's play area including the erection of a piece of play equipment is proposed to be within the</p>

					<p>bounds of the garden on the south side of the hall; arguably the most sensitive part of the historic garden. Here the garden falls into a series of compartments articulated about a north/south axis which centres on the central entrance in the south front of the Hall. Aligned with the front of the Hall there is a lawn flanked by raised lawns to the east and west which are planted with fruit trees. Immediately south of the lawn the land rises, and a grassed terrace walk runs east to west across the width of the garden, c 40m south of the Hall. Short flights of stone steps lead up to the walk at each end. A broad grassed walk, which slopes to the south, aligned with the entrance in the south front of the Hall runs south as a vista from the lawn, over the terraced walk, to a gateway with a broken pediment (late C17, listed grade II) in the south wall of the garden, c 110m from the Hall. The drawing by Samuel Buck (c 1720) shows that this was close to the site of a clairvoie with a low wall surmounted by railings, flanked by piers with finials. It is not known when this was removed, but the gateway was moved to this position in the 1920s by Walter Brierley. There are views from the gateway across rising pasture land (outside the registered area) to a ridge planted with pine trees on the southern horizon which may have been part of the designed landscape, (Scots pine were symbols of Jacobite sympathies). Regarding the siting of the proposed play area we also think that there may be an earth bank created between the vista and the eastern part of the garden probably when the vista was made (late 17th/early 18th century.)</p> <p>We note and support Mark Newman’s detailed Heritage Statement, January 2019 and his proposal of a watching brief during any works. We have not visited the site recently but the proposal is in a potentially sensitive location and special care needs to be taken so that the historical physical evidence and the historical character of the garden are not compromised.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above we do have reservations about the proposed play area and equipment in the south garden. However, we understand that once the play area is established the only visual impact will be from its entrance as the area will be screened by planting. There is the possible noise issue but we hope that this will be minor and we appreciate the incorporation of further attractions for young families. We also appreciate that the National Trust has a limited land-holding at Nunnington which restricts the alternatives for siting a play area.</p> <p>We consider that the development will result in less than substantial harm</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					and should comply with NPPF (February 2019) paragraph 196. We support an archaeological watching brief and would be concerned if there is any further development in the area in the future. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust Reference: Sheeran, George; Nunnington Hall, Yorkshire: Living Quietly in Defeat?; pp113-120; in 'Wentworth Castle and Georgian Political Gardening: Jacobites, Tories and dissident Whigs'; ed Patrick Eyres; Wentworth Castle Heritage Trust; 2012.
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E19/0034	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement of existing septic tank with new sewage treatment system. To involve excavation and replacement of existing damaged foul drain, and installation of new package sewage treatment plant and drainage field below ground. Land Adjacent To Chestnut Cottage, Studley Royal, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 3BB. FLOOD RELIEF/DRAINAGE	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. 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. We understand that this proposal will have minimal impact on the World Heritage Site and Registered Historic Park and Garden (Grade I); Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey. We support the archaeological watching brief and have no further comments to make. Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
Bishops Palace, Wells	Somerset	E18/1819	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of new wall walk to perimeter of Bishop Burnell's Great Hall ruinous remains. Addition of ancillary balustrades. Installation of new handrails to north east and north west tower stairs. Construction of new path parallel to south wall and adaption / enhancement of existing garden planted beds. The	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have looked at the proposals for the Bishops Palace, Wells, and are pleased to say that we consider the proposals to be ambitious, well considered and an enhancement to the existing access and interpretation of the history of the site. The proposals largely relate to the building

				Bishops Palace, Market Place, Wells, Somerset BA5 2PD. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY	remains of the Great Hall rather than the landscape but should provide visitors with a much better view of the wider landscape setting of the site as was originally seen when the building was first constructed. We support this application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Bawdsey Manor	Suffolk	E18/1798	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of a lake for recreational activities such as raft building and canoeing, including excavation, the re-use of excavated materials onsite, and the re-organisation of consented Activity Structures within the Bawdsey Manor Estate. Bawdsey Manor, Bawdsey Manor Estate, Bawdsey, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3BH. EDUCATION, SPORT/LEISURE, WATER FEATURE	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have looked at the documents on line and cannot see any Heritage Statement or Environmental Impact Assessment which describes the effect that this proposal may have on the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Bawdsey Manor. Judging from Google Earth it would appear that the proposed lake site is well screened from the formal gardens and Pulhamite structures to the south-west and along the coastline by a substantial tree belt. However, the site does lie completely within the RPG and as such will change the character of the northern parkland areas. The ground on the proposed lake area is marshy, so making a feature of the water to increase the attraction of the site for visitors is clearly tempting. We would like to see documentation as suggested, to inform your officers and ourselves, as to what the impact of the lake could be upon the RPG. We would be grateful if you could ask the applicant to provide this so that we can further review the application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Christchurch Mansion	Suffolk	E18/1830	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations and extensions to convert existing house into 14 flats and associated external works. 2 Park Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 3ST. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have considered the information provided in support of the application and on the basis of this confirm we do not wish to comment on the proposals at this stage. The amendments are to the western side of the



					<p>existing building and the area which faces Christchurch Park is unaffected. We note the heavy tree cover which screens the house from the park. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>If you have any further queries, please contact us at this email address and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the application in due course.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE TO LOCAL RESIDENTS 24.04.2019</b></p> <p>Please accept my apologies for not responding sooner but I am only just back from holiday and catching up on the email backlog. I am the sole conservation officer for The Gardens Trust and cover all planning applications throughout England in a part time capacity. I am based in Gloucestershire so unable to visit in person. I therefore rely on satellite imagery as well as online documentation to respond. (see Bing Birdseye view attached). Since my original response it has been brought to my attention that many of the screening trees between the development and the park are deciduous, so the extensions may well be somewhat visible from the park over the winter months. The bulk of the extensions have already received approval (IP/07/00118/FUL &amp; IP/16/0018) and going back through our casework log it is clear that we were not consulted on the original application and have not received anything relating to the park since 2004.</p> <p>Our remit is solely in relation to how the application affects the Registered Park and does not include commenting on the effect of the proposal on neighbouring properties. The existing tree screen to the park is thick and I will suggest to the LPA that they request that some of the category C trees are removed and replaced with evergreen varieties such as Quercus Ilex.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer cc Jason Burgess, Oliver Holmes</p> <p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.04.2019</b></p> <p>Further to my initial letter regarding the above application, dated 4th April</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>2019, I have received several communications from local residents concerned at the visibility between the permitted extensions and their houses, as well as Christchurch Park. Whilst Bing Images clearly indicates that the cover between the garden of 2 Park Road and the park is substantial, it has also been drawn to my attention that it is largely deciduous. We would suggest that your officers request that some of the unsurveyed Category C trees at the southern and eastern end of the garden be removed and replaced with suitable evergreen varieties, to thicken the screen.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E18/1521	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed installation of temporary structures to create a temporary jousting arena on River Island, to accommodate live shows during the period from May to September for a period of five years at Warwick Castle. Warwick Castle, Castle Hill, Warwick CV34 4QX. VISITOR ATTRACTION</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.04.2019</b> Thank you for sending us a copy of the applicant's agent's comments with regard to our letter of 26th February 2019. I have discussed their response with my colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust. Merlin continue to maintain that the island has been part of the visitor experience 'for over 100 years.' We stand by the comments in our previous letter namely : 'They offer no justification for this and we are unaware of any such until the small and impermanent menagerie of Countess Daisy in the 1890's. Even this is more likely to have been for her own amusement than to attract visitors. Historically, the island was an open space, with tree planting designed to frame the view of the river front of the castle. Numerous illustrations from Canaletto (1748) onwards make this clear.' We would be glad to see documentary evidence for their statement. Showing the Castle and gardens was a perquisite of the housekeeper and gardener when the family were not at home until the late C19. Visitors saw was only what the Earls had created for their own enjoyment. The establishment of visitor attractions per se only happened after WWII, primarily after the sale of the castle by the Greville family. We stand by the comments in our letter and would like to reiterate that 'Even though we regularly respond to these (Merlin Entertainment's applications) we must yet again repeat and stress the enormous importance of this historic designed landscape, as it would seem that our comments are always ignored in favour of increasing visitor revenue to the detriment of the historic landscape.'</p> <p>The GT/WGT objects strongly to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Charlecote Park	Warwicks hire	E18/1811	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Temporary siting for a period of three years of 4 x 4 berth and 4 x 8 berth mobile homes for seasonal workers (previously accommodated in hostel and required due to HMO licensing changes) and increase the level of occupation from 72 to 80 seasonal workers. Old Pastures Farm, Stratford Road, Hampton Lucy, Warwick CV35 8BQ. AGRICULTURE	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.04.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. Please excuse the lateness of this response but I have been away and as I am the sole conservation officer for the GT covering the whole of England part-time, I have in this instance just missed your deadline with the added Easter Bank holidays. I have looked at the site for the temporary caravans, and judging from the documentation online and also the register entry for the Grade II* Charlecote Park, the application site would appear to be visible from within the RPG due to the flat topography, lack of tree cover and its relative proximity just over one field distant to the NW of the field containing Half Moon Spinney. We would like to know what other sites have been considered for this temporary housing and why they were rejected in favour of this more sensitive location? In addition, we would like assurances that should your officers decide to grant this application that at the end of the 3 year period, the site will be cleared and no further caravans/mobile homes will be erected there. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Great Barr Hall	West Midlands	E18/1048	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement Dwelling. 12, SKIP LANE, WALSALL WS5 3LL. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2019</b> Thank you for notifying us of the most recent amended documentation. We still have difficulty relating the heights of Nos 10, 12 & 14 Skip Lane as shown in the amended 'Existing and Proposed Street Scene' dated 14.3.19 to what can be clearly seen in the attached photographs from Google Street View. I am attaching a photo of 12 & 14 from Street View. In particular if you compare the height of the bottom of the roof at No 12 from the photo in relation to No 14 you can see that it only comes up a short way from the bottom window of No 14. In the amended drawing this comes almost to the top of the same window. Equally, the roof height of No 12 in the photo can be seen to be pretty much level with the bottom of the dormer window in No 14. In the amended drawing it comes halfway up the pointed roof of the dormer. There is a clear discrepancy and it would appear that the amended drawing still exaggerates the height of No 12

					<p>compared to No 14. The scale at the bottom of this amended drawing is also incorrect. From this the new building would be approximately 4m tall and somewhere over 8m wide. That cannot be correct as the amended 'Front and Side Elevations of No 12' clearly shows the height of the new No 12 as being 8m. Using the scale from this drawing the width of the new building will be pretty nearly 16.3m (53') wide, which is extremely large and does not seem to tally with the size of the existing building as seen on Google Street View.</p> <p>Given that these drawings still contain some unexplained serious discrepancies, we are also unsure about the accuracy of the amended 'Proposed Site Plan' dated 14.3.19 compared to the original 'Location and Site Plan' dated 26.9.18. Even if it is correct, the footprint of the proposed new house is much larger than the present building in relation to No 10, and especially to the rear of the property, towers over the bungalow at No 10 Skip Lane in height and floor area.</p> <p>We have also carefully read the comments of Jillian Rann, the Inspector for the Appeal for APP/V4630/W/18/3207169 relating to 14 Skip Lane, dated 16.1.19 and note that she concluded that 'the proposed development would not cause harm to ... the setting of the RPG' (Para 19). She also did not accept that the proposed development harmed the setting of the listed buildings identified (Walsall/Merrion's Lodge) or Great Barr Hall (Para 22). Her comments indicate that a proposed new larger house in this part of Skip Lane, cannot be refused solely on heritage grounds. While we disagree with her finding, it does leave us puzzled by your email to me of 6.2.19 stating that 'should an appeal be lodged against the Council's refusal of the replacement house, the only reason for refusal now will be based on the Gardens Trust objection' (as per our objection 28.1.19) and that 'The Local Planning Authority, recognizes that as a statutory consultee, your objection to the planning application can only result in the Council refusing the planning application.' This is not the case: as the planning authority you will weigh up all the material considerations, of which our advice on the impact on the registered landscape is one.</p> <p>In our opinion, some of the reasons the Inspector gave for her refusal to APP/V4630/W/18/3207169 should also be applied to the current application : the 'significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings. It would therefore conflict with Policies ENV2 and CSP4 of the Black Country Core Strategy, with saved Policies ENV32 and GP2 of the Walsall Unitary Development</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Plan .... and with the aims of the Designing Walsall Supplementary Planning Document.’ (Para 23) She also found that (Para 27) that ‘the proposed house would also result in an unacceptable reduction in the amount of sunlight and daylight reaching that neighbouring garden (no 12) at certain times. .... The proposed development would cause significant harm to the living conditions of existing and future occupants, and to their enjoyment of their private garden area.’ These grounds for refusal apply to the present application where the proposed new building at No 12 projects back into the garden, substantially further over two storeys at the rear, and to some extent at the front, which has an extremely dominant central gable which would also have the same ‘significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants (here for the single storey No 10 Skip Lane) ... with regard to outlook and light.’ (para 31). The Inspector’s comments regarding the undesirability of the ‘proposed house (having) a significantly greater presence than the existing building (Para 29) and ‘the proposed dwelling (appearing) as an unduly dominant feature when viewed from the front windows and front garden of ... neighbouring house’ (para 30) are also relevant here.</p> <p>Despite the appeal decision quoted above, the GT maintains its objections to application 18/1288 on heritage grounds as set out in our letter of 21.11.18. We also believe there are other grounds for refusal, as outlined in that decision letter.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Nymans	West Sussex	E19/0003	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use and extension of the Riding House to a cafe and kitchen and the associated change of use of Cooks Kitchen to storage and staff WC's. Change of use of the Kitchen Block to toilets and temporary archive facilities. Alterations to Welcome Area cafe; relocate WC's and add changing area to existing kitchen area; and rebuild existing toilet block with a new kitchen block.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2019</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications. Representatives of SGT have read the submitted plans and supporting documents with care and our comments are shown below.</p> <p>There are two parts to this application. The first concerns changes to the Riding House and associated buildings. Of particular relevance to Sussex Gardens Trust is the extension to the Riding House to create a new café. The context for this extension is one of simple agricultural buildings within a wooded parkland setting. However, the solution chosen is distinctly modernistic and utilitarian. While this is not sympathetic to the context,</p>

				Nymans, Staplefield Road, Handcross, Haywards Heath. VISITOR FACILITIES	<p>the site appears to be reasonably well screened from the axial path which runs NW/SE and by trees from the eastern parkland beyond. Nevertheless, there is a risk that glimpsed views of the new extension will be visible from the path and parkland, particularly at twilight when light pollution could be an issue. The Planning Authority should ensure that the structure will indeed be well screened with effective blinds and new planting if necessary, to assist in minimising its impact on the parkland and wider landscape.</p> <p>The second part concerns changes to the Welcome Area. Here SGT has no comment and neither supports nor objects to this part of the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.</p>
Roundhay Park	West Yorkshire	E18/1818	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Refurbishment of existing shelter. Canal Gardens, Roundhay Park, Princes Avenue, Roundhay. REPAIR/RESTORATION	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. 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>The c.200 ha Roundhay Park, registered grade II, is an early 19th century parkland with lakes, sham castle and a canal and with later municipal gardens and park structures. The pleasure grounds called Canal Gardens with the canal running east/west immediately south of the walled garden is shown on the 6":1mile OS map surveyed in 1847. There is a structure at the western end of the canal but it is unclear as to whether this is the summerhouse/shelter or another structure. The summerhouse/shelter is not listed and the register entry describes it as having been 'restored and altered late C20'. We have no indication from the submitted documents nor any photographs as to what the original construction was like, how it was altered in the late 20th century, what the current condition of the summerhouse/shelter is and whether the design is like the original or whether the proposed restoration/repairs are following historic precedent.</p> <p>The summerhouse/shelter is a significant part of Canal Gardens and we support in principle the very worthy project submitted by the Friends of Roundhay Park to repair/restore it. However, we would have liked to see more information submitted; a brief Design and Access/Heritage Statement would have been very helpful. We note from the Application</p>

					<p>Form that there seems to have been pre-application advice from Adam Ward/Phil Ward dated 15th February 2019, however following our contact with you we understand that this has not taken place. In practical terms we trust that the work will ensure that there is no water ingress at the front posts as their ends are below step level. In terms of earlier structures, there are some indistinct and undated photos on the Leodis website, and from these it appears that the shelter was not built until, possibly, the 1920/30s. Prior to that, there was a rustic bridge and maybe a pergola, c 1880s. In that one 1880s photo we can see no sign of a summerhouse. In conclusion, we support the principle of repairing/restoring the shelter/summerhouse which should enhance the Canal Gardens and add to the pleasure of those using the area but we are unsure about the evidence for the proposals.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust has a small amount of funding allocated to conservation projects- YGT Small Grants Scheme - and perhaps the Friends of Roundhay Park might find it of use. Information can be found on our website.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Ledston Hall and Park	West Yorkshire	E19/0010	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Application for repairs to the roof hidden lead valley gutter, replace central lead gutter, Roof water drainage improved with new cast iron down pipe, rendered chimney stacks repaired with matching lime render. The Old Vicarage, New Road, Ledsham, Leeds LS25 5LT. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. 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>The Old Vicarage is near the south east boundary of the grade II* Registered Ledston Hall and Park, however we understand that the works will have no impact on the external appearance of the Old Vicarage or any historic features. The proposal will ensure continued use and prevent further damage to this listed building. We have no comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>