



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES SEPTEMBER 2019

The GT conservation team received 142 new cases in England and two cases in Wales during September, 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, 64 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Clevedon Court	Avon	E19/0704	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Reserved matters application for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of six dwellings on plots 4-9 pursuant to the extent of the outline permission granted as part of hybrid application 17/P/2435/O (Hybrid planning application - Outline permission for the erection of six new dwellings (Plots 4-9), following demolition of the remainder of the existing buildings across the site with all matters reserved for subsequent approval apart from access. Full permission for the retention and conversion of two existing traditional buildings into three dwellings (plots 1-3) with</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT], in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a grade II* Registered Park and Garden pursuant to the grade I listed Clevedon Court which is on the Historic England's register of Historic Parks and Gardens in North Somerset. 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 registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust support the comments made by Historic England concerning the previous hybrid application, that a more agricultural character to the proposed development would better reflect the origins of the site. The house designs submitted, and the materials proposed, have been designed as a series of barns reflecting the pitches and gables of the existing historic barns and farmhouse on site.</p> <p>Summary: The reserved matters, which this application seeks to address, the layout, scale and materials of the new 6 semi-detached houses, appear to have been met, therefore The Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal.</p>

				associated infrastructure, including parking and landscaping). Court Farm, All Saints Lane, Clevedon. RESIDENTIAL	Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Shaw House	Berkshire	E19/0305	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Regulation 3: Erection of new 2 storey classroom extension to existing Block A, comprising 6 no classrooms and associated ancillary spaces connected to existing school building, with surrounding landscaping works. Proposed single storey extension to existing Block B, comprised of 1no classroom connected to existing school building with associated surrounding landscaping works, relocating of 74 no existing cycle stands to south of current location with associated landscaping works. Trinity School, Love Lane, Shaw, Newbury. EDUCATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.09.2019</b> Thank you for reconsulting the Berkshire Gardens Trust and The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Following on from our earlier comments on behalf of BGT and GT, we are pleased to see that the applicant has now submitted a Heritage Statement as requested. As we stated before, it is difficult to justify an objection in principle to the extension proposals as the Trinity School already has 20th and 21st century buildings on its campus. The extension proposed is to the front of the building which houses the main entrance and at two storeys, is no higher than the main building. However, views of this northern sector of the GII listed Parkland will be impacted negatively, further exacerbated by the loss of trees due to the re-structuring of the recently found soakaway. The development proposals will not impact on the setting of Shaw House directly. The Heritage Statement assists in confirming that the extensions would not affect any significant historic landscape and parkland features. However it is important that the overall character of the Registered Park and Garden is conserved and enhanced albeit the school development has already significantly changed the land west of Shaw House. A treed setting to the school along Church Road however has been retained and enhanced. The proposed new tree planting is therefore welcomed but, as three semi-mature avenue trees would be removed, a further replacement tree east of Church Road and north of the new extension to Block A would reinforce this tree setting. We suggest that all proposed tree species should be in keeping with the parkland tree stock and planted as large planting stock. Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Planning Advisor cc: The Gardens Trust
Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E19/0048	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Landscaping to replace steep clay	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2019</b> We still regard this as damaging to the historic design. Regrettably the

				bank, steps to access existing seating area, retaining wall to secure old yew tree roots, raised beds for planting and a sloping rose garden with steps for access (Retrospective). 5 Rosebery Mews, Mentmore, Buckinghamshire LU7 0UE. GARDEN, LANDSCAPE	work has already been done but fortunately is at a domestic scale so it is understandable that your officers would prefer to avoid enforcement action. However, having said all of that, it is very close to the Dairy listed building and firmly within the RPG. It is clearly visible from the abandoned kitchen garden which is now paddock. The only major thing screening it from the listed building is the yew tree which may not be in good health. We feel that it sets a bad precedent for all the other owners but would like to suggest a reasonable compromise, which although not ideal, seems the best that can be done without asking for removal of all the work undertaken to date. We suggest that the glass balustrade be removed and an evergreen shrubbery of well-spaced yew, holly and box be planted for screening. We hope that this is helpful. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
West Wycombe Park	Buckinghamshire	E19/0782	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Display of 5 non-illuminated signs in association with car park signage. Car Park, Chorley Road West, Wycombe, Buckinghamshire. ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the online documentation and can appreciate the difficulties faced by littering at the car park formerly attached to the Garden Centre. It is unfortunate that non-illuminated signs are necessary in such a sensitive historic site, and we would not support any additional signage. We will also be alert for future applications concerning the former garden centre and hope that this site can be put to proper use again in due course. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Corby Castle	Cumbria	E19/0196	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Structural Works To Stabilise Embankment With Piles And Concrete Rafts; Construction Of Retaining Wall, Stone Steps,	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above retrospective application. We very much appreciate you giving us some

				<p>Coping And Estate Fencing (Part Retrospective) (LBC). Cascade Steps, Corby Castle, Great Corby, Carlisle CA8 4LR. LANDSCAPE, GARDEN</p>	<p>leeway in getting back to you about this, as a site visit was absolutely essential to understand the complexities presented at such a sensitive site by the unfortunate work already undertaken. Two members of the Cumbria Gardens Trust (CGT) finally managed to find a mutually convenient date for a site visit with Nicola , and having discussed the matter between us, we would be grateful if you could take our carefully considered comments into account when deciding this application. The water cascade with its temple, grottos, and carved creatures is fantastically theatrical and impressive in its scale and style, and even after 200 years still conveys the beauty of the untamed, wild side of nature, as contrived by man at the start of the picturesque movement. It sits extremely naturally in its steep, woody location, and has the appearance of having evolved that way by itself, which is, we imagine, the original intention. The landscape at Corby Castle is one of the earliest examples of the Picturesque in the UK. It is significant for that reason alone but also because its location. Most picturesque landscapes are much further south. The setting of the cascade in a cliff face overlooking the River Eden is particularly dramatic. The 1st edition of Pevsner describes the statue of Polyphemus as ‘wondrously badly carved but just for that reason very engaging.’ The point being, that the statue was meant to be seen from a distance and not close up. In our opinion, no route was planned down the side of the cascade, and Polyphemus was deliberately sited to be seen from a distance. In Victorian times, the public had access to the park and the likelihood is that a rough informal path developed as people tried to get close up to the statue. This caused erosion in the surface of the cliff and led to the installation of railway sleepers to provide steps near the summer house. The flight of stone steps and balustrade which has been installed entirely destroys that concept and intrudes both visually and physically on the garden. Rather than being a discreet woodland path down the bank, there is now a very visible new structure, which appears to have no connection with the C18th garden and dominates the appearance of the bank close to the Temple. The cut stone walls, smooth sandstone bull-nosed steps and regular, geometric plinths are diametrically opposed to Picturesque garden style of artfully arranged but “natural” informality, curved lines and irregularity. Any “mystery” or sense of excited anticipation coming down through the woods (which the sources in Fiona Green’s report indicate was certainly something that visitors to the garden enjoyed) has been dispelled; the giant statue is now on display rather than</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>taking you by surprise. My colleagues in the CGT were of the opinion that all present agreed that the news steps were a problem.</p> <p>Nicola Allan was very open and accommodating in showing my colleagues around, and went over the progress of the planning application and the issues they are facing. Her solution does seem to be to strike a balance between three requirements :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Being sympathetic to the necessity to limit the damage that has been done, from a preservation / conservation point of view</li><li>2. Being aware that removing the structure will destabilize an already fragile and fairly inaccessible bank</li><li>3. Finding a solution that will be realistically achievable for her client</li></ol> <p>It is difficult to know which of the above should carry the most weight when deciding how to proceed. There is no obligation on the landowner to go back to the original concept, but in an ideal world the installation of the steps without permission provides an opportunity to reinstate the original vision by removing the steps in their entirety and restoring the bank and re-planting. This would be our preferred option and the one that is most in keeping. The steps serve no useful purpose.</p> <p>Any other solution involving retention of the steps is an unsatisfactory compromise and would involve considerable cutting and re-dressing of the stonework. If the steps are retained at all, something must be done to reduce their appearance at the top by the summer house, where they are intrusive and unbalance the setting of the summer house and the cascade.</p> <p>Any new route down the bank could be a series of bark-chip steps held in place with timber and stakes. However, this would clearly be a logistically tricky undertaking from a landscaping point of view. There is no easy way to use large machinery on the site, and if the concrete pilings were removed, a woodchip path would do nothing to prevent possible landslides etc. The risk of landslides and erosion would need to be mitigated at the very least with something like rubber matting held in place by deep steel rods, but more likely retaining walls of some sort. If we are resigned to keeping the staircase, the solutions we discussed such as having a metal estate fence instead of the stone balustrade would certainly help reduce the visible impact. Any such work would involve significant upheaval and would be difficult because of the terrain, but this would achieve the best result. It sounded as if Nicola Allan and the owners are keen to have a rail of some sort mainly to meet Health and Safety requirements. This is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>understandable, but the rail could be even simpler, is in just a hand rail rather than a fence with a middle bar.</p> <p>Reducing the plinth that the stone balustrades stand on would also help, and as discussed with Nicola Allan, need not necessarily involve extending the treads and risers of the steps. Further interventions such as replacing the cut stone wall with coursed rough walling stone could help reduce the “grand” nature of the staircase, and I have sympathy with the recommendations of Historic England to reduce the width and extent of the staircase altogether.</p> <p>I appreciate that these various options do not show an obvious solution, and constraints of cost and logistics must come into play. Unless one goes back to the original concept, in our opinion, the least worst option would be to reinstate a natural rough path but because of the steepness of the terrain, this might not be a safe option. Whatever solution is chosen, the steps as they are now, are completely inappropriate.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
The Italian Garden at Great Ambrook	Devon	E19/0756	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Agricultural building to house livestock. Land East Of Great Ambrook, Great Ambrook Avenue, Ipplepen AGRICULTURE</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust and The Gardens Trust on the above application which affects the setting of the Italian Garden at Great Ambrook, 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 acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have studied the application documents on your website and the Historic England map and entry. We have visited Italian Garden at Great Ambrook on several occasions previously.</p> <p>It is relevant to consider the Appeal Decision, dated 5 November 2018 by the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State (Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/W/18/3206188 Land East of Great Ambrook, Great Ambrook Avenue, Ipplepen TQ12 5UL</p> <p>The setting of the Listed Building and Italian Garden</p> <p>8. The starting point for the consideration of the impact of a development on the setting of a Listed Building is Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed</p>

					<p>Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that special regard is had to the desirability of preserving the building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. The Framework requires an appellant to assess the significance of the Listed Building and its setting.</p> <p>9. The planning statement supporting the application makes reference to the Listed Gardens at Great Ambrook. It concludes that as the appeal site would be sited at a lower level it would be discreet and well screened and as such the proposal would not impact on the Italian Garden or Great Ambrook. Whilst the application was not supported by a statement of significance the planning statement did comment on the listed garden albeit in a very succinct manner.</p> <p>The Councils' report considered that the planning statement contained sufficient information with regards to the requirements of paragraph 189 of the Framework.</p> <p>10. From all that I have seen and read on this matter I have found that the Councils assessment did consider the wider setting of the listed building and the significance of the original avenue (the carriage ride) in relation to Great Ambrook. I saw from my visit that the appeal site would not be visible from within the Italian Garden or Great Ambrook. Nor would it be visible from the colonnaded shelter which is attached to the outside of the walled garden and is mentioned in the list description and which originally enjoyed views towards Dartmoor and Haytor. Though over the years these views have been heavily obscured as the planting has matured.</p> <p>11. Nonetheless the setting of the heritage asset is not restricted to the principal structures nor simply what can be seen from them. The Framework defines the setting as: "The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve".</p> <p>In this case the proposed agricultural building would be of significant size and would be sited adjacent to, and on elevated land from, Great Ambrook Avenue</p> <p>1 As required by paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework which as part of the original landscape setting and is an important approach to the listed building.</p> <p>12. The avenue is one of two approaches to Great Ambrook and the appeal site adjoins that which connects the rear of the house along the valley side towards the Lodge which lies some distance away to the East. It therefore</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>has a functional and historic relevance to the Listed Building such that I consider it would have an effect on the wider setting of Great Ambrook and the Italian Garden. In this context the appeal proposal would appear as a large and incongruous feature which would not be adequately obscured by the planting along the avenue which has gaps within it and from where the existing structures can be seen. This approach to Great Ambrook makes a positive contribution to the significance of the setting of the heritage asset which would, in my opinion, be harmed by the introduction of a large utilitarian building immediately adjacent to the avenue. However that harm would, in the words of the Framework, be less than substantial.</p> <p>13. For the reasons given the proposal would conflict with Policies EN2A and EN5 of the Local Plan and to the heritage protection aims of the Framework. These together seek to ensure that development does not have a harmful effect on the setting of a heritage asset, protects historic features, maintains landscape quality and responds positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area including important historic features.</p> <p>Planning Balance</p> <p>23. Paragraph 196 of the Framework states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage asset, that harm should also be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. With the Framework also making clear that any harm including from development within the setting of the Listed Building requires clear and convincing justification. In this case no public benefits have been identified though it is acknowledged that secure storage for equipment and a workshop would be a personal benefit to the appellant. There is no public benefit which would outweigh the harm which has been identified in relation to the main issues.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>24. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust concurs with the views of the Planning Inspector which are pertinent to the latest application and therefore we object to the planning application. We advise that the application should be refused.</p> <p>Yours faithfully  John Clark  Conservation Officer.  Devon Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



Oldway Mansion	Devon	E19/0871	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of new CCTV column within grounds. Oldway Mansion, Torquay Road, Paignton TQ3 2TD.</p> <p>COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the the Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Oldway Mansion, 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. 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 acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have visited Oldway Mansion on many occasions. We have viewed the Historic England Register map and entry, and the planning application documents on your web site. We would ask you consider the following comments:</p> <p>The Registered site, comprises formal gardens around Oldway Mansion (listed grade II*), with informal pleasure grounds to the east and south, and around Little Oldway (listed grade II) to the north-west; there is a grotto (listed grade II) at the southern end of the formal lawns . A pair of early C20 concrete sphinxes flank the entrance to the east terrace from the carriage court north of the house (walls and sphinxes listed grade II). The terrace wall (listed grade II) which runs south parallel to the east front supports fourteen metal urns (listed grade II) with goat-mask handles, which were brought from Paris. The east terrace is laid out as a lawn, a box-edged parterre, and to the south, a shaped panel of lawn flanked by eight cypresses.</p> <p>The Mansion was extensively remodelled by Paris Singer in the French style in 1901-1904. The formal gardens form the setting for the Mansion and were laid out by the influential French landscape gardener Achille Duchene, who was in demand among high French society at the turn of the twentieth century. He also designed the Water Parterres and the Italian Garden at Blenheim Palace for the Duke of Marlborough.</p> <p>The application is for the installation of a new 8 metre high CCTV column and camera on the lawn of the east terrace. Because of the open nature of the site, the proposed column and camera would be a prominent feature in the formal gardens. It would be seen in juxtaposition with the parterres, the colonnaded facade of the Mansion, and the ballustrated wall and sphinxes flanking the entrance to the east terrace from the carriage court.</p>
----------------	-------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>The 8metres high CCTV column and camera would be a visual intrusion, detrimental to the character and appearance of the significant formal composition by the eminent French garden designer, Archille Duchene.</p> <p>One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is 'to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.'</p> <p>NPPF (para 193) states that 'the more important the heritage asset the greater the weight that should be given to their conservation. NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'</p> <p>The NPPF (para 194) states . 'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:</p> <p>a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;</p> <p>b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I andII* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.'</p> <p>The Gardens Trust considers that the proposal for the installation of a new 8 metre high CCTV column and camera on the lawn of the east terrace would cause substantial harm to the significance of the the grade II Registered landscape and the setting of the grade II* Oldway Mansion. We have not seen any convincing justification for the proposal. We urge your Council to refuse consent for this application as it clearly conflicts with national planning policy with regard to the conservation of the historic environment.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Layer Marney	Essex	E19/0703	II	PLANNING APPLICATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.09.2019</b>

Tower				Reconstruction of garden wall following collapse. Layer Marney Tower, Roundbush Road, Layer Marney CO5 9US. BOUNDARY, REPAIR/RESTORATION	<p>The application lacks a heritage statement, which is only significant insofar as it does not attempt to identify the date or importance of the collapsed wall, which looks 20th century. The rebuilding of the wall is to be welcomed, but using the old bricks can produce very unsatisfactory results. They should only be used if they can be satisfactorily cleaned, and the work should be controlled by a sample panel.</p> <p>Best wishes David Andrews FSA, IHBC</p>
Toddington Manor	Gloucestershire	E19/0773	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 3 no. outbuildings comprising a garden room, double garage and gazebo. 6 The Square, Toddington, Cheltenham. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p><b>CGT/TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Toddington Manor, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The following comments were submitted by Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust in response to application 19/00659/LBC: 'The Gardens Trust, as Statutory Consultee and advisor for planning proposals that may impact on Listed or Registered gardens, parks and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this Planning Application on its behalf.</p> <p>This Application raises three quite separate issues that could influence the outcome of this planning submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The first is the impact of additional construction within the application site on the character of Toddington Manor's Grade 11 parkland and the adjacent ruin of the original Toddington Manor;</li> <li>*The second is the visual impact of this proposal on G.E. Street's Listed St. Andrews Church, its churchyard, and the character of Church Lane; and</li> <li>*Finally, the impact of the quality and disposition of the proposed buildings within the curtilage of the Listed No. 6 The Square.</li> </ul> <p>Parts of Toddington Manor's parkland further to the West have suffered from poor management, but the immediate parkland surrounding this particular location is well managed and retains a fine visual character. This development proposal introduces still more "domestic" visual intrusion along the park's boundary.</p> <p>The quality of the setting of the Church and the churchyard boundary to the North of the Application site has been influenced by a number of recent planning consents and insertions that are not entirely helpful to maintaining visual quality. This proposal and its thinned boundary</p>

					<p>screening may not assist the situation .</p> <p>The three timber clad slate roofed buildings distributed across the Application garden have a rather temporary "garden" quality, which are not considered to be in keeping with the character of No. 6, which is the Listed building.</p> <p>Taking an aesthetic but practical view, GGLT would suggest it would help this proposal to keep the site visually open to the West of the small garden gate to the lane, with wide views maintained under the trees to the arc of the parkland beyond. The thinned shrubbery to the lane would benefit from being thickened up again to form a dense screen, as shown on the tree survey drawings. The double garage might be better in a brick matching the colour of No.6, with two single doors; and set back further West away from the drive to allow easier access for vehicles (this is not clear from the drawings). It is then suggested that the garden room, currently on the West boundary, might better be attached to the South elevation of the double garage.</p> <p>However, the Committee may wish to take a position that just accepts the vagaries of the planning process in this particular location, and what was a subtle relationship between the parkland, the ruined manor, St Andrew's Church and The Square. In a sense, this proposal is the final piece of that rather compromised jigsaw, and GGLT would recommend that the Borough might choose to negotiate a more appropriate solution to this development proposal.'</p> <p>We confirm we have no further comments to add to the above.</p> <p>If you have any further queries, please contact us, and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the application in due course.</p> <p>With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Batsford Park	Gloucestershire	E19/0826	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of extensions to visitor centre to increase size of garden centre shop and arboretum ticket office. Batsford Arboretum, Batsford Park, Batsford, Moreton-In-Marsh, Gloucestershire.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2019</b></p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals having an impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes has consulted The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on its behalf.</p> <p>Knowing the existing visitor centre and its design character, this proposal creates extensions that are in keeping with the character of the existing building, and the whole should merge together as a unified scheme.</p> <p>Therefore GGLT would not wish to raise adverse comment regarding this</p>

					<p>application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Farnworth Park	Greater Manchester	E19/0802	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION ERECTION OF A THREE STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 17NO. ONE BED APARTMENTS WITH CAR PARKING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS. LAND OFF WELLINGTON STREET, FARNWORTH. RESIDENTIAL jo</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. 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>This application is for a revised scheme from that proposed in 97875/16 to which LGT objected in 2017. The site is adjacent to Farnworth Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. The current proposals, for a single block of apartments within the central part of the site, and car parking located in the part of the site which is surrounded on three sides by the Park, represents a considerable improvement on the earlier application and has overcome our objection.</p> <p>We note that the applicant has not provided the earlier Tree Report in the documents supporting this application, and merely refers to trees in a single sentence within the Design and Access Statement. The Tree Report is required to support the current application, suitably amended to accord with the current scheme. We noted in the case of the earlier scheme that some trees would require significant pruning and remedial works. This may now be reduced, but sight of the Report is required.</p> <p>In our earlier responses we noted the limited effectiveness of the landscape scheme for the site. This concern remains. The landscape plan indicates planting within the very narrow areas between the proposed building and the site boundary, providing only minimal screening, and there is no indication of any offsite planting within the Park. The developer's landscape scheme should extend to include works within the Park to compensate for the loss of vegetation resulting from the clearance of the site boundary and to provide some screening and enable mitigation of harm to the setting of the Grade II listed Park. This is particularly important near the east boundary of the site.</p> <p>The development of the site for residential use is welcomed and we look forward to the site being brought back into use. LGT supports the proposals, subject to the comments made above.</p>

					<p>If there are any matters arising from this please contact LGT on <a href="mailto:conservation@lancsgt.org.uk">conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</a>  Yours faithfully  Stephen Robson  S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI  Chair, Conservation &amp; Planning Group</p>
Southsea Common	Hampshire	E19/0725	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  CONVERSION OF TWO GRASS TENNIS COURTS TO ARTIFICIAL GRASS SURFACE WITH INSTALLATION OF SIX, 8M HIGH FLOODLIGHTS. TENNIS COURTS, CANOE LAKE, SOUTHSEA ESPLANADE, SOUTHSEA. SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2019</b>  Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed at Grade II included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the sparse online documentation and were surprised that there was no Heritage Statement accompanying the application as the proposed replacement tennis courts lie within the Grade II Southsea Common which is a flat, open site and therefore extremely sensitive to inappropriate amendments. The Design and Access statement says (page 1) that the proposal is 'to convert two grass courts to artificial grass surfaces' and the drawing GAM/19/038/01 dated 08.05.2019 accompanying the application shows this to be a very bright red artificial grass 'carpet'. The GT would suggest that this surface be changed to a more discreet green artificial 'carpet' to blend better with the neighbouring grass courts and the nearby hard courts which are also green. The D&amp;A also mentions that the new floodlights will be 8m tall. I was unable to discover whether this is the same height as the existing floodlights in place along the grass courts. From the photograph in the D&amp;A only 3 are visible along the northern edge. More floodlights can be seen along the existing hard courts and we would suggest that floodlights of the same design be used for continuity especially as a great many existing lamp columns along the esplanade are group listed. We would also ask that it be made a condition that all floodlighting be switched off at 9pm as suggested.  Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Hemel Water Gardens	Hertfordshire	E19/0744	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  CONVERSION OF FIRST FLOOR RETAIL STORAGE OFFICE SPACE TO FLATS. CONSTRUCTION OF</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.09.2019</b>  Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, of which HGT is a member.  The western side of Marlowes buildings is part of the setting of The Water</p>

				TWO FLOORS ABOVE EXISTING BUILDING. FOUR STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH UNDERCROFT PARKING FOR 6 CARS. TO CREATE 33 FLATS. GROUND FLOOR FLATS ENTRANCES AT REAR OF GROUND FLOOR RETAIL UNIT AND ALTERATIONS TO SERVICE YARD AND ACCESS ROAD TO IMPROVE VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS. 160 MARLOWES, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1 1BA 505523.93 206996.41 BUILDING ALTERATION	Gardens, recently restored by DBC with the aid of Lottery funding. The Gardens are Grade II on the HE Register and the designer, Jellicoe intended that the Waterhouse Street buildings be low rise and set back to reduce any 'canyon effect' which would diminish the perceived scale of the gardens. Similarly the Marlowes buildings, visible from the gardens should be comparatively low rise. At present the street frontage at this part of Marlowes offers a remarkably consistent height line and frontage line, reflecting its importance as an early New Town. An extra 2 storeys on this buildings would adversely affect the setting, and therefore the significance of the Registered Gardens, and the new town atmosphere of Marlowes, which is itself of historic interest. Kate Harwood
Gorhambury	Hertford shire	E19/0767	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Discharge of Condition 6 (relocation of fruit trees) of planning permission 5/2019/2228 dated 20/11/2018 for Change of use from agricultural to equestrian arena with timber perimeter fencing (resubmission following withdrawal of 5/2018/0826). The Walled Garden, Gorhambury, St Albans AI3 6AI. MISCELLANEOUS	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We fully support the relocation of the orchard trees as detailed in this proposal and as discussed by HGT and the applicant on site. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Norton Common, Letchworth	Hertford shire	E19/0768	N	LOCAL PLAN GAP Norton Common consultation. Norton Common, Letchworth.	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have read the Briefing Document and are familiar with the current leaflet and information panels. We are also familiar with Norton Common as a part of the first Garden City. We are pleased that the relic historic landscape of ridge and furrow has been, and will continue to be conserved appropriately. We support the proposals as presented in the Briefing Document, We would like to be informed when the Draft GAP is ready and would be happy to comment on it. Kind Regards

					Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
10 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertford shire	E19/0830	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce 2x Oak trees crown by 70% (T4 and T5). 10 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LF. TREES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information given in this application we would only wish to comment that these oak trees are part of the SherrardsWood Park, laid out by Capability Brown as part of remodelling an much earlier woodland. These trees are therefore part of a heritage asset and should be retained as near to their current state as possible. Kate Harwood
Just House, Northaw	Hertford shire	E19/0832	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of front garden dwarf wall with steel railings and electric gates and installation of two new accesses following removal of existing. Just House, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NJ. ACCESS/GATES, BOUNDARY	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust , of which HGT is a member. Our previous comments on the inappropriateness of the urban design of the gates and railings, also apply to this application. This is a rural village-edge area where the topography and historic development of the estates at Northaw and Nyn Park have given rise to a landscape of designed views but with an emphasis on the natural over the formal. Well Road is a rural thoroughfare and should be respected as such. Suburban boundary designs of the type illustrated in this application are irrelevant to this situation. We would welcome a more sympathetic boundary treatment, in keeping with the historic and rural nature of the area. Kate Harwood
Hexton Manor	Hertford shire	E19/0844	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of Use and conversion of vacant farm workshop to create two small apartments for occupation by the Estate Under Game-keepers. Provision of vehicular access and parking area. Old Generator House, Mill Lane, Hexton, Hertfordshire. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL, CHANGE OF USE	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for applications regarding designated historic parks and gardens. We are disappointed that the design and access statement makes no mention of the fact that this site lies within the boundary of the Grade II Registered landscape of Hexton Manor and therefore does not take the impact of this development on the RPG into account. Further there is no heritage statement which would deal with this aspect. The property is called the Old Generator House. These were often gas generators for walled gardens and houses, situated some way from the main dwelling and glasshouses as they were unstable and also polluting. We are surprised that the design and access statement claims that contamination would not be a problem. In our experience the generation process released large amounts of contamination, mainly from waste



					<p>products which were often used as weedkillers and stored on the land surrounding the generator house. There is no evidence presented that a proper assessment of any residual contamination has been undertaken, or of previous clean-up operations.</p> <p>We would welcome an assessment of the impact upon the RPG of this development, as required by NPPF, and an assurance that there is no, or very low contamination of the site</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Just House, Northaw	Hertfordshire	E19/0852	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Certificate of lawfulness for an outbuilding. Just House, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NJ.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are concerned (as indicated in our response to 6/2019/0737/LAWP) as to the adequacy of the screening. We note that the maximum height of the building is given as 4m and that the building is shown as 2m from the boundary on north and west sides. We would advise that sufficient planting is put in place which will provide adequate screening in all seasons. At present much of the tree cover is deciduous so that views across the historic landscape towards Well Road would be harmed during the winter months or if the tree cover is reduced in any way.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Youngsbury	Hertfordshire	E19/0860	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Main House: Removal of the existing single storey extension from the north-west elevation. Removal of the existing conservatory from the southeast elevation and construction of a garden room. The reinstatement of the second floor and pitched roof structure and chimneys.</p> <p>Reinstatement/construction of lightwells to the north-west and south-east.</p> <p>Erection of a Portico to the south-west elevation. Restoration of the principal facade (south-west) and the remaining facades of the main building including alterations to fenestration.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have already commented on 3/19/0525/FUL for the majority of the works listed in the current application.</p> <p>The additional works in this application.</p> <p>We are familiar with the site and the house, and its landscape and landscape history and have studied the documents provided here. We support the alterations and repairs to renovate the James Paine house.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

				<p>Extensive internal rearrangement and alterations, including the removal of staircases and insertion of new staircases. Conversion including elevational alterations of the Brewhouse into a 2 no. bedroomed house for purposes ancillary to the main house. Planting and landscaping alterations to the area surrounding the site including the introduction of a ground source heat pump and the reinstatement of the walled garden. The installation of a water feature to the south-east of the house. Introduction of an external pool and pool house within the walled garden. Widening of entrance gates and creation of driveway to the west of the site. (as approved under LPA references 3/19/0525/FUL and 3/19/0526/LBC). In addition; opening of existing kitchen/hallway wall. Removal of door between kitchen and dining room. Rebuild of existing utility gable wall. Reinstatement of opening entrance doors to south-west facade. Raising of existing brick arch within the brewhouse to allow improved access. The removal of first floor bathroom &amp; reinstatement of bedroom. Relocation of chimney stack. The installation of SS flues to Brewhouse plant room. New</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				boilers and replacement of flues on the main roof. Youngsbury Access Road From North Drive To Home Farm, Wadesmill, Hertfordshire SG12 0TZ. HYBRID	
Caddington Hall	Hertford shire	E19/0861	N	PLANNING APPLICATION DEMOLITION OF FORMER RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME AND 2 DETACHED DWELLINGS. CONSTRUCTION OF 3 STOREY BUILDING FORMING 48 NEW DWELLINGS, WITH BASEMENT, ASSOCIATED HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, PARKING, BIN STORE AND MAIN ENTRANCE GATEWAY. CADDINGTON HALL, LUTON ROAD, MARKYATE, ST ALBANS AL3 8QB. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for Parks & Gardens on the Historic England Register. The position of Caddington Hall on the ridge above Markyate Cell (Listed building and Registered landscape) forms part of the setting of the Cell parkland. We have seen no discussion of the effect this very large building would have on the wider landscape including Markyate Cell. We object to the usage of the Walled Garden for storage for the units within the house. This is an historic garden in its own right and should be restored in line with NPPF 192. Storage Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Ponsbourne Park	Hertford shire	E19/0862	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey garage extension. 5 Home Farm Cottages, Ponsbourne Park, Newgate Street, Hertford SG13 8QT. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies within the Ponsbourne Park which HGT has included in their list of Parks & Gardens of Local Historic Interest, and was part of the home farm complex associated with the site. We are concerned that the character of this part of the estate is being cumulatively harmed by piecemeal developments, including at this particular property which has already been extended. The property is also within the Green Belt which is under stress from housing developments elsewhere in the borough. Kate Harwood
Brockett Hall	Hertford shire	E19/0875	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey rear extension. 28 Lemsford Village, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7TN. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have studied the documents provided with this application and note that the rear garden wall it to be demolished and rebuilt. We are unclear if this is part the boundary wall between the registered Brocket Park and the property. If it is then this is part of a designated heritage asset; the property is part of the setting of Brocket Park and we would expect to see a Heritage Impact Statement to cover at least the impact on the setting,

					and thus the significance of Brocket Park and also the wall if it is part of the Brocket boundary. Kate Harwood
604 Howlands, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfordshire	E19/0881	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey side and rear, two storey side extensions. 604 Howlands, Welwyn Garden City AL7 4ET. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. 'We have no comments to make on the proposed extension but do note that there are mature trees and hedges within the vicinity of the proposed works. We would suggest that protection for the root systems of these trees should be required if necessary for the duration of the works. Kate Harwood
Putteridge Bury	Hertfordshire	E19/0897	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Provision of a children's play area and pedestrian trail/cycle route. Land East Of Hayling Drive, Putteridge Park, Luton, Hertfordshire. PLAY AREA, FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee on historic parks and gardens. The area of this proposal lies to the south of the Registered Putteridge Bury parkland, to the east of the park boundary line of Selsey Drive and Hayling Drive. It is within the setting of Putteridge Park and any development here would harm the setting and therefore the significance of the RPG. The NPPF (Section 16) states that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. We would suggest that a children's play area and cycle track are not appropriate. We note that Wandon Park is just to the west of Hayling Drive and consider that would be a more suitable spot for these proposals, rather than the Green Belt land of the former agricultural part of Putteridge Bury park. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Swaylands	Kent	E18/1693	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single dwelling house. Restoration of gardens with associated landscape works. Conversion of a listed boat house to guest house. Land North Of Swaylands School Farm, Penshurst Road, Penshurst, KENT. RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) and Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) with regard to amendments on the above application. We have studied the revised plans submitted. It would appear that the proposed house (2019) has been rotated through approximately 90 degrees to the east when compared to the house of 2011, creating a mirror image with the garage block, kitchen etc moved to the northern side. The amended design is more in keeping with Swaylands and the Dairy to the south, and gives a more welcoming appearance coming up the now slightly sunken drive. Despite these amendments, in our opinion the proposed new house is still too large and does not alter our original objections to this application.

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Combe Bank	Kent	E19/0289	II*	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	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.09.2019</b> Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the amendments to the above application on 19 and 29 August. In addition, we have received the Lighting Assessment Report prepared in by Halliday Lighting dated 27 July, in response to the comments made by ourselves and other consultees to this application. Following further consultation with Kent Gardens Trust and subsequent submission of their comments to you on 5 August we confirm that both our organisations retain the following concerns: On page 3 of the above report Halliday Lighting state 'The site at Radnor House is in a Rural area with Low district brightness, the recommendations for an environmental zone E2 have therefore been applied' Halliday Lighting are incorrect, as the site is in an AONB and in accordance with Table 1 on page 2 of their report the site is in a Natural area and the recommendation is that an environmental zone E1 should be applied. The current proposed lighting arrangement therefore does not comply with this recommendation. Should the Council be minded to approve this application, it is requested that the applicant complies with the guidance provided by the Institute of Lighting Professionals. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Belvoir Castle	Leicester shire	E19/0711	II	PLANNING APPLICATION New clubhouse and indoor cricket school. Belvoir Cricket Club, Harston Lane, Knipton NG32 1RJ. SPORT/LEISURE	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.09.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with a colleague who is extremely familiar with the registered parkland at Belvoir and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The cricket field lies entirely within the Grade II listed Belvoir Castle registered parkland. The view of the Castle, lakes, trout ponds and the Brownian landscaping form the background to the proposed Pavilion and Sports Hall from what is currently one of the best vista points within this

					<p>unique landscape. Research undertaken around the Capability Brown Tercentenary unearthed new information on Capability Brown's considerable contribution to the landscape at Belvoir, some of which has not yet made its way onto the Historic England listing which is currently being reassessed for an upgrade, further raising the site's importance and significance. Much of this can be found in the Duchess's book 'Capability Brown &amp; Belvoir: Discovering a Lost Landscape' describing Brown's significant influence on the late 18th and early 19th century landscaping at Belvoir. Serena Bradbeer's excellent 'A Historic Survey of Belvoir Park and Garden' (Aug 2019) brings all this new information together and will be invaluable for your officers when deciding this application.(see attached)</p> <p>The GT understands that replacement of just the Cricket Pavilion is not an option and that any proposed new build must also include the Sports Hall. The large size of this new structure (approximately 929 sq m) at 6.3m tall at its highest and a lower twin pitched roof of 4.5m, is in our opinion, entirely unsuitable for this sensitive location, especially due to its unsympathetic, industrial appearance. The new building would be unduly dominant and sits unhappily with the nearby listed Victorian gatehouse as well as impacting negatively upon visitors' impressions when arriving at the entrance to Belvoir from the south, historically one of the more important entrances to the park. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from development within its setting. Any harm to a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification (NPPF Para 194). In our opinion this proposal would cause harm not just to the registered landscape but also the setting of the Grade I Belvoir Castle and other listed structures within the landscape. We feel that this building would not enhance or sustain the significance of the various heritage assets and detracts from their setting.</p> <p>The GT suggests that this application is contrary to the Conservation Area Policy of Melton Borough DC, in particular Policies BE8 (Planning permission will not be granted for development which would adversely affect the setting of a listed building) and BE2 (Planning permission will not be granted for development within a designated conservation area unless it is of a high standard of design and would preserve or enhance the traditional character of the area).</p> <p>Whilst we support the need for a new Pavilion to encourage and train youngsters, we must object strongly to this proposed new building which is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>detrimental to the setting and significance of not just the Park but also the Castle and other listed structures nearby.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Whatton House	Leicestershire	E19/0884	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from workshop/garage associated with Whatton House to a cafe (use class A3). External alterations and partial rebuild, creation/alteration of openings in courtyard wall and installation of turnstile. Whatton House, London Road, Long Whatton, Loughborough, Leicestershire LE12 5BG. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, CATERING</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. It is unfortunate that we were not notified in a timely manner as just one working day gives us little time to study the documentation properly, especially as I am based in Gloucestershire and do not know the site. However, we are fortunate that our colleagues in the Leicestershire Gardens Trust (LGT), who are familiar with the site, were meeting today and have been able to give me their local input at short notice.</p> <p>The online documentation is extremely unclear and from them it is difficult to understand how the new structures will impact upon the registered park (RPG). The Planning, Heritage, Design and Access statement (April 2019) illustrations on pages 4 &amp; 5 are differently aligned and as the former does not show the structures affected, the inclusion of a later OS map including these for comparison with what is proposed would have been far more useful. Consequently, describing and comparing the detail in these two drawings with what is proposed has been made more difficult. There does not seem to be a photo of the greenhouse which is proposed for demolition, any indication of its manufacturer and approximate date, or views to and from these structures within the RPG. There is no visual impact assessment and I have been struggling to get a clear comparison of what the site looks like now and what is proposed.</p> <p>My colleagues have reassured me that they believe the greenhouse to be fairly modern and neither that, the water feature or the brick outbuildings are of particular merit. In their opinion the proposals will enhance the entrance to the garden. I would like to reiterate had I not had the benefit of the LGT's local perspective I would have had to say that the documentation was of insufficient quality to enable me to have come to this conclusion. Under the circumstances we do not object to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Melton Constable Hall	Norfolk	E19/0706	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing outbuildings and construction of replacement building to house biomass heating plant and the installation of distribution pipe work to serve a number of estate buildings (part retrospective). Melton Park, Dereham Road, Melton Constable. BIOMASS, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The current walled garden at Melton Constable Hall was built for Sir Edward Astley 4th Bt by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown as a replacement for an earlier walled garden in a different location, as shown on the 1703 engraving by Kipp and Kniff. The contract between Brown and Sir Edward now resides in the Norfolk Record Office and is dated 1764. The contract describes the work Brown will carry out and the payment he received, in instalments, was recorded. An early 19th century wall was inserted across the middle of the garden and Brown's walls' heights increased to accommodate the 19th century glasshouses that were built onto the north wall.</p> <p>Whilst carrying out their research in 2014/15 Norfolk Gardens Trust were able to record Brown's walled garden and all its associated glasshouses, garden bothies and boiler house. The latter two on the north elevation of the north wall (proposed site for the new bio-mass boiler) were already in a ruinous state, the corroded boiler still in situ. It is commendable that the proposed new buildings to house the bio-mass boiler, silo and chipper will be made of a matching red brick under a red pantile roof, sympathetic with the other buildings nearby. We note that the flue will project above the north wall, and although painted black, it will be visible from the kitchen garden. Extensive pipework will run from the boiler to the main Hall, East Wing, Justice House (part of the former Elizabethan house) stable yard residences, walled garden cottages (west side) and the newly restored vine houses on the central wall. We trust that trenches dug to accommodate this pipework will not affect any historic landscape or garden features/buildings. It may be worth keeping an archaeological watching brief. It is also difficult to judge how much noise the boiler and chipper will generate, but we hope it will be at a level that will not disturb the nearby residents and the tranquillity of the deer park.</p> <p>We realise the environmental advantages of building this sustainable</p>



					<p>method of heating, but we must emphasise that every precaution must be taken to protect the fabric and setting of Norfolk's only Capability Brown walled kitchen garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Alnwick Castle	Northumberland	E19/0639	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Construction of 5 new fish and eel passes at weirs on the river Aln. Castle Weir, Denwick Lane, Alnwick, Northumberland.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Castle and Canongate Weirs do not appear to be substantially affected in terms of visual impact, apart from perhaps some new elements being visible at close range. The landscape surrounding Castle Weir in particular is extremely sensitive in landscape impact terms, and the GT/NGT are glad to note that the proposed works appear to have a minimal impact upon the registered landscape. We therefore have no objection in principle to the modifications proposed but would support the request by the Assistant County Archaeologist and Buildings Officer for more information on the weirs to enable your officers to make a proper determination.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E19/0755	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent  Regularisation of conversion of outbuildings to provide additional residential accommodation. Walled Garden, Part Of Gardeners Cottage, Allerton Lane, Allerton Park, Knaresborough, North Yorkshire HG5 0SE. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – Allerton Park, registered Grade II. 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 designed landscape and gardens at Allerton Park include the surrounding parkland, enlarged in the 1720's and reworked in the 1770's. The brick-walled kitchen garden of c 1770 is in the south west corner of the registered site, listed grade II with its accompanying Gardeners Cottage. The east wall has a gateway with stone piers and the north wall – the</p>

					<p>subject of this application – includes an orangery with lean-to greenhouses on its warm southern elevation with two ranges of 19C lean-to storage and potting sheds on its outer face now converted into residential and holiday-let accommodation. The photograph of the orangery in the Heritage Assessment at 4.7 indicates the design of the building before it was radically altered; built of brick it had tall multi-glazed round headed windows of the traditional orangery design developed during the 18C, and which enabled tender citrus fruits to be grown in large tubs, carried outside in the summer, and overwintered in the orangery. The lean-to glasshouses may have been used for peaches, figs or vines or tropical flowers such as orchids, heated in the winter by the hot wall behind. This is a retrospective planning application. The orangery and lean-to glasshouses, altered by the previous owner of the property have been carried out without consent and the building changed ownership in 2015. We appreciate that some of the previous work undertaken at the walled kitchen garden has helped to preserve some of the structures and give them a new use but we are concerned that the orangery was redeveloped into a residential annex, without paying heed to its historic design at Allerton Park and without listed building consent. We consider that this application’s documentation does not give quality information regarding the original or the proposed structure and it appears that the redevelopment was never a conversion of the existing orangery but an entirely new concept.</p> <p>The Planning Statement 5.11 notes: ‘With regard to the grade II listed walled kitchen garden, the heritage statement states that alterations have masked to some extent the function of the central buildings along the north wall of the garden. It advises that significance of these central buildings resides in the ‘story’ that they tell about their function. Orangeries seem to have had a distinctive appearance and this has now been lost as a result of the alterations. This might cause some future confusion about the past use of this part of the garden. To those who know or are learning about the history of walled kitchen gardens, it will no longer be possible to ‘read’ the function of this central building. As such, some harm has been done to the significance of the listed walled kitchen garden.’</p> <p>We note that Policy 7A of the Local Plan advises that development will not be permitted where it would adversely affect the character or setting of a Registered Park and Garden and specifically seeks to protect their historic</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>interest. Although this retrospective application only applies to a part of the registered site it is also a listed structure and its historic design should have been protected in order to retain as much integrity of the historic area as possible.</p> <p>In addition, we are not convinced that this application complies with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Feb 2019) paragraphs 193, 194, 196.</p> <p>Therefore, the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust advise the refusal of this application as we consider that had the applicant originally and now, submitted accurate drawings as existing and as proposed, LBC would not have been granted for such a transition, and that this is not a restoration of the historic existing orangery but a totally new concept.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee, Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E19/0794	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Rationalisation and extension of existing overflow car park to provide additional parking and pedestrian pathway with associated landscaping, signage and electric connection points. Fountains Abbey Visitors Centre, Swanley Grange Fountains To Horse Coppice Fountains HG4 3D. PARKING</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.09.2019</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – Studley Royal, registered Grade I and a World Heritage Site (WHS). 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>Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey are inscribed under two of the ten criteria for inscription for World Heritage Sites. Their Outstanding Universal Value is expressed under each criterion as follows: Criterion i) “Studley Royal Park including the ruins of Fountains Abbey owes its originality and striking beauty to the fact that a humanised landscape was created around the largest medieval ruins in the United Kingdom. The use of these features, combined with the planning of the water garden itself, is a true masterpiece of human creative genius”. Criterion iv) “Combining the remains of the richest abbey in England, the Jacobean Fountains Hall, and Burgess’s miniature neo-Gothic masterpiece of St Mary’s, with the water gardens and deer park into one harmonious whole, Studley Royal Park including the ruins of Fountains Abbey illustrates the power of medieval monasticism, and the taste and wealth of the European upper classes in the 18th century.”</p>

					<p>The site for this planning application lies within the boundaries of the Studley Royal Park and Fountains Abbey World Heritage Site and the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but outside the Registered Park and Garden. The site is well screened from the rest of the WHS. We note that the National Trust has 5.2 million members and last year Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal welcomed a total of 404,037 visitors through the pay barrier with 75% of these people arriving through the visitor centre and we understand the need to rationalise and extend the existing overflow car park. We consider that this is a well thought through application to meet growing public access and are pleased to note that the lighting will be via hook-ups as needed for evening events.</p> <p>The HSIA Research and Analysis report (National Trust, 2019) provides a valuable assessment and notes that the proposal will involve 'an element of permanent visual change', but that the present screening and soil bunding will remain in place. It recognises that 'on a bare earth model' the proposed development would be visible from the south and from more distant views, whilst there would be the potential for visual impact 'if there was to be a loss of all vegetation screening on the south side of the development sites.'</p> <p>Taking this into consideration we encourage the National Trust to look at developing tree/shrub – including evergreen tree/shrub – cover to the south and to put in place a maintenance plan for the continuing management of the trees and shrubs and for restocking in the event of a catastrophic event such as might occur with climate change. This would mitigate any potential landscape harm to the significance of the WHS, the Registered site and the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. We support the work of the National Trust in conserving, repairing Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey and making it accessible to the public, particularly as it is such an important place, combining the ruins of a monastic site with an early water garden and designed ornamental pleasure grounds and of course as a World Heritage Site.</p> <p>We consider that this application meets the requirements of the NPPF and have no objection but trust that our advice above will be helpful.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee, Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Studley Royal	North	E19/0795	I	PLANNING APPLICATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.09.2019 (Copied to ICOMOS and National</b>

	Yorkshire			Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion for the extension and remodelling of Studley tea rooms and surrounding landscaping. Studley Royal Tea Rooms Studley Park Ripon North Yorkshire HG4 3DY. CATERING	<p><b>Trust)</b></p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust was represented by our Conservation and Planning member, Heather Garnett at the July Fountains Abbey Studley Royal (FASR) Stakeholder meeting and has reported back to the YGT Conservation and Planning sub-committee at our meeting on Tuesday. Members have also attended the recent consultation exhibition at FASR. We support the work of the National Trust in conserving, repairing Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey and making it accessible to the public, particularly as it is such an important place, combining the ruins of a monastic site with an early water garden and designed ornamental pleasure grounds and of course a World Heritage Site (WHS). The northern entrance to the water gardens (Ripon end) is the historic way into the designed landscape and we support efforts to enable the public to enjoy this historic route with its designed views. However, we appreciate the sensitivity of the landscape and support the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the above proposal. As you know the site is in a valley so we trust that the EIA will take into account the extensive views, the screening and layout of car parking etc. Please could you keep us informed of progress.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee, Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Gledstone Hall	North Yorkshire	E19/0895	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Retrospective application for summer house in rear garden. West Lodge, West Marton,. Skipton BD23 3JL. GARDEN BUILDING	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Yorkshire Gardens Trust. Unfortunately, the notification went to a former trustee of the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and we have only just been made aware of it. The notification address was the Gardens Trust (GT) but they have never received it. The Gardens Trust is the Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. 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. The GT notifies the YGT of planning applications on a weekly basis and we are authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>If your authority could please notify the GT of relevant planning applications by e-mailing: <a href="mailto:consult@thegardenstrust.org">consult@thegardenstrust.org</a> that would be very helpful.</p> <p>From 1918 to 1922 Edwin Lutyens time was almost totally taken up with</p>

					<p>war memorials. His meeting with the Lancashire mill owner, Amos Nelson, enabled him to return to garden designing, but in a severely classical style and the result is Gledstone Hall, (listed grade II*) usually recognised as one of Lutyens best classical houses. Gledstone Hall is on the H E Register of Parks and Gardens at grade II.</p> <p>The design of Gledstone Hall gives formal access from the north and the drive enters the walled forecourt sweep by passing between the two detached flanking pavilions (listed grade II* with the Hall) standing at the north-west and north-east corners of the forecourt before passing through a fine ironwork screen and carriage gates with an ornamental overthrow carrying the Nelson arms. The gates are flanked by large urn-topped piers. The subject of this retrospective planning application lies in.</p> <p><b>We consider that the roof of the summerhouse and its</b> the garden of the north-west pavilion (West Lodge) part of the historic design of Gledstone Hall and within the curtilage of the main building and so affects its setting and that of the registered garden. It is clear that the whole of Lutyens' concept for the approach to Gledstone was to produce a balanced design incorporating the hall, forecourt and lodge pavilions. Unfortunately, the roof of the summerhouse protrudes above the line of the western edge of the forecourt and is visible when viewed from the front door of the Hall, the forecourt and the approach and now affects this balanced design. The roof of the summerhouse is not of a material and coursing which reflects the roofs of the hall and most of the other buildings, which we understand were constructed using natural Cotswold stone slates and in diminishing courses, which have weathered over time. By contrast the roof of the summer house is covered with regularly-sized small brown concrete tiles and ridge tiles which will not weather in the same way.</p> <p>We understand from the Design and Access Statement and Heritage Statement that the design of the summer house has been informed by the pyramidal form and pitches of Lutyens' designs for the original building and by the early tennis pavilion. However, it seems that the pitch of the roof does not match that of the hall to which it is visually linked. We consider that the roof of the summerhouse and its material is inappropriate and causes harm to this sensitive historic setting and is contrary to HE's The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3, (second Edition) published December 2017 and NPPF (revised July 2018) paragraphs 184 and 193.</p> <p>For the above reasons we object to this retrospective planning application</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>and hope that changes can be made to the structure that will be sensitive to this important heritage site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Hawkstone	Shropshire	E19/0700	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of canopy structure, installation of platform lift and 1.1m high boundary fencing; renovation of outdoor swimming pool and change of use to a wedding venue. Hawkstone Park Hotel, Weston Under Redcastle, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY4 5UY. HOTEL/HOSPITALITY</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for your notification of the above scheme, which has been forwarded to us from the offices of the Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust is a Statutory Consultee in matters relating to planning applications affecting a Registered Park and Garden and we are acting on their behalf in this instance.</p> <p>We have consulted the documents relating to this case on the Shropshire Council website and note that the proposed development is for an area within the boundary of the Grade I Hawkstone Park Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>We recognise the intention behind the proposed adaptation of and alterations to the former swimming pool but have a number of concerns relating to it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• firstly, that the screening provided by the existing hedges surrounding the former swimming pool may not be sufficient to hide the proposed 'awning';</li> <li>• second, that the visual impact of the proposed development as viewed from the Grade II Listed Hawkstone Park Hotel appears not to have been assessed, or that this assessment has not been made available;</li> <li>• third, that the cultural significance of the swimming pool structure and its relationship to the Hawkstone Park Hotel seems also not to have been taken fully into account. Indeed, the Design, Access &amp; Heritage Statement submitted by the Applicant states explicitly that 'The existing pool and changing room buildings have no cultural significance' and that it similarly '...has no architectural significance...' although they were '...added to Hawkstone Park Hotel somewhere between 1902-54' and will presumably be considered as part of the Listing of the Hotel itself;</li> <li>• fourth, we are concerned that the application as it stands may in the future give rise to further requests for development, for example a semi-permanent marquee in the adjacent field, either beyond the pool itself or between the pool and the hotel;</li> <li>• finally, that the application may similarly in due course give rise to a</li> </ul>

					<p>specific request for the proposed seating area within the pool itself to be covered over, given that it is intended currently to remain open to the elements at all times and in all weathers.</p> <p>We request therefore that determination of this application be paused until the above questions are addressed. Given present levels of information, we have no alternative but to object to the proposals as they stand, given the potential impact both upon the fabric and setting of the Grade I Registered Park &amp; Garden, and upon the Grade II Listed Hawkstone Park Hotel.</p> <p>If it would be helpful, we would be willing to meet the applicants &amp;/or their representatives on site to discuss the proposals further, as well as Shropshire planning officers.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Christopher Gallagher Vice Chair, Shropshire Parks &amp; Gardens Trust</p>
Compton Castle	Somerset	E19/0788	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of solar panel array and ancillary works. Land At Compton Castle, Old Road, Compton Pouncefoot, Yeovil, Somerset BA22 7EH (GR:364791/125626). SOLAR</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The GT/SGT have looked at the online documentation, and the Design and Access Statement refers to a Heritage Impact Assessment. For some reason this does not seem to be amongst the paperwork online. Whilst it is stated that the solar panels are well screened, without an HIA, our fear is that the proposals will have a significant and adverse impact upon the Grade II Compton Castle Registered Park and Garden. We would be grateful if we could see this document so we can comment more decisively.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cathedral Close and Linear Park, Lichfield	Stafford shire	E19/0689	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Resurfacing and reorientation of 4 no existing tarmac courts; replacement of existing fencing and floodlights. Tennis Courts, Beacon Park, Swan Road,</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2019</b></p> <p>The application is for the reorientation and upgrading of the tennis courts within Beacon Park, part of Lichfield Linear Park a grade II Registered Park and Garden within Lichfield City conservation area. While accepting this is an urban park with facilities consistent with its location the positioning of the tennis courts with their hard surfacing, rigid geometrical form, tower</p>



				Lichfield. SPORT/LEISURE, EXTERNAL LIGHTING	<p>lighting and fenced enclosure so close to and readily visible from the softer landscape of pleasure grounds in Museum Gardens is visually incongruous and unfortunate. Nonetheless they are an established feature in the landscape and the Trusts do not object to the proposal to reorientate and resurface the courts, and improve the perimeter fencing. A dark green would be preferable to the black mesh proposed.</p> <p>The Trust do however object to the replacement of the four existing lighting columns with eleven taller units. The proliferation of columns will be highly intrusive and harmful to the historic landscape, their presence emphasised by projecting well above the height of the fence. The Trusts do not oppose floodlighting the playing facility per se but query why it is necessary to install so many new columns and their height. Evidence elsewhere suggests it is possible to provide brightly lit playing surfaces with modern LED luminaires mounted on columns approximately the same height as the perimeter fencing against which their presence would be much less noticeable. It is suggested the applicants be requested to amend their proposals for an alternative scheme along these lines.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Alan Taylor</p>
BABERGH AND MID SUFFOLK JOINT LOCAL PLAN	Suffolk	E19/0527	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council second round consultation on new Joint Local Plan	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (JLP). We have objected to several applications affecting the setting of Chilton Hall and its Registered park over the past few years and are glad to note that in the emerging JLP on page 160 the Policies map indicates that the area of land fronting Church Field Road (which Caverswall/Prolog have previously sought to develop as warehousing) has now been 'whitelisted' and is not allocated for any development at all. We fully support the comments within Appendix 1 of the Heritage Sensitivity Assessment (see footnote), and we are glad that your officers have recognised the heritage significance of this area.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust strongly supports the removal of the allocation of employment use for the site and suggests that there should also be no future allocation for residential housing on this particularly sensitive area of land.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Lady Herbert's Garden	West Midlands	E18/1697	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for the discreet insertion of new internal elements and reinstatement of former features including the earlier oak beam and floor and replacement exterior doors and windows to facilitate a change of use to a residential unit. Swanswell Gate, Hales Street, COVENTRY CV1 1AH. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.09.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on these applications. We are writing this in consultation with the statutory consultee, The Gardens Trust</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the proposals for these gates are now submitted together, enabling a fuller appreciation of their joint impact. We are also pleased to see that they are accompanied by an expanded Design and Access Statement/Heritage Appraisal. However, it is still not compliant with the NPPF requirement to assess the impact of the proposals on adjacent heritage assets. This has not been done in relation to Lady Herbert's garden, in which the two gates form an integral part of the design and feature in several of the important views within and into the garden. The fact that the Council's own Conservation Area Appraisal deals very well with the garden makes this omission even more inexplicable, particularly as we are now at version G of the report.</p> <p>It is not our role to comment on the architectural details of the application, which do appear to have been well thought out. We entirely support bringing historic buildings back into use as this is the only way to ensure their long term survival. However, we do have some concerns about the application.</p> <p>The plans show a large tree to be removed from land at the north of Cook Street Gate. This is not within Lady Herbert's garden, but is a significant item in its setting and the setting of the gate, forming a green backdrop to the gate when seen from the garden. If a proper evaluation of the impact of the proposals had been done, images showing the gates in their settings could have been included.</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity on the nature of the accommodation to be provided. The DAS is coy about the meaning of "high quality short stay accommodation." The supplementary information on dwelling units in both cases says that one additional unit of "other" residential accommodation is to be provided, while the applications themselves say it is for non-residential accommodation, and in the case of Cook Street Gate that it is to be one hotel or hostel room. The distinction is important as the pressure to introduce residential paraphernalia around small historic buildings such as this, can often have a detrimental impact on the landscape in which they sit. Although a holiday let seems the only feasible use for the Cook Street Gate accommodation, Swanswell Gate could potentially be a full-time, even if not permanent, home, which would increase the potential for pressure on the surrounding environment.</p>
-----------------------	---------------	----------	----	---	--

					<p>There is to be no car parking provision. If the lets are to be for short holidays it can be argued that the central position means a car is unnecessary, but can this be enforced? The holiday let above Eastgate in Warwick often results in the presence of a parked car under the arch, which is not an ideal outcome. Longer occupation by, say, a business person would result in greater pressure in this regard.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned at the lack of storage for waste and recycling. It is not hard to find images of both gates with filled black bags outside (one in the DAS!). That is without residential occupancy. What is to happen to the waste and recycling between the end of a tenancy and the next collection day? How is recycling to be enforced if there is nowhere for the containers to be stored? We assume that Coventry has a policy requiring suitable provision for waste. In this sensitive area it is surely imperative that it not be neglected in this case.</p> <p>We therefore respectfully suggest that these issues be dealt with before permission is granted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Christine Hodgetts Conservation Secretary</p>
Lady Herbert's Garden	West Midlands	E19/0890	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of Use of Cook Street Gate to residential accommodation. To include construction of new exterior access stair to upper floor. Cook Street Gate, Cook Street, Coventry CV1 1RA. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.09.2019</b> As per E18/1697 above</p>
Lady Herbert's Garden	West Midlands	E19/0891	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of the Swanswell Gate to a residential accommodation, with insertion of new internal elements and reinstatement of former features including the earlier oak beam and floor and replacement of exterior doors and windows. Swanswell Gate, Hales Street, Coventry CV1 1JA.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.09.2019</b> As per E18/1697 above</p>

				CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--