



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES MAY 2019

The GT conservation team received 149 new cases in England and one case in Wales during May, 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, 30 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Kings Weston House	Avon	E19/0002	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed removal and reinstatement of Kingsweston Footbridge, (replaced with increased headroom). Footway Bridge Over Kings Weston Road, Bristol. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT], in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development of dismantling, repairing and re-erecting Kings Weston footbridge which will affect a grade II listed bridge as well as a nationally registered park and garden.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We have considered both of the submitted plans and documents, and would like to comment as follows.</p> <p>The heritage assets of Kings Weston are of very significant value, both nationally and to Bristol. The Kings Weston footbridge is a Grade II Listed structure on the National Heritage List for England. Raising the bridge will have considerable detrimental impact on the key views of the eight adjoining heritage assets identified in the Heritage Statement.</p> <p>The current proposal of access ramps with 'doglegs' and returns will detract considerably from the setting of the bridge and other adjacent assets.</p>

					<p>The National Planning Policy Framework says “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)....Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification”.</p> <p>Having studied the responses to both planning applications, the AGT supports the reinstatement of the Kings Weston Bridge, however we are not convinced that an exhaustive investigation has taken place regarding transport solutions. As the Conservation Advisory Panel states: ‘ There is no in depth transport study as part of the application to investigate re-routing of HGV’s away from the road entirely’.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed development within the Kings Weston Estate will cause substantial harm to the significance of the Historic Park and Garden.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust object to this proposal in its current form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Blaise Castle and Hamlet	Avon	E19/0053	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Permanent signs at key entry points to the Blaise Castle estate to advertise the Blaise Castle House Museum and provide essential information, including facilities and opening times. Blaise Castle House, Henbury Road, Henbury, Bristol BS10 7QS.</p> <p>ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE</p>	<p>WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT], in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed erection of six permanent signs in a nationally registered Grade II* Park and Garden.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We have considered all of the visual information submitted with this application and have made a site visit. Consequently, we would like to comment as follows.</p> <p>The proposed signage adjacent to the fingerpost, [B, post mounted aluminium monolith with removable trays], is very intrusive into the landscape being on the historic tree line of one row of the historic elm avenue [planted by Sir Samuel Astry c1700, pre-dating the Harford family and Repton]. The avenue has been partially replaced by limes, and also</p>

					<p>partially blocked by inappropriate conifers. Nonetheless, it is an important feature in the Blaise history.</p> <p>We would like to suggest that this sign is omitted or relocated to a less conspicuous position, possibly on a wall of the house.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework says “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)....Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification”.</p> <p>We consider that the sign ‘B’, in its proposed position within the Blaise Castle Estate will cause significant harm to the historic views within the Historic Park and Garden.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust object to this proposal in its current form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Halton House	Buckinghamshire	E19/0102	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 8no. detached houses along with associated services, roads and external works. Land At Harebridge Lane And Upper Icknield Way, Aston Clinton, Buckinghamshire. RESIDENTIAL OUTCOME Refused</p> <p>APPEAL LODGED 04.04.2019</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the appeal process affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. It is unfortunate that neither the GT nor our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust were notified about the original application, as the site is immediately adjacent to the Grade II registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Halton House, which is itself Grade II*. We would certainly have provided comments had we been consulted. We are taking this belated opportunity to submit our thoughts on the proposed new housing and would be grateful if you could pass our comments to the Planning Inspectorate for consideration when deciding this matter.</p> <p>The sparse online documentation accompanying the original application makes no mention whatsoever of the RPG. Due to the application site’s proximity to a national heritage asset the applicant should have provided a Heritage Statement and a Visual Impact Assessment. When the application was refused it was noted that the application was contrary to several policies within the Aston Clinton Neighbourhood Plan (ACNP). It is also</p>

					<p>contrary to the Revised NPPF para 189 as there was no consideration of the significance of the heritage asset or the contribution made by its setting. Due to the development's failure to comply with sustainability as per paragraphs H5 and EN1 of the ACNP, in our opinion it also fails Paras 192b & c of the revised NPPF. In our opinion it also further damages the setting of the RPG by closing the gap between two housing developments which have already negatively impacted upon the significance of the RPG. Should this development be permitted it would link the two developments and present as an almost continual line of development on the boundary of the RPG.</p> <p>We would ask your officers to take into consideration Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views, p2 : 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change' which would be relevant in this instance. P5 also states : 'The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary.' The alteration of the character of the landscape, which will become more residential, adversely affects the experience of the surrounding landscape character and asset (p11) increasing the 'Busyness, bustle, movement and activity' inevitably involved with more housing, cars etc. We would also suggest that (p12) 'Cumulative assessment is required under the EU Directive on EIA. Its purpose is to identify impacts that are the result of introducing the development into the view in combination with other existing and proposed developments' is also relevant.</p> <p>As you will be aware, despite the Design and Access statement accompanying the original application failing to be aware of the Grade II* Halton House (2.4.2) or mention the RPG, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting (ie. the RPG and Halton House), the local planning authority shall have special regard (our emphasis) to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting (Section 66(1)). Decision makers should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>exercise. The considerable importance and weight applies to all harm, although with greater force the more important the listed building or setting. If harm is identified then there is a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>The GT and BGT object to the original application and urge the Planning Inspectorate to refuse this appeal for the reason given above.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Barlborough Hall	Derby shire	E19/0101	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Siting and personal residential use of two temporary static residential caravans on land at Barlborough Springs Fishery (Retrospective). Barlborough Springs Fishery, Ward Lane, Barlborough, Chesterfield. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens (Barlborough Hall Grade II registered park and garden), as per the above retrospective application.</p> <p>The static caravans are situated at the heart of the registered parkland (RPG), within about 200m of Barlborough Hall. This means that the applicant should also have submitted a Heritage Statement, accompanied ideally by a Visual Impact Assessment written by specialist consultants familiar with the particular sensitivities of an RPG, with their application. These significant omissions, together with the unlawful siting and occupation of the caravans over a number of years, in our opinion clearly indicate that the applicant has given no thought to the impact his temporary structures have on the significance and setting of the historic landscape. A site visit has confirmed that, even with full foliage on the trees, the caravans are plainly visible from Ward Lane, a public right of way that passes through the RPG. They appear utterly alien to the character of the landscape, and have a significant negative impact on the historic assets.</p> <p>We concur with your Conservation Officer's comments and reasons for objection, and will not repeat them here for brevity.</p> <p>We would draw your officers' attention to Historic England's advice : page 2 'A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.' Also on page 2 : 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need</p>

					<p>to consider the implications of cumulative change.’ Page 2 also says : ‘The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as ... land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.’ In our opinion Para 185 of the Revised NPPF is also relevant here, given the past history of the poor state of the site, specifically Para 185 ‘Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats’ and P185(c) ‘the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness’ which is clearly not the case in this instance. In our opinion, the applicant has also not complied with the NPPF para 189 and 192 (c). We do not think that the applicant has justified the conditions set out in the NPPF para 194.</p> <p>We note that the current application is for temporary permission, however the accompanying Design and Access Statement suggests that a permanent presence on site is required for security reasons. It also states that security problems existed prior to the applicant’s purchase of the site. The applicant should therefore have been aware of these factors as well as the previous planning issues that relate to the site before taking on the business. Whilst it is clear that the applicant and his family find themselves in a difficult personal situation, this does not constitute a ground for granting permission for this unlawful development.</p> <p>The GT objects to the above retrospective application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
The Hoe	Devon	E18/1690	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Statue to commemorate Lady Nancy Astor. Grassed Area In Front Of Elliot Terrace, Plymouth.</p> <p>SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 98.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the amended application which affects The Hoe, 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.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust previously supported the proposal for the statue opposite Lady Astor’s former home in Elliot Terrace. However, we are most concerned about the amended proposal which now includes an access path from The Promenade across the grassed area to the proposed statue.</p>

					<p>We consider that the access path would detract from the simple open character of The Hoe and The Promenade.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust objects to the amended proposal for an access path The Promenade across the grassed area to the proposed statue as it would harm to the significance of the the grade II Registered landscape. We would suggest that perhaps it might be more appropriate to consider an alternative site for the statue.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
The Italian Garden at Great Ambrook	Devon	E19/0035	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Construction of building for use as holiday accommodation and visitor facilities. Great Ambrook, Ipplepen. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.05.2019</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 Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Rousdon	Devon	E19/0133	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a greenhouse. 2 The Walled Garden, Rousdon, Lyme Regis DT7 3XR. GLASSHOUSE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Rousdon, a designed landscape of national importance, included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on planning applications affecting all sites on the Historic England Register. The 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 have considered the information on your website and do not have any objections to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Knightshayes Court	Devon	E19/0230	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for the erection of 5 fruit cages. Knightshayes Court, Bolham, Tiverton.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Knightshayes Court, an historic designed landscape of national significance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>We are happy to support the proposals.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Painswick House	Gloucestershire	E18/1837	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a new visitor centre, community and education room, function room, greenhouse, secured compound, with associated hard and soft landscaping (386327 - 210466). Painswick Rococo Garden, Gloucester Road, Painswick, Stroud. VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.05.2019</p> <p>The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for Planning Applications that impact on Listed or Registered parks and gardens, has referred this proposal submitted by the Painswick Rococo Garden Trust , to the Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) for its response. Painswick House, its Rococo Garden, ancillary buildings and its Grade11* parkland is a very significant heritage asset. The Rococo garden was established between 1738 and 1748 by Benjamin Hyett to the northwest of Painswick House, and west of the ancillary stable buildings (part of which is occupied by the Rococo Garden Trust). The Listed Park forms a large sweep to the south of the House and extends to the north west. In considering development proposals in heritage settings like this, National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) concentrates on securing appropriate and proportionate protection and conservation of those heritage assets. This proposal sets out to replace the Trust's "centre" presently occupying buildings ancillary to the stables, used to provide access to the Rococo Garden and support management of those gardens. The reason for this, it is understood, is required as there is a legal obligation to vacate these premises in the near future. Thus, the siting of this proposal is subject to both legal and operational constraints that can sit uncomfortably with the rigid application of NPPG. This results in a number of dilemmas that require to be assessed and a balance struck. If no incursion into the listed parkland, however minor or mitigated can be contemplated, the outcome would be</p>

					<p>the refusal of this development proposal. If no other legal or operational option is on the table one would contemplate the closure of the Rococo Garden Trust, and viewed from this position , an uncertain future thereafter. However, looking at this proposal in the round, the other part of this policy balancing act must be to assess schemes that minimises the clash with the NPPG by the design, the footprint and the mitigating earth-shaping and planting of any proposals that form an incursion into this parkland. If a detailed scheme- namely this Application- does survive close analysis, and the loss of heritage asset is considered relatively minimal when set against the entirety of the overall parkland, a case could be made for a solution that might secure continuity of the Rococo Garden Trust management.</p> <p>On this basis, GGLT considers that subject to the above, and particularly the detailed design of the building and the selection of materials, the balance lies with supporting the continuity of the Trust, and the past investment in the restoration and management of this unique garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Berkeley Castle	Gloucestershire	E19/0156	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of memorial garden (368497 - 198971). Berkeley Castle, High Street, Berkeley, Gloucestershire GARDEN, LANDSCAPE	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2019</p> <p>GGLT considers that a memorial garden in this location within the Castle grounds, could be a distinct improvement on the current disturbed condition of this part of the Grade 11* Castle gardens within the context of a nationally significant historic castle.</p> <p>However, this Application does raise a number of important issues that require further consideration. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *There is a lack of documentation that one might usually expect when contemplating development of such a sensitive site within the Castle grounds, regarding the history of this location, and the relationship of this proposal to the tank or pool featured on the 1878 O.S.; *There is little evidence within the sketch proposals of a detailed site survey, or drawings explaining how the garden might relate to or be integrated into the robust character of its Castle setting; and finally, *There is a certain lack of information about materials and construction again to demonstrate how this quite informal garden will fit successfully into the proposed setting. <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E19/0164	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Change	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.05.2019

	rshire			<p>of use of land at Cirencester Park from Horse Paddocks, arena and stables car park, to form a new car park for 250 car spaces. Old Kennels, Tetbury Road, Cirencester. PARKING</p>	<p>The Garden Trust, as the Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that are considered to have an impact on Listed or Registered parks and gardens, has referred this Planning Application to Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) for its response.</p> <p>A proposal for the construction of a 250 space car park adjacent to the Old Kennels within the south east corner of the 1000Ha. Grade 1 Cirencester Park is one that requires very careful consideration; not only within the narrow confines of the "Horse Paddocks", but also within context of the Park as a whole.</p> <p>Looking at the wider picture, GGLT would like to take the opportunity presented by this proposal in the first instance to draw the Cotswold District Council's attention to the issue of the severe deterioration of features within the Park, particularly of the Grade 11* Alfred's Hall; and secondly, the need to much improve both the Park's public access and its interpretation. It is hoped that the District Council might use the opportunity now presented by this Planning Application to focus at least to rectify Alfred's Hall's dubious status as a Building at Risk.</p> <p>Turning to the detail of 19/00853/FUL, the gesture that some public parking provision be made is welcomed, but in GGLT's opinion its scope is seen as both insufficient and unacceptably time constrained. GGLT was not privy to the Pre App. discussions referred to by Heritage England, but it hinted that the adjacent Kennels might present opportunities for wider public engagement. Therefore, the current proposal as it stands should be assessed within this wider context to see how possible further intensification might be accommodated.</p> <p>Without looking at the strictly commercial aspects of this scheme, or the potential highway issues associated with parking and visitor traffic, the current design raises some unanswered questions. It is not evident how the current proposal, and a possible intensified scheme might fit into the "Horse Paddocks" wider setting in the Grade 1. Cirencester Park.</p> <p>From GGLT's point of view, this modification of the Park's use currently represented by this rather utilitarian car park layout needs to be rather more imaginative; and we would urge Cotswold District Council to enter negotiations to address its short comings. In summary, GGLT considers that this proposal needs to be seen within the setting of a major parkland landscape reconstruction, which would help restructure this South West corner of the Park. The scheme would be helped by using parkland scale advanced planting which would then enable proposals such as this to be</p>
--	--------	--	--	---	---

					successfully edited into the overall Park, positively using change to uplift its aesthetic quality. Yours sincerely, David Ball,(on behalf of Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust).
Garden at Kingcombe	Gloucestershire	E19/0236	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Alteration and extension of existing listed building including the demolition and replacement of a modern extension at Kingcombe, Kingcombe Lane, Chipping Campden, Gloucestershire GL55 6UN. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.05.2019 The Garden Trust has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that impact on Listed or Registered gardens and parkland, to respond to CDC on its behalf. Having considered these modifications to Kingcombe in its context as a significant Listed Building in an important garden setting; and in the framework of recent planning permissions; GGLT would not wish to rise any objections to these proposals. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).
Temple Dinsley	Hertfordshire	E18/1239	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent Change of use and extension of school dormitory (C2) to form 6 no. dwellings (C3), incorporating the following listed building works; demolition and removal of conservatory, fire escape stairs and storage sheds; erection of single storey extension to accommodation block and erection of cross wing extension to north east wing; erection of lattice porch to south west elevation. Realignment of boundary wall adjacent the access; formation of amenity, parking areas and associated landscaping (amendment to Listed Building Consent Applications 17/02801/1LB). The Dower House, Hitchin Road,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.05.2019 The Gardens Trust submitted a No Comment to this planning application regarding conversion of the Dower House. On the plans included with this application the wall for the walled garden on the northern side of the site was intact and the plan noted that the wall was 1.2 m high with a gateway part way down. We can find nothing in the plans which suggests that this wall was to be altered. However, on a recent visit to Temple Dinsley (Princess Helena College) we found that this walled has been completely demolished, together with part of the adjoining eastern wall, and the area contains builders rubble. This wall was previously in poor condition but recognizably intact to its full height. We are dismayed at this destruction of a heritage asset set within the II* Registered landscape designed by Lutyens. This is contrary to NPPF Chapter 16 which states that these assets are an irreplaceable resource and to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. It is also contrary to NHDC Policies SP1 (sustainable Development), and HE1 (Designated Heritage Assets). The wall, as far as we understand it, was not part of the planning application and we can see no reason for its destruction. We would welcome assurances that the wall will be rebuilt with period appropriate materials and in the original style as soon as possible.

				Preston, Hitchin, Hertfordshire SG4 7TZ. BUILDING ALTERATION, PARKING	Yours faithfully Kate Harwood Planning & Conservation Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (a member of The Gardens Trust)
Poles Park	Hertford shire	E19/0091	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey rear extensions and blocking up and creation of 2 no window openings. North Lodge, Poles Lane, Thundridge, Ware, Hertfordshire SG12 0SD. BUILDING ALTERATION OUTCOME 30.05.2019 Refused	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.05.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comment on the remediation proposals for the house. However, removal of all the trees marked on the plan will alter the setting both of the lodge and the entrance to Grade II* mansion and Grade II parkland. Some screening along the eastern boundary is required, the few trees outside of the lodge fence being insufficient to maintain the setting of the park entrance. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
54 Bridge Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertford shire	E19/0129	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2 x two-bedroom semi- detached dwellings with associated vehicular access and parking. 54 Bridge Road, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6UR. RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.05.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The cottage at 54 Bridge Road is one of a pair of estate cottages built by Earl Cowper in 1876 on the edge of Sherrards Park Wood, which has been in existence since at least 1599. Bridge Road itself is the southern boundary of these historic woodlands and has been for centuries Development to the rear of this cottage would severely harm the setting of the cottage, which pre-dates the Garden City, both in the approach to it via the proposed drive and the destruction of the rear woodland aspect. It would , in addition, be an intrusion into an area which has formed part of the historic woodland for years and introduce a built element close to the line of the old railway, currently a green walk for the residents of the Garden City. We consider this development inappropriate and harmful in the location." Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Land off Crossway, Welwyn Garden City	Hertford shire	E19/0142	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of equestrian building for existing use for the storage of timber, carpentry/Joinery workshop. Change of use of existing	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2019 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The site in question is within the Green Belt and was part of the Capability Brown landscape of Digswell (which also included the adjacent MalmsWood and Sherrardspark Wood). We would consider that uses compatible with the designed landscape and

				equestrian building to class B1(a) Light Industry B2 (General Industry) or B8 (Storage & Distribution) with associated vehicle parking. Land off Crossway, Welwyn Garden City. MISCELLANEOUS.	Green Belt would be most appropriate within this area. This would include equestrian facilities but not light industry. Kate Harwood CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2019 6/2019/0810/FUL Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Our comments on 6/2019/0811/FULL pertain to this application. Viz: The area is within the Green Belt and part of the remaining undeveloped portion of Capability Brown landscape of Digswell. We would consider equestrian use suitable for this area, but not light industry. Kate Harwood
Northaw Place	Hertford shire	E19/0159	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of a new vehicular following removal of existing close boarded boundary fence and erection of post and rail boundary fence and hedge with timber gate. Northaw Place, Coopers Lane, Northaw. ACCESS/GATES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.05.2019 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information contained in this application and our knowledge of the landscape history of the site, we are satisfied that the design is appropriate for the rural location and the position of the new entrance is historically correct. We therefore, have no objections. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
8 Mandeville Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertford shire	E19/0191	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce 4 x Oak trees Reduce 3 x Hornbeam trees Fell 1 x Hornbeam tree. 8 Mandeville Rise, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JU. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2019 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are unclear from the information provided in this application, the reason why 1 hornbeam should be felled. We would suggest that this be clarified before permission is granted. We have no objections to the removal of epicormic growth from the other trees detailed. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
8 Mandeville Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertford shire	E19/0215	N	PLANNING APPLICATION To remove epicormic growth from 3 x Hornbeam trees Fell 1 x Hornbeam tree -Conservation area. 8 Mandeville Rise Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JU. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2019 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objections to the removal of epicormic growth as detailed. We are unclear from the information given as to why 1 hornbeam should be felled. We would suggest clarification on this before any permission is granted. Kate Harwood
Sledmere House	Humber side	E19/0135	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey link extension to the shop, internal and external	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.05.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on

				<p>alterations, including insertion of two new staircases and raising level of first floor, conversion of part first floor to function rooms and creation of a self-contained flat. Terrace Cafe, Sledmere House, Main Street, Sledmere, East Riding Of Yorkshire YO25 3XG. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>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 pleasure grounds and park of Sledmere House – grade I on the Historic England Register - were laid out by Sir Christopher Sykes 1771-1800 with advice from Thomas White (1736-1811) and Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (1716-83). Sykes was improving the 'wastes' of the East Riding with model agriculture and farms acting as eye catchers. The stable block, listed grade II*, which is the subject of this planning application and is within the registered area, was built by Richard Sykes after he inherited the estate in 1748. Sir Christopher Sykes undertook major building works to the stables in 1775 and 1777. The main façade of the stables, with pairs of coach houses flanking the impressive pedimented entrance with its Tuscan columns and cupola, was an addition to the original building around 1818. The entrance front is now attributed to the York architects, Watson and Pritchett. Since that time there have not been any significant changes to the external appearance of the stables and coach houses, although there have been internal changes.</p> <p>This proposal should have little or no impact on the registered area and the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no concerns over the development in principle. However, we would like to point out some concerns over the details of the proposed air vents and windows.</p> <p>We consider that replacing many of the existing shutters with centre point casement windows will alter the character of the existing stable block, and especially along the interior and exterior elevations of the north-east side. Perhaps this change in character could be mitigated by covering the windows with removable shutters to match the current ones when the function room was not in use. If the shutters were permanent and hinged this would not look sympathetic with the elevation when they are open.</p> <p>We also have some concerns regarding the vent and air intakes for the kitchen on the north-east elevation which we think are even more out of character. We could not find details of their design. Are they to be metallic or slatted wood that could at least be painted white? The same applies to the vents for the toilets on the interior north-west elevation. We make these points as we consider that looking at these details might help reduce the visibility of the changes.</p> <p>In conclusion we do not consider that the proposed development will</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>cause harm to a grade I registered park and garden and will give sympathetic new uses to an historic building. We have no objection but ask that the Council considers the concerns outlined above.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Stonyhurst College	Lancashire	E19/0060	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The erection of an agricultural building, a silage clamp and a slurry lagoon on land adjacent to existing farm buildings. Hall Barn Farm, Knowles Brow, Hurst Green BB7 9PT. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.05.2019</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. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>In our letter of 8 May we noted that the site of the application lies immediately within sight of the Stonyhurst Registered Park and Garden Grade II*. We have visited the site and verified that the impact of the proposed application on views from the Terrace Gardens is likely to be negligible. We therefore have no objection to the proposals.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this please contact LGT on conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Stonyhurst College	Lancashire	E19/0089	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION A temporary (up to five years) single-storey extension to the pre-prep school (Hodder House) containing two classrooms, WC facilities and a cloakroom. Stonyhurst College, Avenue Road, Hurst Green BB7 9PZ. EDUCATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.05.2019</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. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We have reviewed the application documentation in this case, and concluded that the proposed extension has no impact on the Registered Park and Garden at Stonyhurst.</p> <p>We have no objection to this application.</p>

					Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group
People's Park	Lincolnshire	E18/1356	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION . Change of use from garden centre to events venue and installation of replacement portable building. Floral Hall And Aviary, Peoples Park, Park Drive, Grimsby. CHANGE OF USE, EVENT/FUNCTION	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. Since we originally responded on 29th January 2019 we have been able to liaise with our colleagues in the Lincolnshire Gardens Trust and give the application greater thought. We would be grateful if you could take our new comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We note that Navigo are making efforts to ensure that the noise from music will be muted and limited in volume, and that any taxis waiting to collect guests will be required to switch off their engines to minimise disturbance to residents. They also propose security personnel to ensure that guests leave as fast and quietly as possible. However, the later opening times will undoubtedly impact negatively on the peaceful enjoyment of this amenity for the neighbours. Introducing up to 100 party guests and their transport will detract from the peaceful park ambience. The GT would suggest that if your officers approve this application, that Navigo are asked to compensate for the negative impacts for local residents by making an annual contribution towards the maintenance of the rest of the RPG, perhaps by providing gardening help which would also be appreciated by the guests visiting the venue?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Rudding Park	North Yorkshire	E19/0046	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of 2 no. single storey extensions; Erection of 1 no. two storey extension; Erection of single storey glazed link extension; Erection of first floor glazed link extension; Alterations to fenestration including relocation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.05.2019</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>Rudding Park, originally part of the forest of Knaresborough, retains some of the ancient oaks within the parkland. Rudding Park House listed grade I</p>

				<p>of entrance; Demolition of single storey cellar extension; Extension of enclosed service yard; Alterations to landscaping and hardstanding. Rudding Park Hotel, Rudding Park, Follifoot HG3 1JH. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>is orientated with views to the east over a landscaped park included by the eminent landscape designer, Humphry Repton in his designs for the then owner Lord Loughborough for whom he produced one of his seminal Red Books (1790). Repton quotes from this Red Book in his Sketches and Hints on Landscape Gardening... of 1794, and also uses an illustration of Rudding for Peacock's Polite Repository (1792). In the mid- 20th Century James Russell was also involved with garden/woodland designs for Rudding Park some of which have been lost.</p> <p>Rudding Park House became a hotel in 1997 with subsequent alterations and extensions. This application continues the development but pleasingly leaves the historic east elevation of the house and its setting unaltered. There are no landscape changes proposed which would significantly alter any existing historic setting.</p> <p>We note that there have been pre-application discussions with Historic England and Harrogate Borough Council. The design proposals and quality seem logical and well worked out. Our only criticism here is that the applicant seems to have put incorrect north-points onto many key drawings which is unfortunate as this house was rebuilt specifically and unusually, to face east to enjoy Humphry Repton's landscape and views to the lake and the cropped, partial plans with incorrect north-points make interpretation unnecessarily difficult.</p> <p>On the north side, the re-configuring of the entrance arrangement is undoubtedly a great improvement for the hotel, and probably replicates the historic layout. The removal of car parking in the immediate area is a definite improvement enhancing a good 'sense of arrival'. However, we suggest that the landscape design associated with the new layout may become too expectedly sub-urban/hotel-like. Maybe there is an opportunity to recall the stable yard which used to exist here in the design and planting. We agree that the improvement to the service deliveries/yard arrangements to the north will be advantageous but wonder if the service vehicles will exit the service yard in an easterly direction and so briefly emerge into the front of the historic house? If this is the case are there any opportunities for reducing that?</p> <p>We note that there is a glass corridor proposed over the roof of the service areas which is suggested will be invisible. However, it will become very hot on a sunny day and the applicant may need to add brises-soleils to the outside. If this is the case, we suggest that they are grey.</p> <p>On the south side, the new extension to the restaurant will take over the</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>existing terrace area, adjacent to the existing conservatory which looks out onto the gardens and park; so, there is some further encroachment on the grounds. However, the design will improve the interface between the west extensions and the original house.</p> <p>In conclusion the GT/YGT welcomes the improvements to the entrance setting and has no objection to the extensions/alterations to the modern development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Hackfall	North Yorkshire	E19/0143	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of replacement windows. Hackfall Farm, Wapping To Nutwith Common, Grewelthorpe HG4 3DE. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.05.2019</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>Hackfall Farm is a grade II listed house situated just outside the south west boundary of Hackfall which is grade I on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. Hackfall occupies the south and west sides of a steep craggy gorge through which the river Ure flows in a sweeping bend. The site under the ownership of John Aislabie (who laid out the grounds at nearby Studley Royal) was designed with cascades, ponds, rustic follies and grottoes forming an important and early example of using wild natural scenery for its own sake. Due to the topography and its location, Hackfall Farm, although important historically as part of the Hackfall area, is only slightly visible from the southern point of the registered landscape and we do not consider that the proposal will affect the setting.</p> <p>We have no comments to make on this planning application and refer you to your authority's conservation officer for advice.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Plumpton Rocks	North Yorkshire	E19/0149	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of entrance gate and pillars with associated alterations</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.05.2019</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</p>

				<p>to vehicle access and parking; repairing of low wall; back filling of ditch and removal of part of hedge. Plompton Cottage, Farrar Wood To Plompton Park, Plompton HG5 8NA.</p> <p>ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The application site lies within the Grade II* Plompton Rocks registered park and garden (RPG) and is immediately adjacent to the walled kitchen garden (listed Grade II) which formed an integral feature of the mid C18 layout. The buildings ensemble at Plompton is unusual as it is a complete set of buildings built from c1757 onwards by John Carr for Daniel Lascelles as part of the planned scheme for the Plompton estate buildings. Carr was also probably involved with the development of the pleasure grounds, and he certainly designed the rusticated dam and boathouse by the lake.</p> <p>The existing drive at Plompton Cottage has been created out of former parkland and the 'haha' shown in the photographs within the 'Heritage, Design and Access' (H,D & A) statement is referred to by Carr as a 'sunk fence'. The 'haha' is an important feature which defines the relationship between the parkland and the group of buildings/walled kitchen garden. Creating a residential driveway between the parkland and the 'haha' would in our opinion, have a detrimental effect on the way in which this historical feature could be read and understood and would have a negative, suburbanising effect on the RPG.</p> <p>The proposed gateway is in our opinion out of scale and too large. The previous gates were wrought iron, and the gateway shown in Fig 1, H,D & A is wrought iron, so the introduction of very large wooden gates would be out of keeping. If security issues necessitate prevention of access by the public or stock, or to prevent dogs from roaming into the parkland, even a cattle grid in the position of the current gate would fulfil this role. We would also prefer not to see any new gate/barrier on a W/E access in order not to block the W/E view along the edge of the walled kitchen garden. There is already additional parking, in constant use, at the bend in the drive where the new gateway is proposed, and that is quite acceptable.</p> <p>We would not be able to support heavy wooden gates blocking the view along the south side of the walled kitchen garden. In our opinion, this would represent an insensitive development within Plompton Park which has been carefully reconnected to the existing Carr buildings. This development would represent an erosion and retrograde step and detract from the careful work done to date.</p> <p>The GT/YGT objects to this application.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Bishops Palace, Wells	Somerset	E19/0138	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed works to a tree in a conservation area:- T1 - Magnolia - Prune around building, thin to remove rubs within crown. T2 - Handkerchief - Fell. T3 - Foxglove - remove deadwood and rubbings branches, small crown raise x 2.4 metres. T4 - Weeping Willow - deadwood and crown raise to 2.4 metres. T5 - Walnut - Deadwood. The Bishops Palace Gardens Market Place, Wells Somerset BA5 2PD. TREES	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.05.2019 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 are confident that the tree works specified on the documentation map online would not be undertaken unnecessarily and are essential for the health and safety of the trees and public within the Bishops Palace Gardens. However, we would be interested to know why the Davidia (Handkerchief tree) needs to be felled? Has it died? We are glad to see that a replacement will be planted. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Bishops Palace, Wells	Somerset	E19/0178	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed temporary car parking. Land At 355275 145510, Silver Street, Wells, Somerset. PARKING	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2019 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 sparse online documentation for this application and are surprised that considering the proposed car parking lies within the centre of the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of the Bishops Palace, Wells, there is neither a Heritage Statement or a Visual Impact Assessment to help your officers decide upon the effect this will have upon the setting and significance of the RPG and the Grade I Bishops Palace. Have any other less sensitive sites been considered for additional parking and if so why have they been rejected in favour of this very visible piece of ground within the historic meadows of the Palace? No consideration would appear to have been given to the heritage impacts this proposal will have upon the II* RPG and Grade I Bishop's Palace. The negative impacts from within the Bishops Palace will in our opinion be considerable. The

					<p>application documents have little or no information as to what is proposed, if anything, in terms of changes to the surface of the land, what impact there might be on archaeology and so forth.</p> <p>We understand from other online comments that parking is a pressing problem in Wells. Whilst we sympathise with this, we would suggest that this application is poorly thought out and does not take into account the negative impact this very visible application would have upon several major heritage assets. Given the urgency of the lack of parking we anticipate that should this be approved, 'temporary' parking might well become permanent in future.</p> <p>We OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Valley Gardens, Saltburn	Tees Valley	E19/0152	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT OF A CAMPING AND CARAVANNING SITE (TOTAL OF 170 PITCHES); 2 AMENITY BLOCKS; RECEPTION/SHOP/CAFE BUILDING; RECYCLING AREA; CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA; WASTE DISPOSAL POINTS; MOTORHOME WATER POINT; SITE MANAGER'S PITCH; TRACTOR SHED; PARKING PROVISIONS AND INTERNAL SITE ACCESS ROADS; SITE ACCESS OFF SALTburn LANE INCLUDING SITE ACCESS/EGRESS BARRIERS; PEDESTRIAN FOOTPATH LINK TO THE NORTH; LANDSCAPING AND ALL OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS. LAND EAST OF SALTburn LANE, SALTburn-BY-THE-SEA. CAMPING</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.05.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and note that comments within the Archaeology and Heritage DBA, seem to be at variance with those in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal. The former states (p29, 10.1.1.3) 'There are good views to the ridge on which the proposed development is located for example from the Albert Memorial (1387584) (Photograph 12). It is likely that there would be some impact upon these views by the proposed development which would add to the skyline (if only in a limited manner) behind the Toll Bridge Cottage...' and also 'The proposed development may have a negative setting impact upon the wider setting of the gardens, though this is thought to be limited.'</p> <p>Photographs 4 and 12 illustrate the intervisibility between the proposed development and the Albert Memorial within the Valley Gardens. Photograph 12 shows how a development of the scale proposed would potentially affect the views outwards in this direction from the Albert Memorial within Valley Gardens. The memorial was presumably sited to take advantage of the views to the wider landscape, which will inevitably be altered by a development on the skyline. It may be that proposed new</p>

					<p>planting (EDP's Landscape and Visual Appraisal of April 2019, 7.18) associated with the development could reduce the impact in time, though the view to open farmland on the skyline above the valley woodland would presumably be lost.</p> <p>The LVA (p20) states : 'There are no open views towards the site from within the Valley Gardens RPG due to the combination of landform, broadleaved woodland, and in places, intervening residential built form situated on Saltburn Lane.' This would seem to be at variance with the conclusion and photographs provided by the Archaeology and Heritage DBA. We would suggest that your officers ask the developer to provide further landscape and visual assessment (a photo viewpoint?) to assist in determining the likely impact from the Albert Memorial within the Grade II Valley Gardens.</p> <p>We would draw your officers' attention to Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets , in particular p5 : 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary. It can include: land which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it '. We suggest that this is pertinent in this instance.</p> <p>Given that the information provided by the developer has identified that there is intervisibility between the Albert Memorial (Grade II), a significant feature within the Valley Gardens, and the proposed development, and that the proposed development may have a negative impact on the wider setting of the gardens, we would like to express considerable concern about the likely impact on the Valley Gardens RPG. We are surprised that your Authority would have identified this area as a potential holiday park site (D&A 1.2.12) given its sensitivity and potential for affecting the setting and significance of the registered Valley Gardens and the Albert Memorial. We hope that your planning officers pay particular regard to this aspect when making their decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Heathcote, Ilkley	West Yorkshire	E19/0071	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing dwelling and garage and redevelopment with apartment building (ten apartments). Grid Ref: 410904 447626 27 Kings Road, Ilkley, West Yorkshire LS29 9AR.</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.05.2019</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 Limegarth, 27 Kings Road, Ilkley is situated in the Ilkley Conservation Area immediately to the east of one of (Sir) Edwin Lutyens finest house and garden designs; grade I listed Heathcote, its several grade I and II* listed features and its garden registered Grade II. It is one of only two Lutyens designs in Yorkshire. Heathcote is especially important and of arguably international significance as a complete unity of design of buildings and garden (1906-9) where Lutyens worked entirely in a classical manner (with references to the Italian architect Michele Sanmicheli, 1484-1559), following his earlier designs in the vernacular and Tudor mode. The quality of the design and execution of the hard landscaping within the gardens is outstanding and far superior to that of other well-known and most respected landscape designers of the period. He is well-known for his collaboration with the important late 19C/early 20C garden designer Gertrude Jekyll who was responsible for the planting scheme at Heathcote. Heathcote can be considered a precursor to Lutyens later civic work eg in New Delhi and the Cenotaph, Whitehall. Working with his client J T Hemingway, Lutyens designed Heathcote to command its plot, with its design and scale and its situation on somewhat elevated ground.</p> <p>Although we agree that Limegarth is of no architectural merit, it is of only two storeys with a relatively small footprint within its plot bounded by trees, and it has no impact on Heathcote, its neighbour. In our view this will not be the case with this proposed ten apartment building. We note that in section 3.2 of the Planning Statement on page 3 it is stated that "the siting of the new building is on the footprint of the existing buildings." This is misleading as the proposed new building is significantly larger than that currently on the site. And more importantly we note that the height will be substantially higher than the existing dwelling – essentially four storeys as compared with two storeys although this will be somewhat mitigated by the land falling to the east. The GT/YGT consider that the massing of the proposed building will impact on the views both from within Heathcote itself and its setting, particularly from the north and east. The boundary</p>
-------------------	----------------	----------	----	--	--

					<p>trees do have a mitigating influence but as we know trees can be felled within a matter of minutes before preventative action can be taken. They also have a finite life-span. We disagree with Heritage Statement 4.33 that: "It is therefore considered that the proposed building would be subservient to Heathcote and therefore would not impact upon any elements of setting that contribute to the significance of Heathcote."</p> <p>The layout of the gardens at Heathcote relates to the plan form and axial arrangements of the house. The design is strongly formal but not completely symmetrical, and the strong classical elements of the house with its square pavilion-like wings are softened by the use of curves in part of the garden. During the ownership of N.G. Bailey & Co Ltd (1958-2010) the garden on the east side of the mansion, alongside Limegarth, was converted to a car park to comply with a planning requirement. We understand that the company regretted having to do this, otherwise they considered the gardens and greenhouses to be "virtually unchanged since they were laid out to Lutyens overall scheme".</p> <p>We also note that the in May 2012 the Grant of Planning Permission for change of use from office to a single residential dwelling was conditional on "the removal of the tarmac car park on the east side of the building and its restoration as part of the gardens of Heathcote, together with details of a timetable for the implementation of such works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason : In the interests of restoring the setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and its grounds and to accord with Policies BH4, BH4A, BH7 and BH16 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan."</p> <p>Though this restoration appears to have not yet been implemented we suggest that this application should be assessed as if the eastern garden had been reinstated and would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>This former garden still retains a stone apsidal garden shelter (listed grade I), which is a key cross-axial feature mirroring the stone apsidal shelter in the western garden (also listed grade I). An unused Country Life photo (July 9th 1910, No 840144) of the South Terrace Ascent illustrates how even a dwelling far more distant than Limegarth can mar the setting of this eastern extremely distinctive small shelter.</p> <p>We consider that Design and Access Statement, p32, View 5 in the context of Heathcote clearly illustrates the substantial harm that the proximity of this proposed large high building would cause to easterly views across and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>from the entrance court through the opening into the eastern garden (despite the misleading incorrect caption). In addition, it is likely that the increase in shade especially in winter would harm any restoration of the planting and reduce the amenity. View 3 in the context of Heathcote indicates that the top of the hedge had not been cut down to the correct level when the photograph was taken and hence it gives an underestimate of the true impact of the proposal. We also note that the apsidal stone shelter is not depicted in the Computer model of proposed building and so by omission the impact is not indicated.</p> <p>The GT/YGT is not convinced that this planning application complies with NPPF February 2019 paragraph 194 regarding the setting of Heathcote, an asset of the highest significance nor the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) published 2nd December 2017, The Setting of Heritage Assets. We note your authority's statutory duty of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess and section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.</p> <p>We have no objection to the demolition of Limegarth but we consider that the evidence points to the proposed development causing harm to grade I and II* listed buildings and a grade II registered park and garden; such a significant site that it should be given the best protection. Therefore, we object to the proposed development in its present form and ask that the Council considers a more sympathetic proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--