



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES APRIL 2020

The GT conservation team received 123 new cases in England during April, 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, 44 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
16 Knole Close, Almondsbury	Avon	E19/1825	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey front extension to form additional living accommodation. 16 Knole Close, Almondsbury, South Gloucestershire BS32 4EJ. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development, which would affect Knole Park, South Gloucestershire, and is identified as a park of local importance and is listed on the Gazetteer of Historic Parks and Gardens of Avon. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust note and agree with the heritage statement that the proposed development is modest in scale and if built would be in an area of the park that has already been significantly developed. It will not directly impact on the stone boundary wall, and will not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of Knole Park, or impact on any surviving historic landscaping or planting schemes.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>

Dodington House	Avon	E19/1873	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Internal works to install new stainless steel staircase to West flanking tower. Dodington House, Dodington Lane, Dodington, South Gloucestershire BS37 6SL.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a Grade II* listed structure located within a Grade II* registered Park and Garden. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Avon Gardens Trust (AGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The internal works to install the new stainless steel staircase would not appear to affect the external appearance of the Cascade Building of which the west flanking tower forms a part, or the setting of the Park and Garden. The GT/AGT have no comment to make on this element of the application.</p> <p>However, we note that the application also includes the proposed installation of a new timber boarded jetty running the full length of the undercroft, to be supported on stainless steel angles hung off the walls, to allow access to and from boats on the lower lake and inspection of the undercroft fabric.</p> <p>The GT/AGT note from the applicant's response to the Council's Town and Country Planning Acts Incomplete Application Notice of 9th March, that there is no definitive evidence of a former jetty structure, or for the west flanking tower being used as a boat house, although evidence of the former staircase and the length of the flooded vaulted tunnel suggests that boats could be moored here. The applicant also states that there is no evidence of any historic boat house structure elsewhere, and that a boat would have been required for accessing and maintaining the island.</p> <p>However, the Trust understands that all Dodington's accounts refer to the 'Fishing Pavilion' as a Boat House, and it specifically has an arched space below for boat storage. Building work started on this is 1810, before the Cascade House c1820-25. There is also a contemporary boat house at Dodington, which in our opinion would seem ample for boat storage. Whilst the proposed jetty would be in shade and not readily visible from the exterior, boats moored there, particularly at the end of the jetty, could be, leading to visual clutter and detracting from the appearance of the Cascade Building.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT/AGT consider that the proposal to install a jetty at the Grade II* listed Cascade Building at Dodington is likely to lead to adverse impact to the Cascade Building and the wider setting of the Grade II* registered Park and Garden. The Trust considers that the proposal</p>
-----------------	------	----------	-----	--	--

					<p>would result in harm to the Cascade Building and registered Park and Garden, and therefore objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you very much for responding to our earlier comments regarding the above application concerning the works to the Cascade Building at Dodington. In light of the response to Historic England you sent us, and your accompanying reply, the Gardens Trust/Avon Gardens Trust, would like to amend our response to one of 'no comment'. We note that our original letter is not yet posted on your website.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Claverton Manor	Avon	E20/0024	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Provision of children's play area using natural materials and associated landscaping. American Museum In Britain, Claverton Manor, Claverton Hill, Claverton, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset BA2 7BD. PLAY AREA</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the curtilage of the Grade I listed building and set in the Grade II registered park and garden and Claverton Conservation Area. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust note that the scale of the proposal has been significantly reduced since the pre application stage. Also, that the northern parkland that it affects is of less significance than the central gardens and pleasure grounds to the east and south. The important views will remain and hopefully the new planting will soften the impact of the 1980's Exhibition Building as well as contributing to the financial sustainability of the museum.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Stoke Park	Avon	E20/0067	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extension to Care home containing 29no. new bedrooms</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the curtilage of</p>

				and supporting communal facilities. The Elms House, Park Road, Stapleton, Bristol BS16 1AA. INSTITUTION	<p>the Grade II listed Stoke Park, historic park and garden laid out by Thomas Wright between 1748 and 1766, around a country house known as the grade II* 'Dower House'. The Elms, which is the focus of this planning application, is a mid 19th century wealthy merchants house situated close to the boundary of the Thomas Wright designed landscape,</p> <p>Stoke Park Estate. The locally listed park and garden of the now closed Purdown Hospital will also potentially lose some of its open space. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust note that the key views to and from Stoke Park, namely, to the north of The Elms, are the Dower House, its retaining wall and the Obelisk. The park is dominated by woodland to the west providing screening in all seasons, and therefore the extension to The Elms is of little significance to the views within the historic park and garden of Stoke Park. Similarly the impact on the locally listed park and garden of what once was Purdown Hospital, will be of less than substantial harm.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust, in respect of the quality of historic landscape, have no objection regarding the extension to the care home, The Elms.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Claydon	Buckinghamshire	E19/0899	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of four existing estate barns into B1 employment use and the erection of one new storage and maintenance barn, including associated alterations, a bin store, landscape and access works and car parking. Buildings At Farm Courtyard, Claydon Estate, Steeple Claydon Road, Middle Claydon, Buckinghamshire MK18 2EX. CHANGE OF USE,	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.04.2020</p> <p>As you are aware, the Gardens Trust (GT) working with the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) have previously submitted comments (January 30th, 2020) regarding this application and were subsequently invited to attend a site meeting with representatives from AVDC. Unfortunately, due to the current Covid-19 situation, this meeting was cancelled and we were unable to join in a telephone conversation to address the issues raised. However, we note that, following that telephone conversation, revised proposals have now been submitted which amend some of the issues we raised. However, some of our concerns have not been addressed, and whilst Wessex Archaeology have great expertise in their own field, we would question whether they are appropriate consultants to address landscaping issues. We are therefore grateful to be</p>

				<p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p> <p>asked to comment further on the submitted amendments.</p> <p>In considering these amendments, we have referred to our original comments although we are surprised and at a loss to know why they do not appear on the planning website. We would be grateful if this could be rectified as soon as possible.</p> <p>i) The GT/BGT are pleased to note the relocation of the proposed new structure know as Barn E and the revised proposals for the access track. However, the we are disappointed to see that the proposed yard still extends north of Barn E and the existing access track. We would prefer to see the hard surfacing reduced in this area. Whilst it is encouraging that the new built structure is now nearer to the existing structures, our objection related just as much to the extension of the built area into the undeveloped landscape. We therefore object to the extension of the hard standing to the north of the access drive.</p> <p>ii) With regard to the proposed electric gates along the main driveway, we originally expressed a preference for them to be moved nearer to the yard. We have noted the applicant's comments on this matter and so our revised preference would be to locate the electric gates nearer to the first passing bay by the lodges. We still feel their proposed position by the second passing bay is random and interrupts the landscape. In our opinion, such gates need to be situated near developed areas unless they are defining a specific section of the landscape such as a deer park. We therefore accept the need for electric gates but object to the current proposed location.</p> <p>iii) With regard to the post and rail fencing, as the proposals include the introduction of the electric gates, the public would not be able to access the main driveway. As the post and rail fence runs alongside the main driveway, this does not restrict the public wandering anywhere else on the land and therefore we do not accept the arguments for the necessity of the post and rail fencing along the length of the main driveway. We therefore accept the need for post and rail around the farm courtyard and any developed areas but object to its introduction along the main driveway.</p> <p>iv) In our previous comments dated January 30th 2020, we made the following comments with regard to the parking provision for the two cottages; "We note the proposal to close the access of the main road to the existing garage/shed at the Western lodge and would like to express our concern as to whether this would lead to the introduction of access at a later date in a different position. Fundamentally, we would have no objection to closing this access if there is no vehicular access required to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>that particular structure. However, given the concerns being raised about the proposed introduction of 4 car parking places to the north of the Western lodge, we would query as to why this access drive could not continue to provide appropriate car parking for the Western lodge. We would prefer to see this access retained and utilised for parking for the Western lodge rather than spaces allocated to the rear of the lodge.'</p> <p>We now note that the revised proposals have been adjusted to create two parking spaces behind each lodge. Whilst this is a definite improvement on the four spaces behind the western lodge, we would still query why the existing access from the main road to the existing garage and shed is not re-used as we suggested previously. This access and provision exist and would be preferable to creating new parking spaces. However, if the Planning Authority are minded to grant approval for the revised proposals of two spaces behind each lodge, we would ask that there is a condition that the existing access to the garage cannot be reopened in the future and that the current garage ceases to be a garage permanently.</p> <p>v) With regard to the revised planting proposals to mitigate the proposed car parking spaces, we welcome the use of native species, but we would prefer to see informal planting rather than the solid hedges that are proposed on the revised plans.</p> <p>vi) We welcome the removal of the proposed new timber shed so as to avoid further proliferation of small ancillary structures on the site.</p> <p>vii) With regard to the replacement of the hedging surrounding the Eastern lodge, our concerns remain the same - we have no objection in principle if the need is to plant a native species or a healthier hedge. If visibility is the concern, we are curious to understand how replacing one hedge with another will resolve this matter? This matter is not addressed in the revised proposals.</p> <p>viii) Finally, we feel that these proposals would have benefitted from the involvement of a professional landscape consultant who understands the significance of a Grade II registered park and garden and we would therefore encourage the applicant to seek such advice in the event that further proposals are considered in the future.</p> <p>In submitting our comments please note that we still object to a number of issues detailed above and we seek clarification of other issues.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Dropmore	Buckinghamshire	E19/1756	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of replacement dwellinghouse and outbuilding following demolition of existing dwellinghouse, staff accommodation, pool house, workshop, estate outbuildings and maintenance sheds and buildings and open storage yard. Closing up of existing Taplow Common Road access. Burwood House, Taplow Common Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NR. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2020</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. Unfortunately, the GT/BGT are not familiar with this site and, under current circumstances due to Covid-19, there is no opportunity to make a site visit in the foreseeable future and we have had little time to research the site further. Therefore, we have made a desk-based assessment and hope these comments are useful. In considering this application, we have used the information provided by the applicant along with the letter from the Conservation and Listed Buildings Officer in his email dated March 5th 2020.</p> <p>We note the Conservation and Listed Buildings Officer's description of the site :</p> <p>(i) The context of the conjoined Burwood/Dropmore estates is one of a well looked after landscape of woodland and fields, enveloping the main building and its immediate curtilage, and encompassing a number of subordinate structures.</p> <p>(iii) This area of woodland was intended to act as a backcloth to the main house at Dropmore and its immediate enclosure.</p> <p>We also note the comments in the Landscape Assessment undertaken by Camilla Beresford of Askew Nelson as follows (p.17, 3.2) : "The site of the proposed dwelling lies within the designated Ancient Woodland but in the late 20th century or early 2000s the existing works yard constructed. Prior to that this area of woodland appears to have been cleared. The designation remains, however the significance of this part of the ancient woodland, which relates to the historical footprint of the woodland, its landscape characteristics and the ecological resource, has been compromised."</p> <p>We also note that the existing Burwood House is a late 20th century ranch style house situated near to the road and outside of the RPG boundary and has little impact on the significance of the RPG whereas the proposals for the new Palladian-style house sit within the RPG on the site of the former estate yard.</p> <p>Based on the architectural drawings provided as part of this application,</p>
----------	-----------------	----------	----	---	--

				<p>the Gardens Trust wishes to echo the comments of the Conservation and Listed Building Officer as follows: “The size and bulk of the proposed replacement building is a disappointment as its dominant, verticalised and formal character works against the informal, horizontal character of the woodland.”</p> <p>With this in mind, the Gardens Trust recommends that the current application is refused.</p> <p>However, we would like to offer recommendations which are slightly different from those offered by the Conservation and Listed Building Officer :</p> <p>Our preference would be to construct a replacement dwelling on the site of the existing dwelling near to the road and outside of the RPG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whilst the existing dwelling is not of any architectural merit, we would prefer to see an Arts and Craft style structure. We acknowledge that the applicant may prefer the proposed neo-Classical design. In which case, we would recommend that this be positioned on the site of the existing residence by the road. - However, if the planning authority are minded to permit a new dwelling on the site of the estate yard within the woods, we would definitely prefer to see an Arts and Crafts style residence with a lower horizontal profile, utilising more natural materials which would blend more appropriately into the setting. We echo the Conservation and Listed Building Officer’s comments “The objective should be to blend the exterior woodland environment with the fabric of the new house, using hard and soft landscaping to merge the two.” - We would not recommend a modernist design as we feel that this might involve large amounts of glazing. Whilst reflection and light emittance may not be visible from any public place, we do not feel that it would be appropriate in a woodland setting. - Finally, we would again like to support the Conservation and Listed Building Officer’s comments as follows; “Retaining the present 1980s ranch-style residence would be less harmful than the building proposed by the applicant, in terms of the impact upon the designated assets on the estate.” <p>The Gardens Trust therefore recommends refusal of the current proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/1771	I	PLANNING APPLICATION 2 years management plan attached ,various works including felling of 20 trees. Stowe School, Stowe Park, Stowe, Buckinghamshire MK18 5EH. TREES	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2020</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT), a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, has just been made aware of the above application. We would like to make an official complaint that we were not consulted. It came as something of a surprise that it appears to have been received and approved on the same day without any outside consultation. Given that Stowe is a Grade I registered park & garden we would normally have expected to have been consulted as a matter of course.</p> <p>The online documentation did not include the management plan or indeed any details of the proposed work to indicate where or what the work is/was. We would be grateful if you could please forward us a copy of this management plan for future reference. We would have appreciated being sent a copy when it was originally adopted although this is perhaps more down to the applicants rather than yourselves, as it would be invaluable when commenting on planning applications for Stowe. The absence of this crucial management plan makes us wonder whether there are other agreed management plans (or similar) for sites in Buckinghamshire that we have not received? These would of course be extremely helpful when we assess other planning applications.</p> <p>The GT understands that works to trees, or in this case felling, may have been necessary for safety reasons. However, there is nothing to tell us what this particular application was about and it highlights the fact that works to trees is something of a grey area. Stowe is a site of international importance, and the placing of historic trees was very carefully planned. Consequently, it would be really harmful if such felling were part of an avenue or a specimen clump used to direct the eye to a view. We would like to understand why were not consulted, which trees were felled, and why the application was submitted and decided on the same day without the normal consultation process.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you so that we can fully understand this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/1793	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 3 No. additional sheds at the Bourbon Playing	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.04.2020</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>Fields. Stowe School, Stowe Park, Stowe, Buckinghamshire MK18 5EH.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application and our letter put onto the website as quickly as possible so that others can see our comments.</p> <p>We have carefully studied the online documentation for this application, and would like to stress, that the site for the proposed sheds is in an area of high significance at Stowe.</p> <p>Given the above-mentioned sensitivity of this site, we are disappointed that there is no historic impact assessment or indication of level of visibility of these sheds from the designed parkland and pleasure ground beyond. We are particularly concerned about this as views are likely to be damaged particularly from the park to the west, and beyond this from the east end of Brown's Grecian Valley above the ha-ha.</p> <p>We appreciate there may be a need for further facilities and storage, but the lack of an options appraisal is a further worrying omission in the documentation, making it difficult to justify this choice including its impact on the historic environment. It would be preferable to attach the facility to existing buildings e.g. nearby sheds, sited away from the park side rather than build on open ground in the shelter belt which is intended to screen the playing fields and their buildings from the west.</p> <p>The central shed is probably far enough away from the boundaries and sufficiently screened not to be of concern. However, the two sheds on the west boundary of the playing fields set into the tree screen, are of considerable concern.</p> <p>Although these two sheds are a relatively minor proposal per se, in terms of Stowe Registered Park and Garden (RPG) they continue the undesirable precedent for piecemeal incremental development, without being part of a justified masterplan for school property within the RPG. Recently proposals have been submitted for a variety of buildings on virgin sites including a new Design building in Rook Spinney, a new golf club house in the playing fields and new security building at the campus entrance, being only the most recent of many others over previous decades. None of these have been submitted as part of a unified and justified approach to new build. This unfortunately suggests that there is little vision applied to the rationale behind their proposal, or concern for the conservation of the historic environment. We question how many more structures will be</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>required over the coming decades? We urge therefore that before any further new build is permitted in the RPG by the School such a master plan should be submitted to AVDC setting out and justifying the likely required new buildings for at least the next decade.</p> <p>We therefore object to the application and urge that it is refused because of the unacceptable incremental damage and precedent for new build on undeveloped areas which will be caused by the two sheds on the west boundary.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this objection, should permission be granted, the pair of sheds in the belt should be fully screened from views from the west by a selection of C18 evergreen shrubs such as Viburnum tinus, common holly, Portugal laurel, yew.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/1853	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 130 dwellings, associated access and parking, landscaping and amenity space and the change of land from agriculture to use as sports pitches/recreational open space and informal open space. Land West Of Moreton Road And Castlemilk, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2020</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. It has not been possible to visit the development site and assess the likely effect of the proposed development or test the assertions in the Heritage Statement, but detailed local knowledge of the Grade I Stowe RPG of members of the Bucks Gardens Trust has informed this response. The heritage statement ('built heritage' statement) by RPS Heritage states : 'It is important to note that the study site shares no physical or visual relationship with Stowe Conservation Area, Grade I Stowe Mansion and associated Registered Park and Garden, located to the north west. Therefore the setting and significance of these assets would remain unaltered.'</p> <p>and : -</p> <p>'The study site is located to the south east of the central point of Stowe Conservation Area and to the east of Stowe Avenue. Due to the distance, topography and mature greenery, there is no inter-visibility between the study site and Stowe Conservation Area. It is considered that the study site makes no contribution to the significance of the Conservation</p>

					<p>Area, and the designated heritage assets that lie within.’</p> <p>We are not convinced that either statement is accurate. The LVIA Addendum provided does not provide accurate or full coverage of key aspects of views from Stowe, and significant visual harm is likely from more than one key viewpoint with the Grade I RPG, particularly in winter.</p> <p>The site is on the north edge of the town of Buckingham and east of the Buckingham Avenue and therefore south-east of the core of Stowe landscape. It falls within the boundary of the historic setting of Stowe identified in 2009 by Land Use Consultants in their Setting Study for the National Trust and shared with AVDC (see Fig 1 attached). This study identified that the Buckingham Avenue is especially vulnerable due to its narrow linearity. The photograph from Viewpoint 10 in the LVIA Addendum, January 2020, taken on the Buckingham Avenue does not face the development site directly to the east at 90 degrees from the road at a point north of the Castle Fields settlement but faces nearly north, and from a point further south it seems. This conveys no image of the direct view, nor provides any understanding of how much more the new buildings on the site would be visible, particularly in winter.</p> <p>In addition long views south from the elevated environs of the Bourbon Tower/ Keeper’s Lodge, a Grade II listed mid-C18 building that is a key part of the design in this part of the park, include the north edge of Buckingham, apparently including the development site (see Fig 2 attached). This view is vulnerable to inadvertent damage from large scale development such as this. It is important to note that the area is beyond the Stowe Conservation Area but within the RPG. In the LVIA Addendum it is also noted that Stowe Castle is potentially affected due to its elevated position south of the Tower.</p> <p>It is also possible that the development would be visible from the field south of the New Inn drive, on a ridge and an important view for historic visitors to the visitor inn as well as current visitors.</p> <p>We ask for detailed analysis and montages of the visual impact of the development in likely views from the Buckingham Avenue, the environs of the Bourbon Tower and the field south of the New Inn drive before a decision is made.</p> <p>If it is demonstrated that the impact is not harmful, we suggest making a condition that buffer zones are planted as the conservation area cannot just be Stowe Avenue itself and the setting and wider landscape needs to be preserved.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>In our opinion, your officers should not approve this application until they can confirm there is no significant damage to the setting of Stowe. The GT/BGT therefore object unless it can be demonstrated adequately that these key vistas are not significantly harmed by the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E19/1864	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Reprofiling of fishing lake and erection of 6 holiday units. The Villa, Oakfield Fisher, Kingswood Lane, Kingswood, Buckinghamshire HP18 0EQ.</p> <p>HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION, WATER FEATURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposal affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on the Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. The site of the proposal is north of Wotton House at Wotton Underwood, adjacent to the Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG). The online documentation contains no Historic or Visual Impact Assessment addressing the potential impact upon the RPG, and we would certainly have expected such information due to the site's proximity to a Grade I heritage asset. Our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) are familiar with the site and their local knowledge therefore informs this response. Our chief concern is the erection of 6 holiday units. We recently objected to the introduction of glamping (18/02771/APP) in a field in the setting immediately south of the RPG and adjacent to the boundary (refused by AVDC), and that aspect of this application is similar in its issues.</p> <p>We are concerned that the application site is in the key setting adjacent to the major north drive and the units will be visible from it. The land is flat and these will be prominent in the rural setting of the RPG next to the main drive at a point which includes an C18 ornamental bridge carrying it, and around which panoramic views were clearly important. Comments from Ruth Benson from your Development & Delivery Team also raise this concern. We fully concur with her that already the Lake damages views from the north drive as the banks appear as unnatural landforms, above the level of the flood plain. Car parking is visible in winter and the house is conspicuous. The addition of the units would therefore worsen an already unsatisfactory situation</p> <p>The units could also be visible from within the RPG from other points including elsewhere on this drive, from the north and north-east avenues and from Windmill Hill, a key viewpoint of the pleasure grounds with panoramic views over the countryside. Below is an image from Windmill</p>

					<p>Hill showing the likely area of visibility.</p> <p>In addition this is yet another example of incremental development, AVDC having granted permission for a substantial two storey house as part of this holding which received consent in 2016 and for possibly other aspects of this holding that were never notified to TGT. AVDC did not consult TGT on this application so we had no chance to comment and review its impact at the time. This house is clearly visible from both the north drive and Windmill Hill, damages key RPG views and we would certainly have objected to this had we been consulted.</p> <p>Regarding re-profiling the fishing lake, we are unable to assess whether this would have a damaging effect on the RPG or the setting as there is no consideration provided of the external appearance, the effects of cumulative development, and the relationship of the fishery and proposed further development to the wider landscape. We ask that you request further information on these aspects before determining the application. We therefore urge you to refuse this application. Notwithstanding this objection, should the application be permitted then we urge you to impose a condition that the units are surrounded by and entirely screened from the drive and Windmill Hill by a belt of local willow managed in the manner of a pollarded, coppiced or stooled plantation to evoke a local traditional landscape feature.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E20/0006	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of Condition 3 - Accordance of Approved Plans of planning permission 18/03053/APP - To change the design of the proposed outbuilding. Hygge Main Street, Dadford, Buckinghamshire MK18 5JY. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.04.2020</p> <p>In 2018, AVDC consulted the Gardens Trust and Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust on application 18/03053/APP. Initially, the GT objected to proposals at this site and we note that revised drawings were submitted as part of the same application. Unfortunately, due to capacity issues, the GT were unable to respond to the revised application although we note it was more acceptable except for the inclusion of rooflights. We note the application was subsequently approved by AVDC.</p> <p>We now understand that the structure constructed is not the structure that was approved under the above application and we thank Buckinghamshire County Council for consulting us on this retrospective application. We had already noted the structure recently and attach a photograph below that was taken at that time.</p> <p>Whilst we regret that the structure is quite substantial and has been</p>

					<p>rotated on its access, it may be that the gable end of the structure is slightly less noticeable in views from the Stowe registered park and garden that the long length of the roof might be. However, what is indisputable is that the large openings overlook the gateway to Stowe Home Farm and the kitchen garden and are highly damaging to the setting of that entrance. We strongly object to the structure in its present form. To use it as garage in our opinion is certainly not acceptable. The structure appears to be designed as a garage but attests to be a home office and gym. If it is to be used as a home office and gym, the two openings should be reduced in scale to create smaller window openings in order to substantially reduce the amount of reflection and light emittance from the building when in use.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E20/0044	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for reserved matters pursuant to outline permission 19/00817/AOP for layout, scale, external appearance, the access, and the landscaping of the site. The original outline planning application was an EIA application and an Environmental Statement was submitted to the planning authority at that time. Land West Of Dadford Road, Zone K Silverstone Park, Silverstone Road, Biddlesden, Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.04.2020</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The site is within the setting of the Grade I internationally significant Stowe Registered Park and Garden (RPG). In particular, it is closest to the early C18 Stowe Woods and Ridings, an extensive woodland landscape laid out by the most important designer of his day Charles Bridgeman. We append the setting boundary drawn up in 2009 for Aylesbury Vale and The National Trust to show the areas of greatest concern of possible impact within the boundary line, which includes the application site. It is not possible to tell the effect on the historic design of Stowe, particularly the views relating to Riding vistas and the north tip of the Silverstone Riding, from the supplied documentation. Considering the international importance of Stowe, we find it surprising and worrying that there is no acknowledgement whatsoever of the site's proximity to Stowe or any other heritage asset. We urge your officers to require the applicants to submit a rigorous Historic Impact Assessment of views relating to the Stowe Woods and Ridings and other key areas within the boundary of the Registered site from which we can assess the level of impact that will be</p>

					<p>caused on the various aspects of the historic landscape. A huge amount of damage was caused by the visible impact of The Wing building, again outside the site, but in direct line of the most important Riding, terminating and dominating one of the most significant designed views. We are therefore highly anxious to avoid a similar blot occurring elsewhere in the setting with similar damaging results.</p> <p>Aspects that may cause visual damage relate in particular to the height and scale of the highest structures and visibility of materials in long views. For this appropriate screening is essential. Questions on screening to be answered include: Is the whole thing screened from affected vistas along the existing ridings? Is it fully screened from the north tip of Silverstone Riding near the race track, and from the west end of Blackpit Riding, from both of which The Wing is visible and damaging? Are the screening proposals or other mitigation methods sufficient?</p> <p>No information has been provided to answer these questions and assess the level of impact on the RPG.</p> <p>Thus we OBJECT to this application and urge that the Council requests sufficient information to allow an informed decision on the visual impact of the proposal. We would be pleased to review the proposals again with the requested information to hand.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Somerford Booths Hall	Cheshire	E20/0120	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for - Works to the Grade II* Listed Hall to redevelop as one single property pursuant to variation of condition application 20/1169C.</p> <p>SOMERFORD BOOTHES HALL, HALL GREEN LANE, SOMERFORD BOOTHES, CW12 2LY.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2020</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Cheshire Gardens Trust which works with The Gardens Trust as the national statutory consultee. For further information see http://thegardenstrust.org/planning-leaflet.html and http://www.cheshire-gardens-trust.org.uk/Aims</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application for listed building consent.</p> <p>Our concern relates to the proposed change from one to two dwellings in the walled garden. The walls are regarded as a curtilage listed structure to the Hall, listed Grade II*.</p> <p>The walled garden is the space which forms the setting for the listed walls. It makes a positive contribution to the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>The proposal for a single dwelling in the walled garden retains the space but the application for two dwellings, if permitted, would result in subdivision and loss of significance.</p>

					<p>The applicant's case for the proposed change is the housing market and the onerous burden of the maintenance of the walls falling to a single owner. Current market forces cannot be permitted to allow development resulting in loss of historic significance and the degradation of heritage assets which are a finite resource. If the walls are appropriately repaired as part of the development their future maintenance should not be onerous. The landscaping for the two proposed dwellings involves the permanent subdivision of the space. The landscaping may be sympathetically designed but there is no guarantee that it will be retained by future owners. For these reasons we object to the proposed change from one to two dwellings in the walled garden as part of this listed building application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Oldway Mansion	Devon	E19/1855	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Temporary closure of apertures to grotto south east of mansion. Oldway Mansion, Torquay Road, Paignton, TQ3 2TD. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Oldway Mansion, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at grade II. The Gardens Trust, formerly the Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the county of Devon.</p> <p>We have visited Oldway Mansion on many occasions, most recently on 11 March 2020 when we met Neil Coish, Principal Natural Environment Officer of Torbay Council, Tony Ely, Chairman of the Oldway Volunteer Gardeners and Paul Hawthorne, Chairman of the Friends of Oldway.</p> <p>We have viewed the Historic England Register map and entry, and the planning application documents on your web site. We would ask you consider the following comments:</p> <p>The Registered site, comprises formal gardens around Oldway Mansion (listed grade II*), with informal pleasure grounds to the east and south, and around Little Oldway (listed grade II) to the north-west; there is a grotto (listed grade II) at the southern end of the formal lawns . A pair of early C20 concrete sphinxes flank the entrance to the east terrace from the carriage court north of the house (walls and sphinxes listed grade II). The</p>

					<p>terrace wall (listed grade II) which runs south parallel to the east front supports fourteen metal urns (listed grade II) with goat-mask handles. Oldway Mansion and its grounds were extensively remodelled by Paris Singer in the French style in 1901-1904. The formal gardens form the setting for the Mansion and were laid out by the influential French landscape gardener Achille Duchene, who was in demand among high French society at the turn of the twentieth century. Duchêne's designs for Oldway echoed closely his restoration of the Petit Trianon at the Palace of Versailles. The rockery and grottoes with cascades into the stream and lakes below were placed in the south east corner of the grounds, hidden from the formal terraces below a ridge but linked to them by the orangery. The commission for this naturalistic area was given to Veitch's and laid out by Meyer between 1900 and 1902. FW was an inspirational garden designer employed by Veitch of Exeter. I attach an extract from FW Meyer (1852-1906) A landscape Gardener in Devon by Carolyn Keep for your information.</p> <p>Oldway Mansion is included on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register because of its 'generally unsatisfactory condition with major localised problems.'</p> <p>Extensive metal boundary fencing was erected around the wider grotto area some time ago because of structural problems and in an attempt to prevent anti-social behaviour. The boundary fencing seriously detracts from the appearance of this once beautiful area, it's experience and appreciation by visitors. We would hope that a more suitable solution can be found before too long and that the boundary fencing will be removed. The metal grills had already been fitted to the grotto apertures when we visited the site on 11 March. The metal grills have been installed in order to prevent unauthorised access into the grotto, which the metal boundary fencing has failed to do. In the circumstances, the metal grills, whilst not ideal, are an acceptable temporary solution.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Endsleigh	Devon	E20/0027	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for expansion by building 3 bedroom holiday cottage and pool on site of redundant fish hatchery. Hotel	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust on the above applications. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The</p>

				<p>Endsleigh, Milton Abbot. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and responds to consultations in the county of Devon to ensure that your Council receives authoritative specialist advice on development proposals affecting historic parks and gardens and their setting.</p> <p>We have visited Endsleigh previously, including the site of the above application. We have considered the planning application documents on your website together with the Historic England map and entries. We ask you to consider the following comments:</p> <p>Endsleigh is included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England. This is a highly selective list, comprising just over 1600 sites in England, with 56 sites in Devon but only five at grade I. As a grade I site, Endsleigh is in the top 10% and is of international importance.</p> <p>The Heritage Assets of Endsleigh comprise the grade I Registered garden, the grade I listed Endsleigh House including terrace wall to the south east and wall to the north east, and Endsleigh Lodge, Walls of the walled gardens at Endsleigh, Stables to the north of Endsleigh House, Sundial in the garden to the south of Endsleigh House, Retaining wall to the raised garden to the south west of Endsleigh House, Retaining wall on the terrace to the terrace to the south east of Endsleigh House, Rockery and Grotto, Dairy Dell Cottage, Well house stone pier and rustic seat in the Dairy Dell, The Swiss Cottage, The Salmon Larder and Ice House.</p> <p>Endsleigh is a picturesque masterpiece, the result of a Regency collaboration between the sixth Duke and Duchess of Bedford, their architect, Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyatville) and Humphry Repton, landscape gardener. In 1809 Repton submitted a proposal for a cottage ornee to the Duke and Duchess but this was rejected in favour of a larger and more lavish scheme by Jeffry Wyatt, who designed the cottage ornee, stables and other picturesque buildings about the estate. In May 1814 Humphry Repton was consulted on the design of the grounds. His proposals for the creation of an extensive picturesque landscape were presented in the form of a Red Book which was completed in late 1814. Endsleigh is acknowledged as the finest example of his work.</p> <p>The landscape principles advised by Repton were largely adhered to by the successive dukes of Bedford, and the picturesque qualities of the landscape were maintained very much as envisaged by Wyatt and Repton right up to the death of the twelfth duke at Endsleigh in 1953. The property was then</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>run as country hotel until it was purchased in 1962 by the Endsleigh Fishing Club. The gardens gradually declined and the storm of 1990 wrought havoc. In 1989 the Endsleigh Charitable Trust was formed with the aim of restoring the buildings, gardens and arboretum. The Colson Stone Partnership were appointed to prepare and implement a restoration plan. The planning application and listed building application are for Expansion by building a 3 bedroom holiday cottage and pool on the site of the redundant fish hatchery at Hotel Endsleigh. The Design and Access Statement accompanying the application states: 'The Hatchery sits in a steep valley adjacent to the Endsleigh Estate in an area of outstanding natural beauty. The existing building is industrial with no architectural merit and currently stands redundant as a former fish hatchery, hidden from view of the B3362 road that passes through the estate by thick woodlands. Although within the boundary of Hotel Endsleigh, a grade 1 listed building, this site could be classified as an industrial brown field site with existing buildings that are late 20th century and have no historical or architectural merit.'</p> <p>In view of the importance of the site, we believe that the applicant should have included a thorough and complete assessment of the historic landscape by a landscape practice that specialises in historic designed landscapes. To suggest that the application site 'could be classified as an industrial brown field site' displays a clear lack of understanding of the significance of the heritage assets of Endsleigh. We would suggest that whilst the Historic England Register entry description is a useful précis, a more detailed landscape assessment is required to advise on this part of the historic landscape. Good conservation practice indicates that any changes should flow clearly from a thorough understanding of the historic landscape and should not compromise the potential for repairs to the historic landscape in the future. We advise that the development needs to be justified in an historical context and considered in relation to the whole estate. The Gardens Trust believes that the arts of architecture and landscape design are inseparable and complimentary, particularly in relation to historic designed landscapes. Your Council may not be aware that in 1989 the Colson Stone Partnership were commissioned by the Endsleigh Charitable Trust to advise on the restoration of the landscape of Endsleigh. The site of the current planning application at Hatchery Ravine was not included in the Colson Stone Restoration or Management Plans for Endsleigh</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>because at that time the land was not in the ownership of the Endsleigh Charitable Trust as it was owned by South West Water Plc.</p> <p>We consider that it is of considerable relevance to the consideration of this application that the Hatchery Ravine was the site for a viaduct proposed by Repton that he intended to be seen from the Coach Road on the approach to Endsleigh House. Repton carefully planned the carriage drive which was designed to reveal dramatic views of the Tamar Valley. Although the viaduct scheme was not implemented, the potential to see the long vista of the Tamar still exists, although in the vicinity of the Hatchery the view is presently blocked by intervening trees. We would suggest that serious consideration should be given to opening up this viewed part of an improvement scheme for the Hatchery Revine, including the removal of all the structures associated with the redundant fish hatchery.</p> <p>The Colston Stone Partnership did reveal the same view as seen lower down the valley, on the Endsleigh Charitable Trust's land, as part of the Heritage Lottery Scheme. The Colston Stone Partnership also identified this key view in the HLF Management Plan. Their plan is attached. It is important that your Council takes into account that fact that the proposed development is located right on the line of this important Red Book vista.</p> <p>The proposed three bedroom holiday cottage is a large two storey building with a pitched roof and a semi basement, making the building effectively three storeys, considerably taller than the existing single storey hatchery building. The west elevation of the proposed building shows full height glazing to the sitting room, which has clearly been has been designed to take advantage of the long vista from the Tamar. There are two trends to a viewpoint so it is reasonable to say, therefore, that the proposed 'cottage' would be seen from the Duke's Drive bordering the river and from paths within the adjoining Georgy arboretum areas. The proposed building with the pool and attendant structures would be extremely harmful to the significance of the heritage assets.</p> <p>Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved 'in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations' (paragraph 184). NPPF paragraph 193 states that 'the more important the heritage asset the greater the weight that should be given to their conservation.' It should be also noted that 'substantial harm to a assets of the highest significance should be wholly exceptional'. NPPF para 195 states 'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm.... is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.'</p> <p>The applicant has not demonstrated that there would be substantial public benefit to outweigh the harm to the significance of the grade I Registered park and garden that forms the setting of the grade I listed Endsleigh House. The proposed development of a three storey holiday cottage and pool on site of a redundant fish hatchery is not a substantial public benefit. Nor has the applicant provided any justification in terms of the historic landscape. 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. The proposed development would adversely affect heritage assets of the highest significance, namely Endsleigh House, a grade I listed building within a grade I Registered park and garden containing a substantial number of listed buildings. The proposed development would cause substantial harm to the significance of these high graded heritage assets which comprise the Regency Picturesque masterpiece created by James Wyatt and Humphrey Repton and therefore should not be permitted. In conclusion, the Gardens Trust objects to the proposed development in the strongest possible terms as it conflicts with National Planning Policy with regard to the conservation of the historic environment. We urge your Council to refuse the planning application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Shobrooke Park	Devon	E20/0054	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Residential development of up to 257 dwellings and upto 5 Gypsy and Traveller pitches; 8.6 hectares of land made available to facilitate the relocation of Crediton Rugby Club; up to 1.1 hectares of land safeguarded for the delivery of a primary school; access arrangements from A3072</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2020</p> <p>The above application has been brought to our attention. We are surprised that the Council did not consult the Gardens Trust on the above application and we are writing to express our concern. As you are aware the Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and their setting.</p> <p>Under the terms of the 1995 Direction set out in DoE Circular 9/95, local planning authorities are required to consult the Gardens Trust on planning</p>

				<p>(Exhibition Way); pedestrian and cycle access on to Pounds Hill/Stonewall Cross junction, Old Tiverton Road and Pedlerspool Lane; landscaping and area of public open space; and other associated infrastructure and engineering operations. Land at NGR 284185 101165 (Creedy Bridge), Crediton, Devon. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>applications which affect all grades of Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, grade I, II* and II. Consultation with the Gardens Trust is a separate process from consultation with Historic England who are the Statutory Consultee on grade I and II* sites on the Register but not grade II. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and responds to consultations in the county of Devon to ensure that your Council receives authoritative specialist advice on development proposals affecting historic parks and gardens and their setting.</p> <p>The above application affects the setting of Shobrooke Park and Creedy Park, both of which are historic designed landscapes of national importance. Shobrooke Park is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at grade II. Creedy Park is included on the Devon Gazetteer of Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest.</p> <p>The Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England is a highly selective list, comprising just over 1600 sites, with 56 sites in Devon.</p> <p>We advise that the development needs to be justified in an historical context and considered in relation to both these historic designed landscapes. Good conservation practice requires that any development or change affecting a historic designed landscape should be informed by a thorough understanding of the historic landscape and should not compromise the potential for repairs in the future.</p> <p>Crediton is a market town retaining historic features and nestling in rolling Devon countryside, its setting, particularly from the east and north is enhanced by three historic designed landscapes. The approach from Exeter along the A377 passes the historic designed landscape of Downes. Set on a ridge overlooking both the River Creedy and River Yeo, Downes is a 17th century country house, remodelled in the 18th century which was the birthplace of Sir Redvers Buller whose family were lords of the manor of Crediton. To the north of Downes lies Shobrooke Park, which is a Grade II Registered park and garden, known until 1845 as Little Fulford, the house was destroyed by fire in 1945, and its replacement sits on the mid C19 terrace constructed for the previous house. To the north west of the application site, and originally adjoining Shobrooke Park to the west, is the historic designed landscape of Creedy Park, situated in a secluded valley between Crediton and Sandford to the north.</p> <p>The three parks were developed over a similar period in the C18 and C19 in</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the English landscape style with later Victorian elements. A key feature of these parks is their inter-visibility in that they were designed to ‘borrow’ each-others’ landscapes enhancing the vistas within each. This group value of three gentry landscapes is unusual and has already been compromised by development in the Lords Meadow area. Further development incursion would erode the historic, geographic and social significance of the parks irrespective of its impact on the setting of Crediton itself.</p> <p>Both Shobrooke Park and Creedy Park were laid out with extensive woodland on the perimeter hillsides to provide shelter from the prevailing winds, to screen the houses and parks visually from public view, and in several cases were designed to provide walks and drives with key views, some, like Long Plantation, still used today. Both estates were developed from deer parks and have extant features of an historic designed landscape: lodges, carriage drives, formal gardens near the house, pleasure grounds with fine specimen trees and open parkland with both specimen and clumps of trees, lakes with a boat house, walled kitchen gardens and in the case of Shobrooke Park ornamental garden structures. Both estates were designed to share each other’s landscapes with designed views as shown on the attached annotated maps and photographs.</p> <p>The application site is agricultural land which is highly visible from Shobrooke Park and from Creedy Park. Pedlerspool Lane itself is an important part of the setting of Creedy Park because, whilst not perfectly straight in its alignment, it is a planned tree-lined avenue approach to East Lodge, which, as the focal point, closes the vista. There is evidence of ornamental planting indicating that the field to the south of the lane was an element of the historic design landscape. Development on the fields to either side of Pedlerspool Lane would completely change the character of the designed landscape.</p> <p>The proposed development of up to 257 dwellings and up to 5 Gypsy and Traveller pitches, the relocation of Crediton Rugby Club and a primary school on the application site would intrude into the landscape, the designed views and would be highly visible from many parts of both Creedy Park and Shobrooke Park. This would without doubt harm the significance of these heritage assets.</p> <p>Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved ‘in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations’ (paragraph 184). NPPF paragraph 193 states ‘When considering the impact</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.' NPPF paragraph 194 states 'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. NPPF para 195 states 'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to... a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm... is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.'</p> <p>We would advise that the proposal for the proposed development of up to 257 dwellings and up to 5 Gypsy and Traveller pitches, the relocation of Crediton Rugby Club and a primary school on the application site, would harm the significance of the heritage assets of the historic designed landscapes of Shobrooke Park and Creedy Park.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed development of 257 dwellings is far in excess of the provision in the Local Plan. Policy AL/DE/1 of the Mid Devon Local Plan sets out how the Council will plan, monitor and manage the provision of housing. Pedlerspool, Exhibition Road is one of a number of contingency sites to be allocated and released in appropriate circumstances. Policy AL/CRE/12 Pedlerspool, Exhibition Road states A site of 21 hectares at Pedlerspool, Exhibition Road is identified as a contingency site for development to be released in accordance with policy AL/DE/1, subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a 165 dwellings with 35% affordable housing to include at least five pitches for gypsies and travellers; b 21000 square metres of employment floorspace; c A suitable site for the relocation of Crediton rugby club d Layout, design and landscaping, including planting on the riverside that reflects the local distinctiveness and its sloping nature; e The protection of the setting of the wider area, including the upper slopes to the south and west for Green Infrastructure and landscaping; f Provision of a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme to deal with all surface water from the development and arrangements for future maintenance; g The provision of serviced employment land in step with the housing at a rate of at least 1 hectare per 30 occupied dwellings unless it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that such an approach would significantly undermine the viability of the scheme as a whole.
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>h This development shall not be commenced until a Link Road between the A377 and Lords Meadow is in operation unless the Council is satisfied that air quality and traffic impacts as a result of the development would not be material.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust considers that the allocation of the 21 hectares of land at Pedlerspool should be reviewed by Mid Devon District Council as the development of this land would cause substantial harm to the significance of the grade II Registered park and garden at Shobrooke Park and the heritage asset of Creedy Park. We consider that there is no justification for the proposed development in terms of the historic landscape. 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 a full appreciation of the significance of the historic designed landscapes of Creedy Park and Shobrooke Park and their setting. The proposed development would cause substantial harm to the significance of heritage assets and therefore should not be permitted. In conclusion, the Gardens Trust objects to the proposed development in the strongest possible terms as it conflicts with National Planning Policy with regard to the conservation of the historic environment. We urge your Council to refuse the planning application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, John Clark Dipl TP (Dist) (Leeds) Conservation Officer</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</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2020</p> <p>We note that minor changes have been made to the proposed development, but these have not addressed the concerns previously expressed by the Sussex Gardens Trust. It seems to the Trust that the University campus is losing touch with its origins as a low rise landscaped campus, respectful of its landscape setting. The Trust therefore stands by its objection dated 3rd February.</p> <p>Thanks for your patience.</p> <p>Kind regards Jim Stockwell Trustee Sussex Gardens Trust</p>

				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	
Stanmer Park	East Sussex	E19/1817	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Provision of new allotments incorporating erection of boundary fencing, 15no raised garden planters, polytunnel, shed, standpipe and recycling/compost area. Land At Northfield, University Of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9BJ. ALLOTMENTS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2020 Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. The site lies within Stanmer Park, which is included on the list of registered Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II designation. Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application. The proposals lie on the edge of the registered area and would be well screened when viewed from most parts of the park. Hence the proposals would not appear to cause harm to the significance of the registered park and, therefore, SGT does not object to the application, nor does it specifically support it. Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust
Groombridge Place	East Sussex	E19/1832	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY TIMBER CLAD SHED WITH PITCHED ROOF (GROOMBRIDGE MEN'S SHED), NEW CROSSOVER TO EXISTING CAR PARK KERB TO CREATE A COUPLE OF PARKING BAYS, AND ASSOCIATED TREE AND LANDSCAPING WORKS. LAND NORTH OF EXISTING GROOMBRIDGE VILLAGE HALL CAR PARK, STATION ROAD, GROOMBRIDGE, TN3 9QX. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2020 Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. The site lies within Groombridge Place, which is included on the list of registered Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II* designation. Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application. The proposals lie on the edge of the registered area and would be well screened when viewed from most parts of the park. Hence the proposals would not appear to cause harm to the significance of the registered park and, therefore, SGT does not object to the application, nor does it specifically support it. Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell

					On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust
Woodchester Mansion	Gloucestershire	E19/1861	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed play equipment. Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Gloucestershire, GL10 3TS. PLAY AREA	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might have an adverse impact on Listed or Registered gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>This proposal to locate a series of sites for play equipment in the woodland accessing Woodchester Park and Woodchester Mansion has merit for the use of the National Trust managed site. It lies within the Listed parkland boundary, but is not considered critical in the overall historic designed parkland which lies further to the East. The proposal will be a distraction for young people moving up and down the long access drive.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal will have a minimal impact in terms of aesthetic integrity of the parkland. Its difficulties may lie in the management, maintenance and life of the installations, and this is for the National Trust to consider. At the end of the day, such installations are reversible.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Great Rissington Manor	Gloucestershire	E19/1877	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for Security fence upgrade to entrance gates and replacement of neighbouring adjacent timber pedestrian gates at The Manor, Great Rissington, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL54 2LN. ACCESS/GATES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might adversely impact on Listed parks, and gardens, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on its behalf.</p> <p>Without going into the minutiae of the many features of heritage significance that are focused at this point in the Conservation Area, it is important to tease out why additional security of this type is seen to be appropriate in this sensitive location. If security measures are needed, the metal security screens proposed are considered invasive and inappropriate in this historic setting created by the associated traditional stone walls. If security is the overriding issue, other forms of protection should be considered.</p> <p>The new gates and screens associated with the Church are matters resolved by a Faculty application from the PCC. As far as I am aware this process is currently not being progressed, but. I would anticipate that should a Faculty application was to be placed in front of the Diocesan Advisory Committee for consideration, it would have to be supported by a</p>

					<p>detailed Statement of Need and a much more appropriate design solution. On this basis GGLT would recommend refusal.</p> <p>Your sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Bunhill Fields Burial Ground	Greater London	E20/0084	I	GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE Bunhill Cemetery CMP consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above Conservation Management Plan (CMP) and for organising such a useful virtual meeting back in March to discuss this impressive draft document. I write on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT). The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LPGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>Bunhill Fields Burial Grounds is an important heritage asset with a long and significant history, the protection of which must always be balanced and harmonised with the needs of the trees and plants which contribute so much to its character and amenity. As with all gardens and parks, the constantly changing seasons of the natural world demand evolving and sensitive management to protect heritage significance of both built and natural assets. And this draft shows a clear understanding of the space and its heritage significance along with the more recent landscape design and natural planting.</p> <p>The inclusion of so many stakeholders, who will on occasion have different priorities, has ensured a well-rounded and detailed document which will help map out the various needs of the space and precisely the built and natural assets within it. Such a CMP can lead to a logical and balanced approach to future management decisions.</p> <p>I do have one question. In Volume 1, Section 1.2. Purpose and Scope, there is a point – 'Suggest actions and projects that the City of London could take forward to meet its vision for the site'. There is no further mention of this vision within the CMP. Presumably, City of London's vision will be informed, if not dictated, by the contents of the CMP? But it would be</p>

					<p>appropriate to clarify this point, or include this vision if it is held within another planning document, for ease and transparency</p> <p>Please keep us informed on the progress of the CMP, its development and any changes.</p> <p>For these reasons, the LPGT commends the draft CMP, notwithstanding the issue with regards the vision for the site held by the City of London.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,</p> <p>Rosemarie Wakelin, Planning & Conservation Project Officer</p> <p>For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group planning@londongardenstrust.org</p> <p>Cc Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer, The Gardens Trust</p>
22A Winstanley Road, Billinge	Greater Manchester	E19/1848	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for residential development of up to nine dwellinghouses seeking approval of access. All other matters reserved. Agricultural Land South Of 22A Winstanley Road, Billinge. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.04.2020</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 and unregistered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We note that your consultation was addressed to The Garden History Society, which merged with the Association of Gardens Trusts in 2015 to form The Gardens Trust. We have reviewed the above application but in view of current government health restrictions have not visited the site. LGT objects to the current application as explained below.</p> <p>Winstanley Park is a private estate and historic designed landscape with origins at least as early as the late sixteenth century. The Park extends to over 180 ha and comprises the Grade II* listed Winstanley Hall, two areas of Scheduled Ancient monuments comprising a former moated site, and several Grade II listed buildings, stables with statute, estate offices and lodge. Whilst the site is not a Registered Park and Garden on the Historic England List, it is nevertheless an important historic designed landscape, which is enclosed by stone walls, largely extant. Although potentially at risk, the Park is at present almost completely intact. The current Wigan Core Strategy Policies Map indicates the Park boundaries for Winstanley Hall Park clearly covering the application site. The western boundary of the relevant Policy EV4D follows Winstanley Road and includes the open land and fields which act as foreground to the historic Park Wall. This policy boundary also encloses the series of lodges</p>

					<p>on Winstanley Road, the Upholland, Park House and Billinge Lodges as well as Swift Gate Farm. The continuity of the historic Park Wall and the woodland backdrop of Gorsey Hill Wood is a strong visual feature over the considerable length of Winstanley Road. This gives integrity and context to the historic features of the Park, and is a feature of high significance. The importance of context and setting is confirmed in Historic England publication Historic Environment Good Practice Advice on Planning Note 3, which endorses the approach in defining the boundary covered by Policy EV4D.</p> <p>The application site also falls within Green Belt so it would be expected that there are fundamental planning issues against any development of this land.</p> <p>LGT objects to this application for residential development within the setting of Winstanley Park which would weaken the visual significance of the Park in this location and bring unwelcome clutter to the land surrounding the historic Winstanley Park.</p> <p>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>
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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you so much for responding to our letter of 13th February 2020 regarding the above application. We are grateful for your response and satisfied with your comments.</p> <p>I hope you stay well in these strange times.</p> <p>Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

				and in walled garden to existing toilet block adjacent to North Lodge. The Vyne, Vyne Road, Sherborne St John RG24 9HL. DRAINAGE/FLOOD RELIEF, ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY.	
Croome Court	Hereford and Worcester	E19/1417	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a ground mounted solar farm, associated works and ancillary infrastructure, including access tracks, underground cables and grid connection substation. Defford Aerodrome, Rebecca Road, Besford, Worcester WR8 9ES. SOLAR	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2020</p> <p>The amendments to the above application were brought to our attention by a member of the public, and as confirmed by my colleague Alison Allighan's email to you of 4th April, we are disappointed that despite commenting on application on 17th January 2020 the Gardens Trust (GT) were not consulted about the updated drawings and paperwork. I have been able to look at the additional information supplied and have shared them with colleagues in the Hereford & Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&WGT). We would like to reiterate our grave concerns about the application as stated in our original letter and even though these come rather late in the day, due to the lack of consultation I hope you will still be able to take them into consideration.</p> <p>We welcome the confirmation in the updated Ecology, Landscape and Heritage Addendum Note (ELHA) by EDP that the site will not be visible from the church tower (where very few visitors go anyhow). However, this dismisses our valid concerns concerning the effect viewed from from the long Eastern Ridge of Brown's Landscape Design (ELHA p5) stating that they identify 'less than substantial harm on Croome Park RPG and, as was the case with the approved 2014 scheme, should once more be found to be outweighed by the scheme's public benefits.' In our opinion this report dodges what will be the major concern of any visitor to Croome (300,000 plus per annum), namely that the eastward prospect is in grave danger of being spoilt by glare from this extremely large installation. We entirely concur with HE's advice (10.1.20) that ' "The natural terrace makes an important contribution to the design at Croome" by defining the parkland and in controlling views out over Defford Common to the south east.' It also states that the 'gap in the tree belt at the eastern edge of the park is understood to be an intentional feature in the landscape design to take in views from the natural terrace of the wider borrowed landscape over Defford Common and towards Bredon Hill.' We would like to repeat comments from our original letter describing early maps indicating a definite intent of creating designed views from within the RPG towards</p>

					<p>Bredon Hill to the south east, encompassing the application site and shown on Plan EDP H4 Masterplan. It is worth stressing that the boundary of the RPG is a mere c100m west of the application site. I have been unable to locate a Dazzle Survey undertaken to show the effect upon the view from Croome Park's eastern ridge. This is a striking deficiency, given that a substantial part of Brown's circuit walk is along the eastern ridge with a view directly onto the application site. We would urge your officers to request one before deciding upon these amentments.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that due to the current travel restrictions due to Covid-19 it has not been possible to re-visit the site to ascertain just how much of the several hundred yards of solar panels and the associated substations, perimeter fencing, access tracks etc will be visible from this key view from the ridgeline, altering this very much for the worse, this for at least the next three decades.</p> <p>We would like to reiterate our very strong objection to this proposal and repeat our previous suggestion that if this proposal is accepted, any section of the proposed solar area which is visible from within the RPG be kept clear of solar panels, and that the existing woodland belts elsewhere are enhanced, to ensure that the priceless landscape at Croome is safeguarded for future generations.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Goldings	Hertfords hire	E19/1819	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey dwelling. AT: Land To The Rear Of The Green, North Green, Goldings Estate, Waterford, North Green, Hertford. RESIDENTIAL	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee, of which HGT is a member.</p> <p>We OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>Goldings is a notable 19th century landscape around a George Devey house with the views from north park directed southwards towards the south park and Hertford. This was achieved by careful planting of tree clumps, most of which survive.</p> <p>The siting of the proposed dwelling would destroy those views across the park round a designed clump, towards the east and the open countryside. It would add to the cumulative harm that other development in the immediate area has already caused, contrary to the NPPF Chapter 16. The design of the proposed building is unsympathetic both to the original house and the more recent development, contrary to the NPPF Good Design principles.</p>

					<p>There is no justification within the application for a dwelling for a rural worker, in an area primarily of private amenity grounds. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, as this is, should be weighed against public benefit (NPPF 196). There appears to be no public benefit from this application.</p> <p>At the time of the original development (2000) an S106 and a Landscape Management Plan (rev 2018) were drawn up. These clearly state that the area proposed in this application for development is to be part of the communal grounds for the residents of the Goldings Estate with this land to be managed, maintained and enhanced with the objective of maintaining its character (LMP).</p> <p>We consider that this application harms the significance of a designated heritage asset without any offsetting benefits and should be refused.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/0017	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Garage conversion to habitable accommodation and alterations to openings. 52 Beningfield Drive, London Colney, Hertfordshire AL2 1Ux. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The site is set within the registered park of Napsbury Hospital and is part of the setting of the locally listed buildings remaining from the Middlesex County Asylum.</p> <p>We note that the Design and Access statement omitted these designations and is therefore incomplete</p> <p>On the basis of the information given in this application we do not wish to comment.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Hemel Water Gardens	Hertfords hire	E20/0040	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of first floor retail storage/office space to duplex flats. Construction of two floors above existing building and three storey rear extension to create 28 new flats comprising 13 x 1 bedroom flats, 8 x 1 bedroom duplex flats, 3 x studio flats and 4 x 2 bedroom flats . Upgrade to rear servicing yard to improve	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2020</p> <p>Whilst we regret yet further erosion of the heritage assets of Hemel New Town along Marlowes with loss of original roof line, scale and period detailing, we have no comment to make on any effect the development will have on the Grade II Water Gardens.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>

				vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking and refuse storage provision. 160 Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire HP1 1BA. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	
24 Pentley Park, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0047	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Hornbeam (T4), Fell 1 x Oak [T6], Fell 1 x Acer [T10], Fell 1 x Hornbeam [T13]. 24 Pentley Park, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7SB. TREES OUTCOME 24.04.2020 No objection	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.04.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. WHBC's letter refers to felling of 4 trees but the application form refers only to 2 (T4 and T6). No arboricultural report is available on the website so we are unable to comment in detail. We would support the replacement of the trees, preferably all those mentioned in the consultation letter of 14 April 2020, with, suitable ongoing maintenance including watering until such time as the trees are established. The Modernist houses of this area were designed to be seen in a semi-natural woodland setting and this should be conserved. Kate Harwood
1 Stonemead, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0056	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce 1 x Blue Cedar Tree [T1] by 30% Reduce 1 x Copper Beech Tree [T2] by 30%. 1 Stonemead, Welwyn Garden City, AL8 7LX. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.04.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. No reason has been given for the proposed works to trees itemised in this application and no prior advice appears to have been sought from the the WHBC Tree officer. We would support these works only if the condition of the trees or stability of the house at 1 Stonemead necessitated it. As we are unable to determine that from this application we defer to the WHBC Tree Officer's opinion. Kate Harwood
Gisburne Park	Lancashire	E19/1812	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Discharge of condition 4 (WSI), 5 (specification and methodology for works), 6 (specifications of dismantling, labelling, and safe storage of historic fabric), 7 (specifications of pointing finish) and 8 (roof specifications) of Planning Permission 3/2018/0652. Dog Kennels by River Ribble Approximately 90	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.04.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. 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. LGT originally objected to the application 3/2018/0652 because of the lack of detail concerning the original proposals for the marquee and the inadequately defined scope and methodology of the works to the Dog

				metres North East of Gisburn Bridge, Gisburn Park, Gisburn BB7 4HX. MISCELLANEOUS	<p>Kennels. The proposal for the marquee was removed from the application during consideration of the application and the numerous conditions have given some comfort to securing a satisfactory outcome in relation to reconstruction. We have reviewed the current application documentation and have no objections to make. However we would caution the use of lead roof coverings in such a comparatively isolated and unsupervised location. We suggest that this is carefully reviewed.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me, by email consult@lancsgt.org.uk.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Lytham Hall	Lancashire	E19/1878	II	PLANNING APPLICATION RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF COMMERCIAL LIVERY STABLES (BUILDING 4) AND CHANGE USE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS TO COMMERCIAL LIVERY STABLES (BUILDINGS 1, 2 AND 3) TO CREATE A TOTAL OF 45 COMMERCIAL LIVERY STABLES. AND FORMATION OF NEW ACCESS FROM BALLAM ROAD. HOME FARM, WATCHWOOD DRIVE, LYTHAM, LYTHAM ST ANNES, FY8 4NP. EQUESTRIAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2020</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 no objection to the principle of use of the existing buildings for commercial livery, which represents an acceptable use of redundant agricultural buildings. However we would like to draw attention to the significance and fragility of important surviving features within the stables construction of block 4, and the lack of detail of what works are likely to result from planning permission.</p> <p>The current application lies entirely within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Lytham Park and provides the setting for Grade I listed Lytham Hall. We are pleased that Home Farm itself has been assigned a Historic Asset Record (HAR) which has wide coverage:</p> <p>"This includes the Farm House and some of its rear appendages, cobble walls within the stabling, the perimeter wall of the kitchen garden and its crested entrance gate piers. All these structures merit Non Designated Heritage Asset status".</p> <p>We understand that the perimeter wall of the kitchen garden survives as part of building 4, including one of the gate piers referred to in the HAR. This image below dating from early 1900s shows the view looking north</p>

					<p>into the walled garden, and the present block 4 now abuts the right hand gate pier in the photograph. The heritage statement does not include any detail of these surviving structures.</p> <p>Of greater concern are assertions in the Design and Access Statements and the Heritage Statement indicating that demolition of the stables would have no historic impact. Although the structures are largely industrial in nature and of little historic interest, the original walls are to some extent protected by block 4. It is stated in paragraph 4.3 of the Heritage Statement that any demolition of the stables could be achieved without any harm to the historic wall. Careful archaeological and historic assessment of the historic structures will be required before any demolition or alterations take place. We suggest that a condition is included in any planning permission preventing any removal or alteration to historic structures within the building defined as block 4 without separate specific approval.</p> <p>We have no comments on the new road access being created at Ballam Road.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me: 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>
Harris Knowledge Park	Lancashire	E20/0026	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Hybrid planning application for the development comprising: i. Full application for the conversion and refurbishment of Clayton Hall and the Harris Conference Centre to provide 12no. residential units, refurbishment works to allow Glenrosa House, Oak House, The Chestnuts, The Poplars, Holly House, The Laurels and The Lodge to be utilised as residential dwellings, the retention of Ashleigh House and Beech House</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.04.2020</p> <p>We have noted this application and are informed that The Gardens Trust (GT) has no record of being notified 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. We note that the Garden History Society (GHS) is listed as a consultee, (and former address of GHS is still functioning for giving notice to the GT), but as a result of lack of notification, this response will fall outside the Council's deadline.</p> <p>The Harris Knowledge Park comprises the former Harris Orphanage (including its wider site and the Recreation Ground) and is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden on the Historic England List. LGT objected to</p>

				<p>as residential dwellings, retention of the Club House, Laundry House and Yew Tree House and demolition of Pond House and the garage, alongside the construction of 8no. new build detached dwellings and associated access, parking and landscaping works; ii. Outline planning for the construction of 58no. detached dwellings of up to 3no. storeys in height alongside associated access and landscaping works and installation of a substation (access and layout applied for). Harris Knowledge Park, Garstang Road, Preston, PR2 9XB. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>earlier applications to redevelop this site for residential development in 2013.</p> <p>Our position remains that we object to this development which represents a total change of character of the Conservation Area (only reappraised in 2017), and a complete loss of that part of the Registered Park and Garden comprised in the recreation ground. This can only be concluded as substantial harm as defined in NPPF, and therefore requiring exceptional circumstances (paragraph 194) to justify approval. Residential development of such a conventional style and density cannot be assessed as demonstrating exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me, by email conservation@lancsgt.org.uk.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Quenby Hall	Leicesters hire	E19/1880	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Works to north courtyard including demolition of single storey store and erection of new single storey building, installation of raised terrace and alterations to steps. Works to east courtyard including installation of raised terrace, alteration to access steps and landscaping. Alterations to cellar entrance on south elevation. Demolition of existing greenhouses and former dairy building and erection of an outbuilding for a pool house, orangery, workshop and garage with minor operations to former kitchen garden wall at the open</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2020</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. Due to the current restrictions on travel due to the Coronavirus lockdown, it has not been possible to arrange a site visit. Consequently our comments are entirely desk based and all information has been taken from the online documentation supplied.</p> <p>It is clear that a great deal of thought has been given to the proposals, and pre-application discussions with HE and the Conservation Officer of Harborough District Council have led to some amendments to the original plans. The excellent Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and Design and Access Statement have been very helpful in making the impacts of the proposals clear. We would agree with the HIA conclusion (8.20) that around the house 'the heritage implications of the proposals are relatively modest and improve pedestrian access and safety'. The changes in the vicinity of the swimming pool area would also seem to be an improvement on the current condition of the site, with limited affect upon the setting</p>

				air pool location; associated external works. Quenby Hall, Barley Leas, Hungarton, Leicestershire. BUILDING ALTERATION	and significance of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Quenby. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Belvoir Castle	Leicestershire	E20/0014	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from agricultural to leisure use. Land Adjacent To The Engine Yard, Woolsthorpe Road, Belvoir. CHANGE OF USE	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2020</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 Leicestershire Gardens Trust (LGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and do have concerns relating the change of use of the application site from grazing land within the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) to a dog exercise area with associated obstacles, large shed and fencing. The documentation supplied is incomplete in several respects, and we would like further details in order to satisfy ourselves as to the impacts upon the RPG. We would also like to see more details both about the permanent access to the site and the landscaping proposals to ensure they are appropriate for the historic setting of the park which have not been included in this application.</p> <p>The area chosen for the shed lies within 'a vast and impressive designed landscape laid out around Wyatt's spectacular grade I listed hill-top castle and ornamented by finely-wrought buildings' (HE listing group value). The site is also significant as it is shown as fields, on the Capability Brown plan (1780). Both (Belvoir Lodge, outbuildings or the Engine Yard buildings were constructed later.) It is also close, according to the archaeologist's comment, to the suspected earthwork remains of a C11th Benedictine Priory and possible related cemetery. Should your officers permit this application, we would suggest a watching archaeological brief.</p> <p>We appreciate that the dog obstacles will be constructed of natural timber and the fencing is reasonably unobtrusive, but the large shed will not be so discreet and is of a far more permanent nature. We are assured that there will be limited views from Belvoir Castle to the site but again, the supplied documentation does not show any photomontages of views from the Castle to the site. We would like to satisfy ourselves that, during winter months, the shed in particular will not be unduly prominent. Belvoir Lodge is adjacent to the 'doggy day care area' and although not a listed house, it</p>

					<p>is part of the historic estate and enjoys a designed garden occasionally open for charity/church fetes. We have concerns that the noise of the dogs could prove a nuisance as well as impinge of views from the Belvoir Lodge garden. Your officers will be familiar with Historic England's Good Practice Advice, Planning Note 3 (2nd edition), published, 2nd Dec 2017, Part I Settings & Views which states (p2) that 'Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity' – clearly relevant in this instance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Grimsthorpe Castle	Lincolnshire	E19/1871	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing agricultural/storage structures and construction of new Estate Yard comprising sheds for storage of plant equipment, agricultural/estate vehicles, machinery and materials, with workshops and welfare facilities. The Piggery, Grimsthorpe Castle Estate, Swinstead. DEMOLITION, AGRICULTURE, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDINGS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2020</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT), a conservation and education charity, considers it necessary and appropriate to comment on this planning application. As a member of The Gardens Trust (GT, formerly the Garden History Society) LGT works closely with the national statutory consultee for all planning and development proposals affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. LGT advises the GT thanks to local knowledge and, on occasion, comments on their behalf.</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust would like to express concerns regarding the proposed new estate yard at the Piggery in Grimsthorpe Park. We question why landscape plans mention a screening tree belt but are not included in this proposal. The main concern is the scale and 9 metres height of the new storage building intended to replace old farm/piggery buildings within the new estate yard, for reasons as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. its detrimental impact on rural, unspoilt views, both from the B1176 road (between Swinstead, Creeton & Little Bytham) across to the heart of the historic Grimsthorpe Park, and also, from within the park, out to peaceful, unspoilt, country vistas. 2. its damaging impact on the view from the nearby farmhouse south east, altered from the 18C 'Rubbing House', a pavilion depicted in John Grundy's 1753 Survey Book (Lincs Archives 3Anc 4/35/A) and likewise from the open area within the registered park now managed as farm fields and pasture, where the early 18C Foal Field Race Course was established (as depicted in a panoramic Kip/Knyff engraving of Grimsthorpe Castle and Park, c1711). 3. the harmful impact of a 9 metres high, large modern structure in modern

					<p>materials on the original, largely unchanged, major approaches, namely, the early 18C Four Mile Riding and the early 19C Chestnut Avenue (now tarmac road) to Grimsthorpe Castle from London through the Grade I Park.</p> <p>4. the likely degradation of the view from the HE Grade I 'Summer House' (c.1720 by Sir John Vanbrugh) now a private dwelling (with C19 raising at the rear and alterations, possibly due to J. B. Papworth, and C20 alterations) near Swinstead, overlooking Grimsthorpe Park on the north-western edge.</p> <p>5. the visual impact for visitors on arranged, specialist park tours, including for heritage and wild-life experts/ enthusiasts, during the open summer months, and sometimes out of season. Visitors to the heart of the park would even glimpses of a modern large, 9 metres high structure out of keeping and distracting from the historic park ambience in the areas of the afore-mentioned Ridings, Foal Field Race, the SSSI site among the old quarries and ancient oak pasture.</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust therefore consider it necessary to object to this current planning proposal.</p> <p>It is however hoped that further consideration will be given to amend these proposals. We recommend for instance extending the proposed belt of woodland to include one or better still both corners of adjacent fields west, across the road and opposite the new Estate Yard. This would help to minimize any detrimental effects of the new estate yard upon the setting and views of this HE Grade I ancient park, the premier seat and most significant historic estate in Lincolnshire.</p> <p>Your sincerely, Chairman</p>
Gunby Hall	Lincolnshire	E20/0074	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Siting of an additional 5 no. static caravans and the re-positioning of 1 no. existing static caravan.</p> <p>Construction of internal roads and additional vehicular parking areas and the erection of an entrance barrier. Existing caravan sales area on site to be removed.</p> <p>GUNBY LAKES CARAVAN PARK, STATION ROAD, GUNBY, SPILSBY,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2020</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust wish to remain neutral regarding this proposal. In our view, this proposal would have little or no impact on the setting and views from the HE Grade II historic park and gardens at Gunby Hall owing to a reasonably dense belt of trees on the park boundary.</p> <p>Steffie Shields</p>

				LINCOLNSHIRE, PE23 5SL CAMPING	
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E19/0795	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion for the extension and remodelling of Studley tea rooms and surrounding landscaping. Studley Royal Tea Rooms Studley Park Ripon North Yorkshire HG4 3DY. CATERING	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for sending the Gardens Trust (GT) and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) a copy of the Heritage Impact Scoping Report (HIA), a detailed document which we have read extremely carefully. Please note that we have received a copy of the analysis of the NT's 'Scoping Report' (March 2020) that has been made separately and independently of the GT and the YGT by Peter Goodchild and have incorporated various items from it into this letter as we are in complete agreement with these points. I am sorry that it has taken a while to get back to you, but as I explained I have not been well, and am only now catching up.</p> <p>As you know, we have very strong reservations about the proposals for the Café Building at Canal Gates (CG), Studley Royal and although the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Scoping Report goes into considerable detail it does not allay our concerns about the whole concept. Our understanding is that a Scoping Report should address the scope of the heritage impact on the significance of the whole World Heritage Site (WHS) and also its parts, and the 'what and why' for more visitor facilities and interpretation for such an internationally important place. In our view the Scoping Report seems to be asking that the HIA confirms what has seemingly already been decided. We do not think that the report is acceptable as a basis for an objective assessment of the impact that the current proposals will have on the heritage values of the WHS.</p> <p>We have the following observations and concerns related to the report:</p> <p>1.0 Outline description of the proposal</p> <p>1.1 'Even the best of the facilities' architecture is incongruous in this setting'. Despite the historic development of the visitor entrance/facilities at the Studley end/CG we maintain that this was not in the original Aislabie vision and is currently harmful to the significance of the WHS. By doing further development at CG the existing harm is increased. Is this what we want for a WHS?</p> <p>1.3 On our visits we have never felt 'unwelcome' at the CG entrance. A guide-book and map are available and the NT staff/volunteers are very pleasant. What level of welcome, orientation and interpretation is required at this point that could not be given elsewhere? We totally agree that good interpretation etc has been needed at Studley Royal for many years but we consider that the Visitor Centre (VC) should be the place for doing this with</p>

					<p>perhaps some minor interpretation at the Lodge/CG.</p> <p>1.4 We agree that restoration of the historic bosquet should be implemented.</p> <p>1.5/6 We agree with the principle of improving the visitor facilities but disagree with the location. It has not been made clear what other options have been carefully assessed. The impression given is that there are no other options.</p> <p>We disagree with the current proposal to greatly extend the present Lodge to the south-east over what is currently open space.</p> <p>What is the origin of the 'oval enclosure'? Is it known that it was created in the time of John or William Aislabie?</p> <p>The problem with emphasising the visual links between the new building and the historical gardens and landscape, is that however pleasant the views from the new building, the new building will inevitably be an alien addition to the historical landscape. The historical character of this exceptional site should be the most important consideration. It is not just a typical NT property but a WHS.</p> <p>Although we note the experience of the report participants/writers there may be others who could have given even greater level of understanding and sensibility of outstanding historic parks, gardens and designed landscapes and how the myriad of 21C pressures on them can be managed.</p> <p>1.7 The car park is a scar on the hillside to the west of the Lodge/CG area within the designed landscape. What assessment has been done to look at car parking elsewhere? There is also the option of using or expanding the existing car park at the VC and making that the starting point for a frequent shuttle service. (We note that at Tyntesfield for example, there is a good shuttle service to the main VC that seems to work extremely well.) Whilst some improvement to the reception building at CG is perhaps necessary, we query the comment that the proposals have not been 'maximised' to what the NT would generally consider necessary for this volume of visitors. This is not a 'normal' NT property, this is a WHS of international importance, as demonstrated by its name: WHS' designation is Studley Royal Park including the ruins of Fountains Abbey, not the NT's description Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal.</p> <p>We query what is the NT's 'outline understanding of how the estate as a whole can adapt to meet higher visitor numbers if such is required in the future'? Will there need to be further extension of the CG and Lodge facilities and further harm?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>2. Present Site Condition</p> <p>2.2 What is the factual basis for the statement that ‘his original intentions were very soon modified to service the practical needs of Studley attracting many visitors’?</p> <p>The use of hyperbole is not helpful and the contraction in the number of ancillary buildings from the situation is not a justification for adding new ones now if this is what is meant.</p> <p>2.8 We agree that the ‘value of the site to people, through how they end up experiencing it’ is important. But the over-riding experience should be the historic character as opposed to modern facilities, important though they are.</p> <p>We strongly support the NT’s charitable purpose is to provide physical and intellectual access to special places.</p> <p>2.10 We accept that the VC will remain as the primary point of entry, and in our view this needs to be related to the facilities provided at the Lodge/CG. The VC is the place for interpretation and most facilities. The important question that needs resolution is how to make the CG easier for visitors to reach from the VC. We strongly feel that the VC should be the hub for Studley with CG being left readable for its original entrance use, yet kept as undeveloped as possible.</p> <p>A special effort needs to be made to resolve the ‘legal’ problem that revolves around gaining access across land owned by the Shoot. Shooting is being increasingly curtailed, led in part by public opinion, and it is possible that even in 10 years time shooting as we know it now will not be a viable proposition. The outcome for Studley must be what is best for the WHS in the long term. If the shooting issue were resolved would this open up another, less invasive alternative? If so, then the money would be better spent here than on a large new intrusive building in a highly sensitive location. In the meantime, a better interim solution could be courtesy transport on a more regular basis between CG and the VC.</p> <p>It is not the case that there is no other route to the CG other than from the Abbey. There is an existing and specially constructed footpath that runs parallel with the main access road to the VC and as far as the Obelisk Gate. At this point the Deer Park, near St Mary’s Church, can be entered on foot or by vehicle and CG can be accessed both on foot across the Deer Park or by vehicle on the road.</p> <p>Is it actually impossible to provide facilities elsewhere along the circuit and why?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We agree that visitors to areas of the park outside the pay barrier need to be catered for.</p> <p>3. The World Heritage Site and Statement of Outstanding Universal Value</p> <p>3.7 Is Studley Royal an example of the English style of garden design or does it represent an important stage before the 'English Style', and one from which the latter may have developed? It can be argued that Studley Royal perhaps owes more to French thinking than it does to specifically English ideas.</p> <p>We agree that the layout of the garden is determined by local topography. It can also be argued that it is an imposed geometrical layout, but one where the geometrical design deliberately compliments the underlying natural landform, bringing Nature and evident Art together. But it does not operate in the same way as the English naturalistic style, which was intended to be free from geometrical elements.</p> <p>The gardens at Studley Royal were not created 'around' the ruins of Fountains Abbey even if the ruins are a very important adjunct to the gardens. As a modern perception, it is reinforced by the location of the modern VC and the lack of easy access from and to the CG.</p> <p>3.8 We are concerned that the NT has not yet been able to conclude its preparation of a 'List of Attributes' for the WHS. We do not know the nature and cause of the problem given the NT's exceptional experience of managing landscapes and historic parks and gardens in particular. Looking at the interim 'List of Attributes', whilst all the stated attributes are applicable, the list is significantly lacking in that it does not describe the character of the landscape as a whole, nor identify its main component areas, or the relationships between them, and them and the whole. These are main and crucial attributes, and yet the interim 'List of Attributes' is to be used as a key criterion in the HIA. This does not encourage confidence in the judgements made by the NT in the HIA.</p> <p>4. How alternatives to change were considered</p> <p>Our comments on the current state of the list of attribute and associated issues also apply here and at 5 below.</p> <p>5. Outline Methodology and terms of reference for the HIA</p> <p>Our understanding is that the HIA is to be carried out by the NT which gives rise to queries about impartiality. In our view an exterior body should undertake the HIA.</p> <p>We are also concerned that Historic England (HE) and the local planning authority Harrogate Borough Council (HBC) have been closely involved in</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the formulation of the proposals, which leads us to ask about their independence in making judgements about the outcomes of the HIA. (We do not however, know what were the terms of reference in the pre-application advice that was given to the NT by HE.)</p> <p>6. Consultation</p> <p>6.1 We consider that before anything is managed, suitably qualified professionals should correctly identify conservation issues. ICOMOS-UK ought to have been consulted at the outset before any design work was undertaken and the opening paragraphs of the HIA prepared.</p> <p>7. Key impacts of the development</p> <p>7.4.1c 'Visual impact on the development and its wider context: This is likely to prove to be the most sensitive aspect of the development proposal.' We agree that the visual impact will be the most sensitive aspect of the development proposal. And in our view this makes development at CG untenable.</p> <p>7.4.2. 'Clearly views ... will be considered, as will kinetic views....' This should have been carried out much earlier; right at the beginning of the process. The new structure should not impinge on the lake at all especially as this is the key axial view from where Aislabie had intended to build his house. The importance of that view, first depicted by Balthasar Nebot, is enormous. It is of the portal leading from the park into the wonders of the water garden; one of the great set-piece historic garden views in the UK. And it is extraordinarily ingenious, the axis running from the viewpoint, across the lake to the cascade and fishing pavilions, and beyond that along the length of the canal and thence beyond the garden to the tower Aislabie had built on How Hill a mile and a half away outside the park: the view is a work of landscape art. The development site is right in the heart of that view: from the viewpoint you will look down on its roof and its area will be quite clear.</p> <p>We note the contrast between the circumspection with which the VC was located well outside the setting of the Abbey, while this building is located in the centre of the grade I registered landscape, and in the centre of arguably its key vista. Is that harm offset by benefit? Emphatically, no, not to the heritage significance of the place; there is no clear benefit to the interpretation or understanding.</p> <p>In conclusion we strongly support the NT's charitable purpose to provide physical and intellectual access to special places and the great conservation, repair and presentation work that has been done over many</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>decades to sites owned and managed by the NT. However, as we have explained we remain very concerned about the proposals for the Café Building at Canal Gates, Studley Royal and although the HIA Scoping Report goes into considerable detail it does not allay our concerns about the whole concept.</p> <p>The GT/YGT is unable to endorse these proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Grounds Associated with The Retreat	North Yorkshire	E20/0016	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 3 storey healthcare centre including 46 bed-spaces, associated treatment rooms and other ancillary floorspace, primary and secondary access points, car parking, servicing areas and landscaping works. Plot 2A, The Retreat, 107 Heslington Road, York. MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.04.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. 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 site lies immediately to the east of The Retreat which is on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at Grade II*. It is separated from The Retreat by Heslington Road which is in effect a lane bounded by mature trees. The Retreat dates from 1792-96 and is the earliest example of the expression of so-called moral therapy in an asylum estate landscape. It was the most influential model for public asylum estates during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, its example being developed but not entirely superseded. It was influential beyond England, in Europe and North America.</p> <p>While the original layout has been somewhat altered and expanded in the nineteenth century, the surviving layout incorporates the area which has been little altered since the nineteenth century, and is of the highest importance in asylum history for the influence it had in publications relating to the therapeutic use of the grounds; and is thus significant in the mid-late nineteenth century flood of public asylums. It is also still used for the purpose for which it was intended – an extremely rare survival. See NOTE 1 below.</p> <p>The whole of the area to which this planning application relates is rich in heritage assets in addition to the historic park and garden, and includes The Retreat, Grade II*, Stables and coach house with attached mortuary, in the grounds of The Retreat Grade II, also summerhouse, Garrow Hill Grade</p>

					<p>II, Retreat and Heslington Road Conservation Area and Curtilage of the listed walled garden, historically associated with the Grade II listed Garrow Hill. Development of the site has the potential to impact on all these highly significant heritage assets.</p> <p>The proposed development site is an important piece of the open landscape of the area with a significant visual importance being on a slight rise. It is part of the Green infrastructure corridor no. 7 'Tilmire', which is of district value, as identified within the 'Green corridors' evidence base for York City Council emerging local plan (eLP). The site is 'open' in character and has a rural/ parkland feel which will be severely damaged by this proposal; the 'markers' the applicant placed to delineate the height and extent of the proposed development were visible over the fence/ boundary treatment making it clear that the development will be damaging. See also Design and Access Statement Part 2 Fig 28 p31. This also illustrates the likelihood of future requests for tree removal to enable more light to the windows.</p> <p>In our view the proposed development is too large for such a site and the whole design is unsuitable. While green roofs are admirable, they will not compensate for the loss of green space and are not the answer to a building which we consider is too big and uninspired. The car parking is likely to spread when the building is in use. The large mature trees which are such an important landscape feature are likely to have their roots damaged both during the building work and subsequently, and some of the proposed planting such as the Scots pine almost against the building is very optimistic. The new hedgerow planting is cramped and we consider that the existing hedges are liable to be damaged during construction. Wild flower planting requires much more work than many people realise and we question whether the maintenance of the gardens/grounds has been considered carefully. In essence the site is too small for the building and all the car parking resulting in the design for the gardens/grounds being hampered by the lack of space. We do not understand how this proposal will help the mental health of its patients; it is well known that mental wellbeing can be improved by horticulture, trees, and general green space and calm surroundings but we find it difficult to see this in the proposal. See NOTE 2 below.</p> <p>Although we understand that this proposed healthcare Centre for the Schoen Clinic York will provide highly specialized care for Adults and potentially children and adolescents with eating disorders, personality</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>disorders, and other associated complex conditions, we note that The Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust question the need for this clinic although others support it.</p> <p>We concur with the comments from the York City Council Conservation Architect and the Landscape Architect and the points made by Historic England.</p> <p>We agree with Historic England writing in their response letter of 6th Nov 2019, Significance para 3: 'These extremely special buildings and designed landscaped surroundings, strategically placed on the edge of the City, established York in the forefront of pioneering mental health provision in the UK and the World. This is a very rich heritage and legacy the City should be more proud of.' (In addition, this rich heritage can be said to drive tourism with its substantial economic benefits.)</p> <p>We do not consider that this development would comply with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, July 2019, February 2019), Para 184 notes that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. We do not consider that this proposal is compliant. Similarly, with paragraph 193 which calls for great weight be given to the asset's conservation. And we cannot see that the proposed development would address paragraphs 194-6.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust object to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p> <p>NOTE 1: FROM: Sarah Rutherford, The Landscapes of Public Lunatic Asylums 1808-1914, PhD thesis, 2003 Appendix II. Ms Rutherford quotes from Samuel Tuke, Description of The Retreat (York: Alexander, 1813), 22-23. 'It was resolved in June 1792 that a piece of land should be bought and a building for 30 patients be erected on it, 'in an airy situation, and at as short a distance from York as may be, so as to have the privilege of retirement; and that there be a few acres for Keeping cows, and for garden ground for the family; which will afford scope for the Patients to take</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>exercise, when that may be prudent and suitable'. It was planned that the distance from the city should allow privacy to the patients, although the proximity would also allow for convenient communications and deliveries with the provincial centre. It was also intended that the provision of grounds for the use of the patients should include more than just the usual, confined exercise yards.</p> <p>The situation of the establishment and its setting were to be 'cheerful'. The building was sited on a low hill, with a 'delightful and extensive prospect all round', in a situation which provided 'nearly all the circumstances which were deemed likely to promote longevity'. This included the provision of ample fresh air which not only prevented the perceived spread of infection: Tuke believed that the clear, dry air which The Retreat benefited from was also specifically favourable to the recovery of lunatics. He reasoned that 'the general effects of fine air upon the animal spirits, would induce us to expect especial benefit from it, in cases of mental depression'.'</p> <p>NOTE 2:</p> <p>A spatial analysis of proximate greenspace and mental wellbeing in London, by Victoria Houlden, João Porto de Albuquerque, Scott Weich, Stephen Jarvis, published in Applied Geography, Volume 109, 2019, Scott Weich, Professor of Mental Health at the University of Sheffield, said: "Contrary to popular opinion, up until now the evidence for the link between green space and mental wellbeing has been pretty circumstantial. By combining advanced statistical and mapping methods, we've shown that the effect is real and substantial. Basically, we've proven what everyone has always assumed was true."</p> <p>Professor Stephen A. Jarvis, Director of the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Urban Science at the University of Warwick, said: "The EPSRC-funded Centre for Doctoral Training in Urban Science, hosted at the University of Warwick, has been tackling difficult urban questions for several years. Much of this research has been to provide evidence, resulting from the application of data-analytic methods, to support decision making by local councils and government agencies. "This is the first study to provide concrete evidence of how urban greenspaces may improve mental wellbeing in the broadest sense, and should therefore lead to healthier, happier and more productive urban landscapes in the future."</p> <p>https://warwick.ac.uk/newsandevents/pressreleases/green_space_is</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					Also: The Well Gardened Mind, Sue Stuart-Smith, William Collins, 2020.
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/0080	II	PLANNING of Condition No's 1, 2 & 20 of Planning Permission Ref. C6/500/63J/CMA for the continuation of waste disposal operations for a further 6 years from 31 December 2018 until 31 December 2024 with a further year for restoration, to amend the final restoration levels across the site and to amend the final restoration scheme for the southern part of the site; Allerton Park Landfill, Moor Lane (Off A168), Knaresborough, HG5 0SD. LANDFILL/WASTE	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2020</p> <p>Our colleagues in the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) have shared a copy of the email you sent them dated 25th March 2020 relating to the above application. Due to staffing capacity issues and illness, we have not had an opportunity to respond till now. Please accept our apologies for the delay and we hope it is not too late to make some comments.</p> <p>As a follow up to your email the YGT has just become aware of a recent High Court Ruling associated with Section 73 applications [Finney v Welsh Ministers - 5 Nov 2019] which we feel relates to this Section 73 application at Allerton.</p> <p>a 'variation of condition' [a section 73 application] can only be used to vary conditions on an application, and not change the operative part of an approved application</p> <p>In our opinion, the proposals for Conditions 1, 2 and 20 really do considerably change the operations of the original application in a variety of ways. Therefore, based on the High Court ruling, it should be refused. The ruling is quite new but we feel it will have a profound impact on this often used 'loop hole' by developers and look forward to learning your observations on the ruling and the application.</p> <p>In addition, we do not agree with the Officer's finding, that any long-term landfill for future phases can be resolved as and when submitted. On the basis that NYCC are aware that the incinerator will have a 25-year operational period, and have only agreed a landfill provision of 5/6 years, we feel this is rather short sighted and lacking in due diligence by Officers recommending approval and Council Members agreeing to the application. We await your response to the Section 73 ruling and issues of due diligence before the present application is finally decided</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stanford Hall	Nottinghamshire	E20/0090	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of timber club house. Miniature Golf Course At Stanford Hall, Melton Road, Stanford On Soar, Nottinghamshire. GOLF	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2020</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 Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and would be grateful if you could</p>

					<p>take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have looked at the extremely limited documentation online and are disappointed that there is no mention whatsoever that this proposed wooden clubhouse/shed is sited in the middle of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden of Stanford Hall (RPG). The applicant has failed to provide any documentation describing the significance of the heritage asset(s) affected, and therefore the application is contrary to the revised NPPF para 189. At the very least we would have expected a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to accompany the application, and we question whether the absence of this, invalidates the entire application?</p> <p>Stanford Hall has undergone major development as a UK rehabilitation centre for injured MOD personnel, with a great deal of money spent on infra-structure for the residents. Sadly, in our opinion, none of the work undertaken appears to have given any thought towards the heritage significance of the parkland in particular the important early C20th gardens of Julian Cahn's period of ownership. We understand that a listed art-deco swimming pool was demolished with permission. Although in itself the erection of a timber club house is relatively 'minor', the proposal takes no account of the aesthetics of the setting of the RPG, and appears very pedestrian when compared to the Grade II listed thatched tennis pavilion only a few metres to the south of the proposed site. We would have expected a more sophisticated and carefully thought out proposal, and an application which at least acknowledges the importance of the registered site.</p> <p>The GT/NGT suggest that your officers request an HIA in order to make a more informed decision. The current proposals have in our opinion, a negative effect upon the setting of the RPG, and we would hope to see a less utilitarian clubhouse which does not detract from the listed tennis pavilion or the setting of the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hawkstone	Shropshire	E19/1835	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of single storey extension to the NW elevation and alterations; conversion of first floor of outbuilding as ancillary to the	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.04.2020</p> <p>We have received notification of the above application, which was forwarded to us from Shropshire Council and also from the offices of The Gardens Trust (formerly The Garden History Society), on March 18th 2020. The Gardens Trust is a Statutory Consultee in planning matters relating to historic parks and gardens which are included on the Historic England</p>

				<p>existing dwelling affecting a Grade II Listed Building . Rangers Lodge, Marchamley, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY4 5LE. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>Register of Parks & Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England and we are responding on its behalf in this matter.</p> <p>Ranger's Lodge is a Grade II Listed Building and a Listed Building Consent application has also been submitted for this proposal (20/01061/LBC). The Application has however taken no account of the fact that Ranger's Lodge sits entirely within the historic Registered Park of Hawkstone Park, which is included at Grade I on the Historic England National Heritage List. A Grade I listing means that Hawkstone Park, in common with Hawkstone Hall, is of exceptional significance. Only around 9% of all Registered Parks in England are Grade I, making Hawkstone Park very special. It is of the highest significance in terms of Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Hawkstone Park is notable in part as the work of the renowned 18thcentury landscaper William Emes (1729-1803), as well as for its important late-18th century Sublime landscape. Only twelve of the 1,670 Registered Parks & Gardens in England have this Sublime association and of these, three alone including Hawkstone are Listed at Grade I.</p> <p>At present, the Applicant's Planning and Heritage Statement does not make any assessment of the impact of the proposed developments on the significance of Hawkstone Park, as required by Paragraph 189 of the NPPF. This is especially important as Rangers Lodge is located immediately adjacent to the former historic eastern approach to Hawkstone Hall from Marchamley, and several of the proposed alterations are likely to be clearly visible both from it and elsewhere within the Registered Park and Garden. We request therefore that an assessment of the impact is undertaken and that determination of the application is delayed until such assessment is made available. Given that Rangers Lodge, which is the focus of the proposed alsterations, is entirely within the Registered Park, it has the potential to be visible within and to impact on views from, of and across the Park from all directions. The assessment should therefor consider the impact of the proposals 'in the round'. Reference is made in the existing Planning and Heritage Statement to the 'rear' of both the listed house and stables buildings, such considerations are of doubtful application in dealing with the impact of the proposals on the listed buildings and are certainly irrelevant in assessing the impact of the proposals on the surrounding Registered Park.</p> <p>For the present, and with reference to our comments above relating to the position of Rangers Lodge, and the need for a proper assessment of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>impact of the proposals, we make the following specific comments regarding the proposed development(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The massing of the buildings as viewed both from the park and in views of the park will be prominent. Notwithstanding the roofline of the existing single-storey extension to the main house, the multiple roof apexes of the intended single storey buildings, visible in both the proposed S.E. and N.W. Elevations (see Drawing No.3862196) are in conflict with the simple hipped roof arrangement of the main house; • the historic stable block, forming part of the curtilage of the Listed Building itself, is an important feature of the complex, but this does not appear to have been taken into account within the proposed development; • in particular, the proposed multiple glass door and extended window arrangement to the south elevation of the detached stable block, with its associated external decking, are incompatible with its historic form and fenestration and would detract from its appearance and impact negatively on the Setting of the adjacent Grade I Registered Park and Garden; • no account appears to have been taken of the loss of the stable block's interior fabric, including its historic stalls; • no reference has been made in any of the 'existing' or 'proposed' drawings, of the large tree shown on current aerial photographs, in the immediate location of the existing garage. <p>For the present, we Object to the proposals in their current form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Mary King for Shropshire Parks & Gardens Trust & The Gardens Trust</p>
Nettlecombe Court	Somerset	E20/0007	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Prior Notification for proposed agricultural building (38.5m x 22.5m). Land Adjacent To Combe Barn, Nettlecombe (Easting 305128, Northing 138100). AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2020</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 Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Due to the current travel restrictions due to Coronavirus we have been unable to make a site visit and have had to rely entirely on the online documentation for our response. Our immediate concern is the proposal's extremely intrusive effect upon a rural location immediately adjacent to the Grade II registered Park (RPG) of Nettlecombe Court, the boundaries of which lie directly across the B3190 from the proposed barn site. The</p>

					<p>applicant mentions three other sites which were considered, saying that Chidgily would have been best apart from the fact that the land was steep and only farm tracks led there, consequently requiring the expense of a new access track. We would have liked to have seen more details of this site, and again, due to the impossibility of a site visit, we have been unable to ascertain the local situation and see if it was any less damaging.</p> <p>The Detailed Site and Appearance Information document states on p7 that 'Members of the public will not be able to see the workshop at all from the grounds of Nettlecombe Park'. Your officers will be familiar with HE's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017, Part I -Settings and Views, which states (p2) 'The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.' It goes on to say (p2) : 'The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity'. Page 4 also states : 'Because the contribution of setting to significance does not depend on public rights or ability to access it, significance is not dependent on numbers of people visiting it; this would downplay such qualitative issues as the importance of quiet and tranquillity as an attribute of setting, constraints on access such as remoteness or challenging terrain, and the importance of the setting to a local community who may be few in number.' Clearly the frequent passage of extremely heavy and large machinery would negatively effect the setting of Nettlecombe Park in all the ways mentioned above.</p> <p>The Detailed Site and Appearance Information, Revision 1 makes clear on the photo on page 10 and accompanying text, that the proposed barn will 'certainly be visible from the B3190 through the existing access gate and partially visible over the existing hedgerows from approximately a two hundred metres leading up to this junction and one hundred metres leading up to this junction along the un-classified road. The view will mainly be of the screening trees but the whole front of the workshop will be visible from certain angles.' The 100 trees which are to be planted to screen the building will take many years to achieve maturity and it is questionable whether they will screen the building adequately within the next 30 years.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We also are somewhat confused by apparently contradictory statements about carbon payback times. In the Agricultural Workshop – Sam Cowling Revision 1 document, the final page states that the construction materials will generate 148 tonnes of carbon with a carbon payback of 50 years, with the trees apparently offsetting carbon at 3 tonnes a year. In the Detailed Site and Appearance Information, Revision 1, on page 10 it says the site will be carbon negative within 21 years due to the planting of 100 trees around the barn.</p> <p>We feel that the applicant has not sufficiently taken into consideration the effect of this very large building, and crucially the volume of heavy machinery which would regularly access it, in relation to the Grade II RPG of Nettlecombe. Whilst we sympathise with the requirement for a centrally located site to service their holding's machinery repair, in our opinion, this site is entirely unsuitable.</p> <p>We strongly object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Babington House	Somerset	E20/0018	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Repairs to mortar and stone work. Replace missing and rotten oak lintels and replacement of existing iron gate. Babington House, Vobster Cross To Hatchet Hill, Babington, Frome, Somerset. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2020</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 Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and have no objection to the proposals. The heritage and icehouse statements were excellently prepared and were very thorough. They will prove really useful to the SGT for future reference.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Graves Park	South Yorkshire	E19/1840	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of 5 existing modular buildings and siting of two new modular buildings for use as staff office with staff/public WCs and animal isolation unit and provision of</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.04.2020</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</p>

				<p>wheelchair access ramp. Graves Park Animal Farm, Hemsworth Road, Sheffield, S8 8JE. HYBRID</p>	<p>of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Graves Park is a significant and well-loved park and green space in Sheffield. It is the largest public park in the City and forms the setting for Norton Hall (grade II*). The historic park retains much of the parkland character of the original grounds of the hall and, with its varied topography gives the community various recreational opportunities. In 1976, 22 acres of agricultural land adjoining Norton Hall was acquired by the Recreation Programme Committee which became the rare Breeds Centre, now Graves Park Animal Farm. The Norton Conservation Area also borders the animal farm site.</p> <p>The development proposed by this planning application will use the footprint of the existing units but take up less space than the current building area. The proposals have been developed to safeguard the mature trees within the vicinity of the development. There should not be any increased impact on the historic park nor on the Conservation Area or the Local Nature Reserve which is situated to the north of the Farm.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application and support the opportunities that the farm provides for the community in Sheffield.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Charlecote Park	Warwicks hire	E19/1883	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use former coach house from deer larder to biomass boiler house and underground heat network to the Main House, Stable Block, Cafe and Orangery. Charlecote Park, Church Road, Charlecote, CV35 9ER. BIOMASS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.04.2020</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Due to the current Government imposed travel restrictions due to Covid-19, this response is necessarily a desk-based assessment which is informed by the online documentation supplied. Charlecote Park is a Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) and the biomass boiler is to be situated within what is currently a cold store with associated cooling plant inside a Grade I coach house/deer larder. We have no comments to make upon this aspect of the application.</p>

					<p>We have look carefully at the plans for the installation of pipework along the proposed heat route and are happy that the National Trust have made such a thorough assessment of tree health, root zones etc, so that once the archaeology is complete, the least invasive route can be decided upon. We are satisfied that the trees which will be most affected by the proposed main route are mainly poor quality (T61) or reaching the end of their 10-year life (survey 2009) T15, T35 and T53. The one tree in prime condition likely affected, T25, is a yew which is naturally resilient and which with care will survive without too much damage. We support the use of the Airspade method where possible and are satisfied that best practice - the 'No Dig installation', will be used for whatever route is eventually settled upon. We will be interested to discover whether investigative research undertaken will throw further light upon the state of the canals when they were filled in and whether they are indeed a 'sump' holding moisture, and if the investigation uncovers the original source of water for the canals. The GT/WGT have no objection to the proposed work as from the documentation supplied it does not appear to have a detrimental effect upon the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E20/0030	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed alterations and improvements to the Warwick Boat Club, to include: demolition of 1no. squash court and part of existing club house, and replace with two storey extension; redevelopment of the Court 11 to create two synthetic clay courts with floodlights; replacement boathouse on the site of the existing boathouse to include a small stores extension; replacement of existing bowls green with an enlarged synthetic bowls green with floodlights; removal of some trees together</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2020</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We welcome a Masterplan for the site to encourage planned rather than piecemeal development. Comparison of Drawing 101 dated July 2019, with the existing site plan is helpful in this regard. As you are aware, the boundary of the Grade I Warwick Castle Park and Garden registration includes the river Avon up to Castle Bridge, reflecting the conscious design of this view. The boat club is therefore an important element in the setting of both Castle and park.</p> <p>We welcome the reduction of parking spaces on site from 32 to 30, and hope that with improved access from Banbury Road, more members will be encouraged to park in the St Nicholas car park opposite. To this end the</p>

			<p>with replacement planting; remodelling of the Banbury Road access to provide improved access arrangements. Warwick Boat Club, 33 Mill Street, Warwick, CV34 4HB.</p> <p>SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>new post code giving the address as Banbury Road (The Planning Design and Access Statement (PD&A) para 2.2) will be helpful. Whilst there are some tree losses, especially around the existing car park, in our opinion, increased planting on the eastern border of the Boat Club land and the new landscaping below the new tennis courts 11 & 12 compensates for this.</p> <p>We very much appreciate the inclusion of visualisations which we requested in our previous response to W/19/1526 and also photographs within the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), especially photographs 8 and 9. Photograph 9 in particular from Castle Bridge which borders the Grade I RPG indicates that the tree cover in summer will partially screen the new boathouse but we would reiterate our previous comments (GT/WGT letter 1.11.2019 re W/19/1526) regarding a ban on lighting after 9pm to mitigate the significant adverse effect of illumination visible from the bridge at night. The photograph of the view of the Club from Caesar's Tower (HIA p54) indicates just how obvious the tennis courts are, especially their lighting. Increased illumination for the two new courts 11 & 12 and the bowling green can only add to this damage. The visualisation of the Club House extension (Fig 11, HIA p53) shows clearly that the first-floor windows of the 2 social spaces have large windows whose lights will be visible from Warwick Castle and some of the houses in Mill Street. We would suggest that if your officers grant permission for this application, a condition be imposed that as soon as internal lighting is required, blinds must be lowered in these rooms to prevent light spill. The PD&A also refers to the substantial glazing on the new gables facing the tennis courts (3.13). We would suggest that the same conditions be imposed here and on any other windows which may increase light spillage at night. We are pleased to see that the solar panels originally proposed have now been omitted. Heat reclamation from the buildings and a heat pump from the river would be a more sympathetic way of reducing carbon emissions and heating the premises.</p> <p>The design of new extension is an improvement on the current squash court building and we have no additional comments to make upon the redesign of the boathouse, which we can see will be of great benefit to the Club's rowers. It is clear that the Club has gone to a great deal of trouble to balance the requirements of their members with the restrictions of the site and the heritage impacts. The Masterplan drawing indicates that if implemented the current premises will be incapable of incorporating any</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>further development, and any future requirements should be sought on other less sensitive locations.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Compton Verney	Warwicks hire	E20/0082	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION (Retention of) decking with new timber and wire mesh fence. Compton Verney House Estate, Compton Verney, Warwick, CV35 9HZ. MISCELLANEOUS Erin Weatherstone</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2020</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have read the Design and Access statement and looked at the proposed construction method. The existing platform is in a very prominent location directly across the lake from the house. We agree that the wire mesh will not be particularly visible but feel that the proposed fence structure is somewhat utilitarian for such an important location. We wondered whether something a little more discreet might be considered?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Sedgwick Park	West Sussex	E19/1841	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for the erection of mobile stables and storage shed. Erection of an outdoor riding arena with fence. Sedgwick Lodge, Sedgwick Park, Horsham, West Sussex. EQUESTRIAN</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2020</p> <p>Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. The application site lies just within the boundary of Sedgwick Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. Representatives of SGT have studied the documents submitted with the application and in particular notes the concerns mentioned by the Conservation Officer in an e-mail dated 3rd Sept 2019 in which he advised "The existing character of this part of the park is open fields and although these structures are not unexpected in the Sussex countryside they are not attractive additions. I am satisfied they add to the accumulative impact of twentieth century development within the historic park, diluting its character and this is exacerbating the harm. The impact on the registered park is a material consideration and together with the harm within the setting of North Lodge I take the view that the structures are inappropriate development without public benefit".</p>

					<p>Although an amended site plan was submitted on 24th January 2020, this does not appear to change the harm mentioned by the Conservation Officer and this cannot be validated by a site visit due to the Covid-19 restrictions. In these circumstances Sussex Gardens Trust concurs with the comments of the Conservation Officer.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust. Copy to: The Gardens Trust</p>
West Dean	West Sussex	E20/0001	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retrospective approval for the upgrading and resurfacing of an existing private forestry access road on the West Dean Estate. The proposed description of development is as follows: "Retrospective resurfacing of section of private single-track lane." : West Dean Estate, Town Lane, West Dean, Chichester, West Sussex PO18 0QZ. ROAD</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.04.2020</p> <p>Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. The application site lies just within the boundary of West Dean, a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have studied the documents submitted with the application and the objection dated 7th Feb 2020 submitted on behalf of SDNPA Landscape Architect.</p> <p>The land form has been altered a little and perhaps not very subtly (banks just chopped back vertically along the first few metres on the road side of the entrance gates) and the surface is more formal and drive-like in character. In the image from summer 2019 this looks new and rather bright. However the harsh edges are in soft chalky soil that will very quickly slump and grass over while the concrete surface in this relatively sheltered position will quickly obtain a patina that will reduce its surface to a similar colour to a chalk track.</p> <p>In the judgement of the Trust, any adverse impact on the significance of the Park to the west will be minimal. For these reasons SGT does not object to this application, nor does it specifically support it.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Shibden Hall	West Yorkshire	E19/1797	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Shed and veranda for Ice Cream sales. Mereside Visitor Centre, Shibden Park, Godley Lane, Halifax, Calderdale HX3 6XG. CATERING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.04.2020</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</p>

					<p>works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Shibden Hall House is a 15th Century and later manor house and is listed grade II*. The landscape park is grade II on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens and was laid out for the owner Jeremy Lister in the 1830's when the estate was managed by his daughter Anne Lister. She employed the architect John Harper of York to remodel the Hall and provide proposals for structural works in the grounds which were implemented by William Gray of York who also worked at Clumber Park.</p> <p>We understand the great difficulties everyone is in at the moment; we haven't been able to access the documents on the website. Shibden Park is an important heritage asset and we underline the importance of having well-designed and sensitively sited interventions. We would be pleased to be consulted when the documents are available.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Horton Park	West Yorkshire	E19/1833	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> <p>Construction of 11 dwellings and associated works. Land Off Cousen Road, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD7 3JX. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.04.2020</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 – Horton Park (grade II). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This planning application is located immediately to the south of Horton Park on land that was formerly the Joseph Nutter Orphanage built in 1888, ten years after Horton Park was opened. The Orphanage which was unlisted but a feature building at the southern edge of Horton Park, was demolished fairly recently. Its historic link with the park was evident through the matching pedestrian entrances and matching walling adjacent to the footpath at the park's southern boundary.</p> <p>Horton Park, opened in 1878, was designed by William Gay, one of the finest Victorian landscapers in the north. Gay is perhaps best known for his cemeteries, including Undercliffe Cemetery, (established 1854), and Toxteth Park Cemetery, Liverpool (opened 1856), but he also designed</p>

					<p>parks including Saltaire Park (Roberts Park). He was one of the most imaginative and gifted designers of the period, using "raised and sunken terraces to enhance the complexities of the landscape" such as the grand terrace at Peel Park.</p> <p>Map evidence (particularly OS 1893) shows the original layout of the grounds in front of the orphanage is in a simpler style but similar to that of Horton Park and was also likely to have been designed by Gay. In particular the footpath between the park and the orphanage, designed to be lower than their grounds, is in the style of Gay. This enabled the park and orphanage to share borrowed landscapes across specifically designed opposite sections of low boundary walls. Originally it is most likely that metal railings would have topped these walls to enable the reciprocal views to be appreciated.</p> <p>We regret the loss of the orphanage building. As the site is now vacant/derelict, in principle we have no objection to housing. However, we do have concerns about this application.</p> <p>This application squeezes eleven dwellings into the site and very close to the park boundary. It appears to be over-development. Trees will need to be felled and those remaining are likely to be impacted both by the building work and afterwards. This is in contrast to the Nutter Orphanage that had been set back by perhaps twenty metres giving an apron of greenspace to visually flow into the park and vice versa.</p> <p>We consider that the proposal, with dwellings so close to the boundary will adversely affect the significance of the park and this will be further compounded by the loss of tree/bush groups adding to the 'urbanisation'.</p> <p>The layout of the proposed development as seen from the Park is in a contrasting rigid geometrical style and would include parked cars and tarmac. We note the controversial proposal for the housing estate adjacent to the Higher Coach Road, Saltaire in the 1950s, which was resolved by adopting a layout which preserved the open green space between the fronts of houses so as to be sympathetic to the "the pleasant rural atmosphere of the area." Could something like this be achieved on the site of the Orphanage?</p> <p>We note that in this proposal none of these large family houses would be built with a garage. Not only will this lead to views from Horton Park being marred by cars under the present proposal, but due to the lack of any indoor storage space for bicycles, gardening equipment, power tools etc. there are likely to be additional buildings erected.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>As the land adjacent to the north-east boundary of the site would be completely privately owned there would be no control over the landscaping of these plots and hence their contribution to the setting of Horton Park. We totally agree with the pre-application enquiry response, (p12, Supporting Statement) that the trees along the boundary should not be retained within domestic curtilage, but in areas of public or shared open space maintained through a management agreement.</p> <p>The blue palisade perimeter fence has been identified as being a "negative attribute" (Supporting Statement, p.12). We agree that this is partly due to its unsympathetic colour but equally its style is not aesthetically pleasing nor indeed suitable for a residential site. We advise that the original boundary wall is restored and topped with new metal railings reflecting the original period style. We note that original decorative metal railings were still extant in Horton Park in 2014. We recommend that railings are painted a very dark green colour, for example in the shade, "Invisible Green". (Black was not considered to be a good colour for metalwork during the Victorian period.)</p> <p>We have not seen a detailed landscaping proposal for this site. On the Proposed Site plan is indicated "Steps Concrete" for Plot 9. Are these new steps to replace original steps down to the Gateway leading to the Park? These original steps are likely to have been stone and were probably in situ before the demolition of the orphanage building took place.</p> <p>In conclusion we consider that this planning application as submitted will harm the setting and significance of Horton Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Lydiard Park	Wiltshire	E20/0011	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Siting of Propane gas tank. Lydiard House, Lydiard Tregoze, Swindon SN5 3PA. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2020</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 Wiltshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The online documents show the tank in this retrospective application to be sited in a fairly large cleared area. The Heritage Statement says that the tank is to be screened by planting and there is a photograph (from a</p>

					<p>different location) of a high fence of dark green railings with a white painted tank visible inside. In order to avoid any visibility of the tank we would suggest that it is screened with a solid dark green fence and that the new planting is comprised of evergreen shrubs which are properly maintained into the future.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--