



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JANUARY 2020

The GT conservation team received 221 new cases in England and four case in Wales during January, 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, 41 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
Kings Weston House	Avon	E19/1371	II	Planning Application and Listed Building Consent: Proposed demolition of existing single storey teaching block G, with part-demolition, part-extension, and refurbishment of the existing single storey flat roofed school building block C, with internal alterations. Kingsweston School Napier Miles Road Bristol BS11 OUT DEMOLITION, EDUCATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.01.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the curtilage of the Grade II Listed Garden Walls which form part of the former Kings Weston stables, and the wider association with the Grade II Registered Park and Garden, within Bristol, and the Kings Weston and Trym Valley Conservation Area 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. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust note that there are no works proposed to any listed wall or building. Therefore we have no objection to this application. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Clic Cottage, Frenchay	Avon	E19/1441	N	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Relevant	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.01.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory

				<p>demolition of existing flat roof extension. Erection of single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation. Internal and external alterations to include the demolition of existing flat roof extension. Erection of single storey side extension, erection of 1 no. bay window to the western elevation and creation of 2 no. new windows to the south elevation</p> <p>Clic Cottage, Beckspool Road, Frenchay, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS16 1NT.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a locally registered historic 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 have considered the information that you have provided and on the basis of this do not wish to comment on the proposals.</p> <p>We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals. However, if you have any further queries, please contact us at this email address.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Rockwood House	Avon	E19/1364	N	<p>Planning Application: Erection of two storey, 64 no. bed nursing home with parking, landscaping and associated works. Land East Of Gravel Hill Road And North Of Rockwood House Gravel Hill Road Yate BS37 7BW. RESIDENTIAL PARKING EXTERNAL LIGHTING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the curtilage of a grade II Listed House set in the remains of a locally registered park and garden, 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 note that a previous unsuccessful application for a larger, 90 bedroom nursing home was rejected primarily because of its height and volume which impacted negatively on the adjacent listed building. It is clear that the topography of the site and the existing mature trees have been used as a screen to minimise the impact of the new application. However, page 4 of the Design Statement for landscape design recommends 'visually recessive materials' although the illustration of the proposed building is a mix of similar shades of render as that of the listed mansion.</p> <p>The main façade of the original house facing south and west is Ashlar Stone. The remaining elevations of the house and newer buildings are cream render. To ensure that the new building and its access road, are screened by the vegetation from the listed building, perhaps the palette of materials should include timber and the material colours be close in tone</p>

					<p>to its landscape surroundings. As the final statement of the Design and Access Statement is, "The fundamental driving force of the proposed design revolves around the objective of minimising the overall impact of the scheme to the setting of the listed building and its surrounding context".</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers that the application is an improvement on the previous scheme.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Ditton Park	Berkshire	E19/1462	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New glazed circular main entrance, single storey rear infill extension with roof terrace to the west elevation, new pontoon with seating area and enclosure, reconfiguration of the existing car parks to include additional parking and new access to a proposed refuse management area and associated landscaping. Ditton Park, Riding Court Road, Datchet, Slough SL3 9LL. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.01.2020</p> <p>New glazed circular main entrance, single storey rear infill extension with roof terrace to the west elevation, new pontoon with seating area and enclosure, reconfiguration of the existing car parks to include additional parking and new access to a proposed refuse management area and associated landscaping. Ditton Park, Riding Court Road, Datchet, Slough</p> <p>The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust 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 to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. As Ditton Park is Grade II on Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, it is an important part of the history of the Borough's parks and the richness of its history. We are therefore interested in ensuring that this designed landscape is maintained and improved to the benefit of all those who live, work in and visit the town.</p> <p>We are therefore pleased to see that the current proposals for the office building within the park are contained within the footprint of the existing building environment and its parking and are no higher than that existing. The proposals would appear not to affect the wider Registered Park and Garden. On this basis we have no objections to the proposed development but we would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on any future development affecting Ditton Park.</p> <p>However we did notice that the Design and Access Statement refers to a Heritage Statement which we could not find on the Council's website. This would have been helpful in clarifying any effects on the historic landscape.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>

					Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI Chair Berkshire Gardens Trust
THE ROYAL ESTATE, WINDSOR: WINDSOR GREAT PARK	Berkshire	E19/1369	I	Planning application: Retention and refurbishment of one existing building to include re-cladding of the existing building, erection of storage building for B8 storage and distribution use with ancillary office space plus associated access, parking and landscaping, following demolition of existing buildings. Mezel Hill Yard Windsor Great Park Windsor DEMOLITION MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING PARKING	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.01.2020</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 Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and whose expert local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation including the Heritage and transport reports. We have not made a site visit but are familiar with the site. The application area is well hidden within the extensive trees in the Great Park, cannot be seen from outside the Park and the farm buildings are also not visible from there.</p> <p>We are satisfied with the design of the buildings, which will be less extensive than the conglomeration of the present buildings, a brown-field site situated within the Grade I Park. Our slight reservation relates to the proposed use of the buildings. Originally they were farm buildings, and the replacements proposed will be in the same vernacular.</p> <p>The new buildings will be a warehouse for souvenirs of the Royal Collections Trust. These need to be warehoused and distributed around the country. Currently they have a building in the private part of the Home Park. They want to move partly for space and partly for security reasons, to reduce vehicle movements within the private part of the estate. They envisage the number of staff may rise to 25. That should not have an impact on the Park. They do not expect there will be deliveries etc at peak times but clearly there will be movements of heavy vehicles. We are therefore concerned about the precedent of permitting commercial development of redundant farm buildings.</p> <p>We therefore wish to draw your officers' attention to the precedent it sets. The next application may not have the special reasons of close connection with the Crown that this application has, with limited vehicle movements plus security considerations.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E19/0856	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed grain store to store	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for getting back to us with regard to objections from the</p>

				<p>crops grown by M & J Gaymer. Mentmore Park Farm, Mentmore, Buckinghamshire LU7 OQN. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>applicant's agent relating to the proposed planting condition. Please see our responses to the points raised :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have the Garden Trust actually conducted a site visit? If so, they will be aware that the buildings are already well screened from the road. From observation from public access points we have noted that the present building is partially screened from the road, but even so is visible in places, particularly from the very sensitive Grand Avenue approach and from the east park. 2. The proposed building is the same as the one next to it and that did not require a planting condition, when built in 2007. The GT cannot comment on this, except that the existing building adversely affects views from the Grand Avenue (see above). 3. The proposed tree belt would cause significant long-term damage to the existing field/site drainage, which is important to the farm. The GT cannot comment on this. 4. Could this condition be dealt with by cladding the entire side and rear elevation of the building to reduce the visible concrete, rather than planting trees? We refer you to Ruth Benson's comments on the cladding/colour. Planting is preferable, using appropriate species mix as advised. 5. The site for the proposed building is outside of the designated Park and Garden boundary and as it is identical to the building next to it (built in 2007), what detrimental impact has actually been proven or evidenced? It is within the setting not only of the Grade II* park but within that designation it is visible from the very sensitive Grand Avenue, as mentioned above. 6. Encouraging biodiversity around a building designed to store food is not a sensible approach as we want to minimise any potential problems from birds and other animals, especially mice/rodents. The GT cannot comment on this. <p>We do not have the capacity to undertake a further site visit and are happy to leave this to your adviser Ruth Benson.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Claydon	Buckinghamshire	E19/0899	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of four existing estate barns into B1 employment use and the erection of one new</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.01.2020</p> <p>In our letter to you dated October 19th 2019, the Gardens Trust (GT) confirmed that we had looked at the online documentation and liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) but that</p>

			<p>storage and maintenance barn, including associated alterations, a bin store, landscape and access works and car parking. Buildings At Farm Courtyard, Claydon Estate, Steeple Claydon Road, Middle Claydon, Buckinghamshire MK18 2EX. CHANGE OF USE, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>unfortunately due to lack of volunteer capacity, we were unable to make a site visit and therefore unable to offer any comments other than those given in that correspondence.</p> <p>Following the submission of additional documents in response to questions raised by AVDC, the GT/BGT requested a site visit, but the applicant has been reluctant to enable this in a timely manner. Therefore, the following comments are again regrettably submitted following a further desk-based assessment, without the benefit of seeing the site in person.</p> <p>With regard to the proposals for the introduction of a new building shown in the drawings as 'building E', we wish to reiterate our previous concerns in that the proposed structure pushes the built area into the planted area nearer to the pond, and therefore extends the built area to the full length of the rear elevation of the stables. We recognise that Barn E is a 7-bay structure and that there are a substantial number of parking spaces proposed. We assume that the introduction of the hedge is to screen Barn E from the other structures. However, it would be preferable if the proposed new works could be kept as close as possible to the existing developed area, and that no new structures or hard-standing be introduced further north than the top of the access track (which currently stops abruptly but which the applicant wishes to link and utilise). This would ensure that none of the proposed works extend too far into the RPG.</p> <p>We note that the statement from Wessex Archaeology dated November 2019 suggests that, because this is a working area, its contribution to the wider landscape is limited and that previously there had been a proliferation of other utilitarian structures. Nonetheless, the grassed area retains an open, natural character which allows the grassed views to run right up to the built area. The creep of further hard-standing will permanently alter this view and in our opinion, be detrimental to the RPG.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed works at the Lodges, we have now had chance to review the proposals in more detail, albeit without an opportunity to consider their impact on site. Nonetheless, the proposed position for the electric gates seems rather random and it would be preferable to position them nearer to the courtyard area. We have no objection to the passing bays.</p> <p>The GT/BGT would not object to a new timber shed for the Western lodge, although it could be positioned more discretely within the garden of the property, to ensure it is not/less visible from within the RPG. However, we</p>
--	--	--	---	---

					<p>note that the response from Wessex Archaeology dated November 2019 suggests that the shed will be removed from this application.</p> <p>We would like to express our concern about the number and design of the car parking provision adjacent to Western lodge. We note elsewhere in the Design and Access Statement that the applicant has allowed for an 'overprovision of cycle storage' and yet there are four car parking places adjacent to one small lodge. The amendments to the proposals (as shown on Revision B) do not appear to have reduced the impact of these proposals on the RPG. The car parking places are now more prominent from the driveway and to the rear of the property, and the proposed planting to screen the car parking introduces a very formal hedge line into the landscape which is detrimental to the RPG.</p> <p>Furthermore, we note that the Wessex Archaeology statement dated November 2019, suggests that the number of parking spaces has been reduced, but the drawings still show 4 spaces, albeit that they are described as 2 spaces per property. The GT would prefer to see fewer parking spaces and a more informal natural approach to car parking provision at the lodges to reflect the domestic use of these buildings and to retain the vernacular agricultural character of these two structures.</p> <p>We note the proposal to close the access of the main road to the existing garage/shed at the Western lodge and would like to express our concern as to whether this would lead to the introduction of access at a later date in a different position. Fundamentally, we would have no objection to closing this access if there is no vehicular access required to that particular structure. However, given the concerns being raised about the proposed introduction of 4 car parking places to the north of the Western lodge, we would query as to why this access drive could not continue to provide appropriate car parking for the Western lodge. We would prefer to see this access retained and utilised for parking for the Western lodge rather than spaces allocated to the rear of the lodge.</p> <p>With regard to the replacement of the hedging surrounding the Eastern lodge, we have no objection in principle if the need is to plant a native species or a healthier hedge. If visibility is the concern, we are curious to understand how replacing one hedge with another will resolve this matter. We understand that there are proposals for post and rail fencing although we cannot see it on the plans – this may be due to our capacity issues, but it would be helpful if this were pointed out.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.01.2020 Further to our letters of 19th October 2019 and our second one earlier today, The Gardens Trust have subsequently been notified of the extent of the proposed post-and-rail fencing along the main access routes into the property. This introduction is both excessive and unnecessary and will be extremely detrimental to the current open aspect of the RPG. The Gardens Trust objects to this proposal. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Mount Edgcumbe	Cornwall	E19/1284	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Part Retrospective and prior approval of landscaping and associated infrastructure works to construct a scale railway, with ancillary built structures. Mount Edgcumbe Country Park, Cremyll, Torpoint, Cornwall. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.01.2020 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 Cornwall Gardens Trust (CGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the online documentation and would have liked to have seen plans of planting, both existing and proposed, as well as photos showing before and after views from public paths/highways etc. We have no other comments regarding this application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Oldway Mansion	Devon	E19/0871	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of new CCTV column within grounds. Oldway Mansion, Torquay Road, Paignton TQ3 2TD. COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the revised plans for the above application and for confirming that the new CCTV column is proposed to be installed on the grassed area to the right hand side of the former round Riding School building. Thank you for negotiating this revised location which will cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the the grade II Registered landscape of Oldway Mansion. We have no objection to the installation of the CCTV column in the revised location. Yours faithfully</p>

					John Clark Conservation Officer
Lindridge	Devon	E19/1394	II	Planning Application: Replacement agricultural building Address: Lindridge Par, Bishopsteignton, Devon, TQ14 9TG AGRICULTURE BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. Lindridge is a site of national importance as signified by its inclusion on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. The Register is a highly selective list containing just over 1600 sites, of which there are 56 sites in Devon and only 9 sites within Teignbridge.</p> <p>The north entrance to Lindridge is marked by stone wing walls flanking the gate piers and an early C20 two storey lodge (Avenue House) to the east of the gate. The north drive extends 250m through Lime trees towards the former stables; there are fields to the north and south of the drive. The application is for a 'replacement' agricultural building in the field to the north of the north drive. However, the applicant has not indicated what the proposed building would replace.</p> <p>The land to the west of the application site has, to some extent, been degraded by the derelict glasshouse and two (apparently) derelict sheds. The applicant does not make any reference to his intentions for the future of these buildings.</p> <p>The proposed agricultural building would be prominent in views from the north drive and would be seen as a discordant feature in the landscape, causing substantial harm to the future significance of the heritage asset of Lindridge.</p> <p>NPPF para 184 states 'Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.'</p> <p>NPPF para 194 states 'Any harm to, or loss of, significance of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks and gardens, should be exceptional.'</p> <p>NPPF para 195 states 'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm.... is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.....'. In this case, it is apparent that the proposed</p>

					<p>development would undoubtedly NOT be a substantial public benefit. It is evident that the proposed agricultural building would represent an intrusive new development within an historic landscape of national importance. We have not seen any justification in respect of the historic landscape for such a proposal. We advise that proposals for new development should flow clearly from a thorough understanding of the historic landscape and should not compromise the potential for repairs to the historic landscape in the future. We would suggest that the application has been brought forward without any appreciation of the significance of the historic designed landscape.</p> <p>The proposed agricultural building would constitute a significant change to the character and appearance of the landscape, in particular the views from the north drive approach to Lindridge.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Gardens Trust is extremely concerned about the adverse visual impact of the proposed replacement agricultural building which would result in a substantial loss of significance to the heritage asset of Lindridge. We therefore urge your Council to refuse consent as this proposal clearly conflicts with national planning policy in regard to the conservation of the historic environment.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Lindridge	Devon	E19/1394	II	<p>Planning Application: Replacement agricultural building Address: Lindridge Par, Bishopsteignton, Devon, TQ14 9TG AGRICULTURE BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. Oxton House is a site national importance as signified by its inclusion on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. The Register is a highly selective list containing just over 1600 sites, of which there are 56 sites in Devon and only 9 sites within Teignbridge.</p> <p>Oxton House is a C18 picturesque landscape developed by the Rev John Swete, the late C18 Devon diarist and traveller. The picturesque grounds comprised lawns, parterre, shrubberies, parkland and a lake.</p> <p>The site is included in the Heritage at Risk Register compiled by Historic England because the pleasure grounds are neglected, much of the park is ploughed and there is a considerable loss of parkland planting.</p> <p>NPPF para 184 states 'Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource,</p>

					<p>and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.'</p> <p>NPPF para 194 states 'Any harm to, or loss of, significance of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks and gardens, should be exceptional.'</p> <p>NPPF para 195 states 'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm.... is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.....'.</p> <p>We consider that it might be possible to install the 15 solar panels without harming the significance of the heritage asset of Oxton House. We met Malcolm McKee, the owner of Oxton Mere, on site yesterday and we suggested that if the proposed solar panels were sited as far back towards the site boundary as possible, they then might not impact visually on the historic designed landscape of Oxton House.</p> <p>Mr McKee suggested 'mocking up' the position of the solar panels with stakes. Mr McKee said that he would contact the Gardens Trust when this has been done.</p> <p>Photographs of the site from the road to Oxton House will be sent to you separately</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>John Clark</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p>
Oxton House	Devon	E19/1438	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of 15 solar panels.</p> <p>Oxton Mere, Kenton. SOLAR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. Oxton House is a site national importance as signified by its inclusion on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. The Register is a highly selective list containing just over 1600 sites, of which there are 56 sites in Devon and only 9 sites within Teignbridge.</p> <p>Oxton House is a C18 picturesque landscape developed by the Rev John Swete, the late C18 Devon diarist and traveller. The picturesque grounds comprised lawns, parterre, shrubberies, parkland and a lake.</p> <p>The site is included in the Heritage at Risk Register compiled by Historic</p>

					<p>England because the pleasure grounds are neglected, much of the park is ploughed and there is a considerable loss of parkland planting.</p> <p>NPPF para 184 states 'Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.'</p> <p>NPPF para 194 states 'Any harm to, or loss of, significance of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks and gardens, should be exceptional.'</p> <p>NPPF para 195 states 'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm.... is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.....'.</p> <p>We consider that it might be possible to install the 15 solar panels without harming the significance of the heritage asset of Oxton House. We met Malcolm McKee, the owner of Oxton Mere, on site yesterday and we suggested that if the proposed solar panels were sited as far back towards the site boundary as possible, they then might not impact visually on the historic designed landscape of Oxton House.</p> <p>Mr McKee suggested 'mocking up' the position of the solar panels with stakes. Mr McKee said that he would contact the Gardens Trust when this has been done.</p> <p>Photographs of the site from the road to Oxton House will be sent to you separately</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>John Clark</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E19/1466	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Banner attached to advertising hoarding. Icehouse Copse, Stover, Devon.</p> <p>ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>Stover Park is a site national importance as signified by its inclusion on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. The Register is a highly selective list containing just over 1600 sites, of which there are 56 sites in Devon and only 9 sites within Teignbridge.</p> <p>Stover Park is included in the Heritage at Risk Register compiled by</p>

					<p>Historic England, because they consider that the condition of the site is unsatisfactory with major localised problems. The setting is under threat from development, including road widening and housing allocation. A parkland plan was produced through a Natural England Stewardship Scheme in 2014. An application has been made to the National Lottery Heritage Fund to implement the plan's recommendations and their decision is expected in March 2020.</p> <p>NPPF para 184 states 'Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.'</p> <p>NPPF para 194 states 'Any harm to, or loss of, significance of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks and gardens, should be exceptional.'</p> <p>NPPF para 195 states 'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm.... is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.....'. In this case it is clear that the proposed banner attached to an advertisement hoarding would NOT be of any public benefit.</p> <p>The proposal for a banner attached to an advertisement hoarding would detract from the character and appearance of Stover Park.</p> <p>The proposal has been brought forward without any appreciation of the significance of the historic designed landscape.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust considers that the proposed banner attached to an advertising hoarding at the entrance to Ice House Copse would harm the significance of the heritage assets of Stover Park. We therefore ask your Council to refuse consent as the proposal clearly conflicts with national planning policy in regard to the conservation of the historic environment</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Athelhampton	Dorset	E19/1280	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Drilling of a single vertical well for the appraisal and production of oil, together with the establishment and construction of the site	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Dorset</p>

				<p>compound. Adjacent to Athelhampton Road, DT2 7LJ. MINERAL EXTRACTION</p>	<p>Gardens Trust (DGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. Please accept our apologies for the delay in getting this back to you.</p> <p>For the GT/DGT the key initial point is whether the proposal will impact on the Grade I designated garden at Athelhampton House. The applicants have provided some information on this issue, even if their conclusions are very broad-brush, and do not assess impacts of particular points within the landscape in detail. However, the GT/DGT are satisfied that there is no inter-visibility between the House and garden as the proposal is essentially small-scale in terms of its impact on the landscape. The A35 dual carriageway is of importance here, but not as much as is implied by the documentation. The road is at ground level south of the proposed site, and it is only the wooded landscape that prevents views opening up.</p> <p>There are other issues here what the DGT trusts will be taken into consideration. These include the tanker traffic that will be necessary, proposals to deal with any run-off during construction and pollution during production. These points are particularly relevant in the light of recent weather: there are many watercourses running through the fields at present, in addition to the main Piddle river: these conditions need to be taken into account in this proposal, and not regarded as a 'one-off' event. The proposal needs to be considered in terms of Paras 209/a and/b of the NPPF :</p> <p>209. Minerals planning authorities should:</p> <p>a) recognise the benefits of on-shore oil and gas development, including unconventional hydrocarbons, for the security of energy supplies and supporting the transition to a low-carbon economy; and put in place policies to facilitate their exploration and extraction;</p> <p>b) when planning for on-shore oil and gas development, clearly distinguish between, and plan positively for, the three phases of development (exploration, appraisal and production), whilst ensuring appropriate monitoring and site restoration is provided for.</p> <p>We note the irony that this application is being considered at the same time as another in the grounds of Athelhampton House for renewable sources of energy.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

Groombridge Place	East Sussex	E19/1362	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FENCE AROUND VILLAGE PLAYGROUND WITH NEW ENCLOSURE WHICH INCORPORATES FOUR TOWERS THAT EXCEED 4 METRES IN HEIGHT (AS PART OF PROJECT TO RENEW PLAYGROUND). GROOMBRIDGE RECREATION GROUND, STATION ROAD, GROOMBRIDGE, TN3 9RB. BOUNDARY, PLAY AREA	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.01.2020</p> <p>Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. The site lies within Groombridge Place, which is included on the list of registered Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II* designation.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application.</p> <p>The proposals lie on the edge of the registered area and would be well screened when viewed from most parts of the park. Hence the proposals would not appear to cause harm to the significance of the registered park and, therefore, SGT does not object to the application, nor does it specifically support it.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell</p> <p>On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Plumpton Place	East Sussex	E19/1551	II*	PRE-APPLICATION Removal of pear/cherry avenue. Plumpton Place. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.01.2020</p> <p>Following your phone conversation with my colleague, Alison, at the Gardens Trust in early January, she has asked Sussex Gardens Trust whether we have any comments to contribute to a pre-planning application at Plumpton Place about a pear/cherry avenue that may be removed.</p> <p>My own knowledge is limited to visit in April 2010 - I recall the rose garden but not the pear/cherry avenue. However I have consulted other SGT colleagues including Virginia Hinze who used to work at Historic England and is the author of the HE Listing for Plumpton Place.</p> <p>It is helpful that a project at the University of California (funded by SGT) has just been completed and Jekyll's plans, surveys, photographs and letters with Edward Hudson are all now available on this website Plumpton Place - Jekyll archive (61 items in total).</p> <p>The site survey (see below) before dredging work and reconfiguration to Lutyens plans doesn't show any trees/planting in the area where the trees in question are now located (see image below with approx site of trees circled in red).</p> <p>https://calisphere.org/item/d018e7a4-2b2a-4152-bbce-125ba0289886/</p>

					<p>Indeed part of the area in question is, I think, shown as largely open in this photo from 1928 (the area is on the left in the background) https://calisphere.org/item/d018e7a4-2b2a-4152-bbce-125ba0289886/?order=57</p> <p>The feature concerned has no apparent association with the reason that the site is registered - which is the design work that Lutyens commissioned from Jekyll and which is focused on the immediate house surrounds and the Mill pond and house.</p> <p>So our conclusion is that removal of the trees is unlikely to adversely affect any Jekyll features.</p> <p>If a planning application is submitted we would appreciate being consulted (in addition to the Gardens Trust).</p> <p>Kind regards Jim Stockwell On behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust</p>
Alresford Hall	Essex	E19/1403	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed farm diversification to create a childrens adventure play-land within Alresford Hall Farm. Alresford Hall, Ford Lane, Alresford, Colchester, Essex CO7 8AY. PLAY AREA</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2020</p> <p>I am commenting on this application on behalf of the Essex Gardens Trust, which represents The Gardens Trust, a statutory consultee on historic landscapes and gardens. We wish to register an objection to this application for a children's adventure playground at Alresford Hall. Alresford Hall is of historical importance as the manor Alresford. It stands in an isolated position, above a valley, to the south of the village which is a modern development centred on the railway station. The ruined medieval parish church is to the west on Ford Lane, from which the current access to the Hall and the properties on the estate is taken. This is a stretch of countryside which has been little disturbed except by gravel workings. The Hall is listed grade II. It owes much of its appearance to Matthew Martin, a director of the East India Company, who bought it in 1720. North of the Hall is a grade II post-medieval eight bay barn, and to the south of it a walled garden, also grade II. On level ground to the east of the Hall, there was until recently a nursery. This business has closed, and the buildings there largely cleared. It is in this area that the playground is proposed. It would occupy an area of about 200m square, in which there would be structures for a variety of activities. To the south would be a service and play building 40m long and 10m wide, and parking for over 150 cars. To the north would be a new access road from the B1027. It is difficult to see how this would not affect the setting of the listed buildings, changing the character of the area from rural/agricultural to commercial and developed</p>

					<p>with built form.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment with the application has failed to recognise the existence only 200-300m south of the proposed car park of a complex of listed building, including the II* one known as The Quarters, historically associated with the Hall. The confusing name of The Quarters apparently references a link to Cromwell's troops, but the principal part of the building dates from about 1765 and is a chinoiserie summerhouse or fishing lodge situated by a lake formed from a dammed stream. In origin this may well have been a millpond for the manor. An estate map of 1730 shows a straight drive cutting a view through woodland on the valley side down to the pond. The sweet chestnut trees that are a major component of this woodland may well date from about this time. The summerhouse was designed by Richard Woods for Thomas Martin as a Chinese temple with a cupola above sweeping soffits or eaves, large ogival headed sash windows, and a trellis work balustrade to the veranda facing the lake. Chinese style structures were popular adornments of 18th century gardens, but often of impermanent materials or at risk of changes in fashion, such that relatively few have survived. Woods was a significant landscape designer with about 40 known commissions. Some were in Essex where he settled from 1768, eventually becoming surveyor to the 9th Lord Petre at Thorndon Hall. At Alresford, he probably also improved the lake and its surroundings. The lake, the summerhouse, an island with a willow tree, and in the distance an 18th century brick bridge (also grade II), form a perfect 'Willow Pattern' picture. This, however, is not how Constable chose to portray it in his painting of 1816, which is a direct view of the summerhouse from across the lake. Around the summerhouse, there are also three roughly contemporary grade II listed buildings, a cottage, and outbuilding, a dovecot, whilst on the other side of the lake there is a listed icehouse. These buildings, and the landscape, are part of a historic ensemble with the Hall, and the Heritage Impact Assessment should be revised to take account of them. They may not be intervisible with the development site, but historically they were part of it, and in terms of heritage values, they score highly for aesthetic, evidential and communal values. Their setting, as the wider surroundings in which they are experienced, to use the NPPF definition, will be damaged, as will that of the listed buildings at the Hall, in particular by a loss of tranquillity, an essential feature of this picturesque landscape. With the presence of tens of thousands of people a year, and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>200 car movements a day, only a few hundred metres away, it could not be otherwise. The car park and the play building are a point nearest The Quarters, when ideally they should be to the north nearest the access road. The outcome would be contrary to the recommendations of the NPPF (170) which says planning policies 'should contribute to enhance the natural environment' from the effects, inter alia, of noise, and ensure new development 'is appropriate for its location', taking into account the likely effects of pollution, which includes noise (180). It is absurd that the agents say there is no need for a noise assessment. The development would also be inconsistent with the NPPF's emphasis on the 'desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets', and on the 'desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness' (192).</p> <p>This is not the right place for a development of this sort, and we urge your authority to refuse the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely David Andrews FSA IHBC</p>
Highnam Court	Gloucestershire	E19/1408	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of outbuilding into living accommodation and erection of a link extension and detached garage. Chepstow Lodge, Highnam, Gloucester. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee, has notified The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this Application on its behalf.</p> <p>This proposal to extend Chepstow Lodge, which is set within the Listed landscape of Highnam Court, creates a marginal intervention to its overall setting. The associated trees will screen the proposed freestanding garage, but great care should be taken in reshaping and root protection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, on behalf of GGLT</p>
Highnam Court	Gloucestershire	E19/1409	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey side and rear extensions. Linton Lodge, Newent Road, Highnam. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust to respond to this Application on its behalf. Within the overall Listed landscape setting to Highnam Court, compared to Chepstow Lodge, Linton Lodge has a greater visual impact on the A40. However, since its original construction, the Lodge has had a number of extensions that have rather clouded the quality of its original character. With this in mind, subject to achieving a close match with the external facing materials, GGLT would not wish to raise adverse comment on this proposed extension.</p>

					Yours sincerely, David Ball, on behalf of GGLT.
Woodchester Mansion	Gloucestershire	E19/1434	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent The existing spillway to Old Dam has collapsed at its lower extent. The proposed work is to remediate this damage (382056-201386). Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Gloucestershire, GL10 3TS. WATER FEATURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2020 The Garden Trust has notified The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this Application on its behalf. GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comment regarding this proposal for remedial work to the spillway. Yours sincerely, David Ball, on behalf of GGLT
Syon Park	Greater London	E19/1279	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of a one-way link road between Syon Park and London Road, including associated engineering operations, earthworks, drainage and landscaping. SYON HOUSE, SYON PARK, BRENTFORD TW8 8JF. ROAD	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.01.2020 We refer to the above consultation which has recently been brought to the attention of the Gardens Trust and affects Syon Park, which is a Grade I listed Park and Garden. As the Statutory Consultee for historic designed landscapes of all grades in England which are on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest held by Historic England we would expect to have been included in this consultation and are concerned that this process has not been undertaken. However, we have considered the information provided in support of the application and on the basis of this confirm we do not wish to comment on the proposals at this stage. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals. 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. In addition, we would be grateful to be consulted on all future planning applications which are likely to impact on sites of all grades included on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Thank you for your help in this matter. With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Croome Court	Hereford and Worcester	E19/1417	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a ground mounted solar farm, associated works and ancillary infrastructure, including access tracks, underground cables and	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.01.2020 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 Hereford &

				<p>grid connection substation. Defford Aerodrome, Rebecca Road, Besford, Worcester WR8 9ES. SOLAR</p>	<p>Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&WGT) who know Croome extremely well, and whose expert local knowledge informs this response. We are gravely concerned about the effect of the proposed 107.7 ha (266 acre) solar farm from the outward view from the ridge within the RPG, and its impact upon the significance of the Grade I registered park at Croome. We appreciate the importance of providing green power in the future, but the siting of any such solar arrays must be undertaken with great sensitivity in order not to detract from our irreplaceable national heritage. Historic England (HE) have summarised the importance and significance of the unique landscape at Croome in their response, and the National Trust (NT) have devoted years of work and countless sums of money restoring this gem of international importance. Currently the site receives c300,000 visitors per annum.</p> <p>HE also mentions (Heritage Assessment (HA) Para 1.18) early maps which record a gap in the trees towards the south of the eastern ridge, recorded in the Broome survey of 1763, the Snape map of 1796 and the Hopcraft survey of 1810 – indicating a definite intent of creating designed views from within the RPG towards Bredon Hill to the south east, encompassing the application site and shown on Plan EDP H4 Masterplan. It is worth stressing that the boundary of the RPG is a mere c100m west of the application site. We suggest that this is in direct contradiction of Para 3.32 in the LVIA which states ‘The deliberate screening of the land immediately beyond the RPG, including the application site, indicates that it was not considered to make any contribution to the setting of the registered park.’ We entirely concur with H&WGT’s comments in relation to W/14/10244/PN on 29th July 2014 : ‘it is considered that Croome provides a prime example of Capability Brown deliberately constructing such a view into the contrasting ‘unparked’ and unimproved common land to the east’ and which goes on to say ‘the observation of English Heritage regarding the circuits of the park recommended by Dean in 1824 which must have taken in views of the outlying land from the main gates to Dunstall Castle.’</p> <p>The proposed site is slightly larger than the one consented to in 2014, (W/14/01244/PN) reinstating an area originally dropped from the first proposal. The enormous solar array will be present in key views from the wider (and higher) landscape of Croome’s eastern ridge. We therefore disagree with Para 4.20 within the LVIA (relating to Photoviewpoints EDP6 & 7) that ‘The site is barely visible as it (sic) located alongside the furthest eastern boundary of the airfield.’ We understand that the NT plan to open</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>the tower of Grade I St Mary Magdalen as a viewing platform, and would ask your officers to ensure that the applicants undertake an additional photomontage from this viewpoint, as it not clear how much of the solar farm will be visible from this important visual receptor. This may well highlight an even greater impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>We also feel strongly that just because the modern buildings of Defford Airfield contribute negatively towards the setting of the RPG, there is no reason to add to the degradation of the views. Your officers will be aware that '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.' HE's advice also states (p4) 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.' In our opinion, additional unacceptable harm will be caused to the setting and significance of Croome RPG.</p> <p>We are also concerned by the relative lack of emphasis being placed on the effect of the solar farm upon the Grade I listed RPG. The LIVA devotes just 4 paragraphs to this, downplaying its importance, but instead has many pages describing the impact upon the AONB, public rights of way, local roads, railways and residential receptors. The summary of the effects upon the landscape character and design does not even mention the Grade I RPG. It demotes this internationally significant landscape (Para 2.9) 'it is not a 'criteria a' landscape, but instead a 'criteria b' landscape' as far as decisions are concerned.</p> <p>There is also a discrepancy within the documentation with regard to how long the solar array would remain in situ. The HA states (Para 5.42) that it has a life of 25 years, whereas the LVIA states that the life of the facility is anticipated to be 35 years.</p> <p>Since the previous application was approved, circumstances have changed somewhat : the area of the solar farm has grown and the proposed viewing platform on top of the Croome Church may well open up a larger affected vista. We would urge your officers to ensure that if this proposal is accepted, that any section of the proposed solar area which is visible from within the RPG is kept clear of solar panels, and that the existing woodland belts elsewhere are enhanced, to ensure that the priceless landscape at Croome is safeguarded for future generations.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Briggens	Hertfords hire	E19/1224	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning application for development including demolition of existing structures, refurbishment and change of use of existing Grade II Listed Brickhouse Farm Barn and structures and erection of a residential led mixed use development comprising: up to 1,500 residential market and affordable homes; a mixed use local village centre; retail, business and community uses; primary school, early years and nursery facilities; leisure and sports facilities; open spaces, ecological areas, woodlands and public realm; pedestrian, cycle and vehicular accesses and network within the site; associated drainage, utilities, energy and waste facilities and infrastructure; works to and realignment of the existing highway; other supporting works, facilities and infrastructure; together with associated temporary enabling works or structures. With all matters reserved apart from detailed works to the A414 Church Lane junction. Land Off Church Lane, North of the A414, Hunsdon and	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.01.2020</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 Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (HGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have grave concerns that the many key heritage assets in this area will be harmed by this development. The documents in this application do not give sufficient information on specific measures to address light, noise, and traffic pollution on the heritage assets and indicate that the key parkland setting rising eastwards from Lords Wood will be destroyed.</p> <p>The parkland lying between Lords Wood and Hunsdon House was part of the great Tudor parkland, further details of which can be found in Rowe, A Tudor and Early Stuart Parks of Hertfordshire. The ponds in Lords Wood, now a Scheduled Monument, are closely stylistically related to European Renaissance water features of the time, such as at Pratolino, at a time when Henry VIII was introducing renaissance culture into England. The parkland, formerly Pond Park, provides the setting for Hunsdon church, visible from the ponds area and is depicted in an 1546/47 portrait of the future Edward VI by William Scots, and is also the setting for the ponds which are now the SM.</p> <p>To the south of the site lies the important 18th century park and house of Briggens, and the park of Stanstead Bury, all nationally designated by Historic England. To the west of the site lies Olive's Farm, purchased by Henry VIII as part of his Hunsdon estate, whose land overlooks the Pond Park. To the North of the site lies Hunsdon Park and House.</p> <p>The setting of all these heritage assets will be affected by the layout of Village 7 on the rising ground north of the A414. The setting of heritage assets is a key part of their significance as detailed in both the NPPF and in the Historic England the Setting of Heritage Assets (GPA3.2). Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (para 184), and when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to that asset's conservation</p>

				Eastwick, Hertfordshire. MAJOR HYBRID	(para 193). HGT, on our behalf, commented on the heritage significance of the Gilston Area including Village 7, during the Local Plan process and we also commented (2nd July 2019 – see attached) on the wider Gilston application 3/19/1045/OUT. We consider that further consideration must be given to ways of mitigating the detrimental effect of the proposed development upon the various heritage assets. We would like to see the development removed from the Pond Park section. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
8 Wendover Lodge, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E19/1355	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Crown reduce 1x Scots Pine (T1) Remove Ivy from 1x Holly tree (T2) Reduce 1x Scots pine by 20% and remove ivy (T3) Crown reduce 1x Copper Beech tree by 1.5m (T4) Remove ivy and deadwood from 1x Red cedar (T6) 8 Wendover Lodge, Church Street, Welwyn AL6 9LR. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.01.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are unclear as to why the application includes crown reduction of trees T1, T3 and T4. The Tree Report included in the application does not mention crown reduction, merely monitoring of the trees and removal of ivy for some trees (and deadwood for T6). We suggest this is clarified before permission is considered. Kate Harwood
17-19 Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E19/1390	N	Planning Application: Change of use of common land (pavement) to external seating (A3/A4) Address: 17-19 Howardsgate Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AL CHANGE OF USE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.01.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objection to the provision of tables and chairs along Howardsgate as indicated in the application. However, we consider the pavement at Wigmores North to be too narrow to accommodate passers-by and tables without adversely affecting the street trees and landscape. Kate Harwood
Toxteth Park Cemetery	Merseyside	E19/1282	II	PLANNING APPLICATION To continue to use part of cemetery land as a bin store in connection with existing adjacent student accommodation. Land at Toxteth Cemetery, Smithdown Road,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.01.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is

				<p>Picton, Liverpool, L7 4JQ. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We have reviewed the application documentation, but not visited the site. It is noted that the application site occupies a prominent location within the Grade II Registered Toxteth Park Cemetery, where recent residential development has been covered by application 14F/2945. Neither LGT nor GT or its predecessor, the Garden History Society have any record of receiving consultation on that earlier application, where it appears the development has extended beyond the area of the former yard, and extended over open land within the Cemetery. We recognise that the development has secured the future of several listed buildings within the former stonemasons yard, but we would have had comments to make on that application.</p> <p>LGT objects to the current application as it stands for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is noted that the current application is for construction of the bin store within the Cemetery, which is already completed. It is not explained why a retrospective application is being pursued at this late stage. More importantly, as can be seen from the photograph, the enclosure of the bin store fails to give adequate screening of the bins which are visible from both the Cemetery and Smithdown Road. For this reason we have concerns about the application and we recommend the application is not approved as it stands. It is noted that the store occupies the former location of an entrance to the Cemetery, and we do not object to the use of this land for the current purpose. However, we recommend that a pragmatic solution is pursued to provide more modest screening within the existing wall and railing enclosure in order to screen the bins.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me by email conservation@lancsgt.org.uk.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Stanley Park, Liverpool	Merseyside	E19/1307	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION To erect part four/part five storey building comprising 15no. flats with landscaping, parking and associated works. Site of 19-19a</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member</p>

				Anfield Road, Liverpool, L4 0TE. RESIDENTIAL	<p>organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We have reviewed the application documentation, but not visited the site. It is noted that the application site occupies a prominent location overlooking the Grade II* Registered Stanley Park Cemetery, and adjacent to the important listed Pavilions and Terraces.</p> <p>We support the regeneration of this site, and applaud the very comprehensive Design and Access Statement prepared to support this application. We have no objections to this application. If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me by email conservation@lancsgt.org.uk.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Broughton Hall	North Yorkshire	E19/1298	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for Listed Building Consent for dismantling and rebuilding of east and west retaining walls, buttresses, spandrel walls and parapets using existing stone, excavate clay infill (approx. 2000 sq. metres). Removal and re-attach 3 No. external clamping plates, shot blast and repaint, replace all tie rods. Infill bridge using reinforced earth infill, walls straightened and tied into reinforced earth infill on land at Broughton Bridge, Old Lane, Skipton, North Yorkshire, BD23 3AG. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.01.2020, walls straightened and tied into</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 listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Broughton Hall is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Broughton Bridge, mid 19C listed grade II, lies within the registered historic park and garden to the north west of the Hall and adjacent to Mill Wood. We understand that the works to be undertaken will be to best practice conservation standards. We note that vegetation and trees may be removed if needed on the northern approach to the bridge. Our advice is to employ an arboriculturist with historic designed landscape experience to work with the contractors throughout the project in order to minimize damage to the adjoining woodland during the working operation, to provide advice and to oversee any felling or works to existing trees that is required. The arboriculturist should also advise on any protection to woodland and woodland trees that is required throughout the period of works on the site and to recommend and oversee any planting that is</p>

					<p>required following completion of the construction works.</p> <p>We suggest that your Authority's Arboricultural team prepares an appropriate detailed brief for the employment of the Arboriculturist.</p> <p>We have no objection to this planning application and support the careful conservation of the bridge and its surroundings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Craigmar, Hebden	North Yorkshire	E19/1336	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>householder planning permission for removal of roof, fascias, soffits, gutters and downpipes, and replace with zinc covered pitched roof and new fascias, soffits, hoppers and downpipes. Craigmar, Hebden. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2020</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 respect of such consultations. We also give advice on non-registered sites and about fifteen years ago Craigmar was included in a joint research and recording project between the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority. It is not included by HE on their Register. We have been unable to access the documents for this planning application on your Authority's planning website and we do not have any specific comments to make on this application.</p> <p>The following is some of the information that we have on file from 2005 which may be useful:</p> <p>Craigmar was built by Thomas Stockdale in 1923 who having seen a house that he liked on Lake Geneva, commissioned Mr Hartley, an architect, to draw up plans. The garden was designed at the time to be in keeping with the castellated, Italianate house it complements (quite different from the local vernacular style) and to accommodate the sloping sites to the south and east sides of the house. We do not know the designer but the garden was laid out by a York firm and lot of plants and seeds came from Dobbie in Edinburgh. The curving drive is bordered by a laurel hedge. To the east of the drive, as it climbs up from the bottom of the garden towards the house, is an oval terraced rock garden with a waterfall, pool and small central island with a bridge too it. Beside this pool is a stone- built grotto/cave facing west. On either side of the steps leading from the drive down to the rock garden are five round beds. A mature holly hedge forms a boundary between this rock garden and a rectangular shaped plot cut into</p>

					<p>the slope nearer the house which stands on a terrace. Laurels were planted on the steep grassy slope between the terrace and rectangular plot for stability, with central steps traversing the laurel to connect terrace and plot. A second grotto with fine view to the south is set under these steps and below is a rockery and levelled lawn laid on gravel with a path and herbaceous border to its south side. To east and west of this lawn are two large weeping ash trees. The path returns uphill along the eastern beech-hedged boundary to reach the terrace on the south side of the house. There is a smaller garden to the north of the house.</p> <p>We have not visited the site since 2005.</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>
Marske Hall	North Yorkshire	E19/1345	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Full planning permission for conversion of Marske Hall from 10 existing open market apartments to 10 open market/holiday lets, plus 10 new holiday lets; conversion of basement to associated facilities; conversion and extension of the kennels to form café; use of existing garden building as electricity sub-station and conversion of The Sawmill to an events venue. Marske Hall and Sawmill, Marske. HYBRID</p> <p>OUTCOME 05.02.2020 Withdrawn</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for extending the deadline for consultation on this planning application and listed building consent. The Gardens Trust (GT) and Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) would like to put forward the comments below.</p> <p>As you know the GT is the Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We do give advice on non-registered sites. About fifteen years ago Marske Hall was included in a joint research and recording project between the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority. In the mid 1990's, during the English Heritage Register Review, a number of historic designed landscapes and gardens in North Yorkshire and including Marske Hall were put forward as likely to be suitable for Registration, however they were never taken any further due to lack of resource. Significance: The North Yorkshire County Record Office (NYCRO) holds the Hutton of Marske archive (ZAZ) and recent research by YGT indicates that Marske Hall Park and Garden is a multi-layered landscape with its origins likely to be in a medieval deer park. There is indication that there was a house with hall close meadow, orchard, garth and water mill (NYCRO MIC 1286/8879), prior to the estates purchase by Sir Timothy Hutton (1569-</p>

					<p>1629) in 1597.</p> <p>Amongst the papers of Archbishop Matthew Hutton (1524/5-1605/6) and his son Sir Timothy Hutton there are extensive records relating to the buildings & alterations at Marske Hall 1609-1634 and an agreement for laying out the garden June 27 1625 (NYCRO MIC 1286/8813 onwards).</p> <p>The Hutton family of Marske included two Archbishops of York; Matthew (1524/5-1605/6) and a later Matthew (1692/3-1758) who was Archbishop of York 1747 and Archbishop of Canterbury 1757. The family were famed for horse racing and the breeding of racehorses and John Hutton II (1691-1768) bred a colt, Marske in 1750 who won top races and sired the great and unbeaten racehorse, Eclipse.</p> <p>The Hutton's brought about a series of landscape changes and developments at Marske Hall from the period of the Elizabethan hall into the mid-19th C and the early 20th C. Today this historic designed landscape remains much as it was a hundred and more years ago. The significant phases of development are:</p> <p>The significant landscape/garden features in 17th C were the eastern entrance court, the formal avenue of lime trees on Cat Bank, (almost certainly <i>Tilia x europaea</i> 'Pallida', contemporary with the avenues at Castle Howard and a remarkable survival), the deer park and to the north the new (walled) garden alongside Marske Beck and the mill below the Hall.</p> <p>In 18C those garden and landscape features remained apart from the entrance court which was removed as the house and stables were remodelled or rebuilt, (the former c.1730, latter c.1750) and the land modified to form a smooth grass approach with a drive from the east, in something of the English Landscape style typical of gentry estates in mid-century, and later a picturesque landscape around the Beck as shown in the George Cuit the elder (1743-1818) paintings. The 1718 Buck sketch (Samuel Buck's Yorkshire Sketchbook) and the 1732 survey (NYCRO ZAZ(M)2, MIC 2001/9-13, Fig1) indicate possible gardens south of the Beck with a small, pitched roof building with ball finial, which architecturally has similarities to a gazebo/banqueting house. There is a walled garden further east on the north bank – this was in the area that became the fountain and terrace in 19th/20th C. The main walled gardens, as exist today, are probably from 18th C. They appear to contain structures from a number of periods of development - a small 'orangery'-type building, an unusual heated wall, and two different vineries. Their incorporation into the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>designed landscape is significant as the interior of the walled garden is a clearly visible element of the landscape.</p> <p>John IV (1774-1841) was a keen farmer and early in 19C he built a range of farm buildings on a U-shaped plan (the sawmill) and probably also the kennels north-west of the hall. His Gothic Barn built as a cow byre/hay barn makes a delightful eyecatcher on the hillside to the south east of the hall. The early/mid 19th C saw the formation of larger ornamental gardens with fish ponds, walks, bridges, and later (late19th/early20thC) a terrace with statues overlooking a fountain. There was planting of ornamental trees (diary of Timothy Hutton (1779-1863) during the mid-19th C and probably earlier, which resulted in an American garden (see Ref below), near the Hall and extended ornamental woodland to the east flanking the Marske Beck which at its eastern end included a wooded island accessed via a bridge.</p> <p>In addition, the area to the west of the hall, with the sequential arrangement and relationships established between stable block, kennels and hall, illustrates the importance of horse breeding and hunting with dogs by the landed gentry, and the Hutton Family in particular, in the 18th C and 19th C. More unusually in a designed landscape, the functional buildings - the sawmill and kennels – are in close proximity to the main house, and in the case of the kennels, ornamented in such a way as to be presented as a 'garden feature'. This may be a measure of their importance to the Hutton family.</p> <p>Impact: The GT and YGT are concerned about the proposed car park's impact on the hall (listed grade II*), the assemblage of other listed buildings and the overall significance of the historic designed landscape and gardens. We also have concerns about the future of the stable block which is a significant feature, historically important, and which we understand is not included in this planning application. We are of the opinion that there needs to be much more consideration of the landscape west of the hall as part of the planning application, and that there should be an overall landscape plan.</p> <p>Planning Policy: We are not convinced that this application is compliant with paragraphs 193 and 194 of the NPPF, February 2019. Additionally, NPPF paragraph 197 which refers to the impact on non- designated heritage assets is also relevant. The currently undesignated heritage asset - the historic designed landscape - is the element that provides the setting to all the designated heritage assets and allows them to be understood and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>experienced in a coherent, historical context. Marske Hall has far greater heritage significance due to the ability to appreciate all of the designated assets as a group; greater value being derived from the sum of the parts. We also note the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (2nd edition), pub, 2nd December 2017, The Setting of Heritage Assets, and the statutory duty of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.</p> <p>In conclusion: Marske Hall and its park and gardens have evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value; a significant heritage asset. The Hall and estate need a secure future where the owners/residents respect and care for it. We support finding a viable future. However we do have concerns about the parking proposal and its impact on the designed landscape (non-designated heritage asset) as this is a critical part of the setting of the grade II* listed hall and makes an important contribution to the significance of the hall and the assemblage of listed buildings (stables, kennels and sawmill). We think that the proposed car park would have a detrimental impact on to this part of the designed landscape due to the physical alterations to the landform (grading), the disruption of to the gentle landscaping of the area through the change of materials (gravel) and the visual interference the cars would cause to our appreciation of these relationships. There may also be archaeology regarding the earlier house and we also have concerns about the future management of the gardens. For the reasons outlined above we have strong reservations about this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust Refs: Hall, Ivan, Samuel Buck's Yorkshire Sketchbook (facsimile from Lansdowne MS 914 in British Library), Wakefield Historical Publications, 1979, p376-7. Hatcher, Jane, Richmondshire Architecture, pub C J Hatcher, 1990 p143-149. Hatcher, Jane, George Cuit the elder (1743-1818), Tennants Auctioneers, Leyburn, 1992. NYCRO ZAZ Hutton of Marske Archive:</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>a) ZAZ 70-82 Catalogue Entry 8813 Papers relating to building and alterations at Marske Hall, 1609-1624. Agreement for laying out garden (524) June 27th 1625, MIC 1286/8813 onwards.</p> <p>b) NYCRO ZAZ(M)2, MIC 2001/9-13; A Survey of the lordship or manor of Marske in the county of York, the estate of John Hutton taken in the year 1732 by Francis Gainford Scale 6 chains to 1inch. See digital copy appended, Fig 1.</p> <p>c) NYCRO ZAZ 89 & Maps Architectural Drawings: Marske Hall Stables, "Plan of the Stables". Court is 60ft square within. An old drawing undated, ?late 18C of the John Hutton II stable block. Accommodation on W for 8 running horses, entrance, 8/9 common horses, on N for grooms apartment, 3 coach houses, stairs, on E for 7 coach horses, principle entrance and 7 hunters, on S for 8 strangers horses and stair area. No plan of 1st floor.</p> <p>American garden: There are redwoods and wellingtonia's in the woodland north of the Hall, so we consider that the Hutton's were planting an American garden. So-called American Gardens were a concept dating from second part of 18th C when hardy North American plants were relatively easy to obtain but the idea developed in 19th C as conifers were introduced. The deodar cedar arrived from the Himalayas in the 1830's. The Horticultural Society of London (later becoming the Royal Horticultural Society) sponsored Hartweg to bring Californian conifers in the 1840's, and the most exciting horticulturally at this time were the redwoods and wellingtonia's of California discovered and introduced to England in the 1850's (Wellingtonia 1853).</p> <p>As many N American plants are ericaceous, the soil at Marske would probably be very suitable without going to the trouble of bringing in peat or making 'beds of bog earth'. The Timothy Hutton diary entries of the tree planting in 1851 shows Timothy very aware of the aesthetics and perspective, and the island he mentions is presumably the one in Marske Beck between Coney Warren Wood and Thicket Wood.</p>
Albert Park, Abingdon	Oxfordshire	E19/1318	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of modern side and rear extensions, the remodelling of Crescent House, and the remodelling and extension of the	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.01.2020</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 Oxfordshire</p>

				laundry building to create new house masters accommodation, a new building to provide boarding accommodation and a link corridor to link the new building to Crescent House and the laundry building. Crescent House, 21 Park Crescent, Abingdon OX14 1DD. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>Gardens Trust (OGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have undertaken a desk-based assessment and have been unable to visit in person. We were surprised that the online documentation regarding the new buildings for Abingdon School did not mention the Grade II registered Albert Park (RPG) which lies directly across the road from Crescent House. The paperwork merely referred to the possible effect of the proposals on listed buildings in the vicinity and that the site lay within a Conservation Area. The application site lies within the setting of the RPG. Since Albert Park and the houses around it are part of a conscious piece of urban design/town planning of the late 19th century it is important that any proposals for modification or new build maintain the overall design aesthetic. These need to preserve or enhance the setting of the RPG or better reveal its significance. We would therefore have expected photomontages of the views from within the RPG both towards Crescent & Cobban Houses and back towards the Park. The Massing View photos Nos 1 & 2 go some way towards this, but it is not apparent how thick or mature the tree cover on the edge of the park is, which softens and to some extent disguises the proposed building from within the RPG. The school's Conservation Appraisal mentions that there is little inter-visibility between the park and the buildings 18-21 Park Crescent (Paras 2.49-2.51). We would suggest that if your officers are minded to approve this application, careful attention is paid to the size, detailing and materials appropriate to preserve and enhance the setting, character and appearance of the RPG and Park Town conservation area, and that the school be required to undertake a tree survey for the relevant boundary trees within the park and a condition be imposed that if necessary additional tree planting be undertaken by them to ensure there are no gaps in cover should any over mature trees be lost.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Albert Park, Abingdon	Oxfordshire	E19/1349	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of a modern flat roof extension to Austin House, the remodelling of Austin House, a new building to provide boarding accommodation and a link	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.01.2020</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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments</p>

				<p>corridor to link the new building to Austin House. Austin House, 76 Bath Street, Abingdon OX14 1EB. EDUCATION</p>	<p>into consideration when deciding this application. We have undertaken a desk-based assessment and have been unable to visit in person. We were surprised that the online documentation regarding the new buildings for Abingdon School did not mention the Grade II registered Albert Park (RPG) which lies directly across the road from Crescent House. The paperwork merely referred to the possible effect of the proposals on listed buildings in the vicinity and that the site lay within a Conservation Area. The application site lies within the setting of the RPG. We would therefore have expected photomontages of the views from within the RPG both towards Crescent & Cobban Houses and back towards the Park. The Massing View photos Nos 1 & 2 go some way towards this, but it is not apparent how thick or mature the tree cover on the edge of the park is, which softens and to some extent disguises the proposed building from within the RPG. The school's Conservation Appraisal mentions that there is little inter-visibility between the park and the buildings 18-21 Park Crescent (Paras 2.49-2.51). We would suggest that if your officers are minded to approve this application, careful attention is paid to the size, detailing and materials appropriate to preserve and enhance the setting, character and appearance of the RPG and Park Town conservation area, and that the school be required to undertake a tree survey for the relevant boundary trees within the park and a condition be imposed that if necessary additional tree planting be undertaken by them to ensure there are no gaps in cover should any over mature trees be lost.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E19/1410	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed installation of temporary structures to create a temporary jousting arena on River Island, to accommodate live shows for approximately six weeks between June and September (inclusive) for a period of two years at Warwick Castle. Warwick Castle, Castle Hill, Warwick, CV34 4QX. VISITOR ATTRACTION</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.01.2020 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 Warwick Gardens Trust (WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We welcome the reduced time frame for the above attraction, down from five years to two, and for one less month each year. However, we would still like to reiterate our very strong objection to this revised application for all the reasons given in our two previous letters (26th February 2019 and 1st April 2019).</p>

					<p>We would like to repeat, and stress yet again, the enormous importance of this historic designed landscape. The HE entry for Warwick Castle states : “The principal historic interest of the Park and Gardens is in their association with ‘Capability’ Brown.... and also Robert Marnock and Harold Peto, who designed mid-19th and early-20th century gardens respectively. Together these layers of history which illustrate the improvements and tastes of the various owners ... contribute to the significance of the Grade I grounds.”</p> <p>The jousting arena is very clearly visible within the Registered Park & Garden (RPG) and is overlooked by the Grade I Castle. In our opinion this application does not comply with the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 (2017) as it negatively affects the character and quality of the RPG and does not in any way integrate well with the existing landscape. Other views are also adversely affected (see previous letters) and the impact of noise on the residents of nearby properties has an extremely negative effect. We would urge your officers to bear in mind HE’s advice : ‘The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places’. This document also (p12) states that ‘Cumulative assessment is required under the EU Directive on EIA. Its purpose is to identify impacts that are the result of introducing the development into the view in combination with other existing and proposed developments’.</p> <p>As you will be aware, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting (ie. the RPG), the local planning authority shall have special regard (our emphasis) to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 66(1)). The Courts have interpreted preservation as meaning to keep safe from harm. The statutory duty to have special regard to a listed building means that decision makers should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise. The considerable importance and weight applies to all harm, although with greater force the more important the listed building or setting. If harm is identified then there is a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>strong presumption against the grant of planning permission. The GT/WGT strongly urge WDC to halt the relentless commercialisation of the site and limit the loss of significance and setting to the unfortunate structures already in place. The GT/WGT strongly OBJECTS to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Conock Manor	Wiltshire	E19/1208	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of existing stable block to assisted care accommodation. Construction of timber framed car port, shed and replacement gates. Conock Cottage, Conock SN10 3QQ.</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to amendments on the above application affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. We have studied the online documentation and the only difference we can see is that in the Revision E document (as opposed to the original version D), the existing and proposed elevations of the pedestrian gateway have been removed. We welcome the retention of the original gate and gate piers.</p> <p>However, this small concession in no way allays our concern at the remaining proposals. The amount of development already undertaken on the application site, which lies well within the Registered Park & Garden (RPG), is in itself prominent from views both within and without the RPG and also from two public footpaths : the first northwest of the garden of Connock Cottage, and the second slightly further away and south of the A342. In our opinion, adding to the harm already caused to the setting of the RPG is unwelcome. We feel that the application does not appear to have given sufficient consideration to additional development within the heart of this sensitive historic designed landscape, particularly given local topography which allows for surprisingly wide viewpoints.</p> <p>We stand by the comments made in our original submission objecting to this development (17.12.19) and would ask your officers to keep them in mind when coming to their decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
WALES					
Wynnstay	Clwyd	W19/0023	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>VARIATION OF CONDITION NO. 1 IMPOSED UNDER PLANNING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.01.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting with the Welsh Historic Gardens Trust on the further revisions to App ref P/2014/0342</p>

				<p>PERMISSION P/2014/0342 TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF TIME BEFORE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE COMMENCED. WALLED GARDEN, WYNNSTAY HALL ESTATE, RUABON, WREXHAM</p>	<p>WHGT strongly objects to this planning application. The proposed scheme is an inappropriate and unsympathetic commercial new build. This planning application was recently discussed at a recent WHGT planning seminar in the light of the original 106 Agreement - please see attached. It was noted that according to the original 106 Agreement this scheme is now out of date. The original outline planning was for a glassy conservatory style terrace arrangement – referencing glasshouses and conservatory structures which may once have been found within the walled garden designed by Capability Brown or Richard Woods. The original scheme should by now be completed.</p> <p>The submitted revised details of boundary treatment and the elevations are nothing like the 1772 Georgian Blackburn House, West Lothian, the selected historical precedent for the Wynnstay walled garden development in the Design Statement. This example is inappropriate as this is not garden architecture. However, the simple elegance and symmetry of Blackburn House with generous spacing between the central block and its pavilions is not evident in the proposed layout or in the elevations. The boundary detailing and considerable changes in the elevations in the revisions fail to address the serious design issues of the development. Garaging, recycling and waste management should be sited underground to alleviate the physical and visual impacts of the drives, garages and bin yards. An underground solution for parking and waste management would neither degrade the landscape nor exacerbate the problems already experienced at Wynnstay.</p> <p>Architecture within sight of Capability Brown’s Dairy and James Wyatt’s orangery*, (later converted to a chapel after the fire), needs to be of architectural merit, elegant and built to a very high standard.</p> <p>The design problems with the first unit of this walled garden development, Watkin Manor, where the fabric of the historic eighteenth century garden walls was destroyed and replaced with sections of prefab wall blocks, totally unsuitable to a rare Grade I landscape, and its poor detailing have not yet been addressed. An enabling scheme is intended to restore the historic landscape, it should not contribute any further damage. The ‘further revisions’ to this scheme in the walled garden enabling development still fail to provide a Conservation Management Plan, a suitable planting plan (Third Schedule (a) and (b) of the 106 Agreement) and details for provision for public access (as per Third Schedule (e- h) of the November 23 2015 106 Agreement) as part of this application.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The site within the walled garden is part of the Grade I Wynnstay landscape listed in the Cadw/ICOMOS Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales. The planning application sometimes refers to this as a Grade II site (see pages 1, 5, in the Design Statement) indicating a lack of awareness of the true heritage value of the site and perhaps accounting for the planning application failing to reflect a proper appreciation of the importance of this site.</p> <p>We would request that the proposal is considered against National Planning Framework particularly section 7 (Requiring Good Design) and Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) and Planning Policy Wales chapter 6.5.25 where register sites are 'a material consideration' when determining a planning application.</p> <p>The International CAPABILITY BROWN Tercentenary Festival in 2016 means that there will be much interest in the conservation and management of this rare Brownian site in Wales.</p> <p>An enabling development is intended to enhance the Grade I landscape and this planning application fails to do that. The current scheme will have a detrimental impact on the fabric of the garden and its important landscape setting.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Glynis Shaw (WHGT Clwyd Branch)</p> <p>*The orangery was damaged by poor restoration in an earlier phase of the Loxley development at Wynnstay.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--