



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JUNE 2019

The GT conservation team received 142 new cases in England and nine cases in Wales during June, 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
Warmley House	Avon	E19/0307	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Discharge of conditions 3 (archaeology), 4 (landscaping) and 6 (utilities and drainage plan) attached to planning permission PK18/4550/F. Construction of 5no. hardstanding bases for caravans (resubmission of PK18/0244/F). Kingsway Park, Tower Lane, Warmley, Bristol BS30 8XT. MISCELLANEOUS	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.06.2019</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee, of the discharge of conditions attached to the above application, We have liaised with our colleagues in the Avon Gardens Trust (AGT) and have the following comments to make on behalf of both organisations.</p> <p>Your officers permitted the above application subject to some specific conditions, which included :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Prior to any groundworks; programme of archaeological work, detailed mitigation, outreach and publication strategy, including timetable' - 'Prior to commencement of development a scheme of landscaping, which shall include details of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection...Details of trees to be felled; proposed planting and times of planting; Boundary treatments; areas of hardsurfacing; All to be submitted for approval by LPA.' - 'Prior to commencement a plan indicating the route of all utilities and drainage will be submitted and approved' <p>The online documentation accompanying this discharge of conditions is in</p>

					<p>our opinion wholly inadequate. There is no WSI for the archaeology, plan for landscaping, no details of drainage, electricity etc.</p> <p>The GT/AGT strongly objects to the cavalier response to the conditions imposed by your officers, We would suggest that you do not permit any work to begin until the conditions imposed are adequately discharged.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Grounds of Thornton Manor	Cheshire	E19/0318	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retention of three marquees within the Thornton Manor Estate at The Dell, The Walled Garden and at the Lake to be used for private functions and conferences (Re-determination of planning application, updated information submitted) (GT Ref 10/0097 date 05.05.2010). Thornton Manor, Manor Road, Thornton Hough CH63 1JB.</p> <p>MARQUEE</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.06.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have serious concerns and reservations about this application, which must be considered within the context of the registered designed landscape as a whole. The grounds of Thornton Manor are registered Grade II* and are on Historic England's At Risk' register, their condition described as "Generally unsatisfactory with major localised problems" and their vulnerability rated as "High". The site lies with an area designated as Green Belt where development is only permitted in "very special circumstances".</p> <p>Our comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We disagree with the view expressed in the Heritage Statement that the marquees have "a neutral impact on the heritage assets". The marquees may be largely screened from the house and from each other but they are alien in form, materials, tone, design, and quality, and limit understanding of the historic landscape - how it was developed, designed, used and experienced. <p>The Dell was a naturalistic space developed from some marl pits; a place of interest and incident on a walk round the parkland, a place to relax for a picnic or tea, and the destination of a linear walk developed from the house. The Dell marquee markedly changes the focus, balance and character of this space causing direct harm to the significance of the landscape in this area.</p> <p>The Walled Garden marquee is large, fills the garden, obstructs appreciation and understanding of the space, and the function and</p>

					<p>relationship of this “part of a connected formal garden” (Mawson, CMP, p13), designed by Mawson and Lever. Though the internal layout was lost some years ago, the scale and positioning of the marquee have resulted in the loss of the sense of space, and views into and out of the walled garden from adjacent spaces. The walled garden marquee causes direct harm to the landscape of the formal gardens.</p> <p>The lakeside marquee is intrusive in scale and tone, much larger than the original boathouse which was designed to accommodate the needs of visitors. However the lake and Manor Wood provide a sufficiently generous setting to accommodate the structure which is screened from other parts of the designed landscape and does not impinge on the main vista down the canal to the house. The lakeside marquee causes slight harm to the significance of the landscape.</p> <p>The marquees each have slightly different impacts on their setting and on the landscape. Collectively the level of harm could be justified if the temporary structures enabled restoration of the registered gardens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was the intention of Wirral BC to grant planning permission for the marquees for a period of 5 years, i.e. temporary permission. The justification being “the generation of an income stream would enable the restoration of the registered gardens” and the reason given “To enable the financial situation to be reviewed and minimise the impact on the green belt from the erection of the structures.” This period has been exceeded and the financial situation is now reviewed through the process of re-determining the application. <p>The marquees have not generated the level of income estimated in the original business plan. Profits have enabled some restoration and management of the lake area but it is estimated that it will take another 31 years (2049) of profits from the marquees for the lake work identified in the 2008 Conservation Management Plan (CMP) to be completed (Enabling Development Statement 1.7).</p> <p>There has been some maintenance of the registered gardens but no restoration. There is work requiring immediate attention, notably to the Lookout, Forum and viewing platform, and possibly to other elements that have deteriorated since the CMP was completed. The level of harm to the significance of the registered gardens caused by the marquees can only be justified if it enables an income stream to progressively restore the registered landscape but this is not happening, or not at an acceptable pace.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We appreciate that the present owner has invested considerably in the property, undertaking building repairs and restoring and improving unused buildings to create a viable business. However given the apparent success of the enterprise which relies upon the setting of the historic landscape for its activities, we consider investment in the landscape to be low. Thornton Manor has a very special landscape which provides a unique selling point for the business. We are extremely concerned that a positive solution is found to sustaining and conserving Thornton Manor and its grounds which are irreplaceable heritage assets of national, regional and local significance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cadhay	Devon	E16/1666	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Extraction of up to 1.5 million tonnes of as raised sand and gravel, restoration to agricultural land together with temporary change of use of a residential dwelling to a quarry office/welfare facility at Straitgate Farm, Exeter Road, Ottery St Mary EX11 1LG. MINERAL EXTRACTION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2019</p> <p>We refer to our letter of 30 April 2018 regarding the above application which affects Cadhay, 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, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and responds to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>Cadhay House (listed grade I) is a two and three storey stone mansion dating from the mid C16 and is set in landscaped grounds. The two medieval fishponds are an important feature of the designed landscape of Cadhay. The smaller fishpond, a rectangular pool extending c 50m east between sloping grass banks, lies some 80m south-east of the House. To the west, the larger pool lies c 50m south of the House and is L-shaped on plan with a wide rectangular pool to the west and a narrow arm extending from the north-east corner towards the smaller pool to the east. The larger pool is embanked to the south-east, south and south-west.</p> <p>The water supply to the fishponds comes from a spring located just below the extraction site at Straitgate Farm, a mile to the west of Cadhay. The fishponds have relied on the spring as a source of water for over 500 years. If the proposed extraction disrupts the spring and the water supply, the fishponds which are an essential and important future of the gardens at Cadhay, will be turned into a quagmire, to the considerable detriment of the historic designed landscape.</p>

					<p>We have studied the report by Rick Brassington, Consultant Hydrogeogist, dated May 2019. on the Groundwork and related conditions at a proposed quarry near Ottery St Mary. The report considers the likely impact of the proposed quarry at Straitgate Farm on the water supply to Cadhay. The conclusions are much as we feared. The Gardens Trust is therefore extremely concerned about the effect that the proposed extraction of up to 1.5 million tonnes of as raised sand and gravel at Straitgate Farm would have on the water supply to the fishponds at Cadhay. We therefore ask your Council, in the light of the additional information by Rick Brassington, to refuse consent for this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Kidbrooke Park	East Sussex	E19/0310	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING DWELLING (MOBILE HOME) AND EQUESTRIAN BUILDINGS WITH A NEW DWELLING OF EXCEPTIONAL QUALITY AND DESIGN (PARA 79 HOUSE), GARAGE & STORE, STABLE BLOCK WITH ANCILLARY LIVING ACCOMMODATION ABOVE, LANDSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS TO INCLUDE THE REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING BRIDGES AND THE ENLARGEMENT OF PONDS. Please see amended landscape masterplan dated 16/05/2019. TYLEBROOK FARM, PRIORY ROAD, FOREST ROW RH18 5HR. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.06.2019</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail dated 11th June addressed to the Gardens Trust (GT). The 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.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>In our earlier letter on this application (dated 14th January 2019) we said “...SGT has no objection to the proposed new structures and very much welcomes the proposals for the landscape. However, the SGT considers the case for the application in this sensitive landscape would be strengthened if it demonstrated a greater understanding of the whole of Kidbrooke’s landscape development and especially of the features that are likely to have been Repton’s work. “</p> <p>In March, representatives of the Trust held a site meeting with a representative of the applicant and explained our views on the spot. The Amended Landscape Masterplan now submitted fully reflect what we said and implementation of these will help give a Reptonian character to the landscape. The Trust welcomes the updated plans.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell For and on behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust</p>
Hatherop Castle	Gloucestershire	E19/0390	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of existing open porch consent</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.06.2019</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might impact</p>

				(18/01116/FUL), to replace with an enclosed porch. The installation of an up and over garage door in place of hinged doors granted in consent 18/01116/FUL. The Severalls, Hatherop, Cirencester, Gloucestershire GL7 3NA. BUILDING ALTERATION	on Listed and Registered gardens and landscape, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. Having compared the consent 18/01116/FUL with the proposed revisions of 19/02202/FUL, GGLT does not wish to identify any outstanding issues. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)
Sezincote	Gloucestershire	E19/0399	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Change of use of outbuildings and surrounding land into residential use, including external alterations to create 4 dwellings, amenity areas, car parking, a bin store and boiler room, and storage buildings. Demolition of two redundant agricultural buildings at The Piggeries And Other Outbuildings At Home Farm, Sezincote, Moreton-In-Marsh, Gloucestershire. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2019 The Garden Trust as the Statutory Consultee for planning applications that may impact on the qualities of Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscape, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on its behalf. In Gloucestershire, the Sezincote Estate is a very significant heritage asset in terms of its architectural significance, its gardens and parkland setting. It has been noted that the condition of the traditional and now redundant farm building comprising the Piggeries group is a cause for concern, and unless a beneficial use is found this deterioration will accelerate. Therefore, in principal, GGLT would welcome this proposal. The scheme does not have significant impact on its wider heritage setting and will have the benefit of maintaining the built form of this model farm group in the wider landscape setting. However, GGLT would wish to draw attention to some of the elements contained in Strutt and Parker's Design and Access Statement regarding the absolute necessity to secure a very high level of quality in the design, attention to detail, and the need for traditional craftsmanship in delivering the restoration work. A key feature of this will be the need to agree a hard and soft landscaping scheme that will tie the built elements together to enclose the building group, and to avoid the "domestic clutter" that becomes associated with residential development intruding into wider areas of sensitive landscape. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)
Highgate Cemetery	Greater London	E19/0259	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Basement Car Park Under Stoneleigh Terrace London N19 5TZ, Full Planning Permission,	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.06.2019 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

				Commercial Change of Use Conversion of a section of the disused Whittington Estate Garages into a wood workshop (sui generis) and amendments to elevation facing the Highgate Cemetery consisting of changing mesh to brickwork, glazing and bars. MISCELLANEOUS	above application. We concur with the comments made by Dr Ian Dungavell the Chief Executive of the Highgate Cemetery Trust, and support his suggestions as to mitigation of the impact of the application upon Highgate Cemetery. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Croft Castle	Hereford and Worcester	E19/0291	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed re-modelling and extending car park, provision of additional toilet facilities, landscaping of area in front of the tea room, installation of solar panels on the roof of the toilets and part of the tea room including alteration and extension of curtilage building to Croft Castle. Croft Castle, Croft, Leominster, Herefordshire HR6 9PW. HYBRID	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2019 The Executive Committee of the Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust has asked me to make the following representations opposing the extension of the said car park. Whilst we are very much in sympathy with the contents and conclusions of Kim Auston's Heritage Impact Report, commissioned by the Trust and accept his evaluation of the three sites, potentially available for additional car parking, we would, however, challenge the limited scope of the report and its conclusions. By opting for an extension to the existing car park the Trust is further diminishing the experience of visitors arriving at Croft Castle. After a pleasant introduction, following the eastern avenue up from Cock Gate, past the cottage orné and with a glimpse of the pools at the bottom of the Fishpool Valley, the visitor arrives at an extensive and unrelenting car park, where the dense tree canopy prevents the use of any natural camouflage to disguise the car-park. Some of the finest trees at Croft can be seen here and there is a glimpse of the Gothic Arch, but the mundane business of passes and tickets, directs the visitor away from all this and towards more modern buildings, loos etc before arriving in the drive to the house beyond the Gothic Arch. All the magic of arriving at a historic property has been dispelled; the orientation is all wrong. Some fresh thinking is necessary. In a sense this is a national problem. The Trust has promoted itself with great success and now has an embarrassing number of visitors. This massive footfall is undoubtedly damaging both for the houses and their precious settings. Yet, as we find at Croft, the management of visitors has hardly changed in fifty years, notwithstanding, that attached to Croft there is an extensive estate in public and institutional ownership. To the west, for example, there is a long disused drive, which passes through woodland

					<p>where a discrete (even discreet) parking area could be hollowed-out. This would enable more active visitors to pass through the parkland on their approach to the Castle. As at other Trust venues less active visitors could be brought in an electric vehicle or perhaps be invited to use a small car park located behind the tea shop and the disused farm buildings to the north of the walled garden. The present car park could be abandoned, the parkland reinstated and through this area the visitors to the Fishpool Valley would pass –as genteel visitors would have done in the 18th century - a fine experience.</p> <p>One of Croft’s greatest assets, but also its Achilles Heel, is its setting, its woodland and high-relief countryside, which is a great attraction for the population spread across the South Midlands and the Severn Valley. Croft car-park is where ‘ramblers’ leave their cars. The objective is Croft Ambrey and the wonderful ridge-way, which also happens to be a national long distance footpath – the Mortimer Trail. Moreover, there are a number of routes that allow the less dedicated walker to return by an alternative footpath to Croft. Taking-in the restored Fishpool Valley will become an increasingly popular choice.</p> <p>A large and increasing body of walkers appear to be using the Croft car-park as their base and, as a consequence, extending the car-park appears to be necessary. This is a burden that the National Trust seems happy to shoulder but there are other agencies who should be involved. A few miles away towards Ludlow at Bringewood (Mortimer Forest) the forestry commission has provided three car-parks in an area considerably smaller than the hinterland of Croft. There is also a Shropshire County Council car-park on Whitcliffe, above Ludlow. It could be argued that the Commission car-parks are in an area of diminished landscape value, compared with the stunning prospects that can be enjoyed along the Aymestrey-Richard’s Castle heights. Less car-parking would be necessary at Croft if Herefordshire Council and the Forestry Commission provided new strategically placed car-parking areas; one, perhaps, at Mortimer’s Cross (where information on the 1461 battle site could be provided) and another to the north-east of Croft – above Richard’s Castle. The Croft car park could then be dedicated solely to members.</p> <p>If, in the short term, it proved necessary to extend the existing car-park, it should be designed to minimise its impact upon the parkland and the adjacent trees. The surface should remain grass-like and retain its informal character. No formal bays marked with lines etc. No trees should be felled</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>and permission should be granted on a temporary basis, to encourage the Trust, and other bodies to consider alternatives. Kim Auston should be commissioned to look more widely for a permanent solution to the Trust's car-parking problem so that the original character of the historic approach to the Castle can be restored in perpetuity.</p> <p>David Whitehead for the Executive Committee of the Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Whitehead, for the HWGT</p>
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertford shire	E18/0865	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a detached dwelling and two replacement bridges following the demolition of existing buildings. Land rear of Nos 10-18 Mymms Drive, Brookmans Park, Hatfield AL9 7AF. RESIDENTIAL</p> <p>OUTCOME 07.11.2018 Refused APPEAL LODGED 23.05.2019 Appeal Ref APP/C1950/W/19/3227950 To be determined on the basis of written representations</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2019 (ADDITIONAL COMMENTS)</p> <p>We understand the point about it not being included within the RPG on the HE definitive register and Dr Prosser's speculation as to why this was. However, there can be little doubt that this was part of the original historic landscape, whether recognised in the 1987 exercise to Register our landscapes or not. This is not the only site in Hertfordshire where sections outside of the RPG were part of the original landscape and in at least one case more information has come to light subsequently.</p> <p>We have also considered the evidence he has presented which includes only some of the evidence used by Prof. Williamson in his assessments. As we said, investigation is ongoing and more may well come to light about how all the parts of this influential and important park connected. We do know that the views were important. Whether they included the views to and from the proposed development is not yet known. At present it is difficult to assess these due to scrub growth in the woodland and lack of work, so far, on this particular aspect.</p> <p>We consider that the present line of Mymms Drive southern houses and gardens constitutes a strong boundary to the parkland, whereas this development is within the historic landscape, even if not the RPG, but bounded by the RPG on west and south where the views to and from the core of the garden. We are also concerned by the fact that this is Green Belt and that WHBC's policies, both in the previous Local Plan and the Emerging one, do aim to protect Green Belt land from inappropriate development.</p> <p>We disagree with the appellants' contention that there would be a neutral effect on the RPG as we feel that housing with its concomitant gardens, parking etc, and any future PDR extensions, would contribute an intrusion into this RPG in which views were so historically important.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>

					Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Panshanger	Hertford shire	E19/0264	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Detailed planning application for the erection of 254 dwellings, associated parking, landscaping and amenity space along with vehicular and pedestrian access from Thieves Lane and Welwyn Road. (HERT3) Land West Of Thieves Lane, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 2EJ. RESIDENTIAL	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This proposed development is contrary to policy HA8 of the EHDC Local Plan in that it does not protect the setting of a Registered Park. Setting is how a heritage asset is experienced so noise, pollution from nearby traffic and street lighting will all cause harm, regardless of any visual intrusion.(The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic England GPA3.2)</p> <p>The access to the park is insufficient, given that there is already large public demand from Sele Farm. We consider that the minimal boundary fences proposed are inadequate to control casual entrance to the park with consequent damage to Blakemore (Ancient Woodland with a significant ground flora) and Lady Hughes's Wood and other parts of the park. This will cause serious harm to the fabric of park of the RPG.</p> <p>The provision of 3-storey blocks is not appropriate for this rural edge development. It does not reflect the neighbourhood development across Thieves Lane in Ladywood Road which is of 2-storey , largely semi-detached, houses. The large number proposed, c 20%, and the urban design, especially of F827, F828, is particularly concerning.</p> <p>We are unclear as to why the northern vehicle exit should be onto the B1000, necessitating right turns onto a very busy road, instead of onto the roundabout.</p> <p>We are disappointed that early suggestions of a community orchard or green space along the B1000 strip have been discarded in favour of housing.</p> <p>We OBJECT to this development on the ground of harm to the setting of a Grade II* landscape, to the potential harm to the woodland from inadequate access provision at the southern end onto FP 29 and 32, and to the urban nature of the design of the buildings.</p> <p>We would suggest that liaison with the owner of the Park would be useful in attempting to reduce harm to the park which is already on the Heritage At Risk Register compiled by Historic England, and already has a large number of visitors.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

Essendon Lodge School, Essendon	Hertford shire	E19/0275	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Oak tree covered by conservation area. Essendon Lodge, School Lane, Essendon, Hatfield AL9 6HD. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of information contained in this application we have no objections to felling the dead oak tree. Kate Harwood
17 Danesbury Park, Welwyn	Hertford shire	E19/0286	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of rear garden room. 17 Danesbury Park, North Ride, Welwyn AL6 9SA. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comments on the design of the garden room. However, as it is to be sited within a former kitchen garden we would suggest that there may well be remains of structures or paths not shown on the historic mapping. Any such remains discovered during the course of work, should planning permission be granted, should be recorded. Kate Harwood
Goldings	Hertford shire	E19/0290	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Restoration and conversion of a water tower; insertion of cladding and windows and erection of 4 storey stair tower to its support structure, to provide a 1 bedroom dwelling. Water Tower, Goldens Way, Goldings Estate, Waterford, Hertfordshire REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2019 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information supplied in this application and our knowledge of Goldings landscape and its history we have no comments to make on the proposal. However, if planning permission is given, we would welcome it be given on condition that the suggested planting of 10 trees is completed and that any trees which fail within a given time frame should be replaced, like for like. Further we would suggest that no domestic garden or garden buildings be permitted within the area of the tower; to preserve the openness of the parkland and its views. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Panshanger Goldings	Hertford shire	E19/0304	II* II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning permission for 342 residential dwellings (of a range of size and type) together with public open and amenity space, access and parking (with appearance and landscaping matters reserved). (HERT3) Archers Spring Land North Of Welwyn Road, Hertford, Hertfordshire. RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.06.2019 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Historic England Register. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The proposed development site lies on the interfluvium between the Registered Parks and Gardens of Panshanger (Grade II*) and Goldings (Grade II) and is within the setting of both sites. Being situated at the top of the ridge gives this site prominence in the views to and from the

					<p>Registered Parks.</p> <p>Panshanger is of exceptional historic interest, having been designed by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown and Humphry Repton, and Goldings is a good example of a 19th century parkland around a George Devey House designed to have views towards Hertford and the countryside around, including towards the proposed development site.</p> <p>EHDC Policy HA8 states that 'Development Proposals should protect the special historic character, appearance or setting of those sites on the Historic England 'Register of Historic Parks and Gardens'.' This proposal clearly is not in compliance with this policy nor with the NPPF paragraph 194. 'Any harm to, or loss of, significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification'. We have not seen any such convincing justification. Further NPPF paragraph 184 states 'These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations'.</p> <p>Significance is, in part, dependent on setting</p> <p>HGT raised concerns about the harm, considerable in our view, on the setting of these landscapes during the EHDC Local Plan consultations on the allocation of HERT3 for development.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Design and Access Statement contains inaccuracies about Panshanger Park and pays scant attention to the effect this development will have on Goldings Park. We have not seen a heritage statement which should be included to address the significance of the two registered parks and the impact this development would have on them.</p> <p>The setting of both landscapes has been addressed merely as selected views, rather than as the heritage asset is experienced (See HE 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' GPA3.2). The loss of much of the rural setting of these parks in this area is detrimental to their significance. It also extends the urban area westwards from Hertford into the rural areas between Hertford, Tewin and Bramfield.</p> <p>Panshanger Park has been added to the Heritage At Risk Register by Historic England, and the cumulative effect of this application and that of the proposed development to the west of Thieves Lane will be to further harm this important landscape.</p> <p>We are further concerned about the detail which is included in this application regarding proposed housing adjacent to the B1000 which</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>should be kept as a buffer and the lack of consideration given to screening in the views and vistas from Goldings Park.</p> <p>We consider that this proposal is contrary to EHDC Policy HA8, and the NPPF , including paragraphs 8, 184 and 194. We therefore Object to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Kate Harwood Conservation and Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertford shire	E19/0333	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alteration to openings and replacement of timber french doors with aluminium bi-folding doors. 7 Boyes Crescent, London Colney, Hertfordshire AL2 1Ub. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2019</p> <p>The Middlesex County Asylum at Napsbury had an innovative landscape laid out by William Goldring in 1902-5. However, much of this has been altered or lost due to more recent housing development.</p> <p>On the basis of the information contained in the planning application and our knowledge of the historic Napsbury landscape we do not object to the installation of bifold doors at this property.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Hertsmere Statement of Community Involvement	Hertford shire	E19/0349	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN Statement of Community Involvement 2019. Consultee list and other relevant background information</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.06.2019</p> <p>The list of statutory consultees omits The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in regard to proposed development affecting a site included by historic England on their register of parks and Gardens. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>HGT also has expert knowledge on the undesignated historic parks and gardens in the borough.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust should be added as a statutory consultee to the Consultee List</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Moor Place	Hertford shire	E19/0400	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a stable block with tack room and hay store. Land at Moor Place, Kettle Green Lane, Much</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.06.2019</p> <p>The Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is concerned about the overdevelopment of the Moor Place landscape. Housing has already been built north of this site in the former walled gardens and yards complex leading to the loss of</p>

				Hadham SG10 6BF. EQUESTRIAN	<p>the very rare Bunyard Fruit Store and to this key part of the historic design. Moor Place landscape is Locally Listed (by EHDC and HGT) as of historic interest and any further development would add to the cumulative harm. We have supported the development of a Heritage Statement developed by the Moor Place Heritage Group which highlights the significance of the site.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to EHDC policy HA8 and also to the NPPF section 16. It is further on a previously undeveloped site in the Green Belt which was the subject of a previous application (3.19.00337/FUL) which was refused.</p> <p>We therefore object to this proposal, Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Combe Bank	Kent	E19/0289	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a full-size artificial grass Hockey pitch with 8no. 12.5m high lighting columns, perimeter fencing, spectator/practice strip, separating mesh curtain and associated works. Provision of other sports facilities including grassed playing fields. Radnor House, Sevenoaks, Combe Bank Drive, Sundridge, KENT TN14 6AE. EDUCATION</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2019</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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have considered the documentation online and have reservations in respect of particular elements of this planning application.</p> <p>Although it is accepted the proposed location for the pitch is probably the optimum of those considered, this location does create particular concerns relating to the construction details.</p> <p>We consider that insufficient attention has been given to the proposed flood lighting. Sevenoaks Planning Department are currently considering planning application SE/18/03588 for a floodlit rugby pitch adjacent to Knole where the applicant has submitted a Lighting Impact Assessment report in support of the application. No similar report has been prepared for this application which we consider necessary as the proposed hockey pitch lies within an AONB. The Kent Downs AONB Unit have already submitted their comments and refer to their AONB Management Plan 2014-19 which has been adopted by Sevenoaks Council.</p> <p>KGT would also reiterate some of the points raised by Kent Downs in their response. These are that the proposed playing field should be a natural colour rather than the blue and red suggested. Indigenous vegetative</p>

					<p>should be planted along the northern side of the pitch to enhance the AONB. Also, the proposed green fencing should be black as green plastic fencing does not assimilate well with vegetation and the lighting columns painted a darker colour to reduce their visual appearance.</p> <p>Kent Downs also point out that if the recommendations of the Institute of Lighting Professionals are followed then the light control zone for an AONB should be E1 (intrinsically dark) and the colour temperature should be 3000kw and not the 4000kw proposed.</p> <p>Should the Council be minded to approve this application it is requested the applicant complies with the recommendations of the AONB Management Plan 2014-19 and the guidance provided by the Institute of Lighting Professionals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Newby Hall	North Yorkshire	E19/0132	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 5 link roads (totaling approximately 2,000 m) within the parkland. Newby Hall, Newby, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 5AE. ROAD</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.06.2019</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 Yorkshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The park and gardens of Newby Hall are grade II* on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens and form the setting for a number of listed buildings, most notably grade I Newby Hall built c. 1695-1705 with wings added by John Carr and William Belwood c. 1780. The park is likely to have 17C origins and was laid out to a partially executed design (1766) by Thomas White (1736-1811) who with his son also Thomas (c.1764-1811), was arguably the most successful follower of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown. They were thus significant 'landscape improvers' and had a practice covering the North of England and much of Scotland.</p> <p>We note that there have been pre-application discussions and that the proposed new sections of road are predominately located on the edge of the park, which is largely open pastureland with scattered trees. The Planning, Design and Heritage Statement (PDHS) writes that the majority of the proposed new sections of road will follow existing tracks (which may have developed from desire lines rather than be part of a historic design), and will be constructed from a stone sub base on a geotextile membrane</p>

					<p>and capped with tarmac chippings, so we presume that the roads will be permanent structures. We note that the West Front Link will be constructed of a stone sub base with limestone aggregate dust on top, which is more sympathetic to the historic landscape. We understand that due to existing established trees and hedges the impact on the registered park will be limited, but we do have some concerns that the tarmac sections will still be visually intrusive and further additions to the existing network of tarmac roads across the park. Might the applicants consider making the less frequently used road surfaces from something more sympathetic and less intrusive than tarmac? From a conservation point of view, we would like to think that should the focus change in the future that the new roads could be returned to pasture.</p> <p>We also note that there are several areas of the park designated for car parking. We were unable to see any plans detailing where the temporary car parks 1A & 1B are to be situated and would be grateful for clarification of their precise size and location. The key to the reference plan after p14 in the PDHS in Appendix 1 doesn't seem to be accompanied by a key explaining what the numbers in boxes are. We appreciate the reasoning behind the new Icehouse Link and West Front link, but are slightly confused as to why the yellow West Front link seems to stop abruptly without actually linking to the Stables Offices and Estate Offices. Why does this new track need to extend beyond where No 6 is on the plan? It may well be that there is an existing track linking this new route to the offices but it is not apparent from the map. In terms of the proposed new roads and the car parking will there be any changes to the parkland's topography and surface, drainage etc and will any trees be lost? We trust that any new signage will be carefully positioned and sympathetic to the historic designed landscape.</p> <p>We note the discussions regarding planning policy in the Planning, Design and Heritage Statement and that the proposed roads are needed to ensure that the Estate has the infrastructure required to support and continue to attract events, the economic benefits of which are critical in ensuring the future viability of the Estate. We do consider that there is some inevitability that the proposed additional 2km of linking roads will cause some damage to the design of the historic park but we trust that the harm will be counter-balanced by the economic and community/public benefits.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Conservation Officer
Clumber Park	Nottinghamshire	E19/0218	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Repairs and Replacement of Damaged Fabric Following Act of Vandalism and Additional Repairs Including Repointing to Ornamental Bridge. Clumber Bridge, New Road, Clumber Park, Nottinghamshire. REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.06.2019 NGT welcome the proposed repairs to the bridge which is a crucial element of the design landscape of Clumber Park. Jason Mordan
Thoresby Park	Nottinghamshire	E19/0228	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Formation of 3 No. door openings to west elevation and 1 No. door opening to north elevation. Thoresby Courtyard, Thoresby Park, Perlethorpe, Perlethorpe Cum Budby. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.06.2019 NGT has no objection to the proposed door openings but notes that the need for the scheme is stated as to enable better access to the area of the parkland that was originally part of the head gardeners cottage garden. However, the proposals do not detail any scheme for the planting and landscaping of this space which clearly must accompany the proposals. Presently this area of the parkland is in a poor condition and it would benefit from a sensitive landscaping project that is appropriate to the heritage of this part of the park. We would have expected the details of a suitable landscaping scheme would be submitted as part of the planning application. We would encourage the LPA not to grant permission until a suitable scheme has been prepared and submitted in view of the designated heritage asset status of the parkland. NGT will be happy to provide observations on any scheme that comes forward. Jason Mordan
Clumber Park	Nottinghamshire	E19/0257	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erect Two Entrance signs. Land East Of Clumber Lane End Farm, Clumber Lane, Clumber Park, Nottinghamshire. ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2019 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 Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have looked at the online documentation and the proposed signs are immediately adjacent to the Grade I designated heritage asset of Clumber Park. Clumber Road is one of the entrances into the designed landscape and was deliberately laid out and planted to appear deliberately less formal and grand than the famous lime tree avenue approach. The proposal is for two large entrance signs which are clearly going to make a considerable impact on Clumber Road, which at present has only

					<p>one formal entrance further to the west, which has smaller and more appropriate signage (Clumber Livery). The 2.5 x 1.5 size of the proposed signs are unnecessarily large and will be visible from some considerable distance. These would damage the appearance and character of the wooded approach to Clumber Park and the setting of the Grade II Trumans Lodge and Gateway (National ref : 1370436).</p> <p>The GT/NGT objects to the proposed signage due to the design and scale of the proposal, and because it would also cause harm to the setting of the designated heritage assets of Clumber Park and Trumans Lodge and Gateway. We would not object to a single or pair of smaller signs of the same scale as those to the entrance to nearby Clumber Livery.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Newstead Abbey	Nottinghamshire	E19/0318	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Masonry repairs to the Grade II* listed Cannon Fort in the grounds of Newstead Abbey. Cannon Fort and Dock, Newstead Abbey Park. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2019</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 Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The GT/NGT are very pleased to see the details of the proposed repairs to the West Front and Cannon Fort at Newstead Abbey. These are both intrinsic elements of the design landscape and designated heritage assets that are considered to be 'at risk' by Historic England and Gedling Borough Council. It is also very pleasing to see that the contractor is to offer open-days and training as part of the repairs project, and the NGT would very much welcome the chance to offer this opportunity to our members who we are sure would be interested.</p> <p>The GT/NGT support this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Newstead Abbey	Nottinghamshire	E19/0319	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conservation masonry repairs to the Grade I listed west front of Newstead Abbey. Newstead Abbey Park, Station Avenue.</p>	<p>See E19/0318 above</p>

				REPAIR/RESTORATION	
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 26.06.2019 (ADDITIONAL COMMENTS) Thank you so much for your email which has been forwarded to me by my colleague in London. I find it very reassuring to hear that Wells Central now has a District Councillor who is concerned about the historic environment. I am really glad that you got in touch... ... I hope that the following thoughts will be helpful. I was glad to see that Historic England and the Environment Agency both lodged strong objections to the application. Given the poor quality of the planning application, as stated in our letter of 25th May 2019, I am very concerned that the planning application has even been registered. My advice at this stage would be to go back to the planning case officer or Chief Planning Officer and ask, given the significance of the site and comments from EA and HE, why such a poor quality application was registered. If parking in the town is such a serious issue why isn't Mendip DC working with SCC to look at the issue more strategically rather than accept a poorly considered application that may or may not help resolve some of their parking issues but at the expense of a nationally important site? It's also worth trying to 'demand' the withdrawal of the planning application until a planning application is submitted which fully considers the significance of the site and the implications of the development. I hope that helps. With very best wishes and thank you so much for your support. Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
North and South Marine Park and Bents Park	Tyne and Wear	E19/0283	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed operational development works associated with the wider North Marine Park refurbishment and restoration scheme, including the following specific items: Area A: Restoration of dwarf brick wall with stone coping and railings to Beacons Entrance; Area B and C: Refurbishment of existing concrete wall and pillars	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2019 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 Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. Studying the numerous documents on-line it is clear that a tremendous amount of work has gone into the proposals for the thoughtful restoration/improvement of the facilities and heritage assets at North Marine Park. We are very glad to note that you have commissioned a CMP and have carefully considered the historic designed landscape in your proposals. It is extremely encouraging to see so much attention being paid

				<p>to Sea Road boundary; Area D: Installation of a Beacon structure artwork; Area E: Reconfiguration of entrance, including refurbishment of existing concrete wall and pillars to Sea Road boundary; Area F: Pathway and staircase installation to the Lawe embankment; Area G: Installation of Children's Play Area; Area H: Installation of adult trim trail Area; Area I: Restoration of Grotto and installation of reinterpreted bandstand and performance space Area; Area J: Restoration of piers, decorative metal arch, dwarf brick wall with stone coping and railings to Pier Parade; and Associated soft landscaping. North Marine Park, Lawe Road, South Shields NE33 2LF. PUBLIC PARK, REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>to a public park and the GT/NGT welcome these positive proposals. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Garden at 1 Castle Hill (formerly Wantage)	Warwick shire	E19/0298	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of a single storey 1 bedroom dwelling to the grounds of 1 Castle Hill, Kenilworth CV8 1NB. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.06.2019 Thank you for advising us on this application. We are writing this in consultation with the statutory consultee, The Gardens Trust. It is disappointing to see this further application which is defended again on the origin of the site as three separate lots offered for sale in 1884. For your convenience I append a slightly updated copy of the report I submitted in response to earlier applications. As you are aware, the garden of Wantage is on the Historic England Register of historic parks and gardens. The application makes much of the supposed lack of impact on the setting of the house, but fails to mention that the garden is a heritage asset in its own right. The application site is a</p>

					<p>valid part of the overall scheme for the garden, which was designed, with the house by its architect Herbert Buckland.</p> <p>Both your local plan and the NPPF would presuppose that a registered garden should be protected from harmful development.</p> <p>We remind you that the current condition of a garden is not a valid excuse for building upon it while its form remains intact. The gardens were not derelict until the present owner allowed them to deteriorate. It is not acceptable for the decay caused by an owner then to be used as justification for development in order to remedy it. We also remind you that there is ample precedent to indicate that lack of visibility from a public place is not justification for development which would damage a heritage asset.</p> <p>The argument that the application site is part of a different building lot from the house site is specious and was rejected by the inspector who heard and dismissed the appeals on W11/0236-7 and W12/0964. Plot 12 was purchased before Wantage was finished (in spite of the wilful misreading of the 1901 census evidence) and its acquisition clearly influenced the design of the house, in giving views of the Castle across it, as well as contributing to the overall design of the garden. The inspector's comment was that regardless of the original intentions of the vendor of this land in the late nineteenth century, it is the continued use of it with this house which is of overriding importance. The whole garden forms the setting of the building, and was created to do so.</p> <p>The Edwardian period saw the climax of a trend which had been developing at the end of the nineteenth century, the architectural garden, where house, pleasure grounds and topography were married together, usually under the direction of the architect.</p> <p>The typical form of gardens of this period was of terraces and compartments with different characters and uses according to the requirements of the owner. On a new site, the architect had the advantage of being able to position the house carefully to take advantage of the land-form and views, with terraces descending the slope and compartments surrounding the house.</p> <p>A sloping site was considered particularly desirable. Jekyll (who worked for Buckland on his own garden in Edgbaston) and Weaver were later to say "it is obvious that its chief merit is that it calls for the free use of terracing and steps, and no other two features of garden architecture give so great an opportunity for varied and striking treatment."</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Wantage, therefore, occupies an ideal site for an Edwardian house and garden and has the characteristic division into square or rectangular compartments. The layout of the garden was evidently well-formed by 1905 (photo in The Studio) and almost certainly represents the desires of the original owner. The text accompanying the photograph and plans declares Buckland to have been the designer of the garden.</p> <p>The applicant bolsters the argument that the house was not intended to have additional garden on the west side by pointing out that the boundary to Plot 10 is only four feet from the house on the east side. However, that side of the house contains the service rooms, kitchen, scullery, coal house etc., with servants' bedrooms above. Secondly, Lot 10 too was part of the garden in the lifetime of the original owner, first as tenant and later as owner, so those gardens too formed part of the overall scheme.</p> <p>Comparison with Abbotsford is not helpful. Firstly, the garden here was not registered and secondly there was a precedent in existing development for the school.</p> <p>In summary, this is a fine survival of an Edwardian house in gardens which were part of the original design, by a respected architect. This proposal will have a detrimental impact on the registered garden and we request that you refuse the application..</p> <p>Yours sincerely Christine Hodgetts Conservation secretary Warwickshire Gardens Trust</p>
Leonardslee	West Sussex	E19/0233	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a new gardener's barn and Victorian style greenhouse (Full Application). Leonardslee House, Brighton Road, Lower Beeding, Horsham. GLASSHOUSE, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.06.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding the above application. The Gardens Trust (GT) - formerly the Garden History Society (GHS) - is a statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>SGT welcomes the commitment of the new owners to the restoration, maintenance and enhancement of Leonardslee and recognises the need for carefully designed and screened utility buildings to support these activities. While the main structure included in this planning application is located well away from the most significant parts of the garden, it is a bulky building nearly 10m high. While there are some existing trees near the site, the application does not</p>

					<p>explain how the buildings would affect views from the Grade I listed Gardens nor whether any planting is proposed to provide longer-term screening.</p> <p>Leonardslee is designated by Historic England as a Grade I Historic Park/Garden. As such, any planning proposal that causes harm, even “less than substantial harm” should be wholly exceptional (NPPF para 132 – 134). As the application is currently presented, it is unclear whether any harm will be caused. Hence SGT is unable to support the application and objects. However, as touched on above, the Trust would not object if these issues were satisfactorily dealt with.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.</p>
Blackdown Park	West Sussex	E19/0387	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of replacement outbuildings, dog kennel and run, removal of garden steps and associated landscaping. Blackdown House, Fernden Lane, Lurgashall GU27 3BT.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.06.2019</p> <p>Thank you for notifying the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) of the above planning application. 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 SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have not visited the site since the making of this application and the views expressed below are based upon the information supplied and some local knowledge.</p> <p>The site lies within Blackdown Park which is included with a Grade II designation on the register of Historic Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England; as such the applicant is required to describe the significance of Blackdown Park (NPPF, para 128) and assess whether the proposals will result in harm to that significance.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the service buildings to the west of the main house will bring about a loss of the current informality of the area but the new modern buildings would not, in our opinion result in an adverse effect on the adjacent registered landscape.</p> <p>In respect of the proposed modifications to the garden layout, the flight of steps from the principal lawn is a significant feature that makes an important contribution to the formality of this part of the registered garden and is an integral part of the garden design. As has been noted by the Planning Officer in his request to the applicant for more information, the accompanying statement is devoid of any proper assessment or reason for their removal. Their removal would, in our view, be a notable loss to a</p>

					<p>registered garden and would result in harm to its significance. The proposed seating area shown on the proposals plan is in design and scale a poor substitute in its relationship to the adjacent gardens. We would hope that additional information, as sought by the planning officer, will be provided and no decision taken on the application until this is received.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---