



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES DECEMBER 2019

The GT conservation team received 117 new cases in England and two 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, 54 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
Tracy Park	Avon	E19/1192	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of an extension to green keepers building (Class D2), creation of hardstanding, aggregate bays, erection of 1 no. building to form staff room with overnight accommodation and associated works. Greenkeepers Cabin, Park Hotel And Resort, Bath Road, Wick, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS30 5RN. GOLF	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2019</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 near to the Grade II listed Walled Garden, which was recorded, in September 1984, to be in poor condition.</p> <p>As the application proposes to add to the current 377 sq.m. a further 586 sq.m., and that the activity within this site will involve the movement of heavy machinery on a daily basis, we would like to see a survey of the 3.5m high walls of the former kitchen garden, with a plan to restore the wall to a good condition, and one that could withstand the construction and daily use of the new buildings, as a condition of planning approval.</p>

					<p>We are satisfied that the new development will be screened by significant tree and hedge planting from the historic setting of Tracy Park. 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. However we would like to see that the restoration of walls of the kitchen garden be made a condition of planning permission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Kelston Park	Avon	E19/1257	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Internal and external alterations for the change of use of Kelston Park House (grade II* listed) and associated buildings from B1(a) office use to hotel, restaurant, bar and events venue, and associated works to the buildings and landscape. Listed Building Consent - "Internal and external works of alteration and repair to the mansion house, coach house, stable and link ranges in association with the proposed change of use to hotel, restaurant, bar and events venue, including removal and replacement of 1990s infill courtyard extension, new plant at roof level, minor extension to 'Piggeries' building, erection of glasshouse within walled garden; repairs and remedial works to all buildings and structures as set out in detail in the Repairs Schedule of Works submitted".</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.12.2019</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* registered park and garden. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust note that the scheme would include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal access to the wider park for hotel guests, and additional tree planting, based on recommendations in a 1994 report which was prepared with assistance from the Countryside Commission's Countryside Stewardship Scheme. • Reducing the extent and visual impact of the asphalt drive, turning and parking area immediately north of the house, closer to the historic footprint, using local self-binding gravel. • Reducing the extent and area of the current office use car parking, reinstating some elements of the historic character to the service yard south of the walled garden, including wall-trained fruit trees. • Repairing the historic fabric of the vacant walled garden, bringing the garden back into productive and ornamental use, layout to be as originally intended with paths and a dipping pond, orchard, vegetable garden and flower and ornamental borders, including the restoration of the ornamental walk path link to the south terrace and erection of a greenhouse on the historic footprint of the original. • Restoration of the ha-ha. • Improving the presentation and accessibility of the terrace by the

				Kelston Park, Kelston Road, Kelston, Bath BA1 9AE. HYBRID	restoration of a wider self-binding buff gravel surface. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers that the proposed scheme has been sensitively designed and therefore supports this proposal. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Aldermaston Court	Berkshire	E19/0486	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Conversion of Manor House and Portland House to residential use, the construction of extensions to Level 4 of Portland House and the construction of two pavilions for residential use adjacent to Portland House to form a total of 229 residential apartments. Demolition of Oxford House and the cricket pavilion and improvements to the Registered Park and Garden. Associated works for car parking, landscaping and drainage. The Manor House Hotel and Conference Centre, Aldermaston Park, Aldermaston, Reading. RESIDENTIAL, BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2019 Holding response from Berkshire Gardens Trust: wireframes Thank you again for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) further 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. Aldermaston Park is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden containing a number of listed buildings and structures. The Registered Park therefore forms the setting to these heritage assets as well as being of historic importance in its own right. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire. BGT notes the applicant has now submitted a group of wireframe montages to illustrate the effect of the mass and scale of the extant permitted development compared to that proposed in the current application. We thank them for this information but also understand that the applicant is proposing to submit revised designs early in 2020 which may alter the configuration of the wireframes. The wireframes produced in October 2019 show a direct comparison (for Rev D) on pages 17 to 22. Although the montages suggest that the new buildings (in white) will appear lower than the existing extant approval (in beige), the horizontal extent is much increased, substantially increasing the perception of the mass and scale of the modern additions to the parkland in all the views illustrated. The effect of the proposed new development on the public views in the approach to the parkland in views F and G is particularly overbearing, especially detracting from the parkland approach. In all views, the proposed shape of the buildings increases the impact of the mass and scale and jars with the form of Portland House which, by comparison, blends more effectively into parkland landscape; as would the extant approved scheme. As expressed before in August 2019, we are concerned that the proposed

					<p>development should not result in any greater harm to the Registered Park and Garden or the parkland setting to the historic built assets than would have arisen if the approved scheme had been built.</p> <p>We also reiterate our request that we would like to see the proposals for the site in their entirety, including the proposals for the Pleasure Gardens and lodges and their curtilages; and the details of the proposed parkland restoration and management scheme, in addition to the landscape strategy; to ensure that the enabling development does properly provide for the appropriate conservation and enhancement of the parkland.</p> <p>We look forward to being further consulted when the revised scheme and above information is received by West Berkshire Council.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Planning Advisor. cc: The Gardens Trust</p>
Park Place and Temple Coombe	Berkshire	E19/1040	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning application for the proposed erection of grooms accommodation with a players gym following the demolition of existing outbuilding. Malmesbury Estate, Remenham Hill, Henley RG9 3HN. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, SPORT/LEISURE OUTCOME Refused APPEAL LODGED</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2019</p> <p>Two conjoined appeals at Park Place, Remenham Hill, Henley-on-Thames, RG9 3HN: APP/X0360/W/19/3224323 Malmesbury Estate and APP/X0360/W/19/3224329 Park Place Stables</p> <p>1. Park Place Stables: Full Planning application 182524 for the erection of a stable (consisting of 24 boxes, tack room, feed room and storage) with outdoor area; and</p> <p>2. Malmesbury Estate: Full Planning application 182327 for the proposed erection of grooms' accommodation with a players' gym following the demolition of existing outbuilding.</p> <p>The Berkshire Gardens Trust, as an interested party, would like to make the following submissions with regard to the above appeals which lie within Historic England's Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Park Place. 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 was consulted at the end of October 2019 following an oversight to consult on these applications during the application process. Park Place is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden containing a number of listed buildings and structures. The Registered Park therefore forms the setting to these heritage assets as well as being of historic importance in its own right. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by</p>

					<p>the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.¹</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. In the short time available BGT has sought to understand the history of the park and the innumerable documents attached to the above appeals. BGT has also looked at the earlier planning history, in particular the outline application O/2008/1353 approved 2008 for the demolition of 8 dwellings and erection of 5 new dwellings; and change of use of 3 dwellings to form 2 boathouses and guest accommodation which included an approved restoration scheme for the park as set out in the IEMP; and 162288 approved 2016 for the creation of a polo facility for private use, comprising of a polo field, exercise track, stable block, all weather practice area, summer pavilion and widening of existing access onto A4130.</p> <p>The owners kindly gave permission for me to visit both sites on behalf of the Berkshire Gardens Trust on 5th December</p> <p>1 The Gardens Trust, a national body recently published a guidance leaflet to explain the place of historic designed landscapes in the planning system, the importance of assessing significance, the statutory consultation obligations, and the role of County Gardens Trusts, in raising awareness of historic designed landscapes as heritage assets. 'The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens' can be downloaded at www.thegardenstrust.org. BGT's own website: www.berkshiregardenstrust.org</p> <p>2019. I noted that public views into Park Place are very limited due to the local topography, mature woodland around and within the site, and very extensive man made banks topped with new 1.2 to 1.5 m high beech hedges along the boundaries with the public roads (the A4130, Culham Lane and Kenton's Lane). There is one view of the Park Place Stables site through the entrance off the A4130 in which the existing stables are already visible beyond large gates. The new planting would suggest that the owners are keen to reinforce the existing screening. However the objectives of conserving and enhancing the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden are not confined to avoiding visual intrusion from public viewpoints. More importantly there is a requirement under NPPF and Local Plan policies to conserve and enhance the integrity of the parkland design and historic features.</p> <p>Park Place is one of the very few Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens in</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Berkshire. Historic mapping shows the original park area (within which both the appeal sites lie) and the extension of the park westwards to Culham Lane at the very end of the 19th century. Some minor development is first shown on the Park Place Stables site in 1960 but the Malmesbury Estate site remains as a mix of woodland and parkland as in earlier maps. By the late 1960s there is a poultry farm at the Park Place Stables site but no change, other than field sub-division, at the Malmesbury Estate site.</p> <p>Overall the upper plateau area, in which the two sites stand, is part of the surrounding parkland with parkland trees, Park Place Farm, extensive wooded areas. In the 1980s a golf course was built within the northern and north-eastern part of the park including both sites. The approved outline scheme O/2008/1353 in 2008 permitted isolated pockets of development within the park subject to a comprehensive IEMP to remove the golf course and restore the park and enhance local landscape features. We understand that, away from the areas of polo development, this plan has been largely implemented. This scheme was later modified with the 2016 permission. This permitted quite extensive development at the Park Place Stables but solely allowed for a riding arena and parking areas on the Malmesbury Estate site.</p> <p>Park Place Stables</p> <p>The area has undergone extensive development for polo facilities. The current appeal scheme seeks to reduce the width of the adjacent arena and place a new stable complex, of the same size as that existing to the east, on the site of an existing long but lower stable block. The new stables are within the stable complex but due to the increase in its mass and scale would be more visible from the A4130.</p> <p>The area of the Park Stables stable (consisting of 24 boxes, tack room, feed room and storage) with outdoor area has already been extensively changed by the current polo facilities. It has not been possible in the time to ascertain whether all of the current built form, including fencing, has the benefit of planning approval. On the basis of what is there now, the Berkshire Gardens Trust consider that the proposed development would lead to some intensification and increase in the mass and scale of buildings visible from the A4130 and the houses opposite the site entrance. When assessing any application for development which may affect a heritage asset, local planning authorities need to consider the implications of cumulative change. However, as the proposed stables are contained within</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the context of the existing polo facilities, they may not further detract from the significance of the remaining Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Malmesbury Estate</p> <p>Google Earth from 2003 to 2019 shows that in 2003 the golf course was established over a large area including the Malmesbury Estate site. One building is visible situated on the Malmesbury Estate site. Sometime between the end of 2010 and March 2012, a large working area, and the additional smaller building set back into the tree cover, was added to the site, together with new tracks and small structures. By this time the golf course had gone so it is assumed that this development was somehow connected to the outline approval. None of these buildings or other development was shown in the approved IEMP or the approved 2016 landscape scheme. The site now has a riding arena on the location of the large working area, two large buildings, several small huts, hardstanding, and a tie-up area for horses (which looks like it's the structure for a marquee).</p> <p>In conclusion, over time the owners appear to have allowed considerable intensification of built form and activity in this area contrary to the approved IEMP and the agreed landscape strategy for the 2016 scheme. None of the buildings including the small temporary ones have been removed, fences have been added and hard standings extended. The appellant seeks to justify the new Grooms Accommodation on the basis that it will be a replacement building in the context of adjoining polo development. However the planning approvals suggest that only the riding arena and adjoining parking areas have permission. The landscape strategy shows naturalistic planting to blend the arena into the landscape and enclosure with a beech hedge. In contrast the boundary of the arena is now dominated by fencing with no integration into the landscape. We understand that the development in both 2008 and 2016 was only approved by Wokingham District Council subject to these enhancements to the park as shown in the IEMP and 2016 landscape strategy; and under exceptional circumstances (which we do not address here).</p> <p>BGT fully support the objectives and detailed proposals of the IEMP. We accept that the introduction of the riding arena has planning permission but the adverse effects on the adjoining parkland are partially limited by the approved restoration, landscape proposals and in particular by the removal of the buildings.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The implications of cumulative change are of much greater concern here. The site is remote from the core of facilities at Park Place Stables, separated from this complex by open grassland areas and the lake with no structures other than some parkland fencing and estate tracks. The approved schemes show that, as part of the restoration of the park, only the riding arena and parking areas should be here. The buildings and small temporary huts should have been removed along with other machinery. Woodland planting should have been implemented with parkland features reinstated including tree groups as shown in IEMP Plan 3b as amended by drawing 028-P100 Rev F in March 2016. We regard this as the correct baseline position.</p> <p>The retention of the American Barn and rebuilding of the adjacent outbuilding to create new grooms' accommodation with a players' gym would spread built form into an area which was identified for parkland restoration. The Design and Access Statement clearly describes the development as ancillary to the polo facility development and therefore seeks to extend and intensify these facilities eastwards into the wider parkland.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement has a small section on 'landscaping' which clearly misunderstands the role of landscape effects and planting in a Registered Park and Garden. The history of development in the park recognises that development should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances and through substantive benefits including the restoration of the park. The proposed development does nothing to further the implementation of the agreed restoration scheme. Partial screening of the proposed development does not justify the proposals. Having said this, BGT do not consider that including parkland landscaping would justify the development of this site.</p> <p>Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens are a fragile and rare historic asset (of which there are only 8 in the whole of Berkshire) which can be easily harmed through visual and physical erosion of the integrity of the park which is valued for both its individual elements and its historic value as a whole. The wider parkland is an important part of that whole, both on its own historic merits but also as a setting to the specific assets including the house, stables, approaches, gardens and pleasure grounds. The polo facilities are already encroaching into the wider parkland away from the core in the northern part (formerly occupied by existing structures such as the poultry farm).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Historic England's citation for Park Place states: The extensive park, largely laid out during the later C18 by General Conway, surrounds the inner core of the gardens and pleasure grounds. Areas of open parkland, many containing clumps and specimen trees, are enclosed by belts of trees and woodland, the latter particularly found to the west of the site. The north-east section, incorporated in the C19, has been overlaid by a golf course (late C20), the remainder being a mixture of arable and pasture. It is clear that the whole of the park is of historic value in its own right and as setting and that the presence of the golf course did not result in such harm as to exclude that area from the Grade II* area.</p> <p>The proposed grooms' accommodation with a players' gym would result in significant erosion of the north-eastern part of the park, intensifying the polo provisions in this area and allowing substantive new building to be established in this area. The character of the former golf course provides no justification for this form of development. The development introduces permanent visually intrusive buildings, structures and activities into the parkland of the Estate. Although some changes in this area have been permitted (drawing 028-P100 Rev F), the approved facilities can be accommodated better without harm to the agreed restoration of the park. We agree with the appellant that the existing buildings on the site do not contribute to the significance of the park (Cotswold Archaeology para 6.12). The proposed buildings would result in further erosion of the north-east part of the park and detract from the significance of the park plateau and the anticipated low key surface only use of this part of the park, as set out in the IEMP and drawing 028-P100 Rev F.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>The Berkshire Gardens Trust respectfully requests that the Inspector dismisses appeal APP/X0360/W/19/3224323 Malmesbury Estate. The development would be contrary to NPPF and Policy TB24 of the Managing Development Delivery document and fail to conserve or enhance an asset of the highest significance.</p> <p>With regard to APP/X0360/W/19/3224329 Park Place Stables, the Berkshire Gardens Trust is concerned that the development would intensify development in this location and increase, both physically and visually, the mass and scale of the polo facilities. However in the context of the approved development, no substantial additional harm may arise provided that the development is limited to the mass and scale and style of building design proposed; that there is no loss of trees or further changes</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					to the arena; and that no further ancillary development arises (such as small buildings or fencing). Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Chair and Planning Advisor
Park Place and Temple Coombe	Berkshire	E19/1041	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for the erection of a stable (consisting of 24 boxes, tack room, feed room and storage) with outdoor area. Park Place Stables, Remenham Hill, Henley RG9 3HN. EQUESTRIAN OUTCOME Refused APPEAL LODGED	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2019 See E19/1040 above
Bracknell Forest Local Plan	Berkshire	E19/1204	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Revised Growth Strategy consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.12.2019 A New Local Plan for Bracknell Forest: Revised Growth Strategy Comments from Berkshire Gardens Trust Thank you for consulting 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. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire. One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire, an important part of the history of Bracknell Forest. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the draft new local plan. Part 1: Revised Growth Strategy BGT welcomes the inclusion of the protection of the historic environment and its setting within the Vision and under Objective B. However we would like to see the inclusion of reference here to historic landscapes, not only the Borough's registered parks and gardens but also those of local .value of which there are many across the Borough. In this regard we request that the following amendments are made Under LP1 para 5.5 bullet 2: By protecting and enhancing the significance of buildings, sites and features of

					<p>archaeological and historic interest, and historic landscapes, together with their setting.</p> <p>We welcome the Glossary description of 'Heritage Asset' in particular the reference to local assets as well as registered assets. However under 'Historic Park and Garden' there is neither mention of the word 'Registered' as defined by Historic England nor any differentiation between Registered and non-designated areas. It is hoped that Bracknell Forest Council will commit to compiling a list of parks and gardens of local value, expanding on the work already done through the Character Areas and Landscape character areas studies to date. We would be very pleased to assist the Council in this work.</p> <p>Sites proposed for allocation: We are pleased to see that no Registered Parks and Gardens will be affected by the allocations in this document. We are also pleased to see that the parkland landscapes around the allocations at Land North of Tilehurst Lane and at Popes Manor, Binfield are both recognised for their non-designated value to be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>Part 2: Non-Strategic Development Management Policies</p> <p>Policy LP42: We very much welcome this policy and the supporting text. The 6 Registered Parks and Gardens are listed. We note that the plan rather relies on the identification of non-designated historic landscapes through the development process. However in the absence of an independent list of assessed assets across the Borough, it is difficult for Development Management to identify whether a potential developer has properly recorded and assessed a local asset. We again urge the Council to compile its own list of parks and gardens of local value.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Planning Advisor. cc: The Gardens Trust</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/0853	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for a mixed use development comprising use classes B1a / B1b / B1c / B8 / C1 / C2 / D1 / non-retail promotional automotive display (sui generis) / social hub (sui generis) (25,500 sqm) including parking and access arrangements, associated</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for drawing our attention to the additional documentation accompanying this application. Our previous response to the above proposals requested a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in order that we and our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust could more clearly assess the effect upon the Registered Park and Garden at Stowe. The applicants have now provided an HIA in which they assert that these proposals cause no further impact to the RPG than the previous application which already has consent. We have read through the HIA and agree that</p>

				landscaping, supporting infrastructure and ancillary works, and demolition of existing structures. MAJOR HYBRID	this application is an improvement and concur with the AVDC's Heritage Officer's view that this proposal is acceptable. We can accept this going forward. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/0865	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Partial Change of Use of former stables to micro-brewery, demolition of former store, associated patio, parking and access, and separate staff canteen (Retrospective). Blackpit Brewery, Blackpit Farm, Silverstone Road, Biddlesden, Buckinghamshire MK18 5LJ. HYBRID	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) again in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. The Gardens Trust/Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust have previously already responded twice with regard to this retrospective application : once supporting the brewery with some constructive comments and the second time objecting to the two other applications (19/02171/APP & 03172/APP) and supporting the AVDC historic team's recommendations. The only apparent change within the new invitations to comment is a letter from Adam Partington of Locus Consulting, whom my colleagues met on their site visit some months ago. We felt at the time that he was keen to develop the proposals to further mitigate the impact of the current and proposed works and that he agreed with our recommendation that they engage a landscape consultant to prepare a Historic Character Assessment and/or a CMP and his recent comments would seem to reinforce that. We would like to reiterate our previous suggestion that a Historic Character Assessment and/or CMP is commissioned so the applicant can reassess their approach. Whilst we appreciate that your officers will wish to make a decision on this quite soon, rather than rush, we would urge your officers to allow a more time for the additional reports we recommended to be commissioned, in order to work out the best approach to mitigate what has already been done and consider ways to improve the rest. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Fawley Court and Temple Island	Buckinghamshire	E19/1125	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of new hard paved car parking area with relocation of the pedestrian entrance & erection of	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the

				<p>two timber pagodas on new parking area. Erection of infill extension to Mole End & pitched roof over existing flat roofed element. Toad Hall Garden Centre, Marlow Road, Fawley, Buckinghamshire. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>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. The GT/BGT object to this proposal as it compounds the incremental damage to the historic character and fabric of the registered park and garden at Fawley Court, associated with the previous garden centre development. This relates not only to the environs of the important C18 walled garden, next to which the proposal is sited, along with the North Park in which it sits, but to the wider effects on the important C18 and C19 north entrance from the Marlow road, and the drive to the walled garden, both key historic features of the designed landscape.</p> <p>Designations and Policies</p> <p>This park is graded II* by Historic England on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, denoting exceptional national significance. The entire park is designated a Conservation Area including the application site. While the walled garden walls are not listed they are part of the setting and curtilage of grade I and grade II Listed buildings.</p> <p>The application is contrary to Policy CP11 Historic Environment in the revised District Local Plan, in which the Council promotes the conservation and enhancement of the Historic Environment of the District, particularly aspects covered in paragraphs 1, 2, 5 and 7. It fails to fulfil national guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework Section 16, Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, paragraphs 185c, 189, 192, 193 and 196.</p> <p>Significance of the Historic Environment Immediately Affected</p> <p>The Heritage Statement lacks detailed identification of levels of historic significance of the immediate development area, both in the broad context of the whole of Fawley Court designed landscape and of the particular component parts which will be affected. It also fails to address historic features in the wider park landscape between the garden centre and the Marlow road which are likely to be affected. It has not used publicly available C18 and C19 historic documents that offer key information to identify the full significance of the various elements affected.</p> <p>The walled garden at the heart of the garden centre is of high significance. It was probably designed in the 1760s by the leading C18 designer Lancelot 'Capability' Brown, within his North Park and adjacent to his West Park. This part of the park including the affected areas had acquired the layout largely by 1788 (estate plan), only 20 years after Brown left. The large</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>productive kitchen garden had an unusual D-shape with two rounded corners. It was a prestigious part of a landscape scheme for a country house estate, as a showpiece for the owners to enjoy and show off to guests. The key structure, the wall, survives, but the interior has lost the historic layout. The changes for horticultural and commercial purposes are reversible and the area could be restored. The position in the landscape is notable, between two key features of the 1760s Brown scheme: the north drive and the North Park.</p> <p>The areas of highest historic significance related to the walled garden include the garden walls, the formerly cultivated areas within the walls, the gardener's house in the south-east corner, the parkland environs and the drive linking the north gateway, White Cottage and Estate Yard. Much of the original historic character has become blurred during the later C20, the area being engulfed with garden centre structures and with a car park to the west and a large glasshouse in the orchard to the north. The C18 entrance and drive were probably by Brown. The approach from the early C19 North Lodge and late C19 iron gateway adjacent is damaged with the gateway damaged by garden centre traffic and the drive widened and with speed humps, and framed by inappropriate fences.</p> <p>Although not at present listed, the C18 and C19 kitchen garden walls, as described and illustrated in the applicants' Heritage Statement, are, together with the gardener's house at the south-east corner, of sufficient quality to make them a candidate for Listing by Historic England.</p> <p>Meanwhile the ensemble should certainly be included on the District List of Locally Important Buildings.</p> <p>The mid-late C20 and C21 changes made for garden centre use in the environs of the walled garden and more widely, particularly in the North Park with large new structures, have not irreversibly destroyed the historic character or fabric. The effects could be mitigated to a considerable degree.</p> <p>Information Supplied with the Application</p> <p>The documentation supplied with this application does not address the effects of the proposals on the historic environment nor does it provide an acceptable identification of all the likely affected key aspects of the historic environment and their significances together with the impact of the proposals on them.</p> <p>Further information is required in order to make an informed decision on the proposal:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>1. A revised Heritage Statement including the period from the mid-C18-mid-C19 which established the current historic character in this area, to understand the development of the landscape from this seminal period and provide a proportionate appraisal of the significances of the individual features which will be affected. It should include the drive, north entrance, and north lodge, and the walled garden in more detail.</p> <p>2. An options appraisal for the siting and design of the proposals to establish why this is the best solution for the historic environment as well as the business case.</p> <p>3. A Heritage Impact Statement for the proposed works identifying the benefits and damage.</p> <p>4. A Heritage Strategy identifying mitigation of the effect of the proposals on both the localised and wider historic environment, and various heritage benefits that could be offered.</p> <p>5. A long term business plan for the whole commercial operation identifying the anticipated effect of proposals on both customer levels, which are likely to increase as a result, and the historic environment, together with the long term strategy for further development of the area, levels of use, and conservation of the historic environment, agreed with WDC. It should identify long term aspirations for further development, if any.</p> <p>Effect of the Proposals on the Immediate Historic Environment</p> <p>The proposed planting and hard landscape materials further damage a localised area of the historic character and fabric of the C18 and C19 park. Extant informal parking in grass will be replaced by modern materials and planting which are damaging in appearance. While many such damaging interventions have occurred in the environs of the walled garden as part of previous development of the garden centre, this must not form an acceptable precedent to allow expansion encroaching incrementally further into the park. Materials such as extensive areas of concrete pavements, bright coloured render, galvanised steel, sawn wood and a domestic scale pergola damage the historic character of a naturalistic English Landscape Park, which is the setting around the garden centre and will be the first sight of the important walled garden area in the approach. No mitigation or heritage gain is offered (as required in Policy CP11 Historic Environment in the revised District Local Plan), such as solving the effect of the increased traffic on the gateway, improving the appearance of the drive or screening the garden centre from the wider park.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Increase in Customer Use and Associated Effect on the Wider Historic Environment</p> <p>The proposals are presented as a localised part of a commercial garden centre scheme. The likely impact on the wider historic fabric and character of the Fawley Court historic environment is not considered.</p> <p>The key issue which has not been addressed is that with the increase in formal car parking capacity, the number of customers and hence car and service vehicle movements will increase. While this is not explicitly stated, nor has a business plan been submitted to support or dismiss this likelihood, it is inevitable that even if not anticipated by the applicants, a considerable such increase in customers will occur. This will damage aspects of the historic environment in a considerably wider area of the park, in various ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 1880s grade II Listed park gateway 250m north-west of the walled garden (in other ownership). The gateway was designed as a domestic vehicle approach to the mansion and as an estate vehicle approach to the walled garden and estate yard. Vehicle movements would have been much less in number with low likelihood of causing damage to the gateway. As the main approach to a commercial garden centre the fabric has suffered considerable damage from vehicles, particularly goods vehicles. The gateway is in poor condition, vulnerable to further damage and unsuited to large numbers of vehicle movements including large commercial vehicles. With increased vehicle movements this fragile fabric will inevitably suffer further and regular damage. The gateway is positioned badly to allow safe access off the busy Marlow road which is also fast-moving at this point and this may contribute to the ongoing damage. The gateway must not be altered to accommodate increased vehicle movements as this will damage the historic fabric and character of the gateway and its environs including the drives at this key entrance to the C18 park. 2. The setting of the c.1820 grade II Listed north lodge 250m north-west of the walled garden. This was designed, as was the gateway, as part of the domestic vehicle approach to the mansion and as an estate vehicle approach to the walled garden and estate yard. The current vehicle movements damage this setting and an increase with further this damage. 3. The estate service drive running 250m across North Park leading from the north lodge and gateway to the walled garden and estate yard. This, now the approach to the commercial garden centre, has been considerably widened from the original narrow gravel drive, and is poorly maintained. In
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>its degraded form it considerably damages the historic fabric and character of the parkland in this area. Additional vehicle use is likely to require changes that result in further loss of historic character and damage the parkland setting.</p> <p>4. The character of the North and West Parks will be damaged by increased vehicle use, including the north drive to the mansion.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In summary we recommend that this proposal is refused as it will contribute to, and endorse the precedent for, the incremental damage to the grade II* park and other landscape elements of the historic environment associated with the garden centre. If a revised proposal is submitted it should address not only the effect on the historic fabric and character of the immediate site and environs of the proposed changes but also the effects on the wider historic landscape particularly the drive and north gateway.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E19/1171	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for demolition of the vinery and potting house. TATTON PARK, KNUTSFORD DRIVE, KNUTSFORD, KNUTSFORD, CHESHIRE WA16 6QN. DEMOLITION</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2019</p> <p>The above application has been brought to the attention of The Gardens Trust (GT). As you aware, we are Statutory Consultees with regard to proposed development affecting all grades of sites included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. As such we are surprised and disappointed that Cheshire East failed to consult us about this application. We would be grateful if you could please ensure that there are no future omissions of this nature. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and submit our comments with regard to this application below.</p> <p>The GT/CGT wish to register our strong objection to this application. The Tatton Park estate was bequeathed to the National Trust in 1958. Cheshire County Council entered into a 99 year fully-repairing lease, which Cheshire East took on in 2009 with 52 years to run. Cheshire East Council is therefore the legal custodian of these nationally important heritage assets. The introduction to the 1987 Glasshouses report submitted with the application states that “the glasshouses and conservatories at Tatton Park are a remarkable group of plant houses”, decorative and utilitarian. “It is rare that such a wide range of buildings should still survive and continue to be used as at Tatton Park”. On page 9, having described some 20th century</p>

					<p>losses, the report states “The retention of those glasshouses which survive is very important.”</p> <p>In c2003 considerable investment was made in rebuilding and restoring the walled kitchen garden and associated facilities, funded with public money by the Heritage Lottery and employing expertise and materials considered the best and most appropriate at the time. The 2006 Quinquennial Survey indicates that the structures were in good condition then. Today all the glasshouses appear to lack maintenance with the Pineapple House being in very poor condition, the whole range of glasshouses on the north wall devoid of plants and none of them open to the public. (Even the contemporary glasshouses used for propagation lack some panes of glass, have not been painted recently and need to have their gutters cleaned.) This not only represents a severe degradation of physical heritage but a loss of the ability of Tatton Park to tell the story of the great country house fed by its walled garden, with grapes on the table all year and fresh pineapples; a sign of horticultural prowess and owner hospitality. What is the point of showing how grapes were stored if there are no vines growing in the glasshouses?</p> <p>Over a period of 12 years there appears to have been persistent neglect of this range of glasshouses. The question of why such neglect has been allowed needs to be properly answered. We understand that due to the difficulties of maintenance it is considered financially unviable to maintain them and that Tatton is working with the National Trust to find an alternative long-term solution. Fund raising is suggested for the replacement of the vinery and potting house, but the lack of firm commitment or timescale for this is unacceptable.</p> <p>Turning to the application it is not clear that statutory consultees have been consulted or that the required legal notices have been posted on the subject buildings. The submitted documents lack a statement of significance for the buildings individually and as a collection of glasshouses, and the impact of the proposals on that significance. In addition a comprehensive options study for the repair or replication of the structures proposed for demolition is required. No protection is proposed for the garden wall, listed Grade II, which has a flue. Without the protection of the glasshouses the wall will deteriorate and may be prone to collapse. The absence of the necessary information renders the current application invalid.</p> <p>Tatton Park has long been regarded as Cheshire’s “jewel in the crown”, a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>place open to all with unique heritage. "Tatton's Vision ... aims to substantially develop its visitor experience by increasing attractions and activities on offer".</p> <p>http://www.tattonpark.org.uk/about_us/tattons_vision/tattons_vision.aspx</p> <p>It appears that while this vision includes investment in the construction of new welcome and car park buildings, it does not include safeguarding heritage, which is the unique selling point of Tatton Park. If Cheshire East does not have the will, skill or resources to commit to looking after Tatton Park then perhaps custodianship should be returned to the National Trust.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Town Walks, Dorchester and Borough Gardens, Dorchester	Dorset	E19/1131	II II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 19no. one bedroom affordable flats, including one wheelchair accessible dwelling. FORMER TENNIS COURTS EAST OF, WEST WALKS, DORCHESTER, RESIDENTIAL	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Borough Gardens, Dorchester and Town Walks, Dorchester, both historic designed landscape of national importance which are included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have considered the information provided in support of the application and liaised with our colleagues in Dorset Gardens Trust.</p> <p>On the basis of this we confirm we have no objection to the proposals at this stage.</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 The Gardens Trust</p>
Great Rissington Manor	Gloucestershire	E19/1211	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for Installation of ground source heat pump plant and associated subterranean pipe array (Retrospective) at The Manor, Great Rissington, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL54 2LN. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.12.2019</p> <p>The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and areas of broader landscape, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>According to Heritage England's designation plan for the Manor House (Listed Grade 11) and the surrounding garden curtilage also (Listed Grade 11), the pipe run leaves the listed ex-stables and then runs on land outside the designated garden to the final array.</p>

					<p>On this basis the GGLT does not wish to raise any adverse comment on this retrospective proposal</p> <p>However, the garden listing does not appear to be resolved on Cotswold District Council's Constraints statement: and as a general observation; for proposals using extensive 1.00m deep pipe arrays and depending on their method statements for installing these arrays, it might be wise to consult the County HMR for archaeological constraints.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Old Paradise Gardens	Greater London	E19/0432	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Phased mixed use development including up to 417 residential units and comprising: part redevelopment and restoration, conversion and extension of former Fire Brigade Headquarters building and demolition of the existing extension and re-provision of obelisk to provide a new fire station (Sui Generis), a new London Fire Brigade museum (Class D1), residential units (Class C3), a ten storey hotel (Class C1) with up to 200 bedrooms and a flexible retail/lobby space (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/C1), and a rooftop restaurant with ancillary bar (Class A3); demolition and redevelopment of the central workshop building to provide buildings of up to twenty-six storeys plus basements, comprising business floorspace (Use Class B1), a gym (Class D2), retail units (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4) and residential units (Class C3); development of land to the rear</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.12.2019</p> <p>This project has had a long history - and was turned down at previous planning inspection. Whilst the proposal for a Fire Museum is a positive use at ground level and an improvement on earlier plans, this does not justify the current expansion and increase in height proposed on this Art Deco Building.</p> <p>This is an area of open space deficiency as result all green space in the immediate surrounds should be judiciously protected. The impacts on the nearest green space, Old Paradise Gardens, as a result of these proposals, however, does nothing of the sort and will have a severe detrimental impact - not least restricting access to sunlight in what is already a relatively shady greenspace.</p> <p>Helen Monger</p>

				<p>to provide a eleven storey building plus basement, comprising a flexible commercial unit (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/D2/B1) and residential units (Class C3); all together with associated areas of new public realm, hard and soft landscaping, basement and surface parking, servicing, means of access and plant and equipment. (The reference for this application for Full Planning Permission is 19/01304/FUL but there is also an associated Listed Building Consent application related to these works with reference 19/01305/LB). Please use reference number 19/01305/LB to view the application documents for this proposal This application is a DEPARTURE APPLICATION: The proposed development is a departure from site allocation "Site 10 - 8 Albert Embankment and land to the rear bounded by Lambeth High Street, Whitgift Street, the railway viaduct and Southbank House SE1" of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015). This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) which is available for inspection with the planning application documents. Hard copies may be obtained for a fee from Lichfield, 14 Regent's Wharf, All Saints</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				Street, London, N1 9RL, UK Open for comment icon, 8 Albert Embankment And Land To Rear Bounded By Lambeth High St, Whitgift St, The Railway Viaduct, Southbank Hse Together With Land Corner Of Black Prince Rd And Newport St London. MAJOR HYBRID	
Westbury House	Hampshire	E19/1107	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of Use of a redundant care home and associated land to a residential use comprising 12 dwellings, access, parking, landscaping, repairs to heritage assets and associated works. Westbury House Nursing Home, West Meon Road, East Meon, Petersfield. GU32 1HY	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.12.2019</p> <p>Further to the pre-app response made by the GT/HGT on 27 April 2019, we have the following observations to make on this planning application. Whilst we are pleased to see that the proposed number of dwellings to be created within Westbury House and its outbuildings has been reduced from 29 units to 12, and that car parking has logically been moved closer to the house, we still have strong reservations on the remainder of the proposal as it stands.</p> <p>SNDP advocates a landscape-led approach to design and although the application alludes to this, we are not convinced that it underpins the proposals put forward. The landscape design for the gardens has been overlain on the Bridgeman plan of 1720s and the confirmatory Lidar image in an attempt to confer some credibility to a landscape treatment, which seems mainly for visual effect with little reference to the impact on landscape character. Wildflower meadows, 'skylark grasslands', mown walks, picnic areas, sculptures, 'wildlife towers' and a 'sculptural landform terrace' are aspirational and undoubtedly attractive to potential buyers. However, they are marginal contributors to the restoration/preservation of the landscape. With no management plan yet supplied it is hard to see how such features can be maintained without high and continuing inputs of money and labour. These issues are not addressed at all, not just in relation to the gardens but the future management of the whole estate. It is significant that the text outlining the landscape aspirations is littered with phrasing such 'could do' this or 'likely to' do that.</p> <p>Other specific issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lot of sub-division around the south elevation for residents' gardens. We question whether this is the right approach: in practice it is likely to lead to bitty maintenance, clashing or inappropriate planting, the introduction of personal items such as furniture and so on, none of which

					<p>would reflect the historic use of the house.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The kitchen garden planted terraces/parterre to the northern elevation are out-of-place with no historic precedent on this site. • Introducing grassland beyond the ha-ha brings in the need for extensive fencing to keep stock out – precisely the function of the ha-ha! • Restoration of the ice houses (characterised as ‘of little aesthetic value’) is listed as an objective but there is no further indication about how their setting and links to the house will be respected and managed. In particular, the proposed car park disrupts that link. • The Chapel is assessed as Priority A on the national At Risk Register and has been for some time, with no solution agreed. A note on the Register: “A project to see the ruins conserved, explained and maintained needs to be agreed and put in action” is not addressed in this application, beyond listing its restoration as an objective. • It is suggested that the walled kitchen garden could be turned into 12 allotments and the derelict green house could be restored. We question whether the purchasers of what will presumably be high-spec, high-price residences will be interested in such an offer. Even if they were, the site will still need to be managed and maintained. We suggest there should be a more imaginative use for the walled garden that could provide a link between residents and the local community. <p>Above all, we believe that this application demonstrates that the future management of the whole estate is questionable in terms of whether the strategy will be implemented in the long term: not just the grounds, but the woodland, waterbodies, grassland and structures. We have observed before that the owner has in the past demonstrably failed to properly manage the landscape. All this should throw doubt on the intentions behind this application.</p> <p>Finally, we would re-iterate, from our submission of 27 April, that any plans should be accompanied by an achievable, costed restoration for the garden features and their setting in the landscape, as a condition of approval. We would like detailed information as to how the asset enhancement will be funded, the future ownership and management of the individual units and communal grounds, what the restoration time scale is, how it will be managed and how management and appropriate care of this unique site will be enforced.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
South Worcestershire Development Plan	Hereford and Worcester	E19/1048	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Review of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP)	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the South Worcestershire Development Plan consultation.</p> <p>The Local Plan is the starting point upon which all planning in the area is based. It is therefore crucial that this document pays special regard to the preservation of designed historic landscapes, whether registered or non-registered, and their settings. This importance of this is set out in Historic England's Good Practice Advice Note, July 2015 'The Historic Environment in Local Plans' which states (p5) that 'The Register of Parks and Gardens (RPGs) of Historic Interest in England, ... is thought to represent only around two-thirds of sites potentially deserving inclusion.' A gazetteer of historic parks and gardens in Worcestershire, very recently published by the Hereford & Worcestershire Gardens Trust (HWGT) (ISBN 978-1-5272-3934-0) will be invaluable in informing your officers of many of these historic designed landscapes.</p> <p>The Local Plan must use up-to-date evidence to assess the significance of historic designed landscapes and their settings, to fully understand the contribution they make to the environment. We concur with our colleagues in the HWGT that no account of the visual impact has been identified during the process of allocating suitable development sites. We would ask your officers to carry out a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for each site, even at this early stage, as it will enable several sites to be discounted, pre-empting unsuitable proposals. We share HWGT'S concern that the nationally important RPGs are not on the Interactive Policies Map and would urge this to be rectified.</p> <p>The GT would refer your officers to the HWGT's comments with regard to specific local sites and fully supports their various observations.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Northaw House	Hertfords hire	E19/0741	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee.</p> <p>We objected to this development on 29 August 2019 (6/2019/0218/LB and 6/2019/0217.MAJ) on the grounds of considerable harm to the important</p>

				<p>parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, 3 dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure. Northaw House, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NG. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>historic landscapes around Northaw, their views and settings and thus their significance , contrary to NPPF . The new proposed site plan does not address our concerns and thus our original letter of objection is still relevant. The harm not only to Northaw House and its setting/significance but to other important historic houses and landscapes in the area from overdevelopment of this site is such that major amendments, including reduction of units around the house, to the proposed scheme are required. Kate Harwood</p>
Balls Park	Hertfords hire	E19/1167	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey rear extension and garage conversion. 21 Willis Grove, Balls Park, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG13 8FH. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. 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.</p> <p>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, as required by the NPPF (189). We have also seen no clear or convincing justification as to why the harm both to the registered landscape and to the setting of the Listed Walls should be permitted.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed extension to the rear does harms the Registered landscape and adversely affects the setting of the Listed walls. There are no public benefits to this proposal to weigh against this harm. We therefore OBJECT to</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Just House,	Hertfords	E19/1203	N	PLANNING APPLICATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2019

Northaw	hire			Replacement of existing timber fence with new 2m high timber fence. Just House, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NJ. BOUNDARY	Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The present roadside fence is backed by a hedge. We have no objections to the replacement of this fence with the design proposed providing the hedge is retained at the current height and augmented where there are less dense sections or gaps. We note that the adjacent fence is lower than the proposed one, although there is a higher fence further along Coopers Lane. The new fence was also be less visually intrusive if it were slightly lower than the proposed height. Kate Harwood
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E19/1206	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey extension with associated changes to boundary walls. Napsbury Tower, 67 Beningfield Drive, London Colney, Hertfordshire AL2 1Ux. BUILDING ALTERATION, BOUNDARY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information contained in this application we do not consider that the proposed extension will cause harm to the registered landscape. However, we are disappointed that the Design and Access Statement omitted to include the Registered landscape in its consideration of landscape constraints on the site. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Digswell	Hertfords hire	E19/1210	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a side conservatory. 46 Kirklands, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7RD. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2019 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information contained in this application we do not think the development would materially harm the setting of the historic landscape to the rear of the property. Kate Harwood
Central Herts Green Corridor	Hertfords hire	E19/1258	Various	LOCAL PLAN LUC Green Corridor Draft Report for Welwyn Hatfield Council (November 2019) EX 169.	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2019 Comments from the Gardens Trust/Hertfordshire Gardens Trust on heritage issues for the Central Herts Green Corridor Group, submitted by Kate Harwood. Whether you agree with the council's stated objectives for this part of the Green Corridor, and, if not, why not. The council's stated objectives are not included in this document in a form which is comprehensive although we do agree with the limited definitions in Paragraph 1.7 and aims in paragraph 1.10 Paragraph 1.1 is incorrect. The Green Corridor should be put in place first as defined by the constraints identified and any buffers need to protect heritage or other assets. Only then can planning of BGS be undertaken We do not agree that the very limited cultural and heritage data contained

					<p>within the document is sufficient to form a basis for evaluation of the assets, their settings and their significance.</p> <p>There is very little about cultural heritage in section 1: a mention in 1.11 and a limited desk-top trawl through the Historic Environment Record (1.15) and the Historic Landscape Characterisation study (1.19) This does not constitute a robust description of the many heritage assets in the area or of the settings of heritage assets further afield. There are various studies such as the Wessex Archaeology report on the Black Fan fen and burnt mound, of which no mention is made, and records of the prehistoric finds in the area are missing as are details of the various moated sites across the whole Birchall Garden Suburb area. Many of these heritage assets contribute to the character of Welwyn Garden City, and are locally rare as earlier development since the 1920s did not either seek to investigate nor to record finds before building took place.</p> <p>Some of the heritage assets at Holwell Hyde are mentioned but these do not include the ancient ditches and pollards from the medieval assart or the Deserted Medieval Village (or hamlet) around the lane junctions at Holwell Hyde. There is no consideration of the setting of heritage assets at Holwell Court, nor the setting of Hatfield House parkland, nor the heritage assets at Essendon, all of which would lose significance by the lack of protection of their settings. For the wider Green Corridor running across the whole of the proposed BGS site we would have expected some consideration of the setting of Panshanger Park and the remains of the 'Capability' Brown landscape which lie to the west of Panshanger Lane as well as within the Registered park.</p> <p>Whether you feel that there are other, sufficiently distinct, options that the examination should consider.</p> <p>The ecological, heritage and hydrological assets, as well as contamination issues to do with the landfill site should be all properly considered before any Green Corridor route is considered. The Central Herts Green Corridor Group has suggested one such route based on our more detailed knowledge of the site. This has been submitted on our behalf by Dr Jonathan Fisher. It does, however still leave the Essendon, Holwell Court and Hatfield Park views and settings at risk.</p> <p>Which of the three, option, if any, you prefer and the reasons why. Your concerns about the appropriateness of the other options.</p> <p>All options do not consider the extension of the Green Corridor beyond these tightly defined boundaries. Consideration of the setting of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Panshanger Park and the views across the interfluvium and valley should form part of any assessment, as should migratory paths for wildlife, hydrological links and recreational routes. The links to Mill Green hamlet and museum to the west, to Hatfield House parkland and Stanborough should also be taken into consideration. The views across the landscape to the south, as far as Brookmans Park from the crest of the interfluvium and to Strattons Tower at Little Berkhamsted, and the views to the Green Corridor, forming not only part of the setting of heritage assets including Grade I Hatfield House park (as well as other designated and undesignated assets) but of the openness between settlements, also need to be considered.</p> <p>For the above reasons we believe that the sound way to proceed would be accurately and comprehensively map the constraints (heritage, ecology, hydrology, contamination) before deciding on the placing of the Green Corridor, and CHGCG have proposed such a mapping.</p> <p>To summarise: this study is disappointing in its scant treatment of the heritage issues, and lack of research into many assets not mentioned at all, let alone the historic views, settings and historic settlement pattern. The suggestion of options for the Green Corridor without due assessment of all the assets is deeply flawed and such options should follow a rigorous constraints analysis, not side-step it.</p>
Ponsbourne Park	Hertfords hire	E19/1297	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of garage. 5 Home Farm Cottages, Ponsbourne Park, Newgate Street, Hertford SG13 8QT.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Our comments for the previous proposed garage extension (6/2019/2235/HOUSE) still pertain., viz:</p> <p>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</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Gardens to Former Amwell House Including Scott's Grotto and Gazebo	Hertfords hire	E19/1316	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Small-scale repairs, maintenance works and re-instatements to the grotto, the gazebo/summerhouse and steps. Scotts Grotto, Scotts Road, Ware, Hertfordshire SG12</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We welcome the repair and maintenance works to Scotts Grotto to SPAB standards of workmanship and period-appropriate materials. We would also suggest that the work be informed by experience and knowledge gained from the on-site investigations and repairs at other grottoes such as</p>

				9JN. REPAIR/RESTORATION	<p>Painshill (Cobham) and St Giles House (Wimborne St Giles). We would hope that repairs to the structures would be followed by proposals to repair and rejuvenate the important landscape around the grotto and summerhouse, which is the remnant of the 18th century Amwell House gardens. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Goldings	Hertfords hire	E19/1323	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of single storey side extension. Construction of 1.5 storey side extension and two storey rear extension. Alterations to existing terrace. Windyridge House, Bramfield Road, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 2HZ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.12.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Windyridge House lies within the Goldings parkland, registered Grade II on the HE Register. On the basis of the information contained in this application and our knowledge of the landscape and its history, we do not wish to comment. Kate Harwood</p>
8 Oaken Grove, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E19/1331	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey front,side extension,and first floor rear extension with alterations to openings 8 Oaken Grove, Welwyn Garden City AL7 4TP. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.12.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comment to make on the rear extension. The front extension would compromise a remarkably intact 'village green' design , important in the planning of Garden Cities by Raymond Unwin and later planners. At present the streetscape around the 'green' is visually uniform in buildings and readable as one of the ideals of the Garden City design as reflecting both the community and the healthy living ideals promoted. We consider that this streetscape should be valued and not compromised by intrusive additions. Kate Harwood</p>
29 Broadwater Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E19/1340	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of office building and erection of 128 flats with associated car parking, landscaping, amenity space, bin and cycle storage, with alterations to existing and formation of new access on Broadwater Road and alterations to the existing access on Broad</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.12.2019 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust. We are unaware of a WHBC overall design statement for the redevelopments along Broadwater Road which would ensure a high-quality appearance referencing the original buildings. The choice of materials - orange and buff bricks, for this development, would seem to be out of keeping with the original finishes on the Shredded Wheat factory, Roche buildings and others. Although the commercial and residential areas of Welwyn Garden City do have such guidance, the industrial areas to the east of the railway line are in danger of losing their visual coherence and thus</p>

				Court. 29 Broadwater Road, Welwyn Garden City AL7 3BQ. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL	any link with the Garden City Concepts of the early town. Kate Harwood
Chiddingstone Castle	Kent	E19/1029	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of dwelling and erection of one dwelling. Three Horseshoes Lodge, Chiddingstone Castle Hill, Hoath Road, Chiddingstone, KENT TN8 7AD. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We appreciate being given a little more time with regard to this application and 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. The current building on the site is a single storey structure surrounded by trees and undergrowth. It is visible from the castle and has a negative, but not insignificant, impact on the surroundings. The online documentation shows that the proposed building is two storey and significantly more substantial, although it has been set at a lower level to reduce the impact. In our opinion, the proposed building is significantly out of character with the environs, both of the listed Chiddingstone Castle, its historic park and garden and on the wider surrounding area. In addition, a more prominent access is proposed together with a large vehicular turning area in front of the house, all formed from hard standing. This hard standing together with the loss of some trees and green undergrowth would adversely harm the setting of the historic landscape of the listed building, park and gardens. We are unable to support this application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
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/OUTBU ILDING, SPORT/LEISURE	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2019 Thank you for getting back to the Gardens Trust (GT) with regard to the impact of the proposals upon the Registered Park and Garden (RPG). We have liaised again with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and take on board your comments with regard to various Green Belt and AONB policies, and respect your opinions with regard to these. Our opinion remains that the developer/agent would appear to be pushing the planning restrictions to the limit. They used the original garage area to gain permission for the approval of the new house to its maximum size (19/01032) and then submitted a further application for a garage 19/02506 more than 5m away from the house in order to comply with a separate

					<p>policy GB3, which we must confess we were not familiar with. You will undoubtedly be familiar with Historic England's 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, which states on p2 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.'</p> <p>One of the conditions attached to 19/01032 was to submit a landscape plan which was submitted under 19/02485/DETAIL in August 2019 which received approval in October 2019. This plan did not include details of the new swimming pool forming part of 19/02506 which was submitted separately, but at the same time as the landscape plan. The planning officer states that as the swimming pool is 'subterranean' in nature its impact would be relatively minor on the landscape. We would suggest that the creation of such a large swimming pool which would have to be terraced into the sloping landscape does create a significant impact especially when the new garage is taken into consideration.</p> <p>Policy GB3 does state 'in order to minimise the impact of outbuildings on the openness of the Green Belt, the Council (Sevenoaks) will seek to restrict any outbuildings to a limit of 40sqm (measured externally)'. The proposed garage shown on drawing no 180713-122 Rev A (part of 19/02506) is not dimensioned, but although it has been reduced from a triple to double garage as part of the application process, it would appear to 45sqm using the scale provided on the drawing, contrary to policy GB3. There is also an existing garage on the site in the NE corner of the property, which is presumably remaining, but we do not know whether this is relevant in respect of this application.</p> <p>With regard to the impact of the proposals upon the RPG, we would have liked to have seen a Visual Impact Assessment so that we could judge what kind of effect the extensive new building would have upon the RPG. In particular, we would like to be reassured that the views from inside and out from the RPG are not adversely impacted. As the GT does not have the capacity to make a site visit (although our colleague at KGT has viewed the property from the adjacent public road), we would appreciate it if your Conservation Officer were able to reassure us that the proposals do not affect the setting and significance of the RPG. With this reassurance we would then be able to withdraw our objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2019 Thank you for your email with the notice from your Conservation Officer saying that that she had no objection but wished to condition the external materials of the garage. In our opinion that isn't exactly saying she has no objections from a heritage perspective, and had we had the capacity to visit we would have felt much happier. The Gardens Trust will withdraw its objection but we do wish to put on record our comment that in our opinion, the developer/agent would appear to be pushing the planning restrictions to the limit. We still feel that the applicant should have provided a VIA and we would have like to be fully reassured by your conservation officer with regard to our concerns on the views as per our 2nd letter. Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Ince Blundell Park	Merseyside	E19/1235	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent to replace 2 no. dormer windows to rear elevation and replace 2 no. sets of external gates and create new opening in wall to driveway. Ince Blundell Hall, Park Wall Road, Ince Blundell, L38 6JL. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2019 Thank you for your consultation letter inviting The Gardens Trust (GT), to comment on the above application. As previously notified to you, the GT as the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with County Garden Trusts, and the responsibility for commenting on planning applications in this context has now passed to the Trusts. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) therefore responds in this case. LGT recognises the importance of the heritage assets notably the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, as well as Grade II* listed Ince Blundell Hall, and numerous Grade II listed estate buildings and garden features. LGT supports the current application. We have visited the site, discussed the application with the Agent Sarah Harrison, and noted the proposals. We look forward to the works progressing. Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Eaton Park	Norfolk	E19/1174	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a self contained	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory</p>

				toilet unit. Model Railway, Eaton Park, South Park Avenue, Norwich. VISITOR FACILITIES	<p>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 Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The railway is close to the main entrance in South Park Avenue and just west of the Ornamental Rose Garden. It consists of two small stations for embarking and alighting and a track that has been gradually extended along the south side of the park. It has proved a popular attraction for children over the years and tends to be open on Sundays and occasional bank holidays, depending on the weather. Over the past year we understand from the Friends of Eaton Park that there have been 44 open days.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and can see that the proposed self-contained toilet unit is tucked behind the Clubhouse and should therefore be barely visible from the park, pavilions or rose garden. We would, however, seek assurance that the yew hedge will remain at its current height to ensure maximum screening. It is described as a Visitors' toilet, so we assume when you enter the enclosure it will be visible, and as children are the main railway passengers, much used. Given that the rest of the station structures are in wood and attractive we would recommend that the rather unattractive toilet model shown in the planning application be given some cladding to harmonise with the overall feel of the railway construct. We also understand that the whole enterprise is dependent on locating the septic tank, so the project may prove more complex and may therefore need to return to planning.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E19/0795	I	PLANNING APPLICATION 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>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for the meeting on 19th November between Conservation and Planning members and trustees of the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and staff of the National Trust.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) as a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT), the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, has kept the GT briefed on their meeting with the National Trust and recently with Kerry Babington of Historic England, about the pre-</p>

					<p>application proposals for the café building at Canal Gates. As you will know the GT is a recognized expert voice in any future development affecting the Grade I site at Studley Royal.</p> <p>We fully understand that visitor pressure at Studley Royal has increased and that there is a need for more café space, much better site interpretation and much better lavatories. We also note that it was recognised as far back as 1989 that improvements are needed at Studley Lodge and Canal Gates. However, explanations given at the recent meetings with YGT about expanding the existing café and associated development, and to construct a further building with associated development has not reassured us. Instead, it has given rise to great concern.</p> <p>We consider that the current proposal for Studley Lodge will have a very damaging effect on this very sensitive area of what is not only a Grade I Historic Park and Garden but also a World Heritage Site (WHS); the only WHS in the UK that has been designated because it is an historic park and garden. This area is very sensitive because it represents the point of transition between the wilder character of the deer park and the more manicured gardens/pleasure grounds. The Canal Gates were and are still a main gateway between the park and the pleasure grounds. In relation to this, it is not just the 'Water Gardens' that are important but the site as a whole and the relationships between the different parts of it, including the parkland, the pleasure grounds, and Fountains Abbey and Hall etc. The Water Gardens cannot be treated in isolation from the rest.</p> <p>Studley Lodge (the café) already impinges on the original character of the area around the lake and on this important gateway between the park and the pleasure grounds. Such a large and evident expansion of the Lodge, even if it is screened, is not in our view an appropriate or acceptable way forward.</p> <p>We understand that for the pre-application study only three scenarios were examined by the architects and these only in relation to the Studley Lodge and Canal Gates site. The options were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Do nothing (b) Demolish the existing café (c) 'Create an experience sympathetic to' a World Heritage Site on the same site. <p>Of these options (a) and (b) were discounted.</p> <p>In relation to (c) there is, of course, the question of what in this case</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>constitutes a 'sympathetic experience'. We do not think that the current proposals meet this requirement.</p> <p>We note that Section 1.3 ('Overview Objectives') of the brief that was given to the architects, contains in effect a fourth option which is: "To meet the needs of the projected visitor numbers where possible, or clearly identify where further new provision may be required elsewhere, if this cannot be achieved within project constraints." This implies taking a wider view of the circumstances at the Studley Lodge and Canal Gates area and considering how provision might be made at other places at Studley Royal with a view to alleviating the problems that have been identified in relation to the Studley Lodge and Canal Gates location. It is not at all clear to us that this fourth option has been investigated or sufficiently explored.</p> <p>It would seem to us that the current proposals should be suspended until such time as the fourth option has been thoroughly explored by appropriate specialists and followed by a thorough review of the current proposals. This needs to be done before a Heritage Impact Assessment is made and certainly before any planning application is submitted.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust feel that with due care and sensitivity, improvements to the visitor experience, the interpretation of the property and its educational role, can be achieved without the damage threatened by the current proposals. We are sure that the NT must be supportive of this aim, and we very much hope that by working together, we can use this as an opportunity to demonstrate that the highest level of thought and consideration has been given to this case in order to conserve and enhance to the highest standards, the historic character of this exceptionally important WHS.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Paul Walshe ICOMOS UK; Val Hepworth, Yorkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Gledstone Hall	North Yorkshire	E19/0895	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retrospective application for summer house in rear garden. West Lodge, West Marton, Skipton BD23 3JL. GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.12.2019</p> <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 & 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</p>

					<p>respect of such consultations.</p> <p>In our letter of 30th September, we explained our objection to this retrospective planning application for the summer house in the rear garden of the north-west pavilion (West Lodge). As this is part of the historic design of Gledstone Hall, and within the curtilage of the main building, it affects the setting of the Hall and that of the registered garden. The new plans indicate that it is proposed to lower the roof of the summerhouse so that it projects only slightly above the hedge line and to clad it in lead or similar. This seems to be a good solution and we withdraw our objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Gledstone Hall	North Yorkshire	E19/1244	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retrospective Application: Ground level paving, steps and dwarf wall to form terrace at North Gable. East Lodge, Gledstone, Skipton, BD23 3JL.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2019</p> <p>On 30th September we wrote to your colleague Mr Joshua Parkinson regarding changes that had been made to the north frontage of the north-east pavilion at Gledstone Hall (listed grade II* with the Hall) and asked whether there has been planning approval for the work as it is in the curtilage of the listed building and within the registered park and garden. He kindly replied that he had forwarded our letter to Planning Enforcement who would be in contact in due course. However, we do not seem to have heard anything and we now notice that the above retrospective application deadline has passed. We trust that our comments below will be taken into account in any decisions.</p> <p>As we wrote in our letter of 30th September for application 2019/20903/HH, from 1918 to 1922 Edwin Lutyens time was almost totally taken up with war memorials. His meeting with the Lancashire mill owner, Amos Nelson, enabled him to return to garden designing, but in a severely classical style which was now applied to the gardens for the first time. (Brown, p138). The result is Gledstone Hall, usually recognised as one of Lutyens best classical houses (listed grade II*) – and with its designed gardens and landscape on the H E Register of Parks and Gardens at grade II. The house and gardens were laid out with a "bold masterful treatment of the landscape creating total unity" using "grand axial planning" (Ottewill, p.195). We understand that Gertrude Jekyll contributed planting plans in 1925 but only after Lutyens had completed his design.</p> <p>The subject of this retrospective planning application is land adjacent to</p>

					<p>the north-east pavilion (East Lodge), which forms part of the historic design of Gledstone Hall; within the curtilage of the main building and immediately to the north of the north-east pavilion also listed with the Hall. The changes affect the 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. In our view the fact that the current approach to Gledstone Hall is from the west, south of the pavilions, is not significant in comparison to the original design approach by Lutyens to produce his fine axial arrangement with the drive from the north.</p> <p>The symmetry of the setting of the lodges is thus fundamental to this design, where their lawns with low dry stone walls provided a visible link to the adjacent rural landscape to the north. Two images in the submitted Heritage Statement and Design and Access Statement give clear indication of the design: page 1 shows plate 136, Gledstone Hall, 1923 in 'The Life of Sir Edwin Lutyens' by Christopher Hussey 1953 and page 3, the Google Earth view dated 29/06/2018. This simple setting would have been deliberately designed to heighten the dramatic experience of entering the Hall's principal southern gardens from the north, by first passing through the courtyard, then the Hall itself, before seeing the vista of the central feature, a sunken tank nearly 200ft long terminated by "one of the most delightful devices of garden architecture, a masonry basin of which the rim is nearly flush with the water so that a silver plate seems held actually against the distant landscape". (Hussey, 1935). Lutyens always selected the materials for his walls, paths and terraces with immense care and the setting of buildings such as these lodges within the rural landscape would have been extremely important to him and to which he would have given his full consideration. And as earlier at Hestercombe, Lutyens proved that "an architect can be in unison with Nature", (Country Life, 1908).</p> <p>The siting of a new far more dominant mortared wall adjacent to the original Lutyens dry stone wall is extraordinary, totally incongruous and damages the original Lutyens design. The use of stone paving instead of lawn is also contrary to the original design for the rural setting of these lodges and of course leads to the loss of symmetry in the setting.</p> <p>We are unable to agree with the submitted Heritage Advice. We consider that the new wall and paving are totally inappropriate and cause harm to this sensitive historic setting and are contrary to HE's The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Note 3, (Second Edition) published December 2017 and NPPF paragraphs 184, 193 and 194.</p> <p>For the above reasons we object to this retrospective planning application and advise that the changes should be removed to acknowledge and conserve the significance of this heritage asset.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Val Hepworth BEM, BSc (Hons), PGCE, MA Conservation Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust REF:</p> <p>Jane Brown, Gardens of a Golden Afternoon, The Story of a Partnership, Edwin Lutyens and Gertrude Jekyll, Allen Lane, 1982.</p> <p>David Ottewill, The Edwardian Garden, 1989</p> <p>Christopher Hussey, Gledstone Hall – II, Country Life, April 20, 1935</p> <p>Country Life, April 13, 1935 Gledstone Hall I</p> <p>p 376. The site provides for a level approach from the north (Fig. 2), sheltered from the east by a wooded knoll, and looking southward down a gentle slope, giving Sir Edwin a variation in levels which he has put to striking effect in the gardens to be described next week.</p> <p>p 377. It is the most markedly Palladian country house that has emanated from Sir Edwin Lutyens's office – probably that has been erected in England in recent years. On the entrance front we have all the traditional components: the broad axial approach, the wrought-iron clairvoye with the urn-topped piers, the flanking pavilions, the detached wings, the walled forecourt, and the columned portico. The beautiful ashlar masonry is the same that inspired Georgian Yorkshiremen</p> <p>p377-8. The most distinctive characteristic of the Gledstone design, however, is the planning of its environs. From the north a most satisfying vista (Fig. 3) is framed by the isolated pair of cottages, acting as detached pavilions, the roof slopes of which are echoed by that of the portico beyond. The general view of the buildings from the north-west reveals broader harmonies. We notice how close and compactly the various parts come together and fit into their setting; how smoothly the roofs flow up in the mass.</p>
Bishops Palace, Wells	Somerset	E18/1819	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of new wall walk to perimeter of Bishop Burnell's Great Hall ruinous remains.</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2019</p> <p>Please accept my apologies for not coming back to you sooner but I have been away for work and am now trying to clear all application responses as far as possible before Christmas. I have tried to find the objections online</p>

				<p>Addition of ancillary balustrades. Installation of new handrails to north east and north west tower stairs. Construction of new path parallel to south wall and adaption / enhancement of existing garden planted beds. The Bishops Palace, Market Place, Wells, Somerset BA5 2PD. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p>under 2016/0463/FUL but an application for reduction of tree height in Radstock comes up instead.</p> <p>Having looked again at the online documentation for the 2019 version of this application, it is apparent that Historic England have worked closely with Mendip DC on pre-application advice. They have taken care to consider archaeological and detailed building concerns and to ensure that any modern materials required for the walkway will be as unobtrusive as possible as far as the setting of both The Bishops Palace and the RPG are concerned. I have spoken again to my colleague in the Somerset Gardens Trust and we both agree that as our remit is solely with the possible effect upon the historic designed landscape, we still feel it will enhance the visitor experience. For this reason, I am afraid we will not be modifying our original comments. I am sorry if this disappoints you, but we are unable to comment upon the health & safety, materials, maintenance and technical matters relating to these, as they are beyond our sphere of knowledge or responsibility.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Sheffield General Cemetery	South Yorkshire	E18/1178	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of garage/office buildings and erection of 22 apartments in 4/5 storey block including semi-basement/part ground floor car parking and ancillary accommodation. Cemetery Road Car Sales, 300 Cemetery Road, Sheffield S11 8FT. DEMOLITION, CEMETERY, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) on the further amendments to this planning application. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We refer you to the contents of our earlier letters of 6th December 2018, 11th March, 21st June and 8th August 2019. (Demolition of garage/office buildings and erection of 22 apartments in 4/5 storey block including semi-basement/part ground floor car parking and ancillary accommodation, Cemetery Road Car Sales, 300 Cemetery Road, Sheffield, S11 8FT. Sheffield General Cemetery. Cemetery Avenue, Sheffield S11 8NT.)</p> <p>Although in principle we are supportive of the redevelopment of this brownfield site and note the revisions which are an improvement with regard to the heritage assets, we remain very concerned that the amendments do not sufficiently reduce the level of harm to the significance of the grade II* registered Sheffield General Cemetery, the Grade II* listed Non-conformist Chapel, Grade II* listed entrance gateway and Grade II listed Montagu House, and the Nether Edge Conservation</p>

					<p>area.</p> <p>Sheffield General Cemetery at grade II* makes it an important national example of the early Victorian cemetery movement and its setting was designed to afford views both along Cemetery Road and within the cemetery itself. Despite the accommodation of the proposal being pulled back from the cemetery boundary (the car parking remains on the earlier proposed footprint), the height and mass of the proposed development still does not respect that of the other structures within the cemetery landscape and along the streetscape of Cemetery Road; it remains essentially four storeys and will still dominate the cemetery and listed former Cemetery Office and have a large massing opposite the residential property on Cemetery Road. It will also be the dominant structure when viewed from below both within the cemetery itself and from the opposite side of the valley to the north.</p> <p>In our view the building should be no more than three storeys. The additional storey increases the harm to the setting of the cemetery and the listed buildings and would therefore need a clear and convincing justification which we have not seen.</p> <p>We are aware that existing trees near the southern boundary of the cemetery will have canopies very close to the proposed building. This also means that any building works will damage the root area and in addition there will be pressure to fell trees to gain views. There should be a landscape plan and a tree planting and management plan agreed in association with the trustees of the cemetery as part of any conditions should your authority move to approve a plan for 300 Cemetery Road.</p> <p>We remain of the opinion that despite the changes the scale of the proposed development would still be harmful to the historic character of the Sheffield General Cemetery, the conservation area and the setting of three listed buildings. Given the high significance of these designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation and this includes avoiding harmful development within their setting. We do not consider that this harm is necessary in order for the site to be developed and therefore in our view the proposals do not accord with paragraphs 193 and 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019. And with paragraph 196; where harm should be weighed against the public benefits. We note the statutory duty of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. We also note Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted March 2009) CS74 Design Principles particularly b. views and vistas to landmarks and skylines and 12.14 ‘... respecting the scale, grain and context of the places in which development is proposed.’</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust wishes to register their strong objection to this application and asks the Council to continue to seek a more sympathetic solution which respects the historic character of this part of Sheffield.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Conock Manor	Wiltshire	E19/1208	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of existing stable block to assisted care accommodation. Construction of timber framed car port, shed and replacement gates. Conock Cottage, Conock SN10 3QQ. CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Wiltshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>There is existing permission for the stables to be converted into a residential building for elderly dependents of the occupants of Conock Cottage which in turn requires a large new garage to be built. Nowhere within the D&A could we see any mention of the fact that the application site lies within the heart of the Grade II registered park (RPG) of Conock. We would therefore have expected the applicant to include a Visual Impact Assessment to enable your officers and other statutory bodies to ascertain what effect both the garage and extension to the stables might cause to the RPG. In particular, it is evident from Plate 3 that the site for the new garage is on considerably higher ground than the barn to the right in the photograph. Although the exact height of the garage is unclear, from the documentation we are assuming that it will have a maximum roof height of 4.4m to match the single storey extension to the stables. If this is the case then the new garage structure would be apparent from the public footpath which runs to the south east of the garden of Conock Cottage. We would have liked to have made a site visit but due to staffing constraints we have been unable to visit the site in person. We would also query the need for a huge glass window in the side of the garage, as this does not seem ‘in</p>

					<p>keeping with the existing building, the main cottage and the grounds of the property' as per the D&A statement.</p> <p>We also concur with your conservation officer's comments that the existing gate should not be removed as it is similar to other original gates at Conock Manor and are curtilage listed. Unfortunately, since we began looking at the documents online, your website appears to have gone down so we cannot quote the exact wording.</p> <p>Should your officers decide to approve this application we would also urge them to insert a clause to ensure that in the future, the new accommodation created from the stable block, is never sold separately from Conock Cottage. The increased footprint of building within the garden of Conock Cottage, has a small but cumulative impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>Should the site be split further, more garages/outbuildings/paraphernalia would be required which would compound this negative impact. We would draw your officers' attention to Historic England's 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. On page 2 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---