



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES FEBRUARY 2020

The GT conservation team received 188 new cases in England and one case in Wales during February, 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, 66 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
24 Cleeve Lawns, Downend	Avon	E19/1587	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Dismantling, relocation and restoration of listed garden seat. 24 Cleeve Lawns, Downend, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS16 6HJ. REPAIR/RESTORATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed programme of restoration and renovation work to ensure the long term viability of a garden feature which forms part of the history of the gardens associated with the demolished Cleeve Hill House. 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 the GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust note that the garden seat is a rare survival of an C18 park and garden, designed by Wright for Charles Bragge at Cleeve Hill, in Mangotsfield. It is known as the 'Kent Seat at No.24 Cleeve Lawns' and is Grade II listed. It is a wooden alcove garden seat C.1750, attributed to Thomas Wright of Durham. Structures such as this take their generic name from William Kent, the architect and designer, who originated this alcove type of garden seat at Rousham Park, Oxon. in the late 1730s. It is listed as a rare survival of an inherently fragile type of garden structure.</p> <p>The present location of the seat has been further compromised by housing</p>

					<p>development and extension to the house's garden in which it currently sits. The scheme proposes to," relocate the structure to the rear of the garden providing a more suitable location with improved view as originally intended for the seat. All works are to be carried out with utmost care and consideration of the structures age and historic value".</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust supports this effort to retain the authenticity of this much re located Heritage Asset by re-using as much as is possible of the original fabric.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Eton College	Berkshire	E19/1507	II	<p>Planning Application: Variation (under Section 73A) of Condition 2 (Approved plans) and Condition 7 (Detailed plans and samples of the Rackets Building) for additional plans to those plans approved under 18/02033/FULL for the construction of a new school sports centre comprising a 9-court sports hall capable of offering multipurpose indoor sports, x8 squash courts, general fitness spaces, an athlete development programme space including a sprint track, dojo space, physio spaces, classrooms and offices for PE staff and students, a triple height climbing wall space, rifle range and associated plant, storage, WC and changing facilities. Construction of a new Eton Sports and Aquatics Centre comprising a 25m pool with movable floor suitable for swimming, water polo and teaching use, a 4-court sports hall capable of offering</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Eton College is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden containing a number of listed buildings and structures. The Registered Park therefore forms the setting to these heritage assets as well as being of historic importance in its own right. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. As Eton College is on Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, it is an important part of the history of West Berkshire's parks and the richness of its history. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the application.</p> <p>I have previously commented on the original application and am grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application for variation. We are satisfied there is no direct effect on the registered garden, and that subject to the tree protection being maintained as promised there should be no deleterious effect on the wider setting. Therefore, we have no objection to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Charles Elly DL, Trustee of the Berkshire Gardens Trust.</p>

				<p>multi-purpose indoor sports and exam use, changing facilities, a spectator area at first floor level which also provides a meet-up space and refreshment point for post-match use, associated plant and storage provision, associated car and coach parking and new access track off Slough Road. Refurbishment and extension of the rackets courts building to provide a new clubroom, viewing gallery and extended changing facilities. Refurbishment of the jacks building to provide a fives clubroom and changing facilities. Refurbishment of fives courts, a new printmaking pavilion to house historic printing presses adjacent to Caxton Schools, following demolition of the existing buildings comprising the gymnasium, indoor swimming pool and the outdoor swimming pool complex (Amended Plans). Address: College Eton College Slough Road Eton Windsor SL4 6DJ SPORT/LEISURE, EDUCATION</p>	
Wootton House	Buckinghamshire	E19/1655	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Material change of use of land from agricultural with timber stable block (now on plot 5) to stationing of caravans for residential purposes for 10 pitches for occupation by gypsy-traveller families with associated utility buildings, hard standing, waste treatment plants, fencing,</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2020, We are frustrated that yet again the Gardens Trust, as a Statutory Consultee, was not consulted when temporary planning permission was granted in 2016 despite the site being adjacent to the Grade I registered park (RPG) at Wotton Underwood. This has occurred on a regular basis with AVDC and despite assurances previously that it will be rectified this remains a regular occurrence. This failure of statutory procedure is compounded, since we have only been consulted on the present application for permanent permission after a local resident realised the omission and alerted us. We urge AVDC, soon to be Bucks County, to</p>

				<p>barn on plot 7 and ancillary keeping of horses-part retrospective. Kingswood Paddock, Kingswood Lane, Wotton Underwood, Bucks HP18 0EQ Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS, HYBRID</p>	<p>ensure that we are always consulted when appropriate. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local input informs our joint response.</p> <p>With regard to the present application documentation, there is no Historic Impact Assessment. This is a considerable omission considering the landscape is one of only 160 Grade I landscapes in the country (the highest designation possible) with the greatest possible significance. However, even without this assessment, it is clear from a visual assessment of the site that significant damage has already been caused to the internationally significant Grade I designed landscape by the 2 acre development which was granted temporary permission. Unauthorised development since then in addition to the current proposal increases the harmful effect of the initial development.</p> <p>We OBJECT to this application for the following reasons, all of which are of equal significance.</p> <p>The immediate setting of one of 3 large-scale early C18 avenues radiating from Windmill Hill is considerably damaged by the scale and type of the adjacent development with its C21 structures. Windmill Hill enjoyed a dramatic sequence of formal views along all these avenues and their adjacent setting is of equal importance because it too was intended to be highly visible. The development is entirely alien to the ornamental designed landscape in the Registered area and to the rural agricultural character of the setting, both of which it damages significantly. The setting has been further damaged by rubbish, tipped material and other detritus associated with the occupation of the site into the environs including the line of the avenue.</p> <p>The view along the north avenue from Windmill Hill is significantly damaged by the C21 development as is clear from the photograph below recently taken from this point. Windmill Hill, and the early C18 avenue views, were incorporated into the pleasure ground at Wotton in the 1750s by Capability Brown, the greatest landscape designer of the C18. It is acknowledged as one of Brown's most important designs and survives intact. Windmill Hill is the most important external viewpoint in his otherwise inward-looking landscape, incorporating an early C18 viewpoint of high significance.</p> <p>Views from the line of the main historic drive, from the A41 are damaged by the development. The drive was a major feature of the C18 ornamental landscape forming the most important approach to Wotton House. Views</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>from this drive were of high importance and the development disrupts the otherwise bucolic views.</p> <p>The application and the existing structures set an unacceptable precedent for incremental damaging development in the setting of Registered designed landscapes.</p> <p>Thus permission should be REFUSED.</p> <p>While we urge most strongly that permission is refused, should it be allowed, then we advise that a condition be imposed that it is entirely screened from both the avenue, the north drive and Windmill Hill via a landscape design using an appropriate palette of C18 plants including largely evergreen subjects. This screen must be managed as an informal belt, and thinned regularly when necessary to ensure good growth. Species should include Scots pine, yew, holly, oak. This will require effective enforcement from the LPA if it is to have any effect.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Knowle	Devon	E19/1461	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Flood alleviation scheme comprising a drainage swale and grassed amphitheatre designed to attenuate surface water runoff and provide a venue for public events at The Knowle, Station Road, Sidmouth, EX10 8HH.</p> <p>FLOOD RELIEF/DRAINAGE, EVENTS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application, which affects The Knowle, an historic designed landscape included on the Devon Gazetteer of Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest.</p> <p>The Knowle was once one of the most famous houses in Sidmouth. Built in 1810, the cottage ornee was described in 1850: ‘the delightful marine villa is an elegant and tasteful residence surrounded by about 11 acres of grounds, divided into lawns, gardens, and conservatories, containing rare and choice specimens of botany.....’</p> <p>Whilst the major part of the original grounds have been built on, the Lodge still marks the entrance and a substantial area of the parkland remains, containing some magnificent trees: Cedar, Wellingtonia and Monterey pine but many are getting well past their natural life span. EDDC have let the rhododendrons revert and have not replanted the appropriate species of parkland trees, eg Sorbus rather than maritime pines.</p> <p>The proposed flood alleviation scheme comprising a swale and amphitheatre has been sensitively designed by the engineers and landscape architects to minimise any harm to the significance of this non-statutory heritage asset. The route of the proposed swale, approximately 0.5m deep, will have a minimum impact on the landscape as it follows the existing contours; the proposed amphitheatre will be an</p>

					<p>interesting modern intervention in the parkland.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust is keen encourage good modern landscape design. The removal of the incongruous hard standing performance area and its replacement by the amphitheatre will be a considerable improvement. We welcome the proposal to plant seven semi-mature trees as part of the works; presumably these will be parkland trees. We would suggest that the scheme should be a catalyst to encourage EDDC to take an holistic approach to the future management of The Knowle parkland, including the conservation of the existing trees and a programme for succession replanting of parkland trees. We offer to work with your consultants and EDDC in bringing forward a set of principles to guide the future management of The Knowle.</p> <p>We are happy to support the application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>John Clark</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p>
Torbay Heritage Strategy	Devon	E19/1569	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Heritage Strategy Review and Update. Invitation to Stakeholders Meeting 17.02.2020	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for inviting the Devon Gardens Trust to participate in your new Heritage Strategy.</p> <p>We are unable to attend the meeting on 27 February but would ask you to consider the following comments.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust (DGT) acts on behalf of the Gardens Trust (formerly The Garden History Society), to offer authoritative specialist conservation advice on historic designed landscapes in Devon. The Gardens Trust is the acknowledged authority on historic parks and gardens in England.</p> <p>As DGT Conservation Officer, I have over 20 years' experience of advising local planning authorities about development proposals affecting historic parks and gardens in Devon and, as the Garden History Society's Conservation Officer for the South West Region for over 9 years, this experience extended across the whole of the South West. The Garden History Society and DGT have had a good working relationship with your Conservation Team over many years, being involved at an early stage with Lupton Park, developing the proposals for the Lutyens garden at the Drum Inn and the successful extensive redesign and regeneration of the Royal Terrace Gardens. As GHS Conservation Officer, I was also involved with discussions with Akkeron regarding their proposals for Oldway Mansion, accepting the proposed development because of the conservation gains.</p>

					<p>More recently, the DGT have encouraged and supported the Conservation Management Plan for Princess Gardens and applaud the improvements that have been made to the gardens. We were pleased to note that your Council have abandoned the totally inappropriate hotel and apartment development proposed for Princess Gardens which, if implemented, would have had a detrimental impact on the gardens. We are already in discussion with Torbay Council and the Friends of Oldway with the objective of securing the future of Oldway Mansion and the restoration of the Achille Duchene landscape design.</p> <p>However, we are disappointed that the Torbay Heritage Strategy 2011 was not adopted by the Council and that there has been no progress especially with regard to sections 'A Vision for Torbay's Heritage' (pp18-19); 'Strategy Objectives' (p.19); and the 8 points of 'Delivery of Heritage Strategy Objectives' (pp 22-23) which ends '[We must] develop a Heritage Action Plan to set out prioritised key targets, projects and deliverables for the protection and enhancement of the heritage of Torbay.'</p> <p>DGT urges that the new Heritage Strategy should set out a clear and deliverable programme to remove Lupton Park, Oldway Mansion and Princess Gardens from the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register. Further, we are very concerned that Torbay Council appears not to have appointed a Conservation Officer or any other professional Conservation staff for over a year and a half, a circumstance that has and will have an adverse effect on the ability to deliver on the strategy and thus on the long-term sustainability of Torbay heritage including its historic buildings, landscapes and gardens.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Devon Gardens Trust are keen to work with Torbay Council in developing the new Heritage Strategy and securing Torbay's important heritage assets for future generations.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E19/1583	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Replacement of residential mobile home with dwelling. Middle Park Yard, Lane Past Park Corner, Teigngrace. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.02.2020</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. We have visited Stover many times and visited the site of the application on 25 February. We would ask you to consider the following comments: Stover Park is a site of national importance as signified by its inclusion at</p>

					<p>grade II 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 House is a fine example of a Georgian mansion set on an eminence in an extensive designed landscape, with carriageways, plantations, a lake and ornamental canals, fashioned out of a previously barren and boggy heathland.</p> <p>The whole design concept is a classic example of the ingenuity and skill of an informed landowner of the late eighteenth century.</p> <p>We After WWI, like many other country estates, Stover Park was progressively broken up and is now in divided ownership. Stover Park is include on the Heritage at Risk Register compiled by Historic England, because they consider that the condition of the site is unsatisfactory with major localised problems.</p> <p>The various landowners have come together to develop an ambitious scheme for restoring the historic landscape of Stover Park and have submitted a Lottery Bid. The key objectives of the bid are to overcome the fragmentation of the historic designed landscape, to restore historic designed views, the conservation of listed structures, some of which are in very poor condition and some are dangerous. Other objectives include improving the setting of Stover Lake (a Site of Special Scientific Interest) and its water quality and to reverse the decline of some of Stover's wildlife species. The considerable effort and enthusiasm of Devon County Council and all its partners in submitting the bid is commendable.</p> <p>The Stover Park Parkland Plan by Askew Nelson Ltd, June 2014, was commissioned by Devon County Council, Stover School, Sibelco and Natural England to achieve the restoration and proper management of the historic designed landscape. The Parkland Plan sets out a number of Threats, Issues and Constraints which affect. the Registered park. The first of these states 'Multiple ownership has led to ... a gradual erosion of the historic designed landscape as individual owners inevitably manage their own land holding rather than manage for the benefit of the entire park. The slow and continuous encroachment of diverse development within the park boundary is compromising the historic integrity of the park.' The proposed development, if allowed, would result in further compromising the integrity of the park.</p> <p>A Certificate of Lawfulness for stationing and permanent occupation of a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>residential caravan at Middlepark Yard Caravan, Teigngrace was issued on 17 March 2017. The applicant proposes the one-for-one replacement of the existing mobile home for a four bedroomed two storey dwelling. No mention is made of the other mobile home. The application plan shows the application site edged red and the other land in the same ownership edged blue, the later land is used for grazing sheep. The caravans can be seen from Templar Way and from the land owned by Stover School.</p> <p>We are concerned that the scheme for a proposed replacement of one of the residential mobile homes with a dwelling at Middle Park Yard has been brought forward without due regard to its potential impact on, or any appreciation of the historic designed landscape of Stover Park. The proposed dwelling would a large detached two-storey 4 bedroomed house of mediocre design without any relationship to the eighteenth century landscape. We consider that the proposed dwelling would be an intrusive discordant building that would be visible within the historic landscape of Stover Park and would cause substantial harm to the significance of the historic assets of Stover Park.</p> <p>The proposal would involve the felling of several trees, but some would be retained. Trees have a limited life and are subject to weather conditions and climate change. The Great Storm of 15-16 October 1987, with hurricane force winds (up to 120mph gusts) decimated huge swathes of woodland across the South West of England having a disastrous impact on many historic designed landscapes. This 'once in 200 year' storm was repeated on 25-26 January 1990 with a more dramatic impact on the parks and gardens of the South West. Climate change is a factor that must be borne in mind, with the potential for more major storms as was again witnessed in February 2020. If the trees surrounding the site of the proposed dwelling were to be lost, in whole or in part, the proposed dwelling would cause even more substantial harm to the significance of the historic assets of Stover Park.</p> <p>Under the National Planning Policy Framework, it is a core planning principle to 'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations' (Para184) 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.' NPPF para 195 states 'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm.... is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.’ We consider that the replacement of a residential mobile home with a dwellings at Middle Park Yard, would not constitute a substantial public benefit to outweigh the harm to the significance of Stover Park.</p> <p>The NPPF defines ‘conservation’ as the process of managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains, and where appropriate, enhances its significance. The proposal has been brought forward without any appreciation of the significance of the historic designed landscape.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Gardens Trust considers that the proposed replacement of one of the residential mobile homes with dwelling would harm the significance of the heritage assets of the nationally important historic designed landscape of Stover Park. The proposed development would conflict with national planning policy in regard to the conservation of the historic environment and we therefore must urge your Council to refuse the application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark, DGT Conservation Officer</p>
Overbecks (Sharpitor)	Devon	E19/1679	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) following planning consent 2224/18/FUL. Bar Lodge, Sharpitor, Salcombe TQ8 8LW. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust on the above application We have no objection to the proposals</p> <p>John Clark</p>
Athelhampton	Dorset	E19/1485	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The installation of solar PV panels and Ground Source Heat Pumps. ATHELHAMPTON HOUSE, ATHELHAMPTON ROAD, ATHELHAMPTON, DORCHESTER, DT2 7LG. SOLAR, UTILIITES/ENERGY SUPPLY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to this proposed development affecting Athelhampton Garden, a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens at Grade I. The Dorset Gardens Trust (DoGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. It is authorised by the GT to respond on their behalf on such consultations. A representative of the DoGT has visited the site and discussed the proposal with the applicant’s agents. The letter submitted to the Council by Historic England is also to hand.</p> <p>Of the three elements to this submission, the solar panels in the eastern service yard, and the ground source heat loops in the western lawn will</p>

					<p>have little impact on the gardens. The trenches dug for the heat loops can be well filled and the lawns replaced. We note the views of the County Archaeologist, which are appropriate. The solar panels in the service yard will hardly be seen from anywhere within the gardens: the site is entirely appropriate.</p> <p>The third element, the solar panel array in the River Cottage field, is of a different order. There would appear to be some potential here for this part of the development to impact on the eastern part of the gardens. However, having walked the site and considered the additional screening that will be put in place, not just for the designated garden, but also for other surrounding property and landscape, the DoGT is satisfied that the proposal is acceptable. The DoGT therefore raises no objection in principle to the development, subject to appropriate conditions to provide for the additional landscaping proposals being controlled.</p> <p>Chris Clarke Dorset Gardens Trust</p>
MANOR GARDENS, WOOTTON FITZPAINE	Dorset	E19/1604	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of dwelling, garage, garden store & associated landscaping. Restoration of listed boundary wall & bothy. MANOR GARDENS, WOOTTON LANE, WOOTTON FITZPAINE, BRIDPORT, DT6 6NH. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2020</p> <p>This application has been forwarded to The Gardens Trust [GT] by the applicant for comment at the request of the Council.</p> <p>The GT is a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Dorset Gardens Trust (DoGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and it is authorised by the GT to respond on its behalf in respect of such consultations. However, this site at Wootton Fitzpaine is not on the national HE list, neither is it included within the DoGT's local list of heritage assets. Therefore, the DoGT does not have a formal position on which to make a comment on this application.</p> <p>However, it is clear that the site is within a walled garden of potential quality, and is also of an unusual configuration. Importantly it is also listed grade II. To that extent, there is merit in considering this application against a range of policies, and not purely those concerned with housing. While the site falls to be considered against Policy HOUS6, it is fairly clear that this site within the AONB does not pass the usual tests, with its location outside defined settlements and lack of sustainability. However, the scope for the renovation of a deteriorating heritage asset (the listed walls) provides a balance to this position.</p>

					<p>Therefore, if the Council does consider that a case can be made for this development within the walled garden, then it follows that the Council should first consider whether the proposal is a potential asset to the location in terms of its size and design. If these tests are passed, then there is scope for an approval to be considered, but with a s.106 agreement to renovate the surrounding walls to an appropriate standard.</p> <p>The DoGT reiterates that this comment is made as an interested party, and should not be taken as a formal view from a statutory consultee.</p> <p>Chris Clarke Dorset Gardens Trust</p>
Stanmer Park	East Sussex	E19/1421	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of Park Village, Lancaster, York, Kulukundis and Kent Houses (total of 852 bed spaces) and health centre and erection of 23no buildings ranging from 1 to 6 storeys comprising new student residences (total of 1921 bed spaces including 20 family units) and ancillary uses including new health & well-being centre, Pavilion Library, retail and restaurant/cafe together with new focal landscaped space, wider landscaping and tree planting and improved pedestrian access. West Slope, University Of Sussex, Lewes Road, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9RH. EDUCATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust on the above application. The Trust has also been notified by the Gardens Trust, the statutory consultee on matters affecting registered historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>The Trust has deep concerns regarding the siting, height and unrelieved bulk of the proposed 'villas' along the western boundary of the campus site, and their negative impact on the open Stanmer parkland landscape. The Trust considers the proposed 'villas' will create an unacceptably hard prominent urban edge, when viewed from the adjacent downland ridge. It is of the opinion that design modifications are required if the stated ambition to create "small cluster buildings along the western edge boundary with the park to enable a greater sense of integration with the character of the wider landscape" is to be satisfactorily delivered. A reduction in the height of the 'villas', greater spacing, and some further cutting into the hill side should be explored and tested and fully illustrated photomontages from viewpoints 2 and 3 produced.</p> <p>As submitted the development is, in the opinion of the Trust, harmful to the setting of the grade II Stanmer Park registered park / garden and more could be done to mitigate this harm. The Trust therefore objects to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Queen's Park, Brighton	East Sussex	E19/1544	II	<p>Planning Application: Erection of 10no lighting columns with LED luminaires to illuminate courts 1-</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust on the above application. The Trust has also been notified by the Gardens Trust, the</p>

				<p>4. Address: Queens Park Tennis Club, Tennis Pavilion, Queens Park East Drive, Brighton BN2 0BQ SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>statutory consultee on matters affecting registered historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>The Trust has deep concerns regarding the siting, height and unrelieved bulk of the proposed 'villas' along the western boundary of the campus site, and their negative impact on the open Stanmer parkland landscape. The Trust considers the proposed 'villas' will create an unacceptably hard prominent urban edge, when viewed from the adjacent downland ridge. It is of the opinion that design modifications are required if the stated ambition to create "small cluster buildings along the western edge boundary with the park to enable a greater sense of integration with the character of the wider landscape" is to be satisfactorily delivered. A reduction in the height of the 'villas', greater spacing, and some further cutting into the hill side should be explored and tested and fully illustrated photomontages from viewpoints 2 and 3 produced.</p> <p>As submitted the development is, in the opinion of the Trust, harmful to the setting of the grade II Stanmer Park registered park / garden and more could be done to mitigate this harm. The Trust therefore objects to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E19/1628	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of 2 teaching blocks and erection of extension to existing building, with associated hard and soft landscaping. at Cirencester College, Fosse Way Campus, Stroud Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire. EDUCATION, DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as the Statutory Consultee for planning proposals the might impact on Listed or Registered parks and landscape, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this Application on its behalf.</p> <p>This proposal redevelops an existing site within the College grounds with a building that although it has considerably greater volume, has the merit of being stylistically and tonally similar to the adjacent buildings. Cirencester Park lies about 150m to the East, and is itself subject to development that will require redefining and re-landscaping the boundary area of Park. As this proposal is visually quite neutral and at a distance from the heritage asset of the Park, the GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>

Newark Park	Gloucestershire	E19/1642	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extension of existing temporary planning permission for the cafe for another 10 years and temporary planning permission for 3 no. outdoor seating pods for 10 years. Newark Park House Ozleworth Wotton-Under-Edge Gloucestershire GL12 7PZ</p> <p>CATERING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) regarding this renewal of this temporary Planning permission. Normally, The Garden Trust would notify GGLT to act on its behalf, and I assume GT has been notified, being the Statutory Consultee on planning proposals which have an impact on the setting of a Grade 1 Listed house in a Grade 11 Registered park and garden.</p> <p>I find this proposal rather difficult. I cannot recall a consultation on the original substantive temporary 5 year consent; and in addition, the consent runs out this month, and one is being asked this time for a 10 year extended temporary consent.</p> <p>The rather random cafe hut does not seem well anchored to designed landscape setting to the house and in my opinion the three temporary domes do little to improve the aesthetic or operational position of providing a cafe. A 10 year consent might as well be a permanent permission. At this stage, I am not persuaded that this is an adequate solution. In spite of the NT's apparent difficulty in using other assets on the site, GGLT is of the opinion that a maximum of a three year temporary consent should be granted, which should provide sufficient time for an alternative and more appropriate option to be finalised.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Stancombe Park	Gloucestershire	E19/1654	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Building restoration and rebuilding of lean-to single storey addition and provision of extended access with parking area. Stancombe Park, Park Lane, Stancombe, Dursley.</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks and gardens, has notified the Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this planning application on its behalf.</p> <p>These ornate and picturesque buildings set into the lakeside and parkland setting of Stancombe, are very much an integral part to the magic of this very important estate. Unfortunately they have been allowed to deteriorate, and are currently in a poor condition following a period of disuse. Some while ago, rather un-sympathetic alterations further reduced their visual quality.</p> <p>This proposal seeks to bring the buildings back into beneficial use, which is to be applauded; and furthermore, the adaptations and new linking extension have been designed in a manner that adds to the quality of the original concept of the group.</p> <p>GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comment on this proposal.</p>

					Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).
Danson Park	Greater London	E19/1478	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of the existing dwellings and erection of a part 1/2/3 storey building to provide a 70 bedroom nursing home, with associated access alterations, car and cycle parking, landscaping and amenity space. 2, 4, 6 And 8 Danson Road, Bexleyheath, Kent. DEMOLITION, INSTITUTION	<p>TGT & CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.02.2020</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 London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT) and are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which has a material impact on the significance of Danson Park, a historic designed landscape which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration.</p> <p>We object to this application, which will impose substantial harm on the setting of Danson Park, and in particular its historic main entrance and avenue, which are described in detail in the Historic England Register entry. The setting of Danson Park has changed dramatically since it was designed in the 18th century by Nathaniel Richmond, but its national significance as an 18th century parkland is still preserved and it can be clearly read and enjoyed as such. The historic main entrance approach contributes a key component to the park's continued significance as an 18th century landscape.</p> <p>We do not object to the principle of a new building following the current line along Danson Road. We do however categorically object to the proposed building that stretches along the Danson Park entrance drive into the park.</p> <p>The application's efforts to portray the entrance approach from Danson Road as inadequate is a wilful misrepresentation – rather it still presents and functions very successfully as the imposing entrance to a distant country house and parkland.</p> <p>The proposal implies that it will offer an improvement on the current back garden buildings by drawing back from the hedge line, but clearly instead it replaces low key domestic buildings of a semi-temporary nature with a large and imposing permanent structure within the immediate setting of a key features of a nationally designated heritage asset. The development may be outside of the park's ownership boundaries, but visually it is very much development within the park landscape.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement suggests that the proposal will 'enhance the park's entrance', by creating a relationship between private and public</p>

					<p>space whereas currently there is a clear distinction between the blank walls of the private houses. It is clear to us that this is simply an attempt to justify the proposal's opportunistic efforts to piggyback on the park's resource for its own benefit, whereas the current 'blank walls' enable the park users to mentally edit out the modern buildings and instead focus on the park instead. It describes a desire to 'provide a visual exchange between the public in the park as well as the residents of the new proposal', but we see this only as an attempt to gain permission for the development to benefit from park views whilst the park users' suffer by having the visual distraction of the new development.</p> <p>Danson Park plays an important role in the local community not only as an open green amenity space but as a publicly owned and accessible heritage asset of national importance. It is quite extraordinary that the application's Design and Access Statement should present this proposal for a commercial private care home as 'another amenity for the residents of Danson Park', when in fact it has a substantially detrimental impact on the existing and fully-public amenity.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that 'substantial harm to ... Grade II registered parks or gardens should be exceptional' (NPPF para 194), and that impact on a park's setting constitutes harm.</p> <p>We ask that you refuse permission for this application in the light of the substantial harm that it will do to the setting and significance of Danson Park.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wandsworth Planning Obligations SPD	Greater London	E19/1625	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Draft Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2020 consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2020</p> <p>The London Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT) is a member organisation of the The Gardens Trust (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 planning consultations. We support the principles of the draft Planning Obligations SPD. We agree that provision should be made for heritage assets and parks and open spaces.</p> <p>In particular we welcome paras 9.3, 9.4, and 12.2. It is important that provision is made for the open space demand arising from development</p>

					and that contributions towards the conservation, restoration and enhancement of the historic environment are sought. Helen Monger/Gillian Morgan LPGT
Lambeth Local Plan	Greater London	E19/1637	n/a	LOCAL PLAN consultation on the Draft Revised Local Plan, 2020	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2020 The London Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT) is a member organisation of the The Gardens Trust (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 planning consultations. We welcome the changes made in response to our previous submission. Helen Monger/Gillian Morgan LPGT
Hackney Planning Contributions SPD	Greater London	E19/1671	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Draft s106 Planning Contributions SPD Consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2020 The London Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT) is a member organisation of the The Gardens Trust (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 planning consultations. LPGT has supported Hackney's approach to protecting and enhancing heritage and leading the way in good urban design. We have welcomed Local Plan policies to protect the Borough's green and open spaces and ensure deficiency gaps are filled and the provision of new open spaces as part of new development to meet the needs of the expanding population. We have previously commented on our concerns for the deliverability of the Hackney Local Plan as follows: With regard to the deliverability of the Local Plan, we hope that mechanisms such as legal agreements and CIL will ensure that developers design quality, publicly accessible landscapes for the future; and development which benefits from its proximity to a public open space or heritage asset contributes to its ongoing maintenance. We do not think the current proposals are specific enough. It is important that provision is made for the open space demand arising from development and that contributions towards the conservation, restoration and enhancement of the historic environment are sought, in particular the heritage assets of parks and open spaces. Helen Monger/Gillian Morgan LPGT

Alexandra Park	Greater Manchester	E19/1585	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing ancillary buildings and glasshouses with phased replacement of new facilities including erection of 2 storey office building, new glasshouse structure, remodelling of existing portal frame unit, hard and soft landscaping works and amended parking and servicing layout. Alexandra Park Depot, Kings Road, OLDHAM, OL8 2BN. PUBLIC PARK, GLASSHOUSE Dean Clapworthy 0161 770 3547</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2020</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. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We have visited the site and been guided through the scheme and its context by the Architect and Landscape Architect. This application is for a very ambitious and worthwhile project which LGT supports.</p> <p>Alexandra Park is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden designed by William Henderson and opened in 1865. The recent restoration works have complemented the original design of this well loved and respected Park. It is noted that the location of the Depot, set on low lying land and the scale of the development has minimal impact on the setting of the publicly accessible and historic areas of Alexandra Park. The aspirations of the project in reorganising the range of uses and activities across the Depot, and securing benefits in training and park management as well as delivering buildings with high environmental standards are welcomed.</p> <p>We understand that during the design process requests have been made for a through-the-night lighting regime. For environmental, ecological and heritage reasons the LGT view is that all-night lighting is undesirable and unwarranted and a balanced and carefully designed system of minimal sensor operated security lighting is more appropriate.</p> <p>It is noted that two non-designated structures, the Messenger Potting shed and Gardeners Cottage/Lodge are excluded from the current project. The Gardeners Lodge in particular makes a significant contribution to the setting of Character Area 4. Whilst these buildings are not currently identified to be demolished, the lack of long term clarity over their future is a concern. We encourage the Council to set out a long term strategy for these buildings, as it appears that once the current project is completed these buildings will have no occupation, and their decay will escalate.</p> <p>We support the application and look forward to the work commencing.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this please contact LGT on conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson</p>
----------------	--------------------	----------	-----	--	---

					S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group
The Vyne	Hampshire	E19/1602	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent</p> <p>Demolition of existing concrete spillway and removal of pedestrian bridge at junction of Large and Lower Lake.</p> <p>Construction of new concrete spillway within Large and Lower Lake, erection of new footbridge along with associated land raising to east and west of existing dam. Erection of new brick flood wall over bypass culvert. Regrading of existing banks to Large and Lower Lakes and north dam. Insertion of new sewage pipe across garden and in walled garden to existing toilet block adjacent to North Lodge. The Vyne, Vyne Road, Sherborne St John RG24 9HL.</p> <p>DRAINAGE/FLOOD RELIEF, ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY.</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.02.2020</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 looked at the many documents relating to this application, and our comments solely address the effect on the historic ornamental landscape and do not concern any technical aspects.</p> <p>Whilst we welcome a much less visually and physically damaging structure, we are concerned that the extensive range of documents does not appear to show a detailed visualisation of the vertical or horizontal surfaces of the weir/spillway, the treatment of its surroundings or the appearance of the bridge other than in sketches from a distance. The appearance of these features is of particular concern in relation to the historic character of the garden. Without this information neither the GT or your officers will be able to comment on whether this is acceptable visually, and whether the proposed adjacent landscaping is as sensitive as possible to the historic character of the garden in this important position. We would therefore request that the applicant provide more information on this aspect so we are able to comment effectively.</p> <p>The proposed railings over the water are iron rail but an adjacent stretch is timber post and rail, as illustrated in document: ELEVATIONS (SHEETS 2 OF 2). We suggest that this too should be of similar style.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Croft Castle	Hereford and Worcester	E19/0291	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed re-modelling and extending car park, provision of additional toilet facilities, landscaping of area in front of the tea room, installation of solar panels on the roof of the toilets and part of the tea room including alteration and extension of curtilage building to Croft Castle. Croft Castle, Croft,</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.02.2020</p> <p>Further to our letter of 9th August 2019 we have looked at the amendments to the above application and wish to repeat our original objection to the proposals. Some National Trust (NT) properties such as Croome or Stowe do have the capacity to accommodate very large visitor numbers as parking is available outside the historic landscaped zone. However, this is emphatically not the case with Croft Castle. In our opinion it is not possible to accommodate the number of cars the NT wish to encourage within the historic epicentre.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Hereford & Worcestershire Gardens Trust wish again to strongly object to the above proposals which will visually damage</p>

				Leominster, Herefordshire HR6 9PW. HYBRID Mr Adam Lewis.	<p>the setting and significance of the historic parkland at Croft Castle. Over-visiting would be highly detrimental to this important heritage asset entrusted to their care. Alternative parking sites outside the core designed landscape should be identified, or else the NT must devise methods of limiting/timing visitor arrivals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Croome Court	Hereford and Worcester	E19/1452	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed waste wood, soil and stone recycling facility and expansion of existing composting facility. Croome Farm, Croome D'Abitot, Severn Stoke, Worcestershire WR8 9DW.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.02.2020</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 Hereford & Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&WGT) and would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation and note that the proposal will not involve adding any buildings to the existing site and merely proposes to repair and replace the existing damaged hardcore and concrete. The Heritage Statement assures us that the sound and smell will be consistent with the existing composting facility that is already taking place there and that the noise from the processing plant will be quieter than the M5 motorway. Whilst the noise may be quieter, in our opinion it will be of a totally different character. Instead of a constant background motorway hum it will consist of sudden crashing bangs, crushing noises and pneumatic drills. We suggest that like is not being compared with like. In our opinion the sudden loud intermittent noises of the work at the waste facility is more likely to attract the attention of 300,000 plus visitors a year to the Grade I registered park at Croome, and would therefore be much more distracting. We have some difficulty in visualizing the stacks of soil, stone and wood which it is proposed to have on the site. The heritage statement suggests that any visual intrusion would be viewed as generally agricultural from the ridge. The site is partially visible from a footpath within the Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Croome and the heritage statement also says (4.11) that the proposal is 'in line with Policy SWDP 6 as it preserves the character of the historic asset of Croome Court Park and the heritage assets included within the parkland.' In our opinion this comment is something of an overstatement, but if your officers are</p>

					<p>satisfied that the facility will not visually impact upon the RPG then we have no further comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Pendley Farm	Hertfords hire	E19/1552	N	<p>Planning Application: Demolition of barn, indoor school and hay barn. Construction of 6 No. dwellings.</p> <p>Address: Pendley Farm Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QY</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Hertfordshire Gardens Trust on this Locally Historically Important Landscape.</p> <p>We have no objections to the demolition of buildings and erection of 6 six houses as detailed in this application.</p> <p>We do, however, have concerns about the indicative new landscaping. No detailed landscape plan appears to have been submitted.</p> <p>We consider the species proposed, red maple and silver birch, to be inappropriate in this rural setting. To preserve the history of the site, as farm complex and subservient to the mansion house landscape, we would expect native species such as hornbeam, oak or beech. If trees of more compact habit are required then rowan, gean, crataegus spp. and others would be more appropriate than those proposed.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Norton Common Greenspace Action Plan (GAP)	Hertfords hire	E19/1561	N	<p>LOCAL PLAN Draft Greenspace Action Plan (GAP) for Norton Common Local Nature Reserve consultation</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic designed landscape, of which Herts Gardens Trust is a member.</p> <p>We have studied the Norton Common draft GAP and support the main aims of the document.</p> <p>From a heritage perspective the most important features are the horse chestnut avenue and the medieval ridge and furrow. We understand the replacement of the horse chestnut with lime as an when required, and support the aim of keeping the visual link to Broadway via the line of the avenue.</p> <p>We also support any measures taken to conserve the ridge and furrow, including locating events elsewhere on the common. We have seen evidence of compaction and erosion in parks such as Tring and Panshanger from Park Run, and although we would not wish to stop runners using the Common, we would urge thought being given to the routes used.</p> <p>The Common is also part of the setting for the many early Garden City houses, some listed, on Icknield Way, Norton Way N and Wilbury Way. Any</p>

					<p>clutter (information boards, way markers &c) should be kept to a minimum and the policy of natural hedging and traditional techniques, as currently practised, should continue.</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Broxbourne Local Plan	Hertfords hire	E19/1666	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Broxbourne Local Plan main modifications consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2020</p> <p>Reference Policy PP1 Reference Numbers MM 10.2 and 10.3</p> <p>Park Plaza West is the site of the late 16th/early 17th century park of Robert Cecil who extended the Theobalds site when he inherited from Lord Burghley. It contains the New River, begun by Robert Cecil, remains of the 'Fair Square Pond' with associated earthworks, the site of Cullings, small ornamental canals to the north of the site.</p> <p>These have only recently been discovered and no archaeological work has been undertaken as yet. These are very significant features in the development both of national historic landscape design and in the understanding of the history of Theobalds.</p> <p>These heritage assets should be recognised in MM 10.2 and 10.3 and the planning of the open space and the commercial development should accommodate them.</p> <p>Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource , and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (NPPF184) . Until such time as detailed investigation has taken place to understand their full significance, these assets should be protected alongside the other named heritage assets detailed in MM102.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Ashridge	Hertfords hire	E19/1688	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of Detached Dwelling and Garage. Plot 7 (Land At Church Road), Church Road, Little Gaddesden, Hertfordshire HP4 1NZ. RESIDENTIAL	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2020</p> <p>The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the HE Register. HGT is a member organisation of GT and is authorised to respond on GT's behalf in such matters.</p> <p>We are therefore disappointed not to have been consulted on this application as it affects the openness of the village, itself a crucial part of the setting of Grade II* Ashridge landscape. We are also unclear why Historic England have not been consulted as this affects the setting, not only of the park but also the Grade I Church.</p>

					<p>The site is within the Chilterns AONB, the setting of a registered park and listed buildings, has TPOs and is not designated for development in the Local Plan. It is also within the Little Gaddesden Conservation Area and will have an adverse effect on the listed and other historic buildings within the village, contrary to NPPF.</p> <p>We object strongly to this application which will adversely affect the openness of the rural village which is strongly visually and historically linked to Ashridge Park and Grade I mansion. Views designed by 'Capability Brown' and others to and from the mansion across the park and views to and from features in the park are a key part of the significance of these highly graded heritage assets. Development here would be contrary to NPPF Section 16. 189. This requires a heritage assessment to be supplied by the applicant. We consider the submitted Design & Access Statement to be wholly inadequate and no separate Heritage Impact Assessment is included with the documents. We consider that the impact in total on the village, its listed buildings and registered landscape to be considerable and adversely affect the heritage assets.</p> <p>NPPF Section 16 is concerned with 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment'. We consider that this development would have the opposite effect and should therefore be refused.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
17-19 Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E19/1697	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Submission of details pursuant to condition 1 (construction method statement) 2 (refuse and recycling details) 3 (cycle parking) and 5 (samples of materials) on planning permission 6/2018/1232/FULL. 17-19 Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AL. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire gardens Trust is a member.</p> <p>On the basis of the information in this application we have no objections to discharge of the conditions.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Herts Gardens Trust</p>
17-19 Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E19/1699	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 6 (plans) on planning permission 6/2018/1232/FULL. 17-19</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member.</p> <p>We commented on the original application that external seating along Wigmores North would not be desirable due to lack of room. We note that</p>

				Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AL. MISCELLANEOUS	<p>drawing LNG4198-202 indicates External Trading along Howardsgate, to which we have no objection, but not along Wigmores North. If this is to be taken as External Trading is not to be along Wigmores North, then we would support that amendment.</p> <p>We have no further comment on this variation of condition 6</p> <p>Kate Harwood Herts GT</p>
Lullingstone Castle	Kent	E19/1674	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey extension, erection of a detached garage, alterations to the roof and to the previously approved window positions. Land West Of Lullingstone Park Farmhouse, Lullingstone Lane, Eynsford, KENT DA4 0JA.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING Hayley Nixon</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2020</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 Kent Gardens Trust (H&WGT) and their expert local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and this application consists of an extension to the dwelling, which was granted permission in April 2019 (SE/19/00316). One of the conditions of that approval was the removal of permitted development rights. According to the planning decision notice this removal was 'to ensure that any future development on the site, maintains the character of the area, protects the Metropolitan Green Belt and does not harm the respective heritage assets in accordance with the policies GB1, GB4 and EN4 of the Sevenoaks Allocations Development Management Plan.'</p> <p>The current application seeks to extend the dwelling from an area of 54sq m by a further 30sq m, which is more than the 50% currently allowed by Green Belt Policy GB1. The Planning and Heritage Statement produced by DHA Planning Ltd in December 2019 states in paragraph 1.4.3 that the area of the original building is 65.55sq m, which is contrary to the area shown on the drawing which equates to 54sq m.</p> <p>The proposed garage is shown on the drawing as 30sq m, which is less than the permitted area of outbuildings of 40sq m. allowed under Policy GB3. However that policy does state that the outbuilding should 'not materially harm the openness of the Green Belt through excessive bulk or visual intrusion'. In our opinion, the garage outbuilding is excessive alongside the existing or proposed extended single storey two-bed dwelling.</p> <p>As the site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt, a Registered Park Garden and an Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB), we wish to register our objection to this application, as the extension is larger than permitted and</p>

					<p>the garage size is excessive.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Moor Park	Lancashire	E19/1546	II*	<p>Planning Application: Replacement of existing fencing with 2.4M high mesh security fencing incorporating gates. Address: The Larches House School, Moor Park, Blackpool, Preston, PR1 6AA ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2020</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. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Larches House School lies within a site surrounded by Moor Park, a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, which owes its origin to the enclosure of Preston Moor in the 1830s, and the major features of which were laid out following the design of Edward Milner after 1860.</p> <p>We have reviewed the planning documents submitted in support of the application and visited the site. It is noted that the current proposals are to complete the mesh fencing already in place around the Larches House School site. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment describes the extent of tree removals which appears justified. It is our understanding from the documentation that no further tree removals will be undertaken beyond that listed in Table 2 and shown on Tree Constraints Plan and the Tree Protection Plan. In this regard it is noted that significant areas of what appears to be natural regeneration within the Park close to the boundary of Larches House School site are not shown on either plan and it is concluded that these areas of young trees will not be affected or damaged during the fencing works.</p> <p>On this basis we have no objection to the current application. If there are any matters arising from this please contact LGT on 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>
Lever Park	Lancashire	E19/1574	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 4no. structures to provide alternative access points</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.02.2020</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</p>

				<p>to existing Go Ape course. Go Ape, Rivington Lane, Rivington, Bolton BL6 7RZ. VISITOR ATTRACTION</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>LGT gave its views on the initial Go Ape Course proposals at the time of the first planning permission in 2008, and we expressed serious concerns about the appropriateness of this development in the Lever Park. These concerns were summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lever Park is a Registered Historic Park and Garden Grade II, and as such is a fragile and sensitive resource which can be easily damaged beyond repair. The Park was created by an important benefactor of national renown working in conjunction with a recognised designer; • Great House Barn is a listed building Grade II and its setting would be adversely affected by the proposals; • Potential conflicts with existing Park users, at a location where there is a major access route for walkers (including mobility impaired users) to gain access to the lakeside walk; • Concerns about effects of Course being fixed to trees, with nails and bolts in trunks, and particularly in the light of a lack of management plan for the wider Lever Park; • The possibility of later intensification and enhancement of Course facilities, requiring for instance, a larger car park or flood lighting. <p>However, planning permission was granted, subject to conditions notwithstanding the objections received. Therefore, LGT's concerns remain unresolved, and are still relevant to any further proposals.</p> <p>In the earlier applications, it was stated that there were no protected or priority species affected, and that no designated sites, important habitats or other biodiversity features were affected. This disregards the Chorley Local Plan Map, which indicates that the whole area of Lever Park is a Biological Heritage Site, and accordingly ecological issues should have been addressed in the earlier applications and the current application.</p> <p>We requested in the October 2008 letter (and reiterated subsequently) the need to undertake a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan for Lever Park, to address the long term care of the historic features of the Park, within which parameters will need to be set for the continued operation of the Go Ape Course. It is recognised that the undertaking of this work is principally a</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>task for the land manager, United Utilities, rather than Adventure Forest Ltd, (T/A Go Ape) however, it is LGT's view that no further planning permissions should be granted until this matter has been addressed between the various agencies.</p> <p>Current Proposals</p> <p>The current application for four timber towers providing access structures to the existing course imposes an increased intrusiveness and further intensification of the use of the course. All this was foreseen at the time of the original application, and this process is likely to continue, increasing the impact and harm to the historic Lever Park.</p> <p>The comments in relation to avoiding and not severing tree roots over 2.5cm diameter are welcome. However, the concentration of tree roots around the bole of each tree will mean that in practice it is difficult to find a satisfactory location for the structures either without unavoidable severance or additional timber accessways at high level. All will increase the disturbance to the tree root plates, and result in greater visual intrusion in the historic Lever Park.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>We have fundamental issues with this proposed development including issues with each of the previous applications. These concerns are summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lever Park is dedicated to the People of Bolton, and the public generally, as set out in the provisions of the 1902 Liverpool Corporation Act. The greater part of the Go Ape Course is within the Lever Park, as defined by the Act, and it is Registered as a Historic Park and Garden Grade II. • The setting of the listed Great House Barn is adversely affected by the Course. NPPF places importance on the setting of a heritage asset, and the harm done to it by traffic and busy thoroughfares. NPPF 2019 Para 189 states 'In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the • significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting'. This comment applies equally to the Lever Park RPG. • A Conservation Management Plan is required for the whole of Lever Park. • The prospect of intensification due to the increased use of the course has been confirmed by experience, as evidenced by numerous subsequent planning applications. Attention needs to be given to find a more appropriate and less sensitive location for this intensive recreational
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>facility, as over time the adverse impacts will be greater and longer lasting. If there are any matters arising from this please contact LGT on conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Stephen Robson</p> <p>S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI</p> <p>Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Buckden House	North Yorkshire	E19/1596	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for creation of an external/outdoor kitchen - Buckden House Outdoor Education Centre, Buckden, BD23 5JA. CATERING, EDUCATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2020</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 on occasion give advice on non-registered sites. About fifteen years ago Buckden House was included in a joint research and recording project between the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.</p> <p>Buckden House is listed grade II with entrances from the village located close to its northern and southern boundaries. The site is bounded by a stone wall, enclosing mature trees.</p> <p>Most attractive gardens were laid out in the mid C19 by Sir John Charles Ramsden and an extensive country park was laid out across the valley by his son. Some alterations were made in the late C19 by Colonel Compton Stansfield, who purchased the Buckden Estate c. 1879. These included moving the northern entrance further north, with a section of part of the original northern drive becoming a path from the House to the boundary wall, separating the existing south lawn from a new northern section. The grounds were well illustrated in early postcards of Buckden house, including a set of Francis Frith 1955 postcards. In particular these postcards show mature hedging on the eastern side of the drive from the southern entrance, which played a principal role in framing the view of the house from the south and also screening auxiliary buildings.</p> <p>It is difficult to comment on these current proposals due to the total lack of detail in the plans and the omission of any relevant photographs. We understand from the Design, Access and Heritage Statement at 5.1: 'It was recommended that an alternative location is found where the kitchen would be less conspicuous and a greater distance from the listed</p>

					<p>building. The proposal is located on the south-east elevation as recommended. This wouldn't obstruct any elevations of Buckden House but does provide views overlooking the garden. This would be considered a preferable location if the kitchen could be sited in the area currently used for car parking as far away from the building as possible.'</p> <p>There does not seem to be any detailed information or photographs of the actual location, its impact on the listed building, and on the submitted Tree Care Plan there is no description of the hedging that it is proposed to remove, re its species, age, condition etc., nor for the adjacent trees. Similarly, we would expect that the planning application would include provision for replacement tree and shrub planting.</p> <p>The Design, Access & Heritage Statement also states that the proposed site is "currently used for car parking" but does not give any indication if a suitable alternative parking area might exist. We suggest this needs to be addressed at this stage.</p> <p>Although an outdoor kitchen may be a useful adjunct for current teaching purposes at Buckden House, we propose that if it is built it should follow conservation principles, so that in the future if it is no longer used it can be easily removed and the area re-instated. In the light of this and the fact that this is a historic garden, set in a rural location and additionally lies within a Conservation Area, we consider that the proposed "concrete raft", approximately 5mx5m, beneath the canopy is totally inappropriate as hard landscaping.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above we have strong reservations about this proposal in this location.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Mulgrave Castle	North Yorkshire	E19/1607	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of 1 no. 4 bed dwelling with integral garages. Land To Rear (South) Of Daneholm East Row Sandsend Whitby YO21 3SU. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2020</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.</p> <p>This planning application lies in the fishing village of Sandsend, near part of</p>

					<p>the eastern boundary of the Mulgrave Castle park and estate. Mulgrave Castle is on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at grade II*. The park was laid out by the first Earl of Mulgrave in the late 18C and early 19C incorporating proposals made by Humphry Repton (d.1818). The site is made more significant because Repton's Red Book of proposals is still held by the family.</p> <p>The planning application lies within the Conservation Area and north of the registered Historic Park and Garden (HP&G). The proposal site is some distance from the registered H P&G boundary to the south at Birstly Dale/Preston Head and we think that it is unlikely to cause harm although we are unsure about the visibility of the variety of roof lines proposed. However, the proposed development will possibly be visible across the river, and to rise obtrusively above the small- scale vernacular cottages along East Row. Across the river is where the registered H P & G boundary is close to the coast. It would have been helpful if the application had included sections to show the proposals in relation to the general setting. We have been unable to make a recent site visit and request that a Conservation Officer advises.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
The Long Walk, Knaresborough	North Yorkshire	E19/1634	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of detached store / servery; Erection of freestanding boat hire sign. The Marigold Cafe, 16 Waterside, Knaresborough, North Yorkshire HG5 8DE.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2020</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.</p> <p>This planning application is just across the wide river from The Long Walk at Knaresborough, and thus is immediately outside the eastern boundary of the grade II registered historic park and garden.</p> <p>The proposal is to create a detached storage building with canopy and an external servery area to service customers using the external seating spaces. It is also proposed to erect a sign within the site advertising the boat hire business. The sign is to be in a similar style to the 'Marigold' sign at the entrance. The existing buildings have undergone extensive</p>

					<p>refurbishment in the past. They have a slate tiled pitched roof and vertical timber weather cladding to the walls with a waterproof render finish as flood defence at low level. The proposed storage building canopy and servery will be constructed out of a timber framework with timber cladding to match the main buildings on the site. The roof will be relatively low to keep the building as discreet and unobtrusive as possible whilst still being practical.</p> <p>This is a good submission in keeping with the site and we have no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Ingleborough Hall	North Yorkshire	E19/1660	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of an external/outdoor kitchen - Ingleborough Hall Outdoor Education Centre, Clapham, LA2 8EF. CATERING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.02.2020</p> <p>About fifteen years ago Ingleborough Hall was included in a joint research and recording project between the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.</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. Although Ingleborough Hall is a non-registered site, the Hall is of significance as the home of the Farrer family of whom the best- known member was Reginald Farrer (1880-1920), the traveller and plant collector. He travelled to Asia in search of a variety of plants, many of which he brought back to England and planted near his home in the village of Clapham, North Yorkshire. He published a number of books, although is best known for My Rock Garden.</p> <p>Ingleborough Hall is listed grade II* and is within the Clapham Village Conservation Area. The gardens and designed landscape are significant although not included on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>This planning application is for an outdoor kitchen to be sited north-west of the principle elevation of the Hall and adjacent to a single storey timber building currently used as a classroom. This should have minimal visual impact on the heritage assets. We have not noted any new access paths to</p>

					<p>this proposal. The Design and Access Statement at 10.1 states that there are TPO's on the trees within the area of development and we trust that such works involved with trees will be in accordance with BS5837 as stated. Similarly, any works to make access paths will follow this standard to safeguard tree roots. We would like to point out that a nationally rare hornbeam was identified in the grounds of Shamba near Farrer's pool so there may be rare trees in the grounds of Ingleborough Hall too. We recommend that a tree expert checks the species, varieties and condition of those trees affected and gives advice before any planning permission is given. We also have concerns about the concrete base for the outdoor kitchen and its likely impact on the trees and their future growth.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
York Minster Precinct and 2 Minster Court Garden	North Yorkshire	E19/1686	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN York Minster Precinct Draft Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission Draft consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2020</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust has been contacted by members concerned about the prospect of building on the large lawn to the rear of no. 2 Minster Court, just below and adjacent the York City Wall, put forward in the York Minster Precinct Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the Statutory Consultee regarding to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We also give advice on historic parks, gardens and designed landscapes that are not registered.</p> <p>We have read the plan and applaud the general principles and strategic planning which is being undertaken. We understand that as part of the process the overall coherence of the green landscape is being examined and how to best reveal the very many layers of change that have occurred in the Precinct. This is welcome. We understand the iconic status of York Minster and its Precinct; its huge historic and cultural significance, the multitude of worshippers, theologians and community who have loved and sustained it over hundreds of years and the financial constraints that underpin it now and in the future.</p> <p>In terms of the quadrant of the Pre-submission draft - Area 4 - which</p>

					<p>includes No 2 Minster Court garden; we have viewed the site from the City Wall.</p> <p>No 2 Minster Court garden is situated to the north/northeast of the Precinct within the Central Historic Core Conservation Area, within the Area of the Scheduled Monument and in the setting of grade II* Minster Court buildings. The view from the City Walls across the garden is a 'Notable View' and a calming green space. It is designated as Area 4 in the Project Area; 'Chapter of York Staff Housing and Storage'. Essentially the Deanery Garages are proposed to be extended more or less completely across the lawn to the eastern boundary impacting on the 'Notable View' and removing a green heritage asset.</p> <p>We would like to make the following points of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The loss of the main lawn would compromise the historic setting and integrity of the whole property, a grade II* listed building in a residential area. - The proposed new building would remove the current verdant view of trees and garden from the City Walls and should be protected. - There may be archaeology which would be disturbed/damaged. - Fig 22 of the draft plan shows two 'high quality' trees and four 'moderate quality' trees which will be too close to the proposed build and will require removal. - none of the houses in Minster Court have front gardens. Compared with many other cathedrals' precincts, York Minster has relatively few gardens to maintain and should not be reducing them further. - The city's green spaces need to be protected and nurtured, to maintain biodiversity, air quality and amenity for residents and visitors alike. <p>We have noted the laudable Church of England plans to be carbon neutral by 2045 and the York Minster Precinct draft, p44, Policy GP1 Sustainable Development. We are not convinced that development on the garden of No2 Minster Court complies with either and offer the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - plant an orchard, juice the apples and either sell the bottled juice or serve it in the proposed café. This is a long- term plan as is the café. - remove the lawn and plant a vegetable garden to support the proposed café ie to reduce our carbon footprint and food miles. - establish a 'Friends of the Precinct Gardens' group to support the Minster in the maintenance of its green spaces. - Explore working with NT gardens staff and those who work at Greys Court - a 'gardening collective' to raise the profile of all garden spaces in that
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>area (and to attract a team of volunteers).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lease the garden to a local chef eg Tommy Banks at Roots on Marygate, so that he might develop a walled kitchen garden in the city centre. As the Minster was never a monastery, it doesn't have a refectory, hospitium, cloisters etc but it could now have a kitchen garden. - plant a meadow, such as Kings College Cambridge plans to do: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-cambridgeshire-51179488 <p>In terms of the Learning Centre - Area 3 - we welcome the research/assessment that is being done to understand the area of The Residence/Old Palace and its garden areas. These probably had three historic phases which may need further work to understand how they have evolved and their significance. We don't think that this area is well-understood and proposals will need to take account of any underlying archaeology. We are pleased to read that healthy mature trees and the Kohima War Memorial to the Second Division are to be incorporated into the overall design which we trust will be a fine, possibly contemporary addition, (but with references to the site's history), to the Precinct's public green space.</p> <p>The green spaces of York Minster Precinct are as much a heritage asset as the buildings. The York Minster staff are current custodians of the whole including the gardens. The proposals for new garden space and the gardens of 2 Minster Court are a valuable part of the portfolio and we trust that they will be looked after as carefully as the built heritage assets.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust Duncan Marks, Duncan.Marks@yorkcivictrust.co.uk</p>
Albert Park, Abingdon	Oxfordshire	E19/1348	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Two storey rear extension and first floor side extension with internal alterations to provide additional living accommodation. The addition of a rooflight. 17B Park Crescent, Abingdon OX14 1DF.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2020</p> <p>Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to this application. We have undertaken a desk-based assessment as we have been unable to visit in person.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation and read the Planning, Heritage, Design and Access statement. The application site lies within the setting of the Grade II Registered Albert Park (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</p>

					<p>need to preserve or enhance the setting of the RPG or better reveal its significance. The applicant has indicated that the proposed additional work will match that of the existing building so we are satisfied on that count. We would suggest that if your officers are minded to approve this application, careful attention be 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. We did not find any documentation relating to the tree cover between 17B Park Crescent and the RPG. From the online paperwork it would appear that the new extensions are unlikely to be too intrusive upon the setting of the RPG. However, without the benefit of a site visit this cannot be ascertained entirely as there are no photographs. We would suggest that if your officers consider it necessary, a condition be imposed that additional appropriate tree planting be undertaken should the new extensions be felt too intrusive.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Albert Park, Abingdon	Oxfordshire	E19/1349	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>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 corridor to link the new building to Austin House. Austin House, 76 Bath Street, Abingdon OX14 1EB. EDUCATION</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.02.2020</p> <p>Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to this application. You have already received the Gardens Trust and Oxfordshire Gardens Trust's responses for P19/V3260/HH for 17B Park Crescent and P19/V3213/FUL for Crescent House. This third response relates to another application by Abingdon School for updating the boarding accommodation. We agree with your pre-application advice that the School have taken care to work sensitively in relation to the impact of this proposal upon designated heritage assets. The new building and link corridor are further from the Grade II listed registered Albert Park (RPG) than the Crescent House application (P19/V3213/FUL) and the trees along the frontage of the application site should obscure views from within the RPG and the setting of the buildings in Park Crescent.</p> <p>We are confident that should your officers approve this application, they are sufficiently aware of the sensitivities of the RPG and conservation area to ensure that if any additional arboricultural conditions are required to provide necessary long term screening, these will be imposed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Blenheim Palace	Oxfordshire	E19/1413	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Remediation and restoration works comprising engineering operations for the removal of silt from the Queen Pool and upstream part of the Great Lake via dry dredging, to include partial dewatering of the lake; works to the banks of the Queen Pool for the creation of habitat features; partial air drying and deposition of silt arisings to create a new landform up to a maximum of 4.8 m in height; including the necessary temporary haul roads to enable the development. Queen Pool, Blenheim Park, Woodstock.</p> <p>WATER FEATURE, REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<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 Gardens Trust (OGT) and they have arranged a site visit on the weekend of 2nd February in order to make a more fully informed response.</p> <p>In the meantime, we do have a few initial comments. It is clear that the proposed works to Queen Pool are necessary in terms of dredging and silt removal. On the site visit, my colleagues propose to look carefully at the proposed height increase of the bank with regard to its impact upon the original design concept for the Queens Pool and banks/views etc. They hope to access the CMP for Blenheim which should also be helpful. We will get back to you with a fuller response as soon as they have been able to visit. We hope this will not hold things up.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.02.2020</p> <p>Further to our letter of 26th January, Oxford Gardens Trust (OGT) committee members were able to visit the site on 1st February to assess the likely impact of the proposed new landform feature, up to a maximum 4.8m in height in the northern part of the site and to the east of the Grand Avenue, an area that has been under arable cultivation for nearly two centuries. The Gardens Trust and OGT are now in a position to comment more fully on this application.</p> <p>The organic shape of the landform has been designed to subtly raise an existing plateau by continuing the existing contours around it. We were satisfied that this will blend discreetly into the landscape and that no historic parkland grass or mature trees will be lost. We also welcome the very considerable benefits of restoring the Queen's Pool to a condition consistent with Lancelot Brown's original design, as well as improving the biodiversity of the park and raising the water quality of the lake. However, there are submerged features in the Queen's Pool of exceptionally high landscape and archaeological significance relating to past periods of landscape history, forming the setting to Blenheim Palace and the former Woodstock Palace. This archaeological evidence requires</p>
-----------------	-------------	----------	---	---	---

					<p>investigation and recording in line with the requirements of the NPPF. We would like to see conditions imposed to protect these features, which will not be discharged until all the elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any dredging activities must avoid disturbance to submerged archaeological features as shown in the applicant's submitted materials - The applicant is required to implement a programme of archaeological work in accordance with the WSI. The programme should include measures for : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timely examination and recording of all archaeologically significant material or evidence in Queen's Pool and the surrounding site where silt deposition is proposed • The reporting of the results of this work to the planning authority and the Historic Environment Record • The publication of the results as appropriate • The archiving of any material recovered and produced during the works at an appropriate and accredited repository <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Blenheim Palace	Oxfordshire	E19/1424	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Formation of new pedestrian opening in the park wall and addition of a new cast iron gate. Ditchley Lodge Gate, Blenheim Park, Woodstock. ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2020</p> <p>DThank 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 they have arranged a site visit on the weekend of 2nd February in order to make a more fully informed response. On the site visit, my colleagues propose to look carefully at the proposed pedestrian gateway entrance and gate at Ditchley Gate, especially with regard to detailing, as currently the extremely heavy gate is difficult for pedestrians to open with ease. We will get back to you with a fuller response as soon as they have been able to visit. We hope this will not hold things up.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Wentworth Castle	South Yorkshire	E19/1566	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of new dormer bungalow and associated works including provision of new vehicular entrance gates; Pine Lodge, Stainborough Lane, Hood Green, Barnsley S75 3EZ.</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2020</p> <p>The above application has belatedly been brought to our attention by colleagues in Historic England (HE) the day before the response period expired on 29th January 2020. The Gardens Trust (GT) is a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by HE on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application within a Grade I landscape (RPG), and as such we should have been consulted. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) who know Wentworth well, and their expert local knowledge informs this response. We are grateful for a little leeway in response time and have studied the online documentation as well as the 1st edition 6" and 25" maps which are not included in the online information.</p> <p>The site for this planning application lies immediately within the south west boundary of Wentworth Castle Park. Wentworth Castle's triple Grade I listing, for its historic parkland, its gardens and its house, emphasizes the site's importance internationally. It is a significant resource for large urban communities and is the only grade I registered park and garden in South Yorkshire; a very important heritage asset for your Authority. The area is also designated as the Wentworth Castle and Stainborough Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is clear from the maps that there has long been a small building close to the site of the bungalow, possibly an animal house and paddock within the historic parkland. It was screened from view by the associated avenue running up to Archer's Hill Gate from the 'Old Cold Baths' opposite Cold Bath Farm. Although the Baths were destroyed during open cast mining after the Second World War, the Farm survives and its central courtyard was the focal point of the Rotunda steps. Therefore, it is clear this was not an insignificant area of the park. The Heritage report states that the applicants are seeking permission to demolish a small bungalow with attached garage and swimming pool and are only slightly increasing the floor area. It would appear to us that in fact they are doubling it in size to create a five-bedroom dwelling with double garages 'for four cars'.</p> <p>Much of the original avenue survived into the C20th. The very old beeches which remain north of Keepers Pond are probably the last remnants. Likewise, T13 (an old beech), acknowledged by the Arboricultural Report and Impact Assessment, is outside the boundary. This must surely constrain the siting of the new building and is not the property of the applicants to prune?</p>
------------------	--------------------	----------	---	--	---

					<p>The applicant makes no mention of the Park Wildlife and Conservation Plans which should still exist within the Council archives. Keepers Pond, which is three centuries old and appears on the Estate map thought to have been surveyed c1728 by Badeslade (Sheffield Archives VWM 63R) will be significant to any work undertaken by the applicant as it is the home of great crested newts which are a heavily protected species.</p> <p>We were also very concerned to see that within the Coal Authority Pre-Application Report that there is correspondence relating to trial trenches and ‘stripping’ of soil which will be required in order to ascertain whether the three mine shafts (Nos. 431402-030,031,032) thought to be in the north west corner of the site - give or take 8metres of accuracy - need to be opened and any danger or inadequacy dealt with. After demolition of the bungalow more checks within the footprint of the proposed new house would be required to check for gas emissions etc. for the opencast part of the site. This does not appear to take into account the effect upon the surveyed trees and their root zones, and the dimensions required for machinery access, and is not mentioned in the tree survey. We also note in the Coal Authority Pre-Application Report, concerns that the existing mature oak tree within the application site is likely to be seriously affected by trial trenches and ‘stripping’ of soil.</p> <p>Regarding the Heritage Statement at 6.2 we do not agree: the whole of the registered historic park and garden with its views is significant. Similarly, we do not agree with the statement at 7.5.</p> <p>In our opinion the supplied documentation is inadequate for a full planning permission application. We fully support HE’s comments about the intrusive impact of these proposals upon the RPG and for brevity have not repeated their references to the National Planning Policy Framework which we also endorse. We note in the Barnsley Local Plan (adopted January 2019) Policy HE1 The Historic Environment, that Wentworth Castle parkland is specifically included as an asset, and Policy HE4 Developments affecting Historic Areas or Landscapes which lays out how the setting and heritage significance of a RPG can be protected. The lack of acknowledgement of its impact upon the RPG within the Heritage Report is a surprising and unfortunate omission.</p> <p>The existing bungalow on the site does not make a contribution to the character of the parkland and we have no objection to its demolition. We consider that it would be possible to accommodate a new dwelling on the site, but this should be sensitively designed to fit comfortably into the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>surrounding parkland and the views towards the site.</p> <p>In conclusion we object strongly to this application in its present form. We concur with the advice from HE and should your officers be minded to permit the application we wish to be informed of the committee dates etc.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer cc. Neil Redfern, HE</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2020</p> <p>Further to the Gardens Trust & Yorkshire Gardens Trust's letter of 30th January regarding the above application, I hope you will not mind us sending some additional background research which has just been brought to my attention. This additional information does not change our strong objection but may be helpful to your officers when deciding this application.</p> <p>In the original letter we referred to the 'Old Cold Baths'. There were two or three cold baths on the Wentworth Castle estate. The following account is taken from: 'Use and Ornament: Bath Houses in Yorkshire Gardens and Parks, c. 1688–1815, in With Abundance and Variety: Yorkshire Gardens and Gardeners across Five Centuries, Susan Kellerman (Yorkshire Gardens Trust, 2009).</p> <p>The cold bath at the site on Stainborough Lane, opposite Cold Bath Farm, first appeared on an estate map of c.1730 as two large rectangles, which might suggest open air plunge pools. (Sheffield Archives, VWM/Maps/63R, Estate plan of Wentworth Estates, c. 1730, possibly by Badeslade.) The feature survived, in some form, for a further 200 years: the rectangles marked 'Old Cold Bath' appear on OS maps between 1855 and 1948. A plan of 1882 suggests that the same water source was then supplying water to the house (SA, VWM/Maps/3, Plan of a water course from Cold Bath to Wentworth Castle, July 1882). This plan marks 'hydrant' by the mansion, so this might have been intended for fire-fighting purposes. An earlier map, dated 1881, 'Plan of Water Course from Mag Wood to Cold Bath', shows a lengthy system of pipes taking water from Mag Wood to Cold Bath Farm, with outlets and air traps shown along its length, pipes being between 2' and 6'6" below ground (SA, VWM/Maps/7R). A visit in 2005 recorded indications in the adjacent field of some kind of surviving underground water source or course. The view from this site across the Wentworth</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Castle landscape and its architectural features is breathtaking. If this C19 underground water supply system still exists, it is probably itself of historic and archaeological interest, and may potentially be at risk during demolition and construction work.</p> <p>The cold bath here was one that Ms Kellerman wrote about in the above-mentioned book, pp. 113-14. It is a significant location because, apart from the cold bath there, shown on a map c. 1730, there is also a 'Plan of a Water Course from Cold Bath to W Castle' 1882, which shows water from near the Cold Bath being taken by pipes to W Castle and then on to Weigh House. By the mansion a hydrant is shown, suggesting the water might have been designed for fire-fighting at the house. An earlier plan dated 1881 'Plan of Water Course from Mag Wood to Cold Bath' shows a lengthy system of pipes taking water from Mag Wood to Cold Bath Farm, with outlets and air traps shown along its length, pipes between 2-6'6" below ground.</p> <p>We hope this additional information is of help and interest to your officers.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer cc Neil Redfern, HE</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.02.2020</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust recently responded to the above application. We were very disappointed that we were not directly notified about this by your officers as the GT is a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by HE on their Register of Parks & Gardens. Having looked several times at the website for this particular application, it is apparent that despite responding, we are still not listed amongst the names of consultees. We would be grateful if you could correct that as soon as possible. The Gardens Trust has produced a leaflet to help local authorities understand their responsibilities with regard to this. I am therefore attaching a copy of this which I hope you will find helpful.</p> <p>I also understand from my colleagues in the Yorkshire Gardens Trust that there should be some consultee only documentation. I was not able to see this online. If this is correct, I would be extremely grateful if you were able to forward it to me immediately so that we can amend our response if necessary, in light of additional information.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Shrubland Hall	Suffolk	E19/1595	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a petrol filling station (PFS), associated store and 2no. drive thru's and creation of new vehicular access. Land At Norwich Road, Coddendam, Suffolk. HYBRID	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.02.2020</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 Suffolk Gardens Trust (SGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The applicant has gone to some lengths to describe the heritage assets involved – the Grade I registered Shrubland Hall park and gardens (RPG) with its numerous listed structures and a Humphry Repton Red Book of 1789, and the Grade II Needham Lodge, attached walls and pavilions (II) remodelled by Charles Barry c1860. The Heritage Statement (4.5) states that the ‘proposals are likely to generate a minor level of less than substantial harm to the significance of Needham Lodge’ and that (4.4) the ‘aesthetic quality of its seeming isolation will be reduced.’ In our opinion cutting down almost all the trees/vegetation from an area currently wooded, the last buffer screening both the lodge and RPG from the A14, and replacing it with (4.1) : ‘a shop, centrally located to the application site; a drive through coffee outlet to the south-western section of the application site and a drive through restaurant located to the north-eastern section of the application site... (as well as) two petrol tanking areas with canopies over, located either side of the shop building’ and a new access road, can in no way be described as ‘a minor level of less than substantial harm’. The aesthetic setting of the heritage assets will be fatally compromised. To add insult to this proposal, there is an existing petrol station, Travelodge and food outlet (Beacon Hill Service Station) directly across the A140 from the proposed new service station, which already provides all the facilities required by the passing motorist. The Heritage Statement (4.4) states that ‘by far the more important element of this setting in terms of the asset’s significance is the Registered Park and Garden of Shrubland Hall’. Humphry Repton was well aware of the vital importance of an entrance lodge, and he wrote in the Red Book for Blaise Castle (1796) that ‘the greatest improvement in the character of the place will be the entrance from the high road..’ It is no different at Shrubland. Today, just as in Repton’s time, visitors’ initial impressions are set by the</p>

					<p>entrance to an estate. The presence of a petrol/service station directly opposite and in full view of the entrance lodge, as well as a newly opened up vista to a major road (A14) impacts massively and detrimentally upon the significance of not just the lodge, but also the setting and significance of the entire RPG.</p> <p>It would seem to us that the destruction of the final remaining screening of the lodge from the A14 and the building of a 2nd visually intrusive and inappropriate petrol station, is clearly contrary to the Babergh Local Plan (CN06). The proposals do not harmonise with the Grade II lodge, its setting or that of the Grade I RPG, and can by no stretch of the imagination be said to contribute positively to the setting of a listed building or the views to or from it. Although the existing road and other petrol station development have without doubt negatively impacted the setting of the heritage assets, both aesthetically and from a noise point of view, Historic England's Advice note : The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views, clearly indicates that even if '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.' It is hard to see any justification for further harming these irreplaceable heritage assets.</p> <p>The GT/SGT object strongly to this application and we urge your officers to reject these proposals which are clearly contrary to aspects of your own Local Plan as well as the NPPF.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Reigate & Banstead Supplementary Planning Documents	Surrey	E19/1367	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN RBBC Supplementary Planning Documents</p> <p>Consultations</p> <p>Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)</p> <p>Barn and Farm Conversions SPD</p> <p>Historic Parks and Gardens SPD</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2020</p> <p>The Surrey Gardens Trust (SGT) welcomes and supports the revision and reformatting of the proposed SPD.</p> <p>The Trust would not wish to comment on the general form and content of the SPD. The following comments therefore relate to parts of the text, the list of sites at Appendix 1, and the list of organisations etc at Appendix 3.</p> <p>Comment on the text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets the scene in distinguishing between “designated” and “non-designated” heritage

				<p>Reigate Shopfront SPD</p> <p>assets. This is referred to at Para 2.2 of the Draft SPD and reflected in the policies set out at Appendix 5.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that the wording of the SPD needs updating from the 2001 terminology to give consistency and to avoid confusion. For example, “designation” of a locally identified site would now produce a non-designated heritage asset. Further examples of the varied terminology are found in “local non-statutory” at Para 1.5, “registered” and “locally designated” at Para 3.3, and “designation” at Para 3.4.</p> <p>Perhaps “locally listed” could be used for parks and gardens as it is for buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 1.7 – in last line “the” is superfluous. • Para 3.5 - needs a slight adjustment to indicate that the lack of criteria is only for those sites identified locally. • Para 3.9 – correct spelling in caption to read “at” not “a”. • Para 3.16 – suggest addition of dates for Jekyll (1843 – 1932) and Rohde (1881 – 1950) to give timescale and context. • Para 3.23 – in 4th line correct spelling to read “rare” not “rate”. • Para 4.10 – in caption to read “has” not “have” been demolished. <p>Comment on Section 3 and Appendix 1 – Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that no sites are suggested in the SPD for addition to the List of 2001 as amended in 2012. SGT does not have information to hand that would lead us to suggest any additions. We would be happy to comment on suggestions that may arise from the consultation. • SGT would support the proposed boundary changes for Banstead Place (site number 03) and Kingswood Warren (08). • The site plan for Netherne Hospital (11) suggests that the boundary line passes through buildings and may therefore need review. The description should now refer to “former” hospital. • The description for Banstead Wood (04) should now refer to “former” hospital. • The descriptions for Gatton Park (37) and Reigate Priory (36) should have a consistent use of perhaps “Grade II Registered Park and Garden”. <p>Appendix 2: Historic England etc.</p> <p>The Gatton Park Register Entry is given in full. Reigate Priory should be treated similarly and not simply given in a Summary.</p> <p>At page 41 the dates for Rohde (1881 – 1950) would give a timescale for her work.</p> <p>Comment on Appendix 3 – Useful Contacts etc</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 42 - Surrey Gardens Trust entry – to read “An educational charity that since 1991 has raised awareness of and sought to protect Surrey’s rich heritage of historic parks, gardens and designed landscapes. Its members actively research and record sites across the county. Lectures, study days and visits explore and share this understanding. The Trust works with the Gardens Trust (see below) in responding to planning consultations affecting historic parks and gardens”. • Page 43 – At end of The Gardens Trust entry the final bracket needs to be outside “sites”. • Page 43 – RHS now has a Reference Library at Wisley. • Page 43 – NCCPG is now Plant Heritage. • Page 43 - Add an entry for Banstead History Centre, Banstead Library, The Horseshoe, Bolters Lane, Banstead SM7 2AN For local collections relating to Banstead, Burgh Heath, Chipstead, Hooley, Kingswood, Lower Kingswood, Netherne-on-the-Hill, Preston, Tadworth, Tattenhams, Walton-on-the-Hill and Woodmansterne. Website https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/culture-and-leisure/local-history-centres/banstead • Consider an entry for the Banstead History Research Group and their website www.bansteadhistory.com with information and images online and showing their local history publications that are for sale. • Add an Entry for the Historic Environment Record (HER), Surrey County Council, currently at County Hall, Kingston upon Thames. • Page 46 – consider caption for illustration. • Page 47 – at Gatton Park the major part of the parkland is owned by the National Trust with public (bridleway) access. <p>Don Josey On behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust</p>
Mole Valley Plan	Surrey	E19/1553	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Consultation for Mole Valley Local Plan	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2020</p> <p>The Surrey Gardens Trust (SGT) is an educational charity that since 1991 has raised awareness of and sought to protect Surrey’s rich heritage of historic parks, gardens and designed landscapes. Its members actively research and record sites across the county and place those research reports in the Surrey Historic Environment Record. SGT is a member of the Gardens Trust, a statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, and works with them responding to planning consultations.</p> <p>The comments below relate to Environment 6 and associated items in Appendix 1: Glossary, and to one site in Chapter 7.</p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment sets the context for Environment 6. While SGT would not disagree with the general content of Policy EN6 and the supporting text there are unexplained variations from NPPF terminology that seem unnecessary and/or need amendment. • NPPF refers to heritage assets and then identifies “designated” and “non-designated” to which different considerations should apply – paras 193 to 196 and para 197 respectively. Policy EN6 part 1 would seem to apply the same considerations to all heritage assets and while this would be welcomed by SGT it may need re-working in the light of the NPPF. At the least the use of “undesigned” should be replaced with “non-designated”. • Policy EN6 part 2 refers to the Historic Environment Record (HER) as part of Surrey History Centre. This has not recently been the situation but no doubt the SCC response to the consultation will clarify. • In the supporting text it is suggested that “non-designated” should replace “undesigned”, and that in this particular context “Registered” should precede “Historic Parks and Gardens”. • In Appendix 1: Glossary. Some simple re-writing could usefully accommodate the terminology suggested above. Under the current “Historic Asset” the idea that non-designated assets are those identified by the LPA needs to be broadened to perhaps read “locally identified” because the HER, for example, is drawn from wider sources. The reference to “local listing” needs a definition. The definition for “Historic Parks and Gardens” should use “Registered” in the text rather than “Designated”, and might continue at the end to add “and non-designated sites identified locally”. • Chapter 7 - Site SA41 Headley Court – SGT welcomes the recognition of the historic parks and gardens interest and the requirement for a long-term management plan for the formal gardens. <p>If you require any further information please let me know. Don Josey On behalf of Surrey Gardens Trust</p>
Key Hill Cemetery	West Midlands	E19/1484	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of site to include demolition of buildings, change of use/refurbishment, alterations and extensions to retained buildings and erection of new 3-6	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2020</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust with regard to this application concerning the</p>

				storey buildings to provide 69 apartments and townhouses, colive/work studios, B1 employment space, A1 retail space and A3/A4 cafe/restaurant spaces, D2 leisure space with associated basement car park and landscaping. Land at Hylton Street, Key Hill, Hockley Hill, Key Hill Drive & York Terrace, Jewellery Quarter, Birmingham, B18 6HN. MAJOR HYBRID, CEMETERY	<p>redevelopment of a sizeable area adjacent to the Grade II* listed Key Hill Cemetery.</p> <p>We have read the online documentation and welcome the revitalisation of this part of the city. There seems a very positive attitude by the planners and architects to preserve the best of the heritage, with a green and ecological emphasis for healthy living, incorporating Key Hill Cemetery as part of that plan. It is encouraging to see that proposals include a conservation strategy to rescue and repair Key Hill Cemetery and that this will be in line with ICOMOS advice. We are glad to hear that the applicants plan to liaise with the Friends of Key Hill Cemetery and other community groups to produce a management and development plan for the cemetery, described as becoming a heritage park. We would not support anything which might detract from the atmosphere and significance of this important Grade II* heritage asset but are very supportive in general of the area being carefully tidied up and made accessible to the community. We look forward to receiving more detailed plans for the Cemetery in due course.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Leonardslee	West Sussex	E19/1486	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent.</p> <p>Demolition of an existing wooden framed barn. Construction of security gates and erection of 3No. barns and enlargement of the associated gardeners' compound together with construction of an adjoining staff car park. Leonardslee Gardens, Brighton Road, Lower Beeding, Horsham.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, PARKING, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding the above application. The Gardens Trust (GT) - is a statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>Leonardslee is designated by Historic England as a Grade I Historic Park/Garden. As such, any planning proposal that causes harm, even "less than substantial harm" should be wholly exceptional (NPPF para 132 – 134). SGT commented on an earlier application (DC/19/1067) involving a bulky building nearly 10m high and objected because it was unclear whether this would cause harm.</p> <p>SGT welcomes the commitment of the new owners to the restoration, maintenance and enhancement of Leonardslee and recognises the need for carefully designed and screened utility buildings to support these activities. Compared with the earlier application, the present proposals involve a significantly lower building and a screen of trees; the lower roof line and colour of the structure should be far more easily assimilated into</p>

					<p>the area than the bulky barn previously proposed. SGT welcomes these changes and supports the present application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell.</p> <p>On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.</p> <p>Copy to: The Gardens Trust</p>
Standen	West Sussex	E19/1516	II	<p>Planning Application: Restoration of the former Standen Landfill site with a woodland and pasture landfill cap system</p> <p>Address: Evergreen Farm West Hoathly Road East Grinstead RH19 4NE</p> <p>LANDSCAPE, TREES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) and also the Gardens Trust (GT) about the above application. The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have studied the submitted documents relating to the application. We also commented on an earlier application last year. The site is very close to and overlaps very slightly with Standen, which is included on the register of historic parks and gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade I designation.</p> <p>When completed, the proposals should protect the garden from possible harm. The Trust does not object to the application. However, implementation will involve significant disruption due to movement of HGVs and the Planning Authority should ensure that conditions to any approval ensure the impact on Standen and its many visitors is minimised.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jim Stockwell.</p> <p>On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.</p> <p>CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Ledston Hall and Park	West Yorkshire	E19/1469	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building application for partial demolition and alterations to Ledston Hall to form 10 dwellings, erection of energy centre and stores with associated works including new access road, parking provision, and surface water drainage solution. Ledston Hall, Hall Lane, Ledston. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.02.2020</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 listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Ledston 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>Ledston Hall is significant as a fine example of an English Country House estate with a long history. The park has 17C origins and the walled gardens</p>

					<p>and terraces are probably of a late 17C date with the area now called The Grove originally designed by Charles Bridgeman for Lady Betty Hastings c. 1731. (The payments to Bridgeman by Lady Betty are in C. Hoare and Co., Bankers, London, Ledger K, 27 March 1731.) The gardens, designed landscape and park registered at grade II* means that it is a nationally important site of more than special interest.</p> <p>This is a very well-documented application and the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust welcome the proposals, which we hope will ensure a long- term sustainable future for Ledston Hall and provide for the beneficial management of the estate's historic designed landscape. We trust that sufficient parking provision has been made in the plans for public access to the hall. Similarly, that a detailed management plan will be put in place which will secure the future careful maintenance of the gardens and designed landscape and including the car parking etc. We hope that provision will continue for the occasional opening of the gardens and landscape.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E19/1487	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Appilcation for Listed Building Consent for works of restoration, conversion and development to the Mansion House, Stables and Coach House, Camellia House, curtilage and associated buildings within the Bretton Hall Estate and relates works of demolition, new construction, car parking infrastructure and landscaping for hotel, conferencing exhibition uses, offices, non-residential institutions and associated uses. Bretton Hall, Park Lane, Bretton.</p> <p>HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.02.2020</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 listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park, garden and designed landscape at Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park, which is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade II*.</p> <p>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>Bretton Hall is a unique heritage asset combining as it does a number of listed buildings including the mansion; pleasure grounds of late 18C and early 19C, parkland of the 18C with earlier origins and links with two notable landscape designers/gardeners, Richard Woods (1716-93) and Robert Marnock (1800-99); and the Yorkshire Sculpture Park laid out on part of the pleasure grounds and parkland. The declining state of the historic buildings and surrounding area at the core of the Bretton Hall estate has inevitably given considerable concern and the Yorkshire Gardens</p>

					<p>Trust is generally supportive of the proposed new use for the grade II* listed mansion. A number of the proposed works should conserve and enhance the historic buildings which is to be commended, but we have reservations about the impact of some proposals on the setting. The setting encompasses the grade II registered parkland which is significant in its own right. There seems to be scant regard and understanding of 'setting' in the Heritage Impact Statement.</p> <p>The GT and YGT are pleased to support the following proposals:</p> <p>The works to the camellia house and its setting. The proposed removal of 54-space and 29-space car parks just north of the camellia house represent a major improvement to the setting of the camellia house. Similarly, the new paths would be a minor improvement.</p> <p>Setting of Bretton Hall will be improved by the proposed removal of a 49-space car park to the SE of the main entrance.</p> <p>The creation of a wildflower meadow immediately south of the hall, a new little kitchen garden to the north of the hall and clearing the overgrown pond north of the camellia house.</p> <p>We have the following concerns/objections:</p> <p>The proposal to site a large marquee on the south terrace. We are opposed to this as it will have a major impact on views from the south; from the lake and beyond. In our view this proposal indicates the lack of understanding of setting and the importance of views throughout the historic designed landscape.</p> <p>Proposed enlarged 305-space car park NW of the hall adjacent to the current Learning Centre/Kennel Block. This would have a major impact on the landscape and result in the felling of many existing trees and makes a large rectangular grid-like car park the major feature of views from the area of the Yorkshire Sculpture Park (YSP) landscape immediately to the north. (The previously approved plan for a smaller car park builds upon existing parking and maintains numerous semi-mature trees.)</p> <p>We consider that the rectangular grid-like bare 38-space and 31-space car parks immediately NE of the hall, in front of the stable, will be much less sympathetic compared to the approved irregular tree-screened car parks, and have greater impact in views from Oxley Bank and from beyond the woodland to the east which is newly proposed to be thinned.</p> <p>The spur road now shown on some but not all maps, to cut the corner from the approved new access road below the YSP visitor centre to the approved turning circle in front of the mansion, will be highly visible from a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>large area of open-access YSP parkland. The visibility includes from the Lower lake and its listed landscape features and from Oxley Bank up towards Longside Galleries. Traffic on this prominent road would also be a new source of noise and exhaust pollution for all visitors to these areas. The newly proposed 'heavy thinning' of woodland a short distance to the east of the hall needs very careful consideration, in order to strike a balance between improving views across the landscape for visitors arriving at the mansion and making traffic highly visible to visitors to the parkland. We request a tree thinning scheme and future tree management to attain this balance and improve the mixed quality woodland. The scheme should also show how the ha-ha running down the slope through the woodland will be featured.</p> <p>The newly proposed removal of most individual trees close to the south lawn and east of the hall also needs more careful consideration. Again, a balance between opening views for those enjoying the hotel's various function rooms, and the increased visibility and associated increased noise for the large number of visitors to the area immediately to the south. The principle of reciprocity should be a consideration in the felling work and future tree management.</p> <p>We are unclear from the Heritage Impact Statement as to whether the newly proposed removal of a mature area of trees/large rhododendrons to the NW of the hall will give dramatically changed views from the camellia house. It would also open up the view from the landscape further south up the westward side of the mansion – will it be of greenery, buildings or more distant car parking?</p> <p>In the documents we have been unable to find reference to which individual trees are to be felled, either on any 'as approved' plans nor on the new 'Phase 1 submission'.</p> <p>Several plans show a red line around a defined area containing most existing buildings, the camelia house, all proposed car parking areas and the landscape parkland, some of which is currently open to the public and some of which is currently fenced off for building work. We are unclear as to what this means. If this is intended to mark the future boundary between private and public access then we are very concerned. No fencing, hedging or other physical markers should be placed along this line which would have no historic landscape meaning and would be very damaging to all reciprocal views.</p> <p>We have the following general concerns:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>YSP Visitors and separation- The YSP had 480,000 visitors and 40,000 schoolchildren in 2017. The latter are mainly primary schoolchildren who walk in the parkland and access the Learning Centre adjacent to the Kennel Block car park. There will be many more visitors from the new country park visitor centre and walkers entering the parkland legally via various separate public footpaths and bridleways. The application does not describe any separation, or segregation, between parkland visitors and hotel/hotel car park visitors. Mixing traffic and pedestrians is not very safe and even the few proposed new road edge hedge-lines could impinge sightlines of both drivers and pedestrians. In addition, any 'hard' separation (gates, walls, fences) would be a significant intrusion into this (currently open) historic landscape.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement has negligible reference to the impact of the proposed changes to the registered historic designed landscape. There are no before/after views from the landscape, with none from any of the (frequently visited) listed monuments within the landscape. There are plans showing trees and groups of trees removed and areas of woodland removed or thinned with no explanation. There does not appear to be any mitigation plans for any proposed landscape changes to what was previously approved. In our view there needs to be much further clarification regarding the reasons for removing, or retaining individual trees, eg whether to open up a view (of building(s) or of landscape), to improve screening or to enable adjoining, currently overcrowded, specimens to thrive. There needs to be a clear landscape statement/plan showing where it is proposed to plant new trees, their species and size and reasons for the proposal.</p> <p>The new 'Phase 1 submission' includes up to 100 net additional parking spaces alongside a proposed reduced number of overnight hotel visitors. This indicates probable additional short-stay traffic along the (approved) new access road through the public parkland areas, both below the YSP visitor centre and north of Bretton Hall. The additional vehicular traffic will further damage many views across the parkland, increase traffic noise/pollution and result in increased road-crossing safety issues across several parts of the popular family visitor areas.</p> <p>We note that it is claimed that the Landscape Agency report of 2010 is the best available account of the landscape whereas there has been more recent research and publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study Day organised by the Association of Gardens Trusts, Yorkshire
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Gardens Trust and YSP, at YSP September 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Lynch, 'Happily situated, in an elegant style': the Development of the Bretton Hall Landscape, c.1760–1830 • Jan Woudstra, The Influence of Robert Marnock on Bretton Hall, 1825–34. <p>Both papers in Garden History, journal of the Garden History Society, 41/1, 2013</p> <p>We are not convinced that this application is compliant with various paragraphs in the NPPF (February 2019).</p> <p>Paragraph 189 requires the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected and there is scant mention of the registered park and garden in the Heritage Impact Statement. The evidential, aesthetic and communal value are not considered. [The registered park and garden, (lakes in particular) was considerably degraded when Bretton College/Leeds U vacated the site, and the massive restoration project was undertaken in 2014, involving Natural England and substantial public funding.]</p> <p>The requirements of paragraphs 190, 193 and 194 have not been properly addressed.</p> <p>We also note the HE Advice Note 3 (Second Edition, 2017) The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning.</p> <p>We note Wakefield Council LDF Core Strategy paragraphs on Environmental Quality which pays particular regard to Wakefields 'numerous and extensive historic and natural assets' (9.14) and LDF Development Policies, Policy D18, Development Affecting Historic Locations.</p> <p>We have concerns that without further careful consideration some of the proposals will harm the international reputation of YSP and its success.</p> <p>We note the comments of Peter Murray CBE, founding Executive Director of YSP:</p> <p>"What we are trying to do is spread visitors out through the rich and varied landscape – the footfall can cause all kinds of maintenance problems – we want them to explore different parts of the parkland," he says. "The great thing about the Bretton landscape is that it was designed to be discovered. It's based on both vistas and secretive areas that create different moods and characteristics. Over the decades we've utilised that design quality to organise exhibitions and develop projects"</p> <p>In conclusion, for the reason's outlined, we have objections to some</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>proposals in this Listed Building Consent Planning application and trust that they will be addressed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p> <p>cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---