



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES NOVEMBER 2019

The GT conservation team received 188 new cases in England and one case in Wales during November, 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, 47 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Tracy Park Hotel And Resort, Bristol	Avon	E19/1130	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2 no. buildings to from staff accommodation (22 units) for the main hotel (Class C1), with associated parking and access. Land At Tracy Park Hotel And Resort, Bath Road, Wick, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS30 5RN. HOTEL/HOSPITALITY	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a grade II Listed House and its grounds, which are within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and within an area of Green Belt designation, within South Gloucestershire. 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 designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust notes that the proposed development is located to the far western part of the site, which benefits from significant tree and hedge planting. The historic setting of Tracy Park is maintained as there would be no visual or landscape harm that would impact on the designated AONB or the setting of the Grade II listed Tracy Park that dates back to the 17th.Century</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers that the development accords with the core objectives of the NPPF 2019, and therefore has no objection to this application.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Blagdon Water Gardens	Avon	E19/1212	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of buildings [Use Class A1 retail]. Conversion of existing two-storey building to 1no. four bedroom dwelling [Use Class C3]; replacement of existing bungalow [Use Class C3] with 1 no. two-storey five-bedroom dwelling; and erection of 8no. dwellings. Redevelopment of Walled Garden comprising restoration and extension of the existing derelict cottage and heated wall to provide 1no. five-bedroom dwelling and erection of 1no. single-storey five-bedroom dwelling. Improvements to existing vehicular access, hard/soft landscape works, and drainage. Land at Blagdon Water Garden Centre, Bath Road, Langford BS40 5DN. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting grade II listed Kitchen Garden Enclosure Walls and Heated Pineapple Wall built in the late 18th century as part of the wider estate of Mendip Lodge, which is now demolished. 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 welcome the amendments to the original application, particularly as the pineapple wall will be fully restored, available to be seen by the public from the new, proposed Public Green, with the introduction of a Ha Ha and heritage estate fencing. The parking barn will be less intrusive, to the view of the heated wall, in its new proposed setting to the south, near the entrance into the walled garden.</p> <p>We would like to echo the comments made by the 'Ancient Monuments Society' that a survey of the condition of the historic enclosure wall be carried out before works commence and a management plan be drawn up for its maintenance.' A separate schedule of works be produced for the repair of the heated wall, and that a specialist conservation architect is employed to oversee any works to the heritage assets, to ensure that no harm is done to their significance." We note from the information provided in the Heritage Statement that the heated wall: "will be within the ownership of a single property owner [proposed plot 11] who will be directly responsible for its on-going repair and maintenance." How will these responsibilities be enforced and related to the future owner of plot 11?</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust welcomes this amended proposal which will secure the valuable and rare heritage asset of the heated pineapple wall along with the later Victorian building to keep and protect the historic context of this site. The concept of the 'public green' with an information board, combined with the new access route of cellular paving reinforced grass, will allow safe and appropriate access by the residents and visitors, to the south face of the pineapple wall. Avon Garden Trust appreciate this opportunity to share in this consultation, and contribute towards what</p>

					appears to be a good outcome to this amended proposal. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Crowthorne Neighbourhood Plan	Berkshire	E19/1069	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Consultation	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.11.2019</b></p> <p>Policy Reference: CR1</p> <p>Modifications</p> <p>This is an overarching policy affecting any development within the Parish. It is therefore important that all development responds to and integrates with the Parish's historic parks and gardens as part of this policy, as well as the Parish's listed buildings, character areas and archeological features.</p> <p>BGT request that an additional bullet should be added as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of Historic parks and gardens in contributing to the local identity and unity in places, in particular the Broadmoor Registered Park and Garden, but also surviving historic landscape features within the Parish.</li> </ul> <p>Other</p> <p>BGT welcome the inclusion of the Broadmoor Registered Park and Garden in Plan B. We would also like to see the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Under the NDP Glossary: Heritage Assets - Parts of the historic environment which have significance because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest.</li> </ol> <p>Add 'landscape interest': to reflect the NPPF Glossary description Heritage asset: A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).</p> <p>Bettina Kirkham</p>
Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E19/0904	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of sculpture by Joanna Vasconcelos "Wedding Cake" and two historic sculptures within curtilage of "Shepherd Boy with His Dog" (listed Grade II), and relocation of wire and scroll work Pergola (listed Grade II) from the Rose Garden to the	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2019</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 very much appreciate being given additional time to comment on 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.</p>

				<p>Dairy Garden (Retrospective). Waddesdon Manor, Silk Street, Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire HP18 OJH.SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>We welcome the return of the statues and reinstatement of the pergola in this Grade I historic designed landscape, putting Waddesdon in the top 10% of only 1660 nationally significant sites. Due to the importance of this landscape, we would like to express our concern about the introduction of such a large modern sculpture in this position. We have been unable to find a clear height for the structure but it is clearly of some considerable height given that visitors can walk up to a third level.</p> <p>Our main objection is that it is out of scale with the rest of the landscape and the setting of the garden buildings such as the Grade II listed Aviary and the Grade II listed Pergola. Whilst this particular area may have undergone some change over time, the introduction of such a substantial structure will undoubtedly overwhelm everything else in the immediate vicinity and therefore we believe that, whilst we have no objection to the introduction of new contemporary art or sculpture in this area, it should respect the surrounding scale and design of the garden and other structures and not dominate the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E19/1001	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 22.50m high swann engineering column. Land At Wotton End, Kingswood Lane, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire HP18 9RB. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens at Grade I, the highest grade, 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.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation, and whilst we recognise that the photographic survey has taken extensive photographs from around the Registered Park at Wotton (RPG), we feel that this is very partial in its coverage, focussing on the views from listed structures. Whilst some of the structures do have views looking out into the wider landscape, most of the structures are positioned to look towards a specific view such as across the lake or back towards the main house. Therefore this assessment does not sufficiently demonstrate that the mast is not visible from all the key viewpoints within the RPG, merely that it might be less visible from specific designed viewpoints.</p> <p>For examples, Views 2 and 3 are from lower ground down by the lake, and</p>

					<p>Views 4, 5 and 6 are all from structures which are designed to be nestled into the tree belt and which have only have partial views looking into the designed landscape. We also feel that the exact positions from where the pictures have been taken have been extremely carefully chosen. For example, the deer park is taken at the end of the tree avenue and on the site line from the main house but in a position that allows the properties around Grenville Cottage to potentially obscure the view. View 4 from the Turkish Temple suggests that the mast might be hidden by the rise in the tree line, but if you were to walk around 20 ft to the left in the photo, in our opinion, the point they are arrowing might well be visible.</p> <p>There is a noticeable lack of views from the lawned area between the house (view 1), the north Tuscan Pavilion (view 3) and the Turkish Temple (view 4). There are no views whatsoever from the south side of the RPG. Even where only a small top section of the mast might be visible, it is certainly damaging to the design intention of this Grade I Registered landscape which is an acknowledged masterpiece by Capability Brown, as it will be clearly distinct from the adjoining tree line and will therefore draw the eye to it.</p> <p>The only photomontage showing the mast is from outside the RPG where the applicant accepts that the mast will be visible, but it would have been more helpful to have photomontages of views from within carried out to a recognised methodology so that we could assess the impact better.</p> <p>We recommend the Council REFUSES this application unless it is conclusively proved via a rigorous documentary appraisal that no key views will be compromised. This should be demonstrated via a full visual and historic impact assessment carried out by consultants experienced in this specialist field. This appraisal must identify all the significant views within the RPG, including from Wotton House and appraise the level of effect which will be caused for each. This will include more than those we have noted above which have been used as examples to demonstrate particular weaknesses in the methodology.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Designed Landscape of the Pearl Centre	Cambridgeshire	E19/0878	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building consent Proposed internal refurbishment and external alterations to the Pearl	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.11.2019</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</p>

				<p>Centre (including new secondary entrances and outdoor terrace), alongside landscaping changes and the installation of two smoking shelters. The Pearl Centre, Lynch Wood, Peterborough. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>above application. Thank you for allowing us an extension to comment. My colleague in the Cambridgeshire Gardens Trust (CGT) has only very recently had the opportunity to visit, and was also only give limited access, so please accept our apologies that you have been kept waiting.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and whilst we appreciate that the requirements of the current tenants of the Pearl Centre are different from when the site was originally designed and constructed, we do have concerns about the proposed changes which will affect the Grade II registered landscape. The Pearl Centre is rare example of a highly designed landscape associated with a contemporary commercial office building. Very few C20th landscapes are listed to date, so those that have been put on the Register are of particular significance. The site was listed so recently (whilst the proposed development was being designed) and is one of the 'youngest' sites on the Register, that some of the emerging plans had to be altered, as the documentation shows.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 184). It states that great weight to be given to their conservation, irrespective of the level of harm (paragraph 193). Harm should be avoided in the first instance, and any level of harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) requires clear and convincing justification (paragraph 194).</p> <p>In particular we have concerns about removing some of the original features in the entrance courtyard, especially the oriental screen and adjacent cherry tree, which will affect the character and symmetry of the space linking the Physic Garden with the entrance courtyard. The screen is of considerable importance in separating the entrance court from the Physic Garden and provides an imposing element of hard landscaping. The screen also acts to focus the eye on the route through this area from both the entrance court and the Physic Garden and vice versa. Screens are also echoed as a motif in several of the designed garden areas and architecture around the site. The loss of the cherry would also detract from the symmetry and balance of that side of the court. We note a cherry on the other side has been lost and badly needs replacing. The proposed changes represent a degree of harm to the registered park and garden requiring clear and convincing justification in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>This courtyard space was originally intended as a peaceful, contemplative</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>arrival space, but the addition of an outside seating area with its attendant noise and activity, alters the atmosphere. The new outdoor seating area would be inappropriate in the design, introducing an element of movement out of character with the original intent.</p> <p>The large signage totem which announces the new entrance is far too large and dominant, and we would recommend that consideration be given to placing it in a horizontal position which does not come up above the height of the hedge. This would signify the position of the new entrance in a perfectly visible manner, whilst being more discreet. The entrances to other business nearby vary and those that have vertical signs appear markedly out of place in what is a very green area.</p> <p>We were unable to access the areas of the suggested smokers' shelters, but would suggest the colour and form of these is examined in detail to ensure they do not intrude in areas which at present are predominantly green, even immediately adjacent to car parks. We note that the heritage statement includes what appears to be a quote from the HE Register : 'Two areas of parking provision are included within the designated area of the registered garden, and these are landscaped and screened so as to minimize the intrusion of this functional element of the grounds' structure ..' We are therefore surprised at the installation of smokers' shelters in these locations.</p> <p>We also note that alterations have already been carried out to permit a new access to the Nene Hall which involved considerable loss of the Parterre Garden, and there has also been loss of components in the Physic Garden. Should these additional alterations be permitted in their current form, in our opinion they would open the way for future incremental changes which will gradually erode the integrity and significance of the designed landscape over time.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Lismore	Cornwall	E19/1065	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application with all matters reserved for erection of dwelling. Garages, Five Wells Lane, Helston, Cornwall. RESIDENTIAL	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2019</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 Cornwall Gardens Trust (CGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p>

					<p>We have read the sparse online documentation which makes no mention that the immediately adjacent grounds of Lismore House and its walled kitchen garden are listed Grade II (RPG) as are the walls completely surrounding Lismore House's gardens. The application site is therefore very much in the setting of these designated heritage assets and any eventual structure within the building site will directly affect the RPG. We support the improvement of the site, currently overgrown and prone to flooding from the leat which runs through it, but would add the caveat that any proposed new building within this area should fit quietly into the area with careful choice of design and materials. Crucially, it should be limited in height so it does not tower over this remarkable survival of a gardenesque town garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cadhay	Devon	E19/0868	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Agricultural storage building. Land At Cadhay Lane, Ottery St Mary. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust on the revised plans for the above application which affects Cadhay, an historic designed landscape of national importance, included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed agricultural storage building would not cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset of Cadhay. We therefore do not object to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Rousdon	Devon	E19/1081	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed demolition of 2 existing workshop buildings and erection of a 3-bedroom dwelling. Land At The Paddock, Rousdon Estate, Rousdon DT7 3XR. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Rousdon, an historic designed landscape of national significance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations on its behalf in the County of Devon. We have visited Rousdon on many occasions and in respect of the previous application on this site. We have viewed the application documents on your website and ask you to consider the following comments:</p> <p>The current revised proposal is to retain the existing Bay hedge which forms the eastern boundary of the application site, 'combined with the low</p>



					<p>profile nature of the proposed dwelling, the reduction in levels to accommodate its construction.' We welcome this in principle. However, we are extremely concerned about the close proximity of the the Bay hedge to the proposed reduced level of the site.</p> <p>The sections clearly show that the reduced level of the site would be immediately adjacent to the Bay hedge, without any protection zone. This is completely unacceptable. It would result in the removal of all the roots on the inner side of the Bay hedge causing severe stress and eventual death of the Bay hedge.</p> <p>We would suggest that there should be a protection zone of at least 2.5 metres from the base of the Bay hedge before the ground levels are reduced. We would suggest that the hedge roots are suitably protected during the construction works.</p> <p>The applicant should be required to submit amended sections showing the revised siting of the proposed dwelling, the 2.5 metre protection zone adjacent to the Bay hedge and a full specification for the hedge protection methods to be employed during the construction works.</p> <p>We would also suggest that the applicant is required to enter into a S.106 agreement to ensure that the hedge is maintained in accordance with good horticultural practice in perpetuity.</p> <p>Elements such as garden sheds, conservatories, garden enclosures, clothes drying areas etc can be extremely damaging to the historic landscape and we advise that any such subsidiary development should be identified as an integral part of the planning application prior to its determination. We suggest that any further subsidiary development should not be permitted as it would not preserve or enhance the historic landscape.</p> <p>If your Council is minded to approve the application, we advise that, in view of the sensitive nature of the site, it would be appropriate to impose a condition on the planning permission to remove the permitted development rights to control subsidiary development in the future.</p> <p>We hope these comments are helpful</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>John Clark</p>
Coopersale House	Essex	E18/0646	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Grade II Listed Building Consent A new residential dwelling along with the demolition of derelict glasshouse structures and	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.11.2019</b></p> <p>Coopersale House is a grade II listed building located within a grade II registered landscape, which derives its importance partly from an association with Lancelot 'Capability' Brown. To the north of the house, at the northern extremity of the registered landscape, there is a walled</p>

				<p>alterations to the historic garden wall. Land to the rear of The Stables and The Dairy, Houblons Hill, Coopersale, Essex CM16 7QL. RESIDENTIAL, DEMOLITION, WALLED GARDEN</p>	<p>garden. The outline of the latter is shown on a 1758 plan for ‘the new kitchen garden’. Today the garden is not planted or landscaped, the only old feature being a pond, and the wall and adjoining ancillary structures are dilapidated. This application is for a new house built on the north side of the walled garden, both within and outside the garden such that a portion of the wall would be enclosed within it. The scheme is presented as enabling development which would ensure the preservation of the wall and restoration of the garden, justifying development within the Green Belt and within the registered landscape.</p> <p>The proposed design of the dwelling is carefully thought out to mitigate its impact on the heritage asset, being low, single storey with much of the accommodation and parking in a basement. However, there are serious objections to the scheme. It would be totally against Green Belt policy and would add to the on-going incremental erosion of landscape and habitat quality. The garden would become detached from both the house and the registered landscape, no longer ancillary to them, and ceasing to be legible in the wider landscape. It is easy to imagine that the focus of the development would become the house rather than the garden and historic landscape. Thus the Heritage Statement highlights the need to ‘establish a well-considered relationship between the landscape setting for the dwelling and the wider rural context’, in effect a re-ordering of the historic context. The application does not really explain what is so significant about the walled garden that it warrants enabling development. In relation to the guidance in the NPPF, it is not clear how it is sufficiently significant to create the ‘exceptional circumstances’ that might justify building in the Green Belt; nor is it clear how a restored walled garden with a £3 million house attached to it would be perceived as a public benefit outweighing any damage to the heritage asset.</p> <p>Nevertheless, there would undoubtedly be a benefit to the historic landscape if the walled garden were restored, and the landscaping associated with the development were sensitive and low key. But the application is deficient in information on how this would be done. There is no detailed description or even illustration of the fabric of the garden wall. A condition survey of the wall is referred to, but is not included with the application, nor is there any specification for its repair. That part of the wall enclosed within the house would be totally rebuilt because of the disruption caused by the basement, and this is likely to be the fate of much of the rest of it unless there were a detailed conservation plan or</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>statement. There is no indication of how the interior of the walled garden would be landscaped.</p> <p>Were satisfactory information to be provided to remedy these deficiencies, we would not oppose the application, subject to a condition requiring the wall to be restored before the house is occupied.</p> <p>David Andrews Essex Gardens Trust</p>
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E19/1155	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Re-routing and replacing most of the private lane. Cirencester College, Fosse Way Campus, Stroud Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire GL7 1XA. ROAD</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) directly regarding this proposal owing to a time constraint. GGLT is normally notified and responds to such applications on behalf of The Garden Trust, and I will inform them accordingly.</p> <p>Having read your very full Report, the Trust's primary consideration is the possible impact on the visual quality of the Grade 1 Cirencester Park. The proposal is screened from the Park by a hedge, the visual intervention is at ground level, and a suite of conditions cover the works in close proximity to the trees. On this basis, GGLT would not wish to raise any objection.</p> <p>However, the additional, and the primary objective of this Application will be to ensure the separation of vehicular traffic from pedestrians and cyclists, and this is considered to be a major step forward in achieving a necessary level highway safety.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, ( on behalf of GGLT ).</p>
Gunnersbury Cemetery Gunnersbury Park	Greater London	E19/1079	N II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of the existing warehouse and erection of 5 buildings ranging from a maximum of 10 to 16 storeys in height (with a four storey podium) to provide a mixed use development comprising of Technology Showcase (sui generis), retail space (A1/A3), leisure (D2) a total of 11,788sqm, 258 residential (C3) units (block A 83 units, block B 99 units and block C 76 units) and a 219 bedroom hotel (C1) with</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in relation to the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (LPGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>There is a long history of attempts to develop this sensitively-located site at Chiswick Roundabout where the raised section of the M4 crosses the North Circular A406. The most recent scheme was the so-called Chiswick Curve at 32 stories, and before that the 26 storey Pinnacle, as well as other earlier schemes, all of which have come to nothing for a variety of reasons. The current proposal is for a maximum height of 16 storeys with a density of proposed development which is likely to have an oppressive effect on Gunnersbury Cemetery, which lies to the north-west of the site, and is separated from the site by a railway line in a shallow tree-lined cutting. The cemetery was opened in 1929 and is managed by the Royal Borough of</p>

				<p>associated basement parking (350 spaces), amenity space, landscaping, re-arranged access and all associated works. Installation of two zones for internally illuminated advertising panels being 1) 32.5m x 17m and 2) 17m x 9.5m (Advertisement Consent). 2 LARCH DRIVE, LONDON CHISWICK W4 5QL. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>Kensington &amp; Chelsea. It is included in the LPGT inventory but not the Historic England register. However, the visual impact of this scheme will affect a much smaller compass than the previous higher schemes and crucially should not be perceptible from the Kew WHS or in the backdrop to Strand on the Green when viewed from the Surrey bank.</p> <p>The Vantage building adjacent to the south-west side of the cemetery and on the boundary of the Grade II* Gunnersbury Park is 12+ storeys high, and the flats and hotel surrounding the new Brentford football stadium to the south-west just beyond the motorway viaduct are 14-16 storeys high. Whilst the proposed development would be visible from Gunnersbury Park, in the context of the existing development south of the park, we do not consider it would be unacceptably damaging to the visual amenities of the park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
100, Cheyne Walk (part of Lindsey House)	Greater London	E19/1154	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Addition of single storey glazed conservatory/garden room at rear; reinstatement of wall and niche, part of the original garden design by Lutyens. Lindsey House, 100 Cheyne Walk, LONDON SW10 0DQ. BUILDING ALTERATION, REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2019</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 London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (LPGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and can see that a very similar structure was approved in 2000, thereby setting a still valid precedent, indicating that approval for this is extremely likely. We would however, request that your officers ensure that photographs are taken prior to building work commencing, and as soon as the works have been completed to ensure a historic record is kept – these photographs to be made publicly available free of charge through your local record office and/or deposited with the LPGT Inventory. Ideally, we would also suggest that as a condition of approval the applicants agree to open the gardens to the public occasionally, at least one afternoon or morning per year for students and others to appreciate the Lutyens designs, perhaps as part of the annual London Open Gardens Squares Weekend run by our colleagues at LPGT?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Ombersley Court	Hereford and Worcester	E19/0967	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Internal works and internal and external repairs to Ombersley Court. Proposed internal, external and landscape works to convert stables and walled garden into a visitor destination. Ombersley Court, Holt Fleet Road, Ombersley, WR9 0HH. HYBRID</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.11.2019</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 Hereford &amp; Worcestershire Gardens Trust (HWGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the online documentation and welcome the effort that is being made to honour the late Lord &amp; Lady Sandys' wishes, and to maintain the Grade I Ombersley Court as a private residence. We are also supportive of restoring and opening the walled garden and stable block for public benefit as an attraction and function area. We are also satisfied with the discreet construction and positioning of the new garages. We feel sure your officers will also bear in mind the fact that the park &amp; garden (RPG) is Grade II, the stable block Grade II*, the walled garden and glass house Grade II and the walls, gate piers and gates on the north entrance Grade II. This will be important during the decision-making process, especially when considering specific detailing within the extremely significant ensemble of heritage assets. Only 16 other places in Worcestershire enjoy the high status of registration, so decisions made here are of particular importance. Whilst the site chosen for the visitor car park is perfectly reasonable, we do have genuine concerns that even though parking numbers are based on anticipated visitor numbers, and will be adequate for residents, staff and users of the Stable Block meeting rooms, they will ultimately prove insufficient for more than a few extra people to the Visitor Attraction. Lack of parking would increase the likelihood of cars queuing on the Tenbury road because the proposed car park is full. We are also apprehensive about the unacceptably large section of the listed wall (which forms an essential part of the very grand listed Regency north access to Ombersley Court) requiring demolition to enable coach access. We would recommend that instead urgent consideration is given to finding an alternative site for a Visitor Car Park together with overflow parking, and that this is constructed before the Visitor Attraction is opened to the public. If this is not satisfactorily established now there will be very strong, and immediate pressure to clear parts of the historic garden layout and shrubberies as an emergency measure, as opposed to making suitable provision from the outset. We would not be able to support any extended car parking within the shrubberies which form part of the historic layout between the</p>
-----------------	------------------------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>entrance drive and Ombersley village.</p> <p>With regard to the new spur access drive, we support this as a sensible, indeed essential aspect of the project and would ask that your officers insist that the specified tarmac surface be treated with a gravel chip surface to soften the effect. Care should also be taken where the new drive joins the old drive. A somewhat larger curve would be more sympathetic if the topography permits. We also suggest that a Historic Building architect is employed to undertake the precise detailing of proposed alterations, in particular areas such as the new drive gateway which requires careful specification and also the sensitive access/gateway into the Walled Garden Bearing in mind the modifications and caveats above, we support this large and complex application and wish the project every success.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
South Worcestershire Development Plan	Hereford and Worcester	E19/1048	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Review of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP)	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.11.2019</b></p> <p>General</p> <p>1. We are concerned that the process of identifying suitable development sites appears not to have taken account of the visual impact of the proposed development. We would have expected a Visual Impact Assessment to have been carried out for each site. We are aware that the visual impact of development will also be addressed at a later stage when more detailed proposals have been developed for each site, however, even at this early stage such an assessment should have been carried out in order to understand the overall visual impact at each site. This is particularly true of development sites that break the horizon or are in some other way visually prominent. We feel that if this had been done, several sites may have been discounted on the basis of visual intrusion.</p> <p>2. We are disappointed that the nationally important Registered Historic Parks and Gardens do not appear on the Interactive Policies Map. If they had been shown, it would have been much easier for viewers to understand the potential impact on their setting and landscape. As it is, most people will not know, or be aware of their extent, and will therefore not be able to give an informed opinion against some of the development sites.</p> <p>New Settlement Indicative Growth Areas</p> <p>1. Rushwick. We have some concern that there is a potential risk of flooding across part of this site.</p>

					<p>New Settlement Area</p> <p>1. SWDPR49, Worcestershire Parkway. This extensive area, centred on the new Parkway station extends northwards almost to the boundary of the Registered parkland of Spetchley Park. This is a nationally significant designed park that has already been partially compromised by the M5 motorway. There is visual intrusion from moving vehicles but, more significantly the tranquillity of the park has been undermined by constant traffic noise. We are concerned that the setting of the park will be further compromised by noise and visual intrusion. We strongly recommend that the extent of the proposed area is reduced to the north and that a substantial area of heavily planted green open space is established along the northern edge to act as a buffer between the new settlement and the Registered park and its setting.</p> <p>2. Wood Hall, Wolverton Hall and Caldewell. There will be significant impact on Wood Hall which is within the new settlement area and on Caldewell and Wolverton Hall which lie adjacent to the area. These are all historic parks and gardens of local importance that should be considered for protection in future development plans. The settings of and views from these locally important sites should equally be addressed.</p> <p>Proposed New Significant Gap</p> <p>1. A new Significant Gap is proposed, centred on Littleworth, to protect villages and countryside from further encroachment from the proposed new Parkway settlement. We are concerned that this designation is not robust enough to prevent future development across this area. Similarly designated open countryside along the eastern edge of Warndon has been developed in many areas to the detriment of this part of Worcester. This designation would seem easy to overturn. We strongly recommend that this area should be designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>Housing and Employment Sites</p> <p>1. SWDP58c, Ryall. We are concerned that there is the potential for flooding on this site. We are also concerned that, without a Visual Impact Assessment, the visual impact of housing has not been addressed. We feel that development on this site could be visually intrusive.</p> <p>2. CFS0407sc, Sherrards Green. This is a large area proposed for housing very close to Moat Court. We object to this area on the grounds of its high visibility, the loss of valuable green open space, the significant impact on the local landscape character and the adverse visual impact on the eastern edge of Malvern. It is particularly worrying that a Visual Impact Assessment</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>has not been carried out for this site. The land has been previously considered for development and rejected on the basis of visual intrusion and the impact on views from the AONB. It is not a site that should be considered for development.</p> <p>3. CFS1097a, Proposed New Employment Allocation. We object to this proposed development on the grounds of significant adverse visual impact, loss of landscape character and detrimental impact on the setting of the eastern boundary of Malvern. Development here would be highly visually intrusive and encroach on the setting of the village of Madresfield and on the national significant Registered Madresfield Park.</p> <p>4. CFS0117 &amp; CFS0652, Proposed New Employment Allocations. These employment development sites are sited within and adjoining Blackmore Park, an 18th/19th century park of local importance. The western setting of the park, as well as some of the parkland itself will be destroyed by development here. We recommend that this area is reviewed.</p>
Holme Lacy	Hereford and Worcester	E19/1056	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed dwelling. Grounds of Wilsley House, Holme Lacy, Herefordshire HR2 6LU.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.2019</b></p> <p>I am writing again on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust who have asked me to reiterate the contents of my letter of 22nd February 2016.</p> <p>The HWGT believes it would be a mistake to build a small dwelling between Wilsley House and the registered parkland of Holme Lacy House albeit half hidden by a mature hedge. The first action of any tenant/owner will be to open up the view into the park, which would severely compromise the view from within the parkland, which has hitherto embraced the period setting of Wilsley house and its attractive policies.</p> <p>History: Pound Farm, with Wilsley House, was the subject of a historical assessment by the present writer in March 2005, commissioned by Trevor Hewett, Architects, Hereford. In summary this study demonstrated the close association of Pound Farm and Wilsley House with the Holme Lacy mansion, especially with the creation of a new north drive to the mansion in c.1830. Hitherto the approach to the mansion had been from the west. The new owner of the mansion subsequent to the death of Frances Scudamore – ‘the mad duchess’ - in 1820, was Sir Francis Stanhope Scudamore. He turned the house round and demolished the late 17th century stable block that stood to the NW of the present house and created a new stable courtyard at Pound Farm. Wilsley House was refurbished as accommodation for the land agent for the estate. It was fitted up with period features, such as panelling and a staircase, taken from</p>



					<p>the main house. The new stables with a Greek revival arcade were designed by William Atkinson, a pupil of James Wyatt and a prolific Regency architect with a large country house practice viz. Garnons, Hampton Court, Harewood House and The Mynde in Herefordshire. He also designed the lodge that adjoins Wilsley House and probably rebuilt the listed dovecote. This ensemble formed the middle ground in the principal view from the north front of the great house – as it does today. The setting was enhanced by careful planting in the foreground of the park and with spacious lawns on the east front of Wilsley House, planted with cedars to provide an elegant approach to the mansion.</p> <p>On several counts this application will have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the premier country house in Herefordshire:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new house and intensified use of Wilsley House with have a significant adverse impact upon the setting of a II* listed building and a II* registered historic park and garden. The new house would create a poor impression for the many visitors who come to stay at the hotel. Several reception rooms and bedrooms would look directly at the new development across a stretch of the park, which was replanted by the College in c.1990.</li> <li>2. In 1785 on John Harris's Map of the Pound Estate (British Library) Wilsley House has a formal garden with quartered beds on its north flank. Until recently this was cultivated as a productive garden by students at the College. This is very much an appurtenance of the Holme Lacy estate and the new house being proposed on part of the garden would impinge upon the north prospect from the mansion.</li> <li>3. In 1909 a sale catalogue describes the Greek revival stables at Pound Farm as 'The stone-built and tiled stabling situate at the Home Farm (this had always been an alternative name for Pound Farm), is formed on three sides of a large square yard, and comprises five stalls, four loose boxes, two spacious coach houses, harness room and groom's cottage' (HRO, M5/39/117). Before the 20thc and its many recent additions Pound Farm was an important appurtenance of the reconstructed Holme Lacy House. Its character is very reminiscent of the model farms being erected elsewhere on gentry-estates in this period (Susanne Wade Martins, <i>The English Model Farm</i> (2002), p.142. William Atkinson was a specialist in rural buildings and built a new stable block at Garnons in Herefordshire. His essay in Greek revival at Holme Lacy was probably the most impressive because of its prominent position within the purview of the great house.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The Greek revival stables should be listed.</p> <p>The new house is out of place and should be dismissed because of its impact upon a listed house and a registered park and garden.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>David Whitehead on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust</p>
East Herts Open Space, Sport and Recreation SPD	Hertfords hire	E19/0909	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Open Space, Sport and Recreation SPD Consultation Draft 2019 available for view and comment	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2019</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTION</b></p> <p>As statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, consider that this list of NPPF policies should include policies where sports and recreation facilities affect historic landscapes. NPPF, Section 16, has policies regarding harm to, or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset (194). provision of infrastructure can cause such harm within a designed landscape. This needs to be highlighted in this document as many of the developments proposed in the Local Plan affect historic parks and gardens or their setting, and therefore their significance, contrary to NPPF Section 16.</p> <p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <p>We support the provision of facilities in principle as outlined in this document. However, many of the developments proposed in the recently adopted Local Plan affect historic parks and gardens or their settings, including those designated by Historic England or on the EHDC Local List. This includes developments adjacent to historic parks where it would be reasonable to expect new residents to use the historic park as green space for informal recreation. The extra pressure that this places on the historic fabric of such parklands should be included in any calculations and be eligible from CIL or S106 contributions from neighbouring developments.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
34 Coneydale, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E19/0980	-	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of amenity land adjacent Sui Generis, to residential land C3 in association with the enlargement of the front driveway. 34 Coneydale, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7RZ. CHANGE OF USE, ACCESS/GATES	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is member. We have seen no justification for the loss of this amenity verge, one of the key design ideas of Raymond Unwin used in the Garden Cities. We note that other residents have extended the parking area within the front garden without having to lose some of the amenity verge and are unclear as to why this needs to be done at this property.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Link Drive Car Park, Hatfield	Hertfords hire	E19/1043	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a 6 x storey building	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.</p>

				comprising of 80 x flats, associated works to include undercroft car parking, cycle parking, plant and refuse storage. Link Drive Car Park, Link Drive, Hatfield AL10 8TY. RESIDENTIAL	The New Town plan for Hatfield, as for other new towns, promoted low level buildings. Several very tall buildings have already been built in Hatfield compromising historic views from a wide area around. At present, this area of Hatfield with lawns and trees on both sides of the road, offers the contrast between the residential areas and the town centre retail areas. The parking it provides could be better screened to reduce impact on the landscape but this is a minor detail. Buildings as proposed would completely destroy the legibility of the new town idea and the green areas which are so typical and essential in separating areas into discrete units, a key tenet of the new town aesthetic Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
8 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E19/1113	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Silver Birch, Fell 1 x Weeping Ash. 8 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JX. TREES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. There is insufficient information within this application on the condition of the trees or other matters for us to be able to comment. Kate Harwood
Balls Park	Hertfords hire	E19/1161	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey rear extension. 20 Willis Grove, Balls Park, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG13 8FH. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We objected to a former proposal (3/19/1370/HH): Balls Park is an important early 18th century landscape, registered at Grade II on the HE Register, and part of the setting for the Grade I listed Balls Park Mansion. Willis Grove is situated in the former walled gardens, whose listed walls, piers and finials form the western edges of this development. We are disappointed that no Heritage Statement has been supplied which acknowledges the impact the proposal would have on the landscape. We consider that the proposed extension does not respond sympathetically to the Registered landscape or the setting of the Listed walls. We OBJECT to this proposal on the same grounds. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning
Primrose Cottage, Hatfield	Hertfords hire	E19/1172	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of three dwellings and formation of new access following demolition of existing dwelling and buildings. Primrose Cottage, Kentish Lane, Brookmans Park, Hatfield AL9 6EE. DEMOLITION,	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. Primrose Cottage lies adjacent to Woodhill House and Farm AAS48, with the potential for archaeological remains both from the farm and from the Humphry Repton layout of the park as illustrated and mapped in his Red Book of 1803. The estate map of 1820 shows this park laid out and a building roughly where Primrose Cottage now stands.

				RESIDENTIAL	<p>We are further concerned about the number of properties suggested for this relatively small site set in a rural area which has a low density of housing and which does not fall within an area designated for housing either in the current or emerging Local Plans.</p> <p>We would suggest that fewer houses be proposed for this site and that if planning permission is granted, an archaeological watching brief be required for traces of the Repton landscape and estate building."</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Caddington Hall	Hertfords hire	E19/1189	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of former residential care home and 2 detached dwellings. Construction of 3 storey building forming 44 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</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2019</b></p> <p>HGT, a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, objected to the previous version of this proposal on 20 September 2019.</p> <p>Our objections to the proposal have not been addressed , i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no assessment of the impact of a building for this size on the wider landscape including the Grade II Registered parkland of Markyate Call</li> <li>2. The walled garden should be restored to a garden use, and not used for storage which should be accommodated within the main building</li> <li>3. The setting of the walled garden is harmed by not only the external storage units but ill-screened parking adjacent to it.</li> <li>4. The footprint of the proposed building is much larger than the original Caddington Hall and the illustrations on page 9 of the Design and Access statement are totally misleading in showing historic buildings not at all similar to either the original hall or the proposed building.</li> </ol> <p>We OBJECT to this this application not only on the harm this would cause the historic parkland and walled garden but on the ill-advised disposition of of parking and storage units with insufficient screening and lack of consideration of the historic approach required.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Gaddesden Place	Hertfords hire	E19/1190	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey detached annex building. Gaddesden Place, RDA Centre Bridens Camp, Bridens Camp, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire HP2 6EX. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2019</b></p> <p>HGT is a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>We note that Gaddesden Place is a Locally Listed historic parkland and also within the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>The NPPF requires clear and convincing justification (194) for harm to a designated heritage asset. Although this is not required for locally designated sites, we would expect to have seen more details as to why this</p>

					<p>building is required, given the large size of the main building. If this annex is required as part of the RDA facility and the purpose cannot be accommodated within the main building then we would consider that the harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E19/1202	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Garage conversion to habitable accommodation and alterations to openings. 44 Azalea Close, London Colney, Hertfordshire AL2 1Ua. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are disappointed that the heritage section of the design and access statement does not mention that this site is a Registered landscape. However, we have no objection to the proposed changes as described in the application documents.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Hever Castle	Kent	E19/1077	I	PLANNING APPLICATION To establish a 3-year temporary permission for the mobile home to be used by the employees of Hever Castle Golf Club Ltd, in order to assist with fulfilling the proper performance of their duties. Mobile home dimensions: 3.66 metres X 11.3 meters. Hever Castle Golf, Club Ltd. Hever Castle Golf Club, Hever Road, Hever, KENT TN8 7NP. GOLF	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.11.2019</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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>This application is seeking retrospective permission for three years for a mobile home which has already been in the Hever Golf Club work compound since 2015. In our opinion, should permission be granted, a condition be should be attached in order that the mobile home site is not upgraded in future to become a permanent residence, thereby setting a precedent.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Redleaf	Kent	E19/1162	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of detached garage and replacement open-air swimming pool. Redleaf, Penshurst Road, Penshurst, KENT TN11 8HY. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, SPORT/LEISURE	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2019</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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The GT/KGT have reservations on this application. Planning permission was</p>

					<p>given earlier this year (SE/19/1032) for a replacement dwelling which is located in the Green Belt and within the Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Redleaf (house now demolished). Replacement dwellings in the Green Belt have to meet certain criteria, one of which is that the replacement dwelling should not be more than 50% larger than the building it replaces. The officer's report for the new building demonstrated that an increase of 49.82% of floorspace meant that it complied in this respect. Page 9 of the officer's report states 'Any grant of planning permission would ensure that permitted development rights would be removed for other building and enclosures (our emphasis) so that there is no harm to the Green Belt, AONB and the character of the area as a result of any further residential development.'</p> <p>This application SE/19/02056 is seeking permission for a double garage and a large replacement swimming pool, approximately four times the size of an existing swimming pool due to be replaced. During the application process the garage has been reduced from a triple to a double garage but no building structures associated with the swimming pool are shown.</p> <p>This application seeks to overturn one of the conditions of the previous application on this site, that is to prevent further development.</p> <p>It is difficult to comprehend why the application SE/1032 did not include for the provision of a garage for such a large house, although it would have meant a reduction in the house area to comply with the requirements of the Green Belt. It would suggest that this has been done to push the planning restrictions to the limit.</p> <p>We welcome KCC's request for an archaeological condition to be attached. It is our view that the existing tennis courts, the enlarged swimming pool and the new garage form disparate features, spread as they are, over a large area of the curtilage. Taken together they are intrusive and constitute unwelcome development in the Green Belt, AONB and part of the RPG and consequently we object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Marston House	Somerset	E17/1066	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restoration of 114 Acres of Grade II listed Park and Garden including Marston Pond, Thickthorn Wood, Orrery Wood,</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) again about further amendments to the above proposal. The applicants have been given ample opportunity to repeatedly amend their scheme. Despite these revisions, our opinion remains unchanged : we strongly OBJECT to the proposals to</p>

				<p>the Keeper's Cottage and Boat House with enabling development to include 20 Lodges, Hub and Reception buildings. Change of land use from agricultural to Hotel, Leisure and Recreation. Marston Pond, Thickthorn Wood And Horley Wood, Tuckmarsh Lane, Marston Bigot BA11 5BY. HYBRID</p>	<p>turn the Registered Parkland at Marston into a holiday village. Tinkering with the detail of individual proposed structures/pathways and additional tree planting, does not mitigate the resultant harm to any significant degree, or alter the fact that the entire character and setting of this historic designed landscape would be fundamentally changed forever. We are therefore not going to comment in detail on individual alterations to structures such as the Hub, the Keeper's Cottage, the Boathouse or paths, as the overriding principle of unsuitable development still applies. The two-year-old survey of the Boathouse advised urgent repairs to prop up the unsupported 1st floor fireplace and removal of the deleterious vegetation. Nothing has happened. Disregard of this essential advice does not give us confidence in the applicant's commitment towards the heritage at Marston or bode well for its future care.</p> <p>We reiterate our previous comments that the harmful impacts include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the physical presence of a holiday village in the middle of the designed landscape adjacent to a lake which acts as the principal eyecatcher/destination from Marston House (the heart of the Gilpin Picturesque landscape and the major vista from the elevated position of the house);</li> <li>- lighting from the lodges set within predominantly deciduous woodland (with the implications of increased visibility in the winter months);</li> <li>- elevated lighting from the 'tree house' lodges.</li> <li>- Marston House has always looked out over its (unlit) park to a largely unpeopled, undeveloped 'borrowed view'. At night, the middle ground landscape, essentially the area for the proposed scheme around the lake, will become illuminated and destroy the sense of being in an almost untouched rural landscape, compromising the integrity of the Gilpin landscape.</li> <li>- However well designed the proposals are, it does not address the fundamental question of 'why here?'</li> </ul> <p>The senselessness of the scheme and its resultant needless damage is exacerbated, because as mentioned in our letter of 7th August 2019, the Sandersons of Marston House have repeatedly offered to purchase the site at above market value. Grants would be available for the majority of the woodland, thereby removing at one stroke the need for any development at all within the centre of the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>We urge your officers to continue to recommend refusal of this extremely damaging application.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung
Babington House	Somerset	E19/1184	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Alteration to the back of house services spaces, and internal renovations to the bathrooms for the main house on Babington Estate. Babington House, Vobster Cross To Hatchet Hill, Babington, Frome BA11 3RW. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and studied the online documentation. The proposed works seem fairly incidental so we have no particular concerns. However, we do particularly wish to congratulate the applicant on an especially good Heritage Statement which we will use to inform further studies. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Boston Park, Rotherham	South Yorkshire	E19/1026	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Part demolition of existing reservoir and construction of 1 No. single cell & 1 No. twin compartment service reservoir at YWS Boston Park Service Reservoirs, Boston Castle Grove, Moorgate. ENERY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.11.2019</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & 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, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. This planning application affects an area within the north eastern boundary of grade II registered Boston Park and immediately outside the park's boundary to the south east. To the north and north west of Boston Park is the grade II registered Victorian Moorgate Cemetery which is partially located within Moorgate Conservation Area. Boston Park was the first public park in Rotherham and was laid out in the 1870's over a former sandstone quarry, associated with Boston Castle, (listed grade II), a shooting lodge which occupies a prominent position on an escarpment overlooking the Don and Rother valleys. Recent research indicates that Thomas, third Earl of Effingham and ninth Baron Howard began building 'Boston Castle' on 2nd December 1773 as a shooting box and for much of the first half of 1774 'Boston Castle' is referred to as 'the House upon the Common.' The earliest definitive use of 'Boston Castle' as the permanent name of the building is on a receipt dated 29 July 1774, clearly displaying the Earl's sentiments towards the situation in America - very much opposed to the War in America. See note below.



					<p>Boston Park is formed of three terraces and includes specimen trees, a formal garden, a sunken garden or 'dell', quarry garden, an arch or doorway (listed grade II) set into the rock face relocated in 1879 from the demolition of the former College of Jesus in Rotherham, a crown bowling green and land for informal recreation. A further significant feature of Boston Park are the fine views. From the Castle and car park panoramic views extend north towards Wentworth Woodhouse and Barnsley (across Moorgate Cemetery), west towards Sheffield and the moors of the Peak District, and south towards north-east Derbyshire.</p> <p>This is a well - documented application and we are pleased that Yorkshire Water has been meeting with the Friends of Boston Castle and Parklands (including Moorgate Cemetery). We were not aware of the earlier plan to build the reservoirs in the north-eastern field within the registered boundary where there is a covenant dated 1902. We understand that the Friends knowledge and their objection has been a factor in this revision which will result in a much more sympathetic outcome. Currently there are two existing service reservoirs outside the registered boundary to the south-east which are proposed for demolition. The new proposed service reservoir structures are of a similar design and height to the existing structures. During construction work the area within the registered boundary will be a temporary construction compound. This would result in a temporary impact to the registered historic park, the listed structures and the historic character of the conservation area. However, as the land is proposed to be reinstated there would be no permanent impact. We agree with the Heritage Impact Assessment that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets in the vicinity, with the majority of Boston Park not affected by the proposal, and with the functional open parkland character of the area retained once construction is complete.</p> <p>We note that ten trees and self- sown groups are to be felled and twenty-four trees pruned but we are unsure regarding proposals for any replanting and suggest that the advice of the Friends and your authority's conservation officer is sought.</p> <p>With the potential for archaeological remains we are pleased that a programme of evaluation trenching has been agreed with South Yorkshire Archaeology Service and will be carried out prior to the commencement of construction.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>planning application but trust that the work and reinstatement will be carefully executed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E19/1136	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Submission of Details (Reserved Matters Application for Landscaping, Layout, Scale and Appearance to be considered) under Outline Planning Permission DC/17/04052. Land North Of Waldingfield Road, Sudbury. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2019</b></p> <p>Despite the Gardens Trust having submitted letters to you personally, and also your officers, regarding applications affecting the Registered Park and Garden at Chilton Hall, we were surprised and disappointed that Babergh failed to notify us of another application DC/19/04650 relating to reserved matters for the Orchard Site across the road. This was brought to our attention by a member of the public. For the record, we would like to state that your officers also failed to notify us directly about the original application DC/17/04052 for outline consent on this site which we last responded to on 12th June 2018. We have not received any amendments or communications from Babergh since then. The Gardens Trust is a statutory consultee for all grades of registered parks and gardens and as such your officers have a statutory duty to consult us. We require considerable time to consider this complicated application would be grateful if you could grant us 21 days from today to respond appropriately. We will respond sooner if that is possible.</p> <p>Best wishes, Margie Hoffung</p> <p><b>TGT CORRESPONDENCE WITH HE 30.11.2019</b></p> <p>Despite having responded three times to the original outline consent for this site (see attached), Babergh failed to notify us of the above application, and I was only made aware of it a few days ago. I am in the process of reading the documentation. I have not yet managed to go through everything but did read your letter on the planning portal. Since you wrote, I was not sure if you were aware that the developer has obtained consent to create a full 2nd vehicle access road for the duration of the construction further north immediately adjoining Chilton Priory with visibility splays, entrance gates and the associated removal of all hedgerow, trees and planting. This will clearly have a long-lasting adverse impact on the heritage assets at Chilton Hall across the road including the RPG and the rural character and landscape of Waldingfield Road. Replacement trees/hedgerow etc will take a long time to grow to form a</p>

					<p>proper barrier. There was no indication of this in the outline planning permission and it has been hard to find documents submitted for the approval and discharge of conditions. Details were tucked away in a drawing called 'Site Welfare Plan' submitted to the planning officer to seek approval for the Construction Management Plan under Condition 31. The drawing is not clear on dimensions, details of landscaping and boundary hedgerow removal etc. The construction vehicles/equipment/parking and other deliveries etc are all to be located on the area allocated to 'Orchard' in the document appendix EDP3 Landscape Strategy and the access route (or Haul Route) goes along what was a pedestrian footpath. The hedgerow here has apparently already been removed, and the compaction that the construction equipment etc will cause, is definitely detrimental to the establishment of any future orchard etc. It would seem likely that as the houses are being built, prospective purchasers will be directed in and out along this 2nd access to park on what should have been undamaged land, rather than parking on land due to be built on.</p> <p>I will be drafting my response over the next week but am emailing as it seemed clear from your letter that you were unaware of this 2nd access and might like to add further comments to the LPA.</p> <p>With best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E19/0945	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed alterations and improvements to the Warwick Boat Club, to include: demolition of 1no. squash court and part of existing club house, and replace with two storey extension; provision of an additional tennis court with floodlighting; demolition of existing boathouse sheds and replacement with enlarged boathouse; construction of 2no. additional squash courts; replacement of 4no. rink bowls green with 6no. rink</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.11.2019</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documents and it is clear that Warwick Boat Club has almost completely outgrown its premises. As you are aware, the boundary of the Grade I Warwick Castle Park and Garden registration includes the river Avon up to Castle Bridge, reflecting the conscious design of this view. The boat club is therefore an important element in the setting of both Castle and park.</p> <p>Much damage has already been caused to the setting of Warwick Castle by the club's continued growth, in particular by the extremely intrusive lighting erected for the tennis courts. Just because the setting is already</p>

				<p>synthetic bowls green with floodlights; removal of trees and proposed replacement planting along Banbury Road frontage; remodelling of Banbury Road access, turning and parking area; installation of solar PV panels to roof of clubhouse extension. Warwick Boat Club, 33 Mill Street, Warwick CV34 4HB.</p> <p>SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>damaged is no reason to further harm this important element in the world-famous view from both the ridge and that part of the park adjacent to the old bridge. The club's site also impacts on the settings of the Mill street and Bridge End houses. 'The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.' (The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views).</p> <p>The new squash courts give us great concern. While the objective of installing PV panels is admirable, the resultant roof line is an aggressive and incongruous element in the landscape. We would have liked to have seen a photomontage of what the new structure would look like from across the river as it is likely that the new extension to the Club House will be very visible from this point. Any further lighting for the various courts, both bowls and tennis, will only add to the already significant adverse effects. Despite the HIA stating that dense vegetation shields the new building from Castle Bridge, when crossing the bridge at night the illuminations from the tennis courts light up the area as if it were a fairground. We would strongly urge your officers to impose a ban on lighting after 9pm. In our opinion, the club should be exploring ways to expand their activities on other sites locally, rather than exacerbate the problems already suffered by residents of Mill Street. The Planning, Design and Access statement says there has been liaison with local residents resulting in the Club's 'Vision Values and Strategy' document which has been endorsed by all four sports sections of the Club (1.5) but notably not by the neighbours, or this would have been mentioned.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Warwickshire Gardens Trust OBJECTS to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Blackdown Park	West Sussex	E19/1051	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New access track from Fernden Lane for commercial vehicle use. Blackdown Park Fernden Lane. Lurgashall West Sussex.</p> <p>ACCESS/GATES, ROAD</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.11.2019</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and should be consulted directly on this application. However, thank you for notifying the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT). Representatives of SGT have studied the documents submitted with the application and our comments are shown below.</p>

					<p>The site lies within Blackdown Park which is included with a Grade II designation on the register of Historic Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England; as such the applicant is required to describe the significance of Blackdown Park (NPPF, para 189) and assess whether the proposals will result in harm to that significance. At paragraph 7.6 of the Planning Statement, the application concludes that “The effect of the development on the significance of the heritage asset is, therefore, considered to be neutral, if not slightly enhancing”.</p> <p>SGT agrees that burying the overhead power cables would enhance the significance of the park. This part of the application is welcomed.</p> <p>However, SGT considers the construction a new paved track across the park would have an adverse effect on its significance. By introducing additional hard landscaping, the new track would have a harmful effect on views from the nearby footpaths across this part of the parkland and on glimpsed views from Fernden Lane across the meadow to the vale below. SGT does not find the assessment of benefits convincing. The main argument put forward for a new access road is a safety case related to commercial vehicle movements. However, data included at para 3.3 of the Addendum to Planning Statement shows quantified average daily traffic movements of just 6 vehicles per day. Movements connected to the two vineyards and building contractors would be additional to these, but they are not quantified at all (see below). TABLE</p> <p>The Planning Statement explains that parts of the existing track are in a poor state of repair but the simple alternative of repairing this track does not appear to have been considered.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>SGT welcomes proposals to bury the power lines. However, the new track would cause visual harm to significance of the heritage asset; moreover, the very low levels of traffic movements quantified in the application documents do not provide an adequate justification. The simple alternative of repairing the existing track would probably provide similar benefits without causing harm. For these reasons SGT objects to the application being approved in its present form.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Harewood House	West	E19/1045	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.11.2019</b>

	Yorkshire			Building Application to remove existing window to western elevation and replace with PPC aluminium louvre; new internal opening and alterations to existing internal opening. The Hovels, Weardley Lane, Harewood. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; 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, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The site currently known as The Hovels lies within the Grade I Registered Park and Garden surrounding Harewood House and thus lies within a landscape considered to be of international importance. In January 2019 we commented on the planning application for this site 18/07108/FU and we have no further comments to add. We trust that your authority's conservation officer will be advising on this current application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Shibden Hall	West Yorkshire	E19/1063	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of CCTV, security gates, smoke detection system, two internal doors and Isothermal glazing to window on front elevation(Listed Building Consent). Shibden Hall House, Shibden Park, Godley Lane, Halifax, Calderdale HX3 6XG. MISCELLANEOUS	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2019</b></p> <p>cThank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; 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, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Shibden Hall House is a 15th Century and later manor house and is listed grade II*. The landscape park is grade II on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens and was laid out for the owner Jeremy Lister in the 1830's when the estate was managed by his daughter Anne Lister. She employed the architect John Harper of York to remodel the Hall and provide proposals for structural works in the grounds which were implemented by William Gray of York who also worked at Clumber Park.</p> <p>Shibden Hall House is an important building worthy of great care and we trust that Historic England has been consulted for their advice. We have no further comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>

					Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trus
Harewood House	West Yorkshire	E19/1091	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Partial demolition and re-building of Forge House including single storey extension to form offices (B1). Former Blacksmiths Workshop, Harewood Estate, Harrogate Road. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2019</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Harewood House is registered grade I. 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>Harewood House (listed grade I) was designed by John Carr for Edwin Lascelles in 1759. Home Farm lies to the west of the House and within the registered area. The former Blacksmiths Workshop, known as Forge House, (listed grade II), lies within the eastern section of the Home Farm at Stank, and was also designed by John Carr and in the style of a courtyard farmstead c. 1760.</p> <p>This estate yard is considered to be significant "because it was one of the first of its kind in a country house estate, illustrating not only architectural innovation but also a progressive attitude to the estate workforce". (Tatioglu, T. G., 2010.)</p> <p>The adjacent courtyard/quadrangle farmstead to the north-west, designed by Peter Atkinson in the style of John Carr, was a later addition of c.1805. John Jewell in 1819, described the "menagerie, farm-yard, workshops for the different artizans and a variety of other offices" as "forming altogether an elegant little village". In Country Life, 28th June 1979, in an article entitled In Pursuit of Excellence, John Martin Robinson, an authority on Georgian Model Farms, described Stank as "one of the most extensive survivals of its type in England".</p> <p>We have not noted this assessment of the significance of Stank including the subject of this proposal, Forge House, in the planning documents, nor a reference to the grade I registered park and garden or to setting and potential impact.</p> <p>Stank and its associated buildings are features within the grade I registered park and garden and therefore within a historic designed landscape considered to be of international importance. The approach from Weardley by way of Lady Bridge, also designed by John Carr c.1770, was constructed to be an element of the designed landscape by Lancelot (Capability) Brown and others. It continued past the Menagerie and then</p>

					<p>Home Farm, as today, with the architecturally decorative "Tower"/Granary just to the west of Forge-House, a principal feature.</p> <p>Forge House is clearly in a very poor state of repair and we would like to support sympathetic proposals that would ensure its repair and long-term use and we note that as much as possible of the existing fabric of the building is to be preserved and put back as part of the rebuilding exercise. However, we do have some reservations about this proposal to partially take down the building, rebuild and add a contemporary extension to the north with a change of use to office B1 accommodation:</p> <p>The new opening onto the main access road immediately to the south of Forge House will change the appearance of the historic building and we are unsure as to what this area for bikes and bins will actually look like. The site of this new opening bounds the historic approach to Harewood House. It will be prominent and detrimental to the designed views and especially of the "Tower" and the attached archway entrance to Forge House.</p> <p>We also have concerns about the proposed new extension, which is said to replace a former "profile sheet and timber building", which abutted Forge House on the north façade. Map evidence indicates that this former building dates from sometime in the mid C20, as it appears for the first time on the 1:10,560 OS map, published 1968, but not on earlier maps, as seen on the National Library of Scotland website. It appears to have had no historic significance and its demolition has enabled the John Carr buildings in this courtyard to be seen as intended. This 1968 map also appears to indicate that this C20 building was significantly smaller than the proposed new extension, its width being similar to that of the original Forge building, and its western wall an extension of the western wall of the Forge building. We understand that the design of the new extension is to be decidedly 21st Century, and we have no objection to an addition being very contemporary in style as long as proportion, footprint, mass, materials, etc are in keeping. The John Carr model farm buildings are a significant survival. We are not convinced that the new extension as proposed will not cause harm to the overall setting and to the significance of the imposing "Tower" building, especially as it would be clearly visible from the historic route immediately to the south.</p> <p>We have not seen a detailed landscaping plan as part of this application. The choice of hard landscaping materials is important when changes are being considered for what is essentially a significant 18th Century landscape and we recommend the advice of your authority's conservation</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>officer.</p> <p>In summary, we have underlined what we consider are the salient points and have included references below. We are not convinced that this application meets the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p> <p>cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p> <p>REF: Tatioglu, T. G., 2010, PhD Thesis, Biographies of People and Place: The Harewood Estate, 1698-1813, University of York.</p> <p>John Jewell, The Tourists's Companion or the History and Antiquities of Harewood, 1819.</p> <p>John Martin Robinson, Country Life, In Pursuit of Excellence, 28th June 1979.</p> <p>Brian Wragg, The Life and Works of John Carr of York, Oblong, York, 2000 p156 'The stewards annual accounts record work in progress on the substantial farm buildings and estate workshops in the 1760's with references to the hog sties, slaughter house, duck house and tower.'</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--